
Sent: 13/01/2020 4:53:57 PM
Subject: Online Submission

13/01/2020

MR Garry Neville
61 Francis ST
Manly NSW 2095
garry.neville@gmail.com

RE: DA2019/1312 - 63 Francis Street MANLY NSW 2095

13 January 2020

Dear Benjamin,

We are owner occupiers of the neighbouring property to the south. We don't object to development of 63 Francis Street in principle and we understand and accept that there will be an impact on our existing amenity resulting from the development of the site. Our submission relates to the way in which the application is presented, which makes it very difficult for us to gain an appreciation of the degree of impacts on us and neighbouring properties. The two key impacts we wish to raise relate to the building envelope and parking as discussed below.

Building Envelope for Future Development

We note that the introduction of the SEE states that "The proposal has been designed to relate to its site and the streetscape in terms of appearance, envelope, setbacks, bulk and scale. The proposal will operate without any significant impacts to the amenity of neighbouring properties", yet we could not find any discussion, assessment or analysis of these aspects (bulk, scale and amenity impacts) in the application, other than implied by a blanket statement in Table 1 that the new lot "is able to accommodate a compliant dwelling house". This statement doesn't seem to be justified further.

In reviewing the application we are left unsure that it will be possible to design a reasonably sized future home on the proposed Lot B without unreasonably impacting neighbours (as defined by the DCP controls) when site constraints are properly considered, per clause 4.1.1.2 b) of the DCP.

When the proposed long, narrow, steep block, east/west orientation, protection of large trees and set-back requirements are considered, it is likely to result in a very narrow, high built form for any reasonably sized home. We are concerned that excessive and/or non-compliant overshadowing would be unavoidable to our ground level living area (north facing open space/courtyard and adjacent glazed sliding doors). This area is our home's only access to direct sunlight for thermal mass and comfort in living areas in the winter months.

The building envelope shown in the SEE and Site Plan doesn't consider these constraints and appears to simplify the envelope to a footprint (2D) rather than an envelope which has height (3D per DCP definition). It would seem that once the constraints noted above and compliant overshadowing and height/bulk are considered, an envelope fully compliant with Council's DCP on Lot B would be very small and possibly not viable for a reasonably sized home.

Parking

There is high demand for on-street parking in Francis Street with many dwellings including ours unable to park off-street due to topographical constraints. We appreciate that the parking and driveway proposal is just a concept at this stage however, we would like to see a better solution for the final plan than the tandem/stacked parking and elevated driveway presented in the application.

- With respect the tandem parking space, we don't believe that shuffling cars in and out onto Francis Street which is a very narrow, steep, busy street on a bus route is practical and any second car associated with a new dwelling would likely park on the street rather than the car space.
- We would like to see the location of the driveway and layback moved further up the hill such that three on-street car spaces (at 5.2m long per AS2890.1) can be retained between the existing layback at Lot A and proposed layback at Lot B. In the current proposal only two cars can park between the laybacks resulting in wasted on-street parking space (13.5m provided, 15.6 needed). However we note that moving the driveway uphill in this manner would increase the fill needed in the road reserve at the boundary.
- In regard to the fill in the road reserve needed for the driveway, it is not clear to us how pedestrian thoroughfare and drainage will be managed (the footpath is much lower than the road and currently acts as an overland flow path).

The current proposal could result in a loss of three on-street parking spaces i.e 1. Due to new driveway layback, 2. Due to tandem space possibly not used, 3. Inadequate separation of the proposed to the existing layback at No.63.

Regards,
Garry Neville and Christa Sams