
From: DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au
Sent: 9/06/2023 3:49:00 PM
To: DA Submission Mailbox
Subject: TRIMMED: Online Submission

09/06/2023

MR Luke Richmond
12 / 20 Angle ST
BALGOWLAH NSW 2093
[REDACTED]

RE: DA2023/0617 - 24 Angle Street BALGOWLAH NSW 2093

To the appointed Northern Beaches Council Planning Officer, Maxwell Duncan,

I, Luke Richmond, resident of 12/20 Angle Street, BALGOWLAH, object to this development proposal (DA2023/0617 - 22 & 24 Angle Street). This submission details the grounds on which I object under Manly LEP 2013 and Manly DCP 2013.

Firstly, during the construction phase, there would be significant safety issues caused by the use of Angle Street as an entry point to construction. As it is, there are difficulties fitting two cars at once going through the street, with cars regularly having to pull over to allow other cars past. The cul-de-sac also has a very narrow turning path, with recent incidents including a truck crashing into the fencing at 11 Angle Street, and on multiple occasions, trucks have been caught in the power lines at 20 Angle Street causing serious safety concerns and hazards, as trucks have needed to pull into our driveway to make a complete turn. It would be highly inappropriate for vehicles of significant size using Angle Street for construction.

The driveway proposed for use is a shared pedestrian pathway which is regularly used by local students and their parents for: Manly West Public School, St Cecilia's Primary School and Balgowlah Boys High School. It is also highly frequented by shoppers going to Stockland Shopping Centre on foot. Any proposal to extend the driveway would impact on a public area and also disrupt native wildlife, such as bush turkeys which have nested in the area. The public space is also frequently used by residents as a playing area and hosts an annual Christmas party for residents in Angle Street. Nothing has been done to address the public safety of pedestrians and impacts on the green area in this proposal.

There is the high risk of rock vibrations transmitting to more delicate parts of our building with serious concerns about the likelihood of damage being caused to our lot at 20 Angle Street. There has been nothing done to address this.

In addition to these considerable issues that have not been addressed during the initial phases of construction, there is potential for detrimental long-term impacts on local residents. In our lot at 20 Angle Street, there is regular flooding in the top building, and a pump system required installation to reduce sinking of the area. A construction of this significance would have significant impacts on our lot with stormwater flow and potential structural issues. Again, nothing has been done to address this.

The overall design and plans are entirely inappropriate for the surrounding area. There would

be a significant lack of privacy for units in our top building and block the little sunlight available to the lower apartments.

For convenience, I have noted below that the development is non-compliant against the following controls:

Manly LEP 2013:

4.3 - maximum height is 8.5m. Actual is 9.2m, deviation is +8%. If allowance is made for the "excavation" referenced by the proposal, other sections of the building still reach 8.8m & 8.9m from the south elevation

4.4 - floor space ratio is 0.95:1. Actual is 0.5:1, deviation is +90%

Manly DCP 2013:

4.1.1.1 - minimum residential density is 300 sqm. Actual is 102 sqm, deviation is -66%

4.1.2 - height as per above LEP

4.1.2.1 - wall heights deviate at various points from control

4.1.2.2 - development is 3 stories as viewed from 3 elevations. Actual is 2 stories.

4.1.2.3 - roof height, parapets deviate from controls.

4.1.3 - floor space ratio as per above LEP

4.1.4.2 - side setbacks are less than $\frac{1}{3}$ wall height in multiple locations. Balconies extend into setbacks where there are significant privacy concerns.

4.1.4.4 - Rear setback is 3.4m. Actual is 9m, deviation is -62%

4.1.5.1 - total open space is 40%. Actual is 55%, deviation is -27%

4.1.6.4 - d) the proposed road access does not adequately separate pedestrians from vehicles, c) the proposed road access has inadequate vision given the nature of the access, a) vehicles are highly likely to need to reverse and therefore will not always enter and exit in a forward direction

NSW Apartment Design Guide

Objective 3F-1 states that properties up to 12m in height should maintain 6m of separation from habitable rooms and balconies and 3m from non-habitable rooms. The proposed design's minimum is 3.5m & 5.1m to 72A+B West Street's living room from ground and 1st floor balconies respectively and 2.37m to 72A+B West Street's stairwell from the ground floor balcony.

The applicant has submitted requests for exceptions to some of these controls, but I believe these to be insufficient and do not cover all of the noncompliant areas.

On these grounds, I submit an objection to the plans proposed in DA2023/0617.