
Sent: 9/08/2021 3:15:49 PM
Subject: DA2021/0317 141 Riverview Rd Avalon Beach
Attachments: 141 Submission 2.pdf;

Submission re the above DA

9 August 2021

The General Manager
Northern Beaches Council
PO Box 82
Manly NSW 1655

Attention:
Gareth David
Senior Planner, Development Assessment

Dear Sir.

RE: DA 2021/0317 – 141 RIVERVIEW ROAD, AVALON BEACH

We have reviewed the re-submitted documentation for the above development application and are pleased to see that the revised planning provides several improvements to the previous submission.

There are however several matters we wish to comment on:

1. Building Footprint

The reduction achieved to the building footprint in order to maximise the landscaped area and minimise tree removal is minimal. There still is a relatively large house planned on a small, constrained site. The footprint of the dwelling is stated on page 3 of the Key Urban Planning cover letter as being 26,8% of the site area ie 198.4m². This does not appear to include the previously approved carport having an area of 36.0m². From our observations the dwelling has a footprint of approximately 220m² and inclusion of 36m² for the carport results in the total building footprint being approx. 256m² or in the order of 34.5% of the site area.

2. Landscaping

The Key Urban Planning cover letter states that the revised landscape plan will achieve a landscaped area of 55% ie 407.2m². This area includes approximately 58m² of undercroft landscaped area under the storage room and main entry porch and access stairs and 48m² under the concrete balcony of the Living Floor level. Exclusion of these under building areas would result in the site landscaped area only being in the order of 40% of the site area.

Whilst Key Urban Planning present various statements regarding the flexibility that the approving authority must apply in assessing alternative solutions, the inclusion of landscaped undercroft areas, a significant portion of which would be only

minimally available to direct sunlight, would appear to be questionable as a valuable contribution to the sites landscaping.

3. Trees

The trees to be retained along the south-eastern corner of the site, as shown on the proposed cut and fill plan, are immediately adjacent to where the deepest excavations are required. This plan indicates that the excavations are to be battered resulting in excavation being significantly within the SRZ and TRZ of trees numbered 25,26,28,32 and 33. The excavation intrusions are of such a magnitude the chances of these trees surviving must be absolutely minimal, particularly for trees 28,32 and 33.

When assessing these trees in their report, Abacus Tree Services have for each of them nominated a distance within which no excavation works are to occur. The cut and fill plan clearly indicates that none of the nominated distances will be complied with. The Abacus report, when stating the distance each of these trees is “to the proposed development” appear to be stating the distance to the new dwelling, not the distance to where the excavation for the new dwelling is to occur. Consequently in our view, all the TPZ loss calculations they have provided are questionable. It is also contrary to their statement that “ The SRZ/TPZ is an area where no to minimal activities listed above should occur”. One of the activities listed is “Excavating within the drip line and damaging the structural root system.”

For trees 32 and 33, Abacus mention the use of bearers and joists having the potential to retain these trees, state that no excavation works are to occur with the SRZ and no strip footing be allowed on this side of the development. The submitted planning documents provide no indication that this is being achieved.

We request the applicant be requested to amend their excavation requirements or provide alternative construction techniques to ensure the future health of these trees. As Abacus state “ The greater area that can be put aside where no works occur will aid in the preservation of the tree”.

4. Shadow Diagrams

As a note - the survey information utilised on the various shadow drawings for our residence at No 135 are those for the previous dwelling prior to the new house being constructed. We do not know if the new house is in the location of the old one, and what this could mean for the shadow impacts presented.

Conclusion

With the Key urban Planning cover letter making various statements about the existing constraints on the site and suggesting that minor departures to various planning controls and guidelines be considered, it should be remembered that these constraints existed when the site was purchased. The difficulties in achieving anywhere near the percentage of desired landscaped area, difficulties in wanting to excavate with the SRZ/TPZ of trees to be retained all result from the currently desired dwelling footprint.

Yours sincerely

Greg & Bernadette O'Neill