

# **STATEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS FOR PROPOSED ADDITIONS OF FENCING AND CARPORT TO EXISTING DWELLING AT 7 MONA STREET, MONA VALE NSW 2103**

Prepared by:

**Centric Architects Pty Ltd**

Date:

**08/04/19**

Issue:

**A**

## CONTENTS:

1.00	Introduction	<b>3</b>
2.00	The Site	<b>3</b>
3.00	The Proposal	<b>5</b>
4.00	Authority LEP appraisal	<b>6</b>
5.00	Authority DCP appraisal	<b>7</b>
6.00	Conclusion	<b>11</b>

## 1.00 INTRODUCTION:

This Statement of Environmental Effects seeks to explain and appraise the impact of the proposed design on the site, neighbouring properties and environment.

In this Statement the proposed development is presented and assessed against the relevant Planning regime.

## 2.00 THE SITE:

The subjected site is located among residential dwellings in a local street setting opposite Pittwater High School. The site is situated on a roadway where it is accessed directly from Mona Street with surrounding properties consisting of a mix of existing single to two storey residential homes properties abutting to side and rear boundaries. The site generally falls from the eastern rear corner boundary to the front western boundary with a fall of almost 100mm in 45 metres. The site has a total area of 713.10 square metres with depth of approximately 38.1 on one side with 45.72 metres on the other and is orientated long axis east- west and short axis north-south.

The site contains existing small shrubs and small to medium tree's with surrounding neighbour's boundaries presenting well established bigger mature trees. Council is to note that the proposal does not adversely impact on the existing soft landscape and that proposal does not require removal of any significant plantation to achieve fencing and carport within the front setback of the existing property.

The site is currently occupied by a single storey dwelling with 3 Bedrooms, living, dining, kitchen, scullery, undercover verandah at the rear and porch at the front, ancillary structure / shed at rear and finally associated pathways and landscaping surrounds.



Figure 1: Location of Subject Site

The following photos represent the existing house, site and nearby surroundings:



Street appearance south-west of subject site (subject site on right side):





Street appearance north-east of subject site (subject site on left side):



### 3.00 THE PROPOSAL:

As detailed within the accompanying plans the proposal seeks to provide better streetscape of the existing residents whilst providing covered protection to residents when entering and exiting their vehicle. In carrying this proposal out predominantly the existing fence location will be replaced with new proposed articulated fencing with landscaping between and better access to street footpath via front gate.

The design has been documented in consideration to the requirements of The Northern Beaches Council's Pittwater Local Environmental Planning 2014 and Pittwater 21 Development Control Plan 2014, relating to proposed development's fencing and carport additions. This proposed fencing and carport serves to actively contribute to street presence with the carport not gated and being well open. A high degree of attention has been given to the matters of privacy and sunlight access to the neighbouring properties, and has no impact in this regard.

Further, existing landscaping for the proposed development is being retained, with no impact to soft landscaping.

The materials used in the external fabric seek to combine the character of the locally built environment and beachside living of the area, to create a contemporary aesthetic suitable for this beachside City suburb.

The proposal will not require considerable excavation and earthworks.

As the proposal seeks only external fencing and carport non-habitable areas this will not impact on current gross floor area of the property.

## 4.00 PITTWATER LEP 2014 APPRAISAL:

LEP requirements affecting the proposal include:

- **Zoning:** R2-Low Density Residential.  
The residential proposal is compliant with the zoning.
- **Pittwater Bushfire Map:** The subject site is not “Pittwater Bush Fire Prone Land” (Map 2013).
- **Pittwater Flood Risk Map:** The subject site is within “Pittwater Flood Risk Precinct” area on the low to medium just on the edge of mapping. The proposal has a well open area allowing for flood waters to pass through.
- **Heritage Map** indicates the subject land is not listed as having Heritage significance. There are also no Heritage listed items within close proximity to the subject site.
- **Geotechnical hazard map:** The map indicates the subject site is not listed as having a Geotechnical hazard.
- **Foreshore Building Line map:** The map indicates the subject site is outside of the Foreshore Building Line.
- **Coastal Risk Planning Map:** The map indicates the subject site is not subject to a Coastline Hazard.
- **Biodiversity map:** The map indicates the subject site is outside of Biodiversity nominated areas.
- **Acid Sulfate soils map:** The map indicates the subject site is classified as class 2 for Acid Sulfate soils. As outlined in Clause 7.1(6)(a)&(b) within PLEP the newly proposed does not require consent as there are no significant earthworks proposed greater one tone of soil and the works will not lower the water table.
- **Height of Buildings map:** The map indicates the subject site Maximum height of building is 8.5m.  
The highest building element of the proposal is 3.870m above natural ground level (refer dimension on north elevation).
- **Land Reservation Acquisition Map:** The subject site is not subject to acquisition.

## 5.00 PITTWATER 21 DCP 2014 APPRAISAL:

DCP controls affecting the proposal include:

### Section B - General Controls:

- B5 – Water Management:  
Minor impact of additional carport roof will be connected to existing stormwater system.
- B6 – Access and Parking:  
B6.1 – Access Driveway: The access driveway is existing and no changes are proposed to the driveway layback.  
B6.2 – Internal Driveways: The internal driveway is existing and new small portions of pavement are proposed to tie into existing driveway.  
B6.3 - Off-Street Vehicle Parking Requirements: Two parking spaces are required, which is the amount of existing parking spaces on the site provided. Compliant spatial zone has been provided for proposed carport for cars to be side by side.

### Section C - Development Type Controls:

#### CI – Design Criteria for Residential Development

- CI.3 – View Sharing:  
The proposal incorporates an open hipped roof design for the carport with spaced slats for fencing allowing visibility through these elements. The carport is on the south-western boundary where there is a long carriageway driveway leading to adjacent neighbours which will not impact on residents.
- CI.4 – Solar Access:  
Solar access has been demonstrated on Shadow diagram Dwg. No.1100 in which shows that there is a small additional shadowing that falls only on neighbours existing carriage way driveway not on residents dwelling.
- CI.5 – Visual Privacy:  
The proposed front fencing and landscaping between allows for visual privacy to residents when they chose to use front yard.

## Section D – Locality Specific Development Controls: D9 –Mona Vale Locality

- **D9.3 – Building Colours and Materials:**  
The proposed external materials have dark and earthy colour tones as required by this clause. Refer Finishes schedule on Dwg No. 1000. These are subject to final selection by the applicant but shall be in keeping with the images submitted.
- **D9.6 – Front Building Line:**  
Proposed carport is within front building setback in which does not satisfy the direct requirement of 6.5m, we seek on merit basis approval for the carport frontage of 6.23m in which is only 37% of the overall street frontage encroachment into the front building line. Further the carport is not a solid wall element and is open to all sides allowing for good visual access. We also note that No.1 on Mona street closer to Pittwater road has an existing carport within the front setback zone.

As there is minimal frontage being requested of 37% for the carport to be within the front building line we have outlined the outcomes that have been satisfied:

*Achieve the desired future character of the locality* – Yes, as the beach carport design is well in keeping with its locality as well on the same street No.1 has carport on front boundary.

*Equitable preservation of views and vistas to and/or from public/private places.* – Yes, as adjacent neighbour on south-western boundary has a offset due to access driveway and the carport design is open to all sides.

*The amenity of residential development adjoining a main road is maintained.* – Yes, design allows for this refer to the above mentioned comments.

*Vegetation is retained and enhanced to visually reduce the built form.* – Yes, as landscaping between fencing and front boundary will allow aesthetic outlook with reduction in built form and the carport is open to all sides.

*Vehicle manoeuvring in a forward direction is facilitated.* – Yes, as this operation is as per existing.

*To enhance the existing streetscapes and promote a scale and density that is in keeping with the height of the natural environment.* – Yes, the bulk and scale of the design is within the height limit and side building envelope. Further the carport is open to all sides with fencing being below eye level.

*To encourage attractive street frontages and improve pedestrian amenity.* – Yes, design allows for this refer to the above mentioned comments.

*To ensure new development responds to, reinforces and sensitively relates*



*to the spatial characteristics of the existing urban environment.* . – Yes, design allows for this refer to the above mentioned comments.

- **D9.7 – Side and rear building line:**  
Side and rear building is inline with existing structure of the dwelling behind. Further the impacted neighbour on the south-western boundary has a access driveway verge providing separation buffer.
- **D9.9 – Building Envelope:**  
The required building envelope is 3.5m high on boundary then at 45 degree splay. Proposal complies with standard refer to Northern elevation on Dwg No.5000 north elevation.
- **D9.10 – Landscape Area General:**  
Existing landscape footprint retained on site.
- **D9.12 – Fences - General:**  
The front fencing is standardly 1m high max. With proposed front fencing at 1.65m high in which is still below the maximum varied allowance of 1.8m as mentioned within control.

Fencing allows for landscaping to be planted between piers and has 50% of fencing to be timber painted slat screen allowing for partial visibility through front fence.

Further would like to note that proposed fence will be replacing existing fencing height at 1.2m approx., and in similar location.

As outlined below all outcomes of the control will be satisfied with consideration to allowing 1.65m high proposed front fencing:

*To achieve the desired future character of the Locality.* – Yes, as the design is well considerate of the locality as the fencing will be articulated with piers and slat screen & landscaping between.

*To ensure fences compliment and conserve the visual character of the street and nieghbourhood.* – Yes, with height proposed this is set below eye level allowing for more appealing outlook to streetscape of passing pedestrians.

*To define the boundaries and edges between public and private land and between areas of different function.* – Yes, with more defined outline of the front yard this will allow more use by residents allowing for more visual privacy and functionality of this area with front footpath access via gate.

*To contribute positively to the public domain.* – Yes, design allows for this refer to the above mentioned comments.

*An open streetscape that allows casual surveillance of the street.* – Yes, as previously mentioned having the height of the fence below eye level and timber slats in between all provide good casual surveillance of the street.

*Fences, where provided, are suitably screened from view from a public*

*place.* – Yes, design allows for this refer to the above mentioned comments.

*Safe sight distances and clear view of the street (including to and from driveways) for motorists and pedestrians.* – Yes, Internal side fencing and front gate a full slat screens with spaces between allowing for good visual views of passing pedestrians and motorists.

*Unhindered travel for native animals and pedestrians.* – Yes, design allows for this refer to the above mentioned comments.

*To ensure heritage significance is protected and enhanced.* – Yes, as the property is not heritage listed therefore this outcome is not applicable to proposal.

*To ensure an open view to and from the waterway is maintained.* – Yes, as the property is not on a waterway therefore this outcome is not applicable to proposal.

## 6.00 CONCLUSION:

When the proposed additions are analysed in terms of the DCP controls, which limit the bulk and scale of the development, the proposal is generally well within the controls and set outcomes outlined by council. This proposal does not seek to maximise it's potential at the expense of it's surroundings.

Whilst the proposal deviates from the standard guidelines as listed in the DCP, we are seeking a merit based outcome. We believe the encroachment on the front setback and proposed fencing height is counter balanced by a considered and well articulated design that not only offers privacy and safety to the applicant, but also improves the streetscape and thereby public domain.

We note that the principle controls have been satisfied and believe the proposal will be a positive asset to the neighbouring community. We request that Council be in favour of it's approval.