
Sent: 5/04/2024 11:49:24 AM
Subject: Submission to object DA2024/0179

Dear Northern Beaches Council,

I live at 10 James St Manly 2095 and would like to submit an objection to the development application **DA2024/0179** at 30 George Street Manly 2095, for the following reasons:

- **Non-compliant setbacks:** The proposed development has non-compliant setbacks, which adversely impact privacy, solar access and amenity of neighbouring properties and is therefore non-compliant with the Council's DCP.
- **Privacy:** The proposed development will directly overlook our backyard and look directly into our home, including the living room, bathroom and study - especially from the proposed first-floor rear balcony.
- **Inadequate privacy screening/mitigation measures:** The first-floor windows and rear balcony balcony have not been designed or sited to avoid adverse privacy impacts contrary to the Council's DCP requirements. There is no proposal to have any screening or even translucent glazing on the first-floor balcony doors to prevent the occupiers of 30 George Street looking straight into our home from their master bedroom. The "sliding privacy screen" would be completely ineffective. On the cover page to the plans the screens are described as "EXTERNAL LOUVRE/BLIND ADJUSTABLE". They are not really privacy screens. Windows W03 and W04 would look directly into 32 George Street, and overlook the side courtyard. No translucent glazing is proposed. The effect of having a structure so close the boundary on acoustic privacy has not even been considered.
- **Bulk and scale:** The massing of the proposed development has not been sited to avoid adverse amenity impacts on neighbouring properties. The extent of development proposed is excessive, especially in the context of a narrow lot with neighbouring buildings in close proximity. The unsuitability of the site for the development should not justify a lax application of the Council's development controls.
- **Streetscape/desired future character of the area:** The proposed development would be inconsistent with the architectural style of the adjoining dwelling, especially its roof form, and would present poorly to the street - in large part as a result of the non-compliant side setback, excessive bulk and scale, poor siting of massing and insensitive design.
- **Impacts of demolition/construction:** The proposed development would involve prolonged and extensive construction and demolition in close proximity to the boundary which may affect the structures and disturb amenity. The impacts would be lessened with a compliant design.
- **Insufficient information:** The plans lack critical details. For example, the first-floor addition is not dimensioned. There are no sill heights for any of the windows. The setbacks are not even shown. In their current form, the plans would stop development being carried out right to the rear boundary as there are no dimensions to control the extent of the development.
- **Unacceptable precedent:** It would set an unacceptable precedent to approve a non-compliant development of this scale in this area, especially given the significant adverse impacts it would have on privacy, solar access and amenity, and the fact that it has not been designed to mitigate those impacts sufficiently.

Thank you for considering my comments above.

Regards,
Sarah Lovely