
Sent: 21/04/2021 12:36:11 AM
Subject: Re: Submission against Development Application DA2021/0179
Attachments: AC against DA2021-0179 .docx;

Apologies - here is the updated document I meant to send.
Regards,
Ann Collins

ph: 0488 245 815

On Wed, Apr 21, 2021 at 12:34 AM Ann Collins <acollins1806@gmail.com> wrote:
Please find attached submission against Development Application DA2021/0179.

Regards,
Ann Collins

A. Collins
Gordon Street
Manly Vale 2093
E: acollins1806@gmail.com

Submission against Development Application DA2021/0179

I am a resident of Manly Vale. I value the amenity of the area. I believe this is inappropriate development.

I object to the proposed development at 255 Condamine Street MANLY VALE NSW 2093
Manly Vale for the following reasons:

1. Impact of development over the Creek line.

This development will have major impacts to the creekline/riparian zone with placement of columns. The development is built ON THE CREEK! *"The allotment has an area of 863 square metres and is traversed by Burnt Bridge Creek"*.

Will this really happen??? *"to replace the existing dilapidated and unsightly building and degraded creek line with a building of exceptional design quality sitting lightly over the rehabilitated creek."*

Construction over the creek will make the usual basement car park almost impossible, so the whole location of this development is brought into question.

2. Parking implications:

There are only 7 car spaces and no visitor car parking for the building for 39 bedrooms provided. 3 of the 7 spaces are for rideshare vehicles only. Whilst I understand the "boarding House" concept, this is an unrealistic amount of parking. The area is already over parked from the B-line commuters overflowing from the under supplied B-line carpark. There is also no parking along the Burnt Bridge Creek /Condamine street.

Whose role is it to monitor that residents have/not have cars?

This is unacceptable.

3. Over development of this area;

There will be an additional 39 rooms, with possibly 80 additional people in a space which had one house. The rear of the development creates eight tenancies all overlooking the house at the rear of 12 Pitt Street

4. High potential for Flooding:

Flooding to this site would need careful consideration due to the strong flow of water to this creek after and during storms, the last storm water levels were extremely high and part of a rock face has dislodged maybe also being a factor in water levels. Land slips have been noticed over the past years on and around this site, there has been a number of objects blocking the creek in the past with the concern of flooding to 255 with this building plan in the near future.

5. Other:

- There is no setback on the southern boundary.
- How will affordable housing be monitored in this building? What will control the pricing?

- The rooms are too small and will cause overcrowding.
- P4.SEE - *"The street frontage has been activated through the provision of a street facing lounge/breakout space for use by occupants and the introduction of a panel lift door to the driveway to reduce the perceived height of the driveway entrance."* Why would anyone want to use a space on the main road as a breakout space????
- I think this means it is too high! *"Whilst the proposal requires the consent authority to give favourable consideration to a building height variation, strict compliance has been found to be unreasonable and unnecessary having regard to the particular circumstances of the case including the attainment of an appropriate contextual fit and general paucity of streetscape and residential amenity impacts."* ; P16 SEE *"between 12 and 16.35 metres representing a non-compliance of between 1 metre (9%) and 5.35 metres (48%)"*
- Non-compliance on setback even after pre DA meeting? - *The identified non-compliance with WDCP front setback control has been acknowledged and appropriately justified having regard to the associated objectives.*
- Overshadowing of houses behind the development.
- *"This level also incorporates 8 bicycle storage spaces and 8 motorcycle spaces"* – this is good.
- Proposal unsupported by NBC Natural Environment Unit - flood for inadequate flood modelling and A/C and the western lift location.
- Proposal unsupported by Natural Environment Unit – riparian. The proposed building is covering extensively the creek and the floodplain. Approximately 80% of the Burnt Bridge Creek Southern bank within the lot is located under the proposed building. The proposal also shows the building is overhanging the creek bed at two locations. 6 piles are directly located in the creek bank, 7 piles are located on the floodplain. The extensive covering of the banks, the covering of the creek bed and the piles locations are not consistent with Council Policy and are not supported. The Water way Impact Statement is missing from the documentation and must be supplied.
- Proposal unsupported by NBC Water Management Referral Response. The bio-swale details is not showing extended detention depth and is lacking details. The location of the biofiltration is too close to the creek flow path (elevation and location) with risk of damages (erosion of filter material and deposition of sediment from the creek). Access for maintenance is also an issue including risk of falls with 1.25m from top of wall to bio retention base.
- Proposal unsupported by NBC Urban Design Referral Response.
- Proposal unsupported by NBC Roads and Assets Referral Response.
-