

---

**Sent:** 20/04/2021 11:38:38 PM  
**Subject:** Online Submission

20/04/2021

MR Phillip Lambley  
23 Innes RD  
Manly Vale NSW 2093  
phillip.lambley@enstruct.com.au

**RE: DA2021/0179 - 255 Condamine Street MANLY VALE NSW 2093**

Dear Sir / Madam,

I have been reviewing the DA documentation and there appear to be a number issues which need to be addressed before approval should be given namely:

1) Traffic / Parking - there appears to be conflicting traffic generation numbers as the initial traffic generation is on the 7 car parking spaces but this appears inconsistent as the use of the car share vehicles equates to 10 car spaces. Therefore, should the traffic generation be based on 34 car spaces.

The parking numbers are also conflicting as there is 0.18 parking space for each boarding room (7 spaces for 39 rooms) and the car share vehicles are available to residents and the general public, so if the three vehicles are used by the general public, there is only 4 spaces for 39 rooms or insufficient parking as there is 0.10 parking space for each boarding room. As this can be seen, there is insufficient parking for the development.

2) Stormwater / Flooding

The Stormwater Management Plan does not show any stormwater plans on how the water collected and discharged into the creek.

The flooding report does not show any flood profiles through the channel showing the water levels at the 1%AEP. This would assist in understanding how the stormwater would overtop the road in extreme events as Condamine Road has a footpath level is RL10.26 while the flood level for the 1% AEP is RL 11.05. This results in a flood depth of approximately 800mm across Condamine Street.

The flood maps provided in the report show the water flowing across Condamine Street but with the development being constructed over the channel, how is the water to get out? If the water can't get out, then the water will pass under the road under pressure. This would impact on upstream properties and would cause downstream erosion. The water profile would show the increase in afflux upstream as being unacceptable in stormwater standards.

Upon reviewing the architectural plans, it appears that the underside of the slab is not outside the FPL (Flood Planning Level) are requested by Council's Stormwater engineer. This is also a concern as there are two habitable rooms on the ground floor, which is contrary to Council's requirements.

In summary, the development should be rejected on incorrect traffic generations and parking numbers, insufficient flood modelling and incorrect flood planning levels.

Regards  
Phillip