
Sent: 13/11/2025 9:57:24 PM
Subject: DA2925/1549, 4 James St Manly.

I am objecting to the proposed development at 4 James St. Manly, as it has a very destructive impact on my adjacent property, 3a James St.

The proposed development is excessively high, and takes most of the winter sunlight from my house.

The shadow diagrams show how well my first floor rooms receive winter sunlight, at 9.00 a.m., midday, and 3.00 pm at the winter solstice, now. The proposed shadows show no sunlight penetration until well after midday, and not to all windows on the first floor.

The diagrams are misleading or inadequate as they do not show the winter sun entering my living room windows on the ground floor. The sun also comes into that room close to midday, midwinter.

The diagrams do not show the overshadowing of the solar panels on my roof in the morning. The diagram showing 9.am., Winter solstice is confusing.

At present, my house is extremely comfortable in winter. We turned heating on 3 days last winter, using reverse cycle air conditioning.

HEIGHT.

The proposed new house is unnecessarily high, causing much of this overshadowing. Drawing DA111 shows the Eastern, James St elevation of the house and section through the garage, and the elevations of 3 and 3a James St adjacent to the south. The outline of the existing house, built 1904 is shown dotted.

Drawing DA110 shows a section through the proposal, showing heights of 3.600metres from basement garage floor to ground floor level, 3.600 metres from ground floor to first floor, and a ceiling height of 3.000 metres in the first floor bedrooms. The roof is shown to be pitched at 30 degrees.

Drawing DA 109 shows ground floor living room with floor to ceiling height of 3.200 metres (nearly 11 feet, old measurements).

The garage and basement rooms have minimum ceiling heights of 2.700 metres, while the thickness of the ground floor, above the garage, is shown as 900 mm thick. The construction details are not shown. Does it need to be this deep?

The excessive height of the building is the major cause of overshadowing of my house. Should the bedroom and living room floor to ceiling heights be reduced to 2.700metres (9 feet) my solar access would be vastly improved.

At the ground floor, floor to ceiling height could also be reduced to 2.700 metres, surely the 3.200metre ceiling height is unnecessary, when it causes such a negative impact to neighbours.

I will also lose sunlight due to the new building footprint where the house projects further westward on the south west corner, but the proposed increase of the distance between the

new house and my boundary will allow more planting.

Lowering the floor to ceiling heights will not affect the efficiency of the room plans proposed. It will reduce the room volumes making mechanical heating and cooling more efficient. 2.700 ceiling heights are more than adequate for ceiling fans.

STATEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS.

I believe that this statement is very subjective. While the statement is flattering to the proposed new building, the statement ignores the historic relationship with this present building and the immediate neighbours, 5 and 6 James St., built by the same builder in 1904-5 (See Histories of James and George Streets, compiled by Dr. Terry Metherell).

No 3 James St., with the same builder, was significantly rebuilt about 20 years ago, but retained many of the original footings. The historic nature of 4 and 5 are still readily visible. No 6 has a 2nd storey addition, but most ground floor details are still visible. While none of the buildings have been given heritage listing, they do make considerable contributions to the interest of the current street scape. I believe that the loss of No. 4 is regrettable.

Page 24, clause 3.4, Amenity (Views, Overshadowing, Overlooking, Privacy, Noise) attempts to understate the impact on 3a and 3 James St. The proposed upper storey windows to the west and the balcony from Bedroom 1 to the east will overlook the front terraces of No 3a and No 3.

Overshadowing will be significant to No 3a

Clause 3.5, Sustainability, justifies Basix approval of the proposed building, but ignores the significant reduction in functioning sustainability for 3a James St.

LANDSCAPING.

The landscape plans show the removal of significant trees, designated T7 and T8. They are prescribed trees and are beside my northern boundary. The justification for their removal was the excavation for a swimming pool in that corner of the property. This pool is now relocated under the house, and the planted area around these trees has been widened.

I have discussed this issue with Mark Kokot, from Rain tree consulting, and he agreed that this removal is no longer necessary.

I am interested to see proposals to plant Tuckeroo, (*Cupaniopsis anacardioides*) in zone 3 of the proposed gardens. The claim is that mature size of Tuckeroo is 4 metres. This is quite wrong. Tuckeroo is a littoral rain forest tree native to the mid north coast. It can grow in excess of 15 metres, as in Addison Rd., close to the corner of Reddall St., Manly. The tree can have a very dense canopy, and is objected to by local bush regeneration people as it seeds prolifically into Sydney bushland.

WASTE WATER AND SEWERAGE.

The deep excavations and south western extension of the building footprint will cut through the existing sewer line serving 4, 5 and 6 James St. The existing pipeline runs parallel to the western wall of the present house, then runs down towards James St under the retaining wall on the boundary between Nos 3A and 4. These pipes are old terra cotta, presumably dating from building construction. Towards the street fronts of the buildings the pipes kink into part of my front garden, then travel out to the street.

Three years ago part of the pipeline was repaired due to leakage, but the present system is very overloaded, the new house has one bathroom and swimming pool on the basement level, one bathroom on ground floor, 3 bathrooms on first floor.

No. 5 has had a top floor addition and no 6 has become 3 apartments. This new project should be an opportunity to replace the antique common pipeline with systems designed for 21st century needs.

CONCLUSION

I deeply regret needing to forward my objections to this DA now. I had several times offered Mr. and Mrs. Fenton that I would be happy to meet their architect and discuss the project while it was being developed. I also recommended that their geotechnical engineer could look at the rock and strata under my house, work that had been taken to underpin the original rock footings of the 1904 house on which my house largely stands and work needed for the installation of my lift. A certain amount of grief and money could have been saved had they accepted my offer.

I am very committed to Environmental sustainability, which includes community sustainability and good neighbour relationships. My house has had solar panels since 2011, we attempt to live sustainably. I have been a member of many community associations, on several of the committees, and Council advisory committees including the former Manly Heritage Committee.

I am also an active Bush Regenerator on Pittwater's Western Foreshores, and with South West Rocks Community Dune Care on the NSW Mid North Coast.

I regret that I had not been able to contribute positively to this project and to neighbourhood harmony.

We recently installed a lift in 3a James St., to make aging in place easier. I am about to turn 82 years old (20/11/25). I am not excited about a year including massive rock excavation, noise and dust, then ending living in a house that was once sunny, now overshadowed.

Alan Yuille.

B. Arch, UNSW, Grad Dip. Housing and Neighbourhood Planning UNSW. M.Environmental Studies, Macquarie University. Landscape Technician Higher Certificate, Ryde TAFE, Grad Dip Ed.