
From: Vicki Golin
Sent: 5/07/2024 3:23:23 PM
To: Council Northernbeaches Mailbox
Subject: TRIMMED: DA2024/0745. 33 Quinton Road Manly
Attachments: DA2024_0745_33QuintonRd.pdf;

Attention: Development Assessment Team

Dear Sir/Madam

Please accept my submission for the above DA. I own the adjoining semi detached house.

Please acknowledge receipt of this email.

If there are any problems with your ability to open or read the document please let me know on (02) 9977 1615.

Sorry if it rambles a bit.

Yours sincerely
(Lynette) Vicki Golin

(Lynette) Vicki Golin
31 Quinton Road
Manly NSW 2095
5 July 2024

Development Assessment Team,
Northern Beaches Council
PO Box 82
Manly NSW 1655

Attention:
Development Assessment Team

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Development Application No. 2024/ 0745
Property: 33 Quinton Road MANLY

I am the owner of No. 31 Quinton Road, Manly, the semi-detached dwelling which is attached to No. 33 on the southern side. I first moved to No. 31 when my husband bought it in 1983 and have owned it since 2004. The proposal includes building up on the common party wall, extending the common party wall 1.9m to the rear, as well as a southern roof that slopes straight down onto the roof of No. 31.

I am submitting this general letter before the closing date and will send a second letter at a later date after having further independent professional advice and further discussions with the applicant.

In the meantime, while I have no overall objection to the applicant making this application, I do have a number of significant concerns with the design, which I would like properly addressed prior to development consent:

1. I have major reservations and objections about the roof water from No. 33 flowing onto my property, No. 31. Furthermore, there is no Roof Plan provided by the applicant therefore the documentation is inadequate to make a proper assessment. **I request Council to get the applicant to provide a Roof Plan** clearly showing the proposed method of roof water drainage. The roof plan should:
 - a. Show gutters
 - b. The way it is going to drain
 - c. Clearly identify where the gutters are located and the type of gutters, their dimensions, slope and access for clearing.
 - d. Where the gutters drain to, including the downpipes and other parts of the drainage system.
 - e. The shape of the roof.
 - f. Maintenance plan for cleaning rooftop gutter.

Background

The drawings accompanying the application of the Eastern and Western elevation (DA02, DA09 and DA10) show the proposed southern roof of No. 33 sloping down straight onto the southern roof of No. 31, which will result in roof water flowing onto my property.

The previous DA 12/2015 had a horizontal box gutter on top of the party wall entirely within No.33. I am particularly concerned this will result in water from No.33 flowing onto my roof, especially during periods of heavy rain. I am also

concerned that if the owner of No. 33 puts a gutter on top of the party wall and the gutter or downpipe is blocked, it may result in flooding onto my property.

2. The first floor roof should match the existing terracotta tile main roof rather than the grey Colorband metal roof proposed (DA 09, DA 10). Matching roofs look better and enhance the streetscape. Aerial views from the council's DA proposal site confirm the semis in Quinton Rd have matching roofs, except for No. 53. Terracotta tiles have better acoustics, durability, longevity, insulation and energy efficiency. Colorbond roofs are noisy when it rains or possums run along them at night. They also fade, as shown by the terracotta Colorbond roof on my rear skillion roof.
3. Proposed design does not make efficient use of floor space. Previous DA had essentially the same layout for the ground floor, except for a separate toilet and bigger laundry, with no extension to rear by 1.9m of 9.26 sq m. The thoroughfare stayed close to the dividing wall, rather than cutting across the kitchen/dining increasing dead space. First floor of the previous DA was only 35sq m with 2 bedrooms and a bathroom, with centrally located stairs minimizing the space used as hallways. This proposal has a bedroom, a walk through Study, and a bathroom totalling 49.85 sq m. The stairs are located at one end requiring more thoroughfares. Floor Space Ratios exceed the maximum of 0.6:1 allowed under the current LEP setting a precedent for overdevelopment. This proposal exceeds the FSR by 23sq m, whereas the previous DA at 119 sq m was at 0.6:1 provided the same number of rooms with less dead space, did not extend as far to the front and back on the first floor, or require an extension on the ground floor. With an east west length of 14.9m the First Floor almost all the 17.97m length of the building excluding the front verandah. This proposal is much longer than the previous DA which was 9.481m without balconies and 12.801m with. First floor rooms are huge with Bedroom 3 at 6m long and over 20 sq m in area, much larger than BR 1 which is 14sq m, a large bedroom. The Study is also huge.
5. **No shadow diagrams** are included in the Development Application. New diagrams need to be prepared as the proposal is larger and very different from the previous proposal, extending further to the rear and front of the property and including a gabled carport. I have reservations about the height of the gabled roof at the rear, western end, potentially overshadowing my rear courtyard in the morning periods, which I heavily rely on for solar access and clothes drying. I would be more satisfied if there was a hip roof at the western end of the proposed upper floor addition and request the roof design be modified accordingly. The main roof at the rear is currently a hipped roof, as are the rear roofs of adjacent properties including No 35, as is usual for homes with gabled front roofs.

In terms of **overshadowing**. The height of the rear pergola, at RL 44.96m, will increase the shadow on my rear courtyard, as it is on the north side of my property and up to 0.95m higher than the boundary wall between the properties, which has an RL of 44.48 at the eastern end dropping to 44.01m at the western end. I request that the southern edge of the pergola be set back from the common boundary with No. 31, by at least 0.9m, as approved in the DA 12/ 2015, as shown on the Roof Plan DA 11 dated 6/3/2015, Also consider reducing the height of the pergola, as the proposed adjoining Lounge Room is lower at RL 41.81 m, by say 0.5 m to RL 44.46m, still at least 2.65m above ground level

The proposed extension of the dividing wall by 1.9m to the rear will increase the height of boundary to RL 45.85m,, 1.57m above the current boundary wall (RL

44.42m), increasing overshadowing. If it were approved sloping the rear skillion roof down to the west, instead of to the north, would decrease the height above the boundary wall by 0.43m at the western end.

Additional overshadowing and loss of sunlight will affect 4 of the 6m of my rear courtyard. My clothesline which is optimally located, between the southern corner of my home and my garage, 1m to 1.8m in from the southern boundary, currently (July 4) receives sunshine from about 9am at the western end to nearly 4pm at the far eastern end. The applicant suggests I relocate my line to the western end. I often use all 24m of it so need sun on all of it, not just 2m near the garage. I do not have a drier. The proposal will reduce my access to sun for clothes drying to less than the minimum 6 hours required in June. Shadow diagrams showing shading at ground level do not show the full picture as my clothes line is up to 2.0m above ground level. Sun extended 2.4 to 2.7m into my courtyard from the southern boundary on July 4. Much more than shown on previous shadow diagrams for June

5. The proposal will result in loss of sunlight due to the ground floor rear extension and pergola. Sun shines in to the rear living areas of my home, namely the 2.7m wide back verandah and adjoining dining room/kitchen on cold winter days, as observed on July 4. This proposal will take away afternoon sun, whilst the higherv First Floor roof will take away morning sun. I also like to spend time in my sunny backyard reading books etc as my southside semi gets very cold.
6. **Dividing wall between No. 31 and No. 33 not clearly defined.** It is not clear from the plans what will be built on the party wall and what is entirely within No. 33 and what if anything will extend into No. 31. There are many other inconsistencies or errors in the plans, especially in relation to the roof types and front balcony on DA09.

I request that the applicant **provide clear plans of the proposed changes along the boundary** between No. 31 and No. 33, so I have a clear picture of what is proposed to be built. This should include:

- The existing 9 "brick party wall, its length, height and width.
 - Existing roof.
 - Proposed dimensions and location of any addition to the party wall
 - Proposed materials any addition will be built in. I would prefer double brick as per the existing party wall.
 - Exact boundary between No. 31 and No. 33, and what if anything will be built on No. 31, including No. 31's half of the party wall. Clearly define the boundary.
 - Height and length of the proposed pergola above the existing boundary wall and in relation to the back of No. 31.
 - Any changes in the height and profile of the existing metal roofs at the front and rear of the property and how they meet the roofs of No. 31.
7. I request the main roof over the ground floor and proposed first floor to match the existing terracotta tiles on both semis. This is to maintain the aesthetics and street appeal of the building. Other semis in our street have matching roof materials. Terracotta tiles have better acoustics, durability, longevity, insulation and energy efficiency. They don't fade, like the terracotta coloured Colorbond metal roof at the rear of No. 31 has faded. Colorbond roofs are very noisy when it rains or when possums run along them. I hear this on the metal roof over my front verandah. The new carport roof be terracotta tiles to match the main roof. Plan DA 09 has the main roof at the front as Metal Roof abutting No 31's

terracotta tile roof, which would look terrible and potentially cause future problems where they join.

8. Any increase in the height of the party wall, if approved is built in such a way it does not cause any damage to my property.
9. That **any extension**, especially to the party wall, be done in such a way that it will not impact adversely on my property and **still permit a future upper floor extension on No. 31**. (Not that I am planning on doing it).
10. The **First Floor and** proposed **stairs** to the First Floor **be carpeted to reduce noise transmission**, except for the bathroom.
11. I have concerns about **first floor windows facing west** resulting in **total loss of privacy** in my rear courtyard. The windows total over 4.86 sq m in area and are clear glass and are about 1m from the boundary with my property and within 3 to 4 m of my rear yard. They will closely overlook virtually all of my courtyard. I propose that their height and width be reduced by well over half and fixed privacy screens, fixed shutters, and translucent glass in side panels all be considered. The previous DA proposed less windows, a privacy screens and a balcony was added a solid front above 1m high, with the rear of the balcony set back 2 or 3m and the bedroom another 1.7m further, do the rear first floor Windows were around 4m further from from my courtyard, so about 8m from my courtyard. Propose that the rear of the first floor be set back at least 4m to where Bedroom 3 ended in the previous DA. West facing wwindows WiWill create a hot box in summer and look straight into the First floor Windows of 76 Birkley Rd behind.
12. That nothing be built on No. 31, including my half of the party wall, without my written agreement.
13. Note: From the survey plan of No. 31 the front and rear boundary brick boundary fences between No. 31 and No. 33 are entirely in No. 31, except for the first metre at the back of the house (Survey Plan Attached). Both walls have cracks in them, the latter from top to bottom, where the bend in the wall is. At some stage, I will probably need to remove both of them. I ask that the owner of No. 33 not attach anything to them or build onto them.
14. Parking is inadequate for a 4 bedroom "family" home. Street parking is a problem, especially after No Stopping lines were put on Quinton Rd 10m either side of Quinton Lane and 21 m along Quinton Lane about 2 years ago, removing around 6 Parking spots about 2 years ago. Young families want more outdoor space and parking, so move to cheaper houses in suburbs like Manly Vale to obtain a bigger house, as we did, rather than extend our semi. Ssingle storey semis are great homes to retire in, rather than buy a unit and have to deal with a Body Corporate

Council note that there are Easements on the common wall between No. 31 and No. 33. From the Certificate of Title for No. 31:

Vol. 11717 Folio 72
Computer Folio A/314191

L958166
L958167

Cross Easements for Support Affecting the Land shown as 9 inch brick Party

wall "in DP543771 (65 ½ "long).

I request Council, if it were to approve the application, to put in conditions of Development Consent that will address:

- a. That none of the roof water and stormwater from No. 33 be discharged onto my property, No. 31.
- b. The first floor and main ground floor be terracotta tiles to match the existing ones. The new carport also be terracotta tiles to blend in.
- c. The extension be redesigned to make more efficient use of space so it can comply with the 0.6:1 FSR, as the previous DA did.
- d. The applicant not be allowed to extend 1.9m to the rear on the ground floor, especially not on the dividing wall.
- e. If the 1.9m ground floor extension is approved, have the skillion roof slope to the west as our current roofs to reducing overshadowing of No.31 slightly
- f. The proposed pergola and rear ground floor extension by 4m results in an increased height of up to 1.57m on the boundary wall and overshadowing of two thirds of my 6m courtyard. It will also decrease sunlight entering the rear living area of my house.
- g. Fixed shutters be fitted to the west facing windows and their height and width be reduced to reduce loss of privacy
- h. The rear of the first floor be set back about 4m, so it extends no further back than the previous DA before balconies were added to help reduce loss of privacy, sun and amenity in No.31.
- i. The development is designed in such a way that the owner of No. 31 be able to do a similar first floor addition in the future.
- j. The applicant prepares a Dilapidation Report on No. 31.
- k. Privacy screens, preferably fixed shutter screens, be added to the proposed rear first floor windows to prevent loss of privacy to my rear courtyard.
- l. The owner and future owners of No. 33 accept liability for any damage to No. 31 resulting from either the construction itself or any stormwater ingress into my property resulting from the overflow or inadequacy of the drainage, either now or in the future.
- m. Council may see fit to impose conditions on how the proposed gutter on/near the party wall will be maintained. All it takes is one dead bird, dead possum or a stray plastic bag to block it.
- n. A suitably qualified structural engineer provides a Certificate of Structural Adequacy to Council after inspection of the entire party wall, on both sides.
- o. No additions are made to the party wall without the written agreement of the owner of No. 31.
- p. Nothing be built or changed in No. 31 without the written agreement of the owner of No. 31.
- q. All costs of the project are at the expense of the owner of No. 33.
- r. The adjoining dwelling, No. 31, remains liveable and watertight during all stages of the development.
- s. Clarify why plan DA09 has a First Floor balcony at the front when the applicant told me there are no balconies and it is not shown on other plans.
- t. Other concerns outlined in Points 1 to 14 above.

I also request that the following conditions be included from the Notice of Determination for DA12/2015:

*The proposed works are to be independently supported without any reliance on the existing part wall

*The proposed ground and first floor dwelling addition with any associated roof, gutter, downpipes and footings are to be located entirely within the subject site.

* A Dilapidation report is required for this development.

* The proposed pergola set back 900 mm from the boundary (Plan DA 11 revised 6/3/15).

I request Council defer assessment of the Development Application until the following documents are received:

- Shadow diagrams
- Roof plan and roof drainage plan
- Plans showing clearly what is proposed to be built on the party wall and what, if anything, will extend onto No. 31, as outlined in point 5.
- Certificate of Structural Adequacy
- Amended plans with the requested design modifications.

Thank you for allowing my views to be considered as part of the approval process. I can be contacted on (02) 9977 1615 for further information.

Yours Sincerely,
(Lynette) Vicki Golin

PS This was written on my mobile phone using Polaris Office so please forgive any formatting errors. I don't have a computer.

I have not discussed the proposal with the Applicant as she lead me to believe it was smaller than the previous proposal with no balconies, only 1 BR, a bathroom and a study so I thought there be nothing to object too and could do it without consulting an Architect.

