
Sent: 14/04/2019 9:15:54 PM
Subject: Online Submission

14/04/2019

MS Elizabeth Moore
58 Riverview PDE
North Manly NSW 2100
liz_moore_@hotmail.com

RE: Mod2019/0118 - 60 Riverview Parade NORTH MANLY NSW 2100

I am a resident of 58 Riverview Parade, North Manly and wish to raise an objection to the building bulk of the proposed building development intended for 60 Riverview Parade, North Manly as detailed in Mod2019-0118.

Section D9 (Building Bulk) of the Warringah DCP states:-

- "1. Side and rear setbacks are to be progressively increased as wall height increases.
2. Large areas of continuous wall planes are to be avoided by varying building setbacks and using appropriate techniques to provide visual relief.
-
6. Use colour, materials and surface treatment to reduce building bulk.
7. Landscape plantings are to be provided to reduce the visual bulk of new building and works.
8. Articulate walls to reduce building mass."

With the following objectives:-

".....
To minimise the visual impact of development when viewed from adjoining properties, streets, waterways and land zoned for public recreation purposes."

We are not opposed to development or even pushing the envelope but the WDCP clearly states that new developments should minimise visual impact from adjoining properties. We understand that this is a subjective application of a rule. Nevertheless this development is very visually dominant from the northern property. The changes to the design as a result of the council conditions only superficially address the council building bulk design rule requirements.

We would note that the Smiths never spoke to us concerning their original plans. If they had we would have explained our building bulk and privacy concerns and presumably a better design solution could have been realised before the original DA submission.

We'd like to specifically address the 5 points from the above requirements.

1. There is a setback of the first floor wall of 1.346m from the north boundary. The ground floor wall setback is approximately 0.93m. The change is approximately 0.4m. This appears at odds with the illustrated example shown in D9.

These wall surfaces are directly visible from our property. If the walls had been facing the south side walls of our house we would not be concerned.

2. The original design had a very large continuous wall plane. The new design breaks the wall into halves, split at the first floor level and setback 0.4m. This is a relatively negligible visual change and seems at odds with the requirement. Additionally the eaves are approximately 0.93m from the boundary. They tend to loom above our property.

The walls are large very visible continuous areas with no relief. Once the scaffolding is removed the northern aspect will present as a large obvious surface. Also this face is directly visible from our two front rooms.

6. The wall is painted very pale grey which does help to reduce building bulk a little.

7. There are no landscape plantings. Nor is it possible given the proximity to the northern property edge.

8. The wall articulation is 0.4m difference between ground and first floor. This is a negligible difference given the illustrated examples provided in the WDCP.

Some possible solutions would be :-

- Landscape planting on the northern property (58 Riverview Parade) to reduce the building bulk. This could be done quite economically. One or more mature native trees (to be determined) would be effective.
- Removal or reduction of the eaves extent beyond the wall. The eaves greatly add to the building bulk. This is not a straightforward fix and we would note that if we had been consulted initially would not be necessary.