From:	DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au
Sent:	22/08/2024 11:12:07 PM
To:	DA Submission Mailbox
Subject:	Online Submission

22/08/2024

MS Lesley Lawson
97 cLONTARF ST
Seaforth NSW, Australia NSW 2092
[redacted]

RE: DA2024/0986 - 99 Clontarf Street SEAFORTH NSW 2092

Lesley Lawson
97 Clontarf St
SEAFORTH 2092

Northern Beaches Council
https://eservices.northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au/ePlanning/live/Public/XC.Track/Submission.aspx?id=2466361
Att: Jordan Howard

Application Number: DA2024/0986
Proposed Development: Construction of a carport and associated works
Land to be developed: 99 Clontarf Street SEAFORTH NSW 2092

Dear Jordan
Thank you for your time today to discuss this project.
My next-door neighbours, Ian & Cath, the owners of #99 Clontarf St, let me know they were planning a carport to the Southeast corner of their property. I advised at the time that I was supportive in principle. Viewing the application, I have significant concerns regarding the DA. Unfortunately, due to extenuating circumstances, discussions are not currently possible between Ian & Cath and me. I ask Council to consider my points of objection (and suggestions) and address them in your assessment process.
Councils' website shows; Engineering Referral Response - ERR and Landscape Referral Response - LRR. These are based on the Applicants submitted materials which include omissions, notably in the Survey which does not accurately represent the existing front yard: - ground levels, common boundary fence and vegetation. This could lead to misinterpretation of the submission; I have prepared an accurate drawing which I will forward separately in the next day or two.

BULK
The proposed structure is overly high (3.61m above natural ground at SE corner, with a further 0.6m rise for roof fall). This is beyond necessary interior clearance for a carport (2200mm by AS2890.1, see Drg A09). The structure facing the street is excessively wide, 7.4m including the roof over pedestrian entry gate from street (apx 60% of street frontage). The size & bulk of the proposal is out of character with the street, currently and into the future, (properties set

high above the street with steep & rocky front yards, such as #99, #101, #103 and #107, have different needs to provide car accommodation than others in the street). The bulk will result in:
1. Adverse impact on streetscape.
2. Permanent overshadowing of my garden - proposed roof is higher than an existing hedge in #99. The section beside proposed carport starts 2.5m into the property, is currently 3.1m ht, (soon to be reduced by negotiation, with #99, noting 2.5m ht is a common community standard).
3. Overbearing to my front yard. Side set back of 1.1m and 3.61m ht fails the third ht setback requirement.
4. The interior of the carport will not be shielded from view within my yard by the existing low common boundary fence. The proposal does not adequately address resolving this.

ENGINEERING
CARPORT - DRIVEWAY
The ERR for the proposal imposes a condition reducing the width of the vehicle crossing to 3.75m and the width of the driveway at the boundary to 5.5m, to maximise on street parking. Currently there is insufficient space between #97 and #99's vehicle crossings for a single car, I request the repositioning of #99's vehicle crossing to provide a full (5.5m long) on street vehicle space between #97 and #99's vehicle crossings.
Driveway (kerb to vehicle hardstand) does not comply with Council's standard transitions profiles, particularly relating to vehicle scraping as they cross from Clontarf St into to the driveway. Drawings A09 & A10 demonstrate clearance at the entry to the carport but not at the kerb line. It is my experience (from a recent local DA) that Council insists on establishing proof of compliance with their standard prior to approval. Introducing a 1:10 transition at lower end has implications for the overall design of the car hardstand, which is already at maximum slope limits.
Considering the issue of Bulk to neighbour and streetscape, the proposed carport is wider than necessary at 6m, a width of 5.5m is sufficient to accommodate the overlapping of adjacent door swings of the AS2890.1 Parking Envelope.

STORMWATER
The Stormwater system as it exists overflows into my property during rain. Sand (washed from the dirt surface of the side path) blocks the grated drain at the southeast corner of building during moderate rain. The water then flows down the bank (hedge garden bed), over the low rendered brick fence, into my property. A current temporary fix only redirects the water down the driveway. Downstream, the terracotta pipe adjacent our common boundary is exposed and broken near the street boundary, overflowing even in light rain. The whole stormwater drainage system needs review.

LANDSCAPE
The application documentation shows existing Camelia japonica (at the front fence, pink 60 - 70 years old) as being retained. This tree is mature, in good health and a valuable landscape feature to the street and the property. The proposal's (Pedestrian entry roof plus ground works) will kill this tree. A better alternative is to either; deleting the entry roof &/or relocating the tree prior to construction.
I am concerned about the impact of the development on the roots and stability of the large gum tree within my property, I support all measures Council can request of the applicant to protect this tree.
There is no Landscaping Plan to indicate specific plant selection; species, size and location, all of which affect the street and immediate neighbours.

SUGGESTIONS TO MITIGATE ISSUES RE BULK

Height Proposed 3.61m at SE corner. Considering minimum internal clearance height of 2200mm according to AS2890.1, the following suggestions will assist to reduce bulk.
1. Lower whole roof
a. Minimum plus 375mm rise across east face = 2.575m, to u/s structure.
b. Allow 250mm for lift gate mechanism (behind beam = no ht increase)
c. Roof structure & decking apx 200mm = 2.775m
d. These give a reduction in roof height of over 0.8m.
2. Lower roof pitch - currently Custom Orb min 50 pitch = 600mm rise
a. Change roofing profile - 10 pitch readily available at comparable cost
3. Delete continuous roof over Pedestrian gate from street. Or build separate higher roof instead (breaks up roof line).
4. Pitch roof with the slope of the land (beams perpendicular to street)
a. Roof carport in a long span composite (Bondor or similar), apx 100mm.
Reduce width to 5.5m internal, relocate entry gate to north of Camelia and leave Camelia in current location.
Re-consider design and either shift to Northern side of site (closer to the existing house entry) or incorporate with a joint design & build with neighbour at #101 Clontarf St, to integrate the designs & landscaping across both front yards. Done well it will; cost less and make both properties look bigger and more prestigious.

CONCLUSION
The proposed development, while I support the principle of a carport to the front boundary, this application needs redesigning to address the issues raised above, namely, - excessive Bulk, need to comply with Engineering requirements (crossing widths, Council Standard driveway profile, plus stormwater) and unresolved Landscape detail. The changes that are likely warrant a request for more information so that revised plans and their impact can be considered by affected parties.

Yours sincerely

Lesley Lawson
22nd August 2024