

---

**From:** Rodney Joyce  
**Sent:** 1/04/2025 9:36:57 PM  
**To:** Council Northernbeaches Mailbox  
**Subject:** TRIMMED: Submission to DA2925/0089  
**Attachments:** Response.pdf;

Please find my submission in response to the above Development Application.

Kind Regards

Rod Joyce

1 April 2025

11 James Street

Manly NSW 2095

**DA2025/0089- 34 George Street Manly**

With regard to the above Development Application, I would like to raise the following 3 points.

1. The Statement of Environmental Effects states on page 4 that the “The total area of the site is **184 m<sup>2</sup>**, the built floor area of the existing residence is **208.06 m<sup>2</sup>** and There is **no increase** in the floor area of the residence.”

From my review, there is increase in the floor area per the new upstairs bedroom.

In addition, on page A01 of the **34 George St Plans\_- \_Master\_Set**, the the section **PROPOSED BUILT AREA**, the

- Existing Ground Floor is **74.64 m<sup>2</sup>** and Existing First Floor is **52.28 m<sup>2</sup> = 126.92 m<sup>2</sup>**; **which is significantly different to the above number of 208.06 m<sup>2</sup>**.
- Proposed Ground Floor Addition of **11.21 m<sup>2</sup>** and Proposed First Floor Addition of **16.78 m<sup>2</sup> = 27.99 m<sup>2</sup>**.
- Proposed Ground Floor **85.85 m<sup>2</sup>** and Proposed First Floor **69.06 m<sup>2</sup>** with a total of **154.91 m<sup>2</sup>**.

In addition, on page 6 of the **Statement of Environmental Effects** document, “The **proposed Gross Ground Floor Area is 74.65 m<sup>2</sup>** and the **proposed Gross First Floor Area is 61.48 m<sup>2</sup>**. The Total Gross floor area is **136.13 m<sup>2</sup>** resulting in a Floor space Ration of **1 : 0.74** which satisfies the requirements of the DCP.”

It seems, in my review, that there are errors in these numbers and a mix between Built area and Gross Floor Area. I request the FSR to be shown to comply as the above numbers seem to do not provide clarity.

2. Further to above, the new first floor bedroom, has no privacy looking out only on the north and south sides. The existing jacaranda tree is shaped with the main branches on the fence line, as per the survey drawing, encroaching on our property behind. My concern is pruning of that tree to bring it within property boundaries and pruning

of our magnolia trees will result in privacy issues of someone on the proposed balcony.

3. Per the Council's **Water Management for Development Policy**, in **section 9.3.3.2 Requirements for Region 3 – Zone 1 – On-Site Detention**, "The developed site will have a total impervious percentage or area of **no more than 35%** or 250m." As this site is 184 m<sup>2</sup>, 35% would equate to **55.2m<sup>2</sup>**. The site seems to be 100% impervious with paving all around the residence.

From the **Site Plan: Stormwater**, all ground stormwater drains from approximately the rear two-thirds of the property to the back property allowing water seeping into the property behind.

The plans show the removal of an item (crossed square box) behind the back doors (nth east). Whilst is not clear what this item represents, I query if it is an existing drainage pit. I am concerned that with no drainage in this man-made impervious paving, water is allowed to seep to the back fence results to damage to the wooden fence, prematurely deteriorating it, plus also sending additional seepage to our property.

My objection is, if this paving was part of a previous DA approved, why was there not a stormwater requirement for collection and connection to the stormwater, and if it is not part of an approved DA, that it complies with the council. If this DA is approved a condition should be adherence to the **Water Management for Development Policy**.

Kind regards,

Rod Joyce