

Manly Development Control Plan 2013		
Control	Compliance	Comment
<b>Part 4.4 Other Development (All LEP Zones)</b>		
<p><b>4.4.1 Demolition</b></p> <p>Where development involves demolition, the applicant is to demonstrate that the degree of demolition considers any existing building on the land that should be retained and appropriately adapted in order to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Meet ecologically sustainable development principles by conserving resources and energy and reducing waste from any demolition process; and</li> <li>(b) Conserve the cultural heritage of the existing building and that of the locality. An appropriate assessment of potential heritage significance must accompany any DA in relation to demolition. If the property has merit as a potential heritage item, the heritage controls and considerations in this plan apply, and</li> <li>(c) Comply with the requirements of the Northern Beaches Waste Management Policy.</li> </ul>	<b>Yes</b>	<p>The proposal involves partial demolition of the corner of the building and the existing entrance steps. A Waste Management Plan has been prepared for these works in accordance with the <i>Northern Beaches Waste Management Policy</i> and provided in <b>Appendix 7</b>.</p> <p>The proposal does not involve demolition of any items of heritage significance.</p>
<p><b>4.4.2 Alterations and Additions</b></p> <p>Manly Council promotes the retention and adaptation of existing buildings rather than their demolition and replacement with new structures.</p>	<b>Yes</b>	<p>The proposal involves alterations to the façade of the existing building and does not involve complete demolition of the building.</p>
<p><b>4.4.3 Signage</b></p> <p><b>Maximum number of signs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) In relation to shopfronts, a maximum of 2 identification signs will be permitted per frontage (for example 1 fascia and 1 hamper sign), in any 2 of the following preferred locations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under awning;</li> <li>• Awning fascia;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<b>Yes</b>	<p>It is proposed to include one (1) “awning fascia sign” to identify the name of the hotel.</p>



**Manly Development Control Plan 2013 Assessment**

Alterations to Existing Hotel and Restaurant  
58 North Steyne, Manly (Lot 1 DP 1 DP 608972)

Manly Development Control Plan 2013		
Control	Compliance	Comment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A transom sign above the door or shopfront (top hamper);</li> <li>Inside the display window;</li> <li>Below the window sill; and</li> <li>Flush wall signs.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Design Integration</b></p> <p>(d) (i) The design of signs is to be integral to the architectural style and finishes of the building to which they are attached, rather than a “tack on” appearance. In this regard, above awning signs level of a projecting nature are restricted. See also paragraphs 4.4.3.3.c &amp; d.</p> <p>(ii) Applicants designing new buildings or alterations and multi-tenant buildings refurbishment of existing buildings are strongly encouraged to take into account advertising requirements at an early stage, as an integral part of the building. In this regard a Sign Concept Plan is required for the co-ordinated identification and advertising for the development with the DA.</p>	<b>Yes</b>	The proposed signage has been incorporated into the re-design of the façade of the building. The signage will be to identify the name of the hotel and will not require any advertising.
<p><b>Streetscape</b></p> <p>(e) Signs must not have an adverse impact on the streetscape in terms of unobtrusive design, colour, height, size and scale in proportion to building and other urban elements. Not only should a sign be simple, clear and efficient (with a reasonable degree of visibility), but a well-designed sign inspires and promotes confidence in the business or product advertised without impacting on the streetscape.</p>	<b>Yes</b>	The proposed signage is consistent with the design, colour, size and scale of surrounding signage. It is appropriate to the scale of the building and provides clear communication to identify the businesses.



**Manly Development Control Plan 2013 Assessment**

Alterations to Existing Hotel and Restaurant  
58 North Steyne, Manly (Lot 1 DP 1 DP 608972)

Manly Development Control Plan 2013		
Control	Compliance	Comment
<p><b>Maintenance</b></p> <p>(f) (i) Building facades should not be visually spoiled by electrical conduits to illuminated signs or spot lights, and should therefore be taken directly into the building or otherwise concealed by chasing into external walls. (ii) Signs should be located at a height which avoids impact from footpath maintenance vehicles and discourages vandalism.</p>	<b>Yes</b>	The proposal does not involve illumination and therefore does not need electrical conduits. The sign is attached flush to the façade and therefore will not impact on maintenance requirements.
<p><b>Fascia signs</b></p> <p>(a) must not project above or below the fascia or return end of the awning to which it is attached; (b) must not extend more than 0.3m from the fascia end of the awning; and (c) unless the council otherwise approves, must not extend or project beyond a point 0.6m within the vertical projection of the kerb line.</p>	<b>Yes</b>	The proposed signage does not extend above the awning fascia and is located more than 3m from the edge of the kerb.
<b>Part 5.4.1 Foreshore Scenic Protection Area</b>		
<p>LEP clause 6.9(3)(a) to (d) lists certain matters to be taken into account in relation to all development within the Foreshore Scenic Protection Area.</p> <p>(a) Further to matters prescribed in the LEP, the development in the Foreshore Scenic Protection Area must also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) minimise the contrast between the built environment and the natural environment;</li> <li>(ii) maintain the visual dominance of the natural environment;</li> <li>(iii) maximise the retention of existing vegetation including tree canopies, street trees, wildlife corridors and habitat;</li> </ul>	<b>Yes</b>	<p>The proposed façade alterations will not increase the bulk or height of the building. The design will utilise a palette of sun-bleached materials and saturated colours that are sympathetic to the beach environment.</p> <p>The proposal does not involve the removal of any vegetation and will not cause any change to any existing natural foreshore area.</p> <p>The building is located within an established commercial area and the works will have no visual adverse effects when viewed from the harbour.</p>



**Manly Development Control Plan 2013 Assessment**

Alterations to Existing Hotel and Restaurant  
58 North Steyne, Manly (Lot 1 DP 1 DP 608972)

Manly Development Control Plan 2013		
Control	Compliance	Comment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(iv) not cause any change, visually, structurally or otherwise, to the existing natural rocky harbour foreshore areas;</li> <li>(v) locate rooflines below the tree canopy;</li> <li>(vi) consider any effect of the proposal when viewed from the harbour / ocean to ridgelines, tree lines and other natural features; and</li> <li>(vii) use building materials of a non-reflective quality and be of colours and textures that blend with the prevailing natural environment in the locality.</li> </ul>		
<p>(b) Setbacks in the Foreshore Scenic Protection Area should be maximised to enable open space to dominate buildings, especially when viewed to and from Sydney Harbour, the Ocean and the foreshores in Manly. See also paragraph 4.1.4.5 of this DCP and LEP clause 6.10 in relation to Foreshore Building Lines and limited development in the Foreshore Area.</p>	<b>Yes</b>	The proposal does not increase the building and therefore existing setbacks are maintained.
<b>Part 5.4.3 Flood Prone Land</b>		
<p>A1: Development shall not be approved unless it can be demonstrated in a Flood Management Report that it has been designed and can be constructed so that in all events up to the 1% AEP event:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) There are no adverse impacts on flood levels or velocities caused by alterations to the flood conveyance; and</li> <li>(b) There are no adverse impacts on surrounding properties; and</li> <li>(c) It is sited to minimise exposure to flood hazard.</li> </ul> <p>Major developments and developments likely to have a significant impact on the PMF flood regime will need to demonstrate that there are no adverse impacts in the Probable Maximum Flood.</p>	<b>No</b>	<p>The proposal relates to only external elements and does not involve any extension to the building or changes to the floor levels of the building. The proposal will extend the raised entrance area.</p> <p>The proposal is located within a medium-risk flood precinct, which is defined as “all flood prone land which is affected by the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) flood (equivalent to the 1 in 100 year flood) with a free board added”. Without the freeboard added, the Site is clear of the 1% AEP flood extent, as identified within the Manly to Seaforth Flood Study 2019.</p>



**Manly Development Control Plan 2013 Assessment**

Alterations to Existing Hotel and Restaurant  
58 North Steyne, Manly (Lot 1 DP 1 DP 608972)

<b>Manly Development Control Plan 2013</b>		
<b>Control</b>	<b>Compliance</b>	<b>Comment</b>
A2: Development shall not be approved unless it can be demonstrated in a Flood Management Report that in all events up to the 1% AEP event there is no net loss of flood storage. Consideration may be given for exempting the volume of standard piers from flood storage calculations. If Compensatory Works are proposed to balance the loss of flood storage from the development, the Flood Management Report shall include detailed calculations to demonstrate how this is achieved.	<b>No</b>	Given the above, and the minor nature of the works, a Flood Management Report is not considered necessary.
B2: All new development must be designed and constructed to ensure structural integrity up to the Flood Planning Level, taking into account the forces of floodwater, wave action, flowing water with debris, buoyancy and immersion. Where shelter-in-place refuge is required, the structural integrity for the refuge is to be up to the Probable Maximum Flood level. Structural certification shall be provided confirming the above.	<b>Yes</b>	

