
Sent: 15/06/2020 11:25:56 AM
Subject: Online Submission

15/06/2020

MS Ava Shirley
546 Pittwater RD
North Manly NSW 2100
ava_shirley@outlook.com

RE: DA2020/0512 - 532 Pittwater Road NORTH MANLY NSW 2100

Dear Mr Collier,

I am a local resident at 546 Pittwater Road, and also send my daughter to the long daycare centre at 530 Pittwater Road (immediately adjacent to this proposed development). I have several comments that I hope you take into consideration in your assessment of this proposal. They are minor in nature but I believe will improve how this development is used by its residents and also how the development contributes to the wider streetscape.

Waste

The allocation of bin space seems inadequate. There are just 3 recycling bins, and since Northern Beaches has separate plastics and paper, so you would assume two of each would be the minimal required. Even that number seems inadequate for the number of residents at this address, given that collection of these items is fortnightly.

Bicycle Parking

As this development is on a bike path, the provision of just four bicycle parking spots seems inadequate for a project that houses 24 residents. Particularly when one of the house rules in the Plan of Management [POM] encourages the use of bicycles, and that bikes are to be stored in the space allocated to them. In one particular plan, a bike is shown on the deck space. This is highly unlikely as it requires said bike to be carried up the common stairs. For the potential 20 residents in excess of the shown 4 parking spaces, it would be beneficial to know where these are. The use of the private outdoor space adjacent to the common room at the ground floor seems unlikely, given the undesirable outlook to the undercroft car parking. This might be better served as additional bike parking, particularly as the large outdoor terrace upstairs at the front of the building would prove a much more inviting outdoor dining area for residents.

Notification Plans

The elevations supplied as part of the notification plan are inaccurately named and it appears as though the northern elevation has been supplied twice, and southern elevation not supplied. Window locations are not shown on plan, and the loft bedroom plans are also not supplied.

Drying of Clothes

The POM states that no clothing or towels are to be hung on any of the external balcony areas, and yet the SEE states that drying racks are included on each balcony. A dedicated, communal drying area should be provided for in a discrete area of the development. The drying of clothes on balconies is not supported.

Overshadowing

The shadows in winter cast by the rear portion of the building will significantly overshadow the

outdoor play space of the neighbouring childcare centre. In winter, this represents a significant and detrimental impact on the use of the space by the children. Should 530 Pittwater Road ever return to a residential use,

Room heights and Windows

The sections do not appear to show the internal room heights of the kitchen areas. Is it 2130 as per the bathroom? It is my understanding that this is not a compliant height for a kitchen space. The very small window allocation to the bedroom is unlikely to supply sufficient light during the day and will lead to extended use of artificial lighting. Additionally, these spaces are likely to be unmanageably hot in summer. It is unlikely that the bifold doors to the decks would be left open overnight due to security issues, so the rooms rely on a window in the lounge space and the bedroom window for cross ventilation / convection. It seems inevitable that air-conditioning units will be required, and in this instance the retrofitting of such plant equipment will be ill-conceived and likely detracting from the designed built form and cause noise issues. It is necessary to provide housing that has basic natural light and temperature regulation to ensure the longevity of its use.

Southern Boundary Fence

Why does the fence height on the eastern boundary need to be low past the manager's room? It gives unnecessary sight-lines from the street into the under-cover parking area that is unsightly. It would be preferable from a street-scape point of view to replicate the higher masonry wall with paling fence upper portion at the point at which the entry stair exists (approximately 12500mm from the front boundary). This will also provide greater privacy to the childcare centre adjacent. Alternatively, a timber screen could be provided to the southern-most open carapace (carspace 01) to enclose this area from view.

Privacy

The raised balconies from L12, L11, L10 and L09 all appear as though they will overlook the childcare centre, again raising privacy concerns.

Construction and Cost of Work

As this development is beside the long day care centre and bike path, I believe it would be prudent for there to be particular consideration given in the Construction Management Plan in relation to traffic management and airborne dust (including concrete). Additionally, it seems as though the estimated Cost-of-Work is out of step with local construction costs. It is important that this figure be accurately represented to ensure the necessary fees are paid.

I look forward to reviewing your assessment of these issues in your assessment report. It really is imperative that particular care be given to the approval of boarding house developments so as not to alienate the existing residents, detrimentally impact the local area and ultimately cause further harm the reputation of boarding houses which do serve a valuable purpose in providing affordable housing in more affluent areas.

Sincerely,

Ava Shirley

Registered Architect NSW 10339