

urbaine architectural

Date: **15.11.2019**

Project: **70, The Corso, Manly, NSW 2095.**

As a result of the public exhibition process council is in receipt of 2 submission/s from:

The following issues were raised in the submissions and each have been addressed below:

Requirement for a Dilapidation Report

Mitigation of demolition and construction impacts on adjoining properties economic impacts in the locality.

(ii) Social Impact

The proposed development will have a detrimental social impact in the locality considering the character of the proposal.

(iii) Economic Impact

The proposed development will have a detrimental economic impact on the locality considering the nature of the existing and proposed land use.

Section 4.15 (1) (c) – the suitability of the site for the development. The site is considered unsuitable for the proposed development based on the information available to Council, specifically in relation to construction traffic management.

Section 4.15 (1) (e) – the public interest

This assessment has found the proposal to be contrary to the relevant requirement(s) of the Manly LEP and DCP such that it would undermine the desired future character of the area and be contrary to the expectations of the community. In this regard, the development, as proposed, is not considered to be in the public interest.

Section 4.15 Matters for Consideration.

Comments

Mr Ivo Rosbach 7 / 27 Cliff Street MANLY NSW 2095

Steven Sommer 692a Mowbray Road LANE COVE NSW 2066

The matters raised within the submissions are addressed as follows:

Requirement for a Dilapidation Report

Comment:

If the application was to be recommended for approval, relevant conditions would have been included requiring the preparation of Dilapidation Reports for the adjoining properties/buildings.

Mitigation of demolition and construction impacts on adjoining properties

Comment:

It is not anticipated that the proposed development would result in unreasonable/excessive dust and noise impacts, if undertaken in accordance with the suitable conditions and relevant standards. However, the application is recommended for refusal based on concerns relating to heritage and construction traffic management.

The proposed development may have significant impact to the adjoining buildings, local businesses and resident in The Corso.

A construction and traffic management report/ plan shall be submitted to outline the proposed project phasing, construction methodology and traffic control during the construction. The plan shall be assessed by both Development Engineering and Transport Network section. As such, Development engineering cannot provide sufficient assessment on the application in this form. Please refer to Development Engineering again when the construction and traffic management report/ plan is submitted.

Strategic and Place Planning (Heritage Officer)

Additional Heritage Comments:

After review of the documents (the pre lodgement application and the DA application) I have following comments for the heritage item, 70 The Corso, Manly: In the latest DA drawings colours and materials are not consistent with 66 – 68 The Corso in contrary to the heritage Advisor's comments in the pre-lodgement meeting. The main facade facing The Corso is showing bagged brick masonry in the photomontage and there is no description of this material on this elevation. The photomontage does not reflect the ground floor plan. The plan is showing a recess which is required in the 'Manly DCP.

THE PHOTOMONTAGE REFLECTS THE RECESSED SHOPFONT AND HERITAGE DETAILING TO THE GROUND FLOOR.

Part 5.1.2 The Corso' but there is a large glazing without any recess in the photomontage.

The following comments are in relation with Manly DCP Part 5 and Schedule 6:

5.1.2.1 Most existing buildings are significant and are to be conserved, not redeveloped

b) Existing street facades, including all original detailing, are particularly important and are to be maintained. This includes original framing details and materials to windows, doors and other openings. Original details missing or removed should be reinstated and unsympathetic additions removed.

5.1.2.8 Windows and balconies open to the street. To allow interaction between the building and the public street (and to provide natural ventilation), windows to upper floors are to be openable and balconies are not to be enclosed. Where original balconies have been enclosed, Council encourages that they be reopened in keeping with their historic use and heritage significance.

Comment: Enclosing the first floor balcony is not encouraged but if this is not stressed in the pre-lodgement meeting the new window should match 66 – 68 The Corso in terms of the shape (frame, mullions) and the materials.

THE NEW DESIGN ENCLOSES THE BALCONY IN THE SAME MANNER AS THE BALCONY AT NO.66, IN TERMS OF FORM, FABRIC AND COLOUR.

5.1.2.11 Footpath Awnings

Footpath awnings (solid, horizontal & with lighting) are required, but trafficable balconies and post-supported awnings and balconies are prohibited and considered to be an unnecessary intrusion on the available street space. See also Manly Town Centre Urban Design Guidelines for more details on the acceptable design of awnings.

Comment: The height of the awning should match 72 The Corso as per Manly DCP Schedule 6:

"replace signage board attached to awning fascia with one of consistent height with No 72, match depth of awning and apply consistent colour scheme with 66-68."

THE AWNING HEIGHT MATCHES THE AWNINGS OF NOS. 66 AND 68, WHICH SEEMS MORE APPROPRIATE THAN MATCHING THE NEWER BUILDING AT 72, THE CORSO.

5.1.2.13 Shop-fronts are to be Reinstated

a) Where shop-fronts have been removed and replaced with shuttered openings, the reinstatement of shop-fronts is supported for aesthetic and historic reasons. New Shuttered openings will not be permitted.

B)New shop-fronts should comprise a 'frame' established by masonry ends read as vertical continuations of the façade above, and by a solid horizontal plinth between the ground and the window sill. The design of the space within this frame can reflect the use of the premises, and utilise contemporary design. See Figure 51 - Shop-fronts within a masonry frame.

THE NEW DESIGN REFLECTS THESE REQUIREMENTS.

Comment: As stated earlier, the ground floor plan showing the recessed entry is supported.

Further to a review of the available documents and site visit, The site of proposed development is part of a group collectively listed as a heritage item in its own right, it is located in the heritage conservation area and in vicinity of other heritage items. The site was subject to PLM 2018/0254, with notably different proposal. At the time, some verbal comment was provided, and part of abridged written comments are: - I know that the interior of the building (on both levels), as well as the shopfront, have been lost due to numerous alterations in the past. The proposal to re-instate a shopfront reminiscent of presumed original is commendable.

To my disappointment, we have received proposal that includes ultramodern shopfront, strikingly contrasting the original imagery of the item with its ground-to-awning frameless glass structure. On the upper level as well, originally open terrace is proposed to be enclosed (contrary to DCP recommendation and original state); it is further proposed to frame this enclosure in UPVC (!?).

In addition to this, it is proposed to add a parapet wall to the rear side of the building, which appears to have a sole purpose to create a boxed gutter along the northern site boundary. The purpose of this element is unclear, but it is likely that the boxed gutter would collect all kinds of debris and thus lead to gutter blockages and subsequent impact on fabric.

THE PARAPET AND BOX GUTTER IS A REFLECTION OF THE DESIGN AT NO.66, THE CORSO. THE BOX GUTTER WILL BE PROTECTED WITH A MESH TO PREVENT ANY DEBRIS COLLECTION.

On a careful read, and with due respect, I noted that the heritage report did not address site-specific DCP recommendations, albeit it is fair to say that this would not have changed the outcome of this assessment.

The proposal is recommended for amendments in keeping with the above, or refusal.

Traffic Engineer General Description of proposal:

Reasons for refusal:

The previous comments on this DA lodged by the traffic section outlined that a Construction Traffic Management Plan was required to be submitted with the DA to allow an assessment of the impact of the development on surrounding land uses. The construction traffic management plan (CTMP) that has been submitted is considered inadequate and a revised CTMP should be submitted prior to approval of the DA. The following concerns with the submitted CTMP are raised.

- The CTMP and any Traffic Control Plans (TCP's) should be prepared by a suitably qualified Traffic Engineer and/or an RMS Certified Traffic Controller.

TCP HAS BEEN PREPARED BY A SUITABLY QUALIFIED TRAFFIC ENGINEER.

- Pg2 "Work hours" advises that audible site works are will occur between 7am and 6pm Mon-Fri and 7am to 1pm Sat. Works may only occur until 5pm Mon-Fri.

CORRECTED

- Pg 3 incorrectly states that RMS ROL's will be in place for the duration of the project. An ROL is not required on a local road. Council will however require that applications for Stand Plant permits be obtained for any works involving standing of heavy plant on the road reserve.

CORRECTED

- The document references the TCP's in several locations however no TCP's are included with the CTMP. These should be included in the CTMP and need to show how traffic and pedestrians will be managed to cater for various anticipated work scenarios eg demolition, concrete pours and should demonstrate that traffic and pedestrian access through Rialto lane will still be able to occur safely. They should be prepared by an RMS certified traffic controller and attached as an appendix to the CTMP.

CORRECTED

- As the site is only 5.5m in width any truck parking at the rear of the site will impede access to adjacent premises. The CTMP should detail what liaison has taken place with adjacent premises and how their property access will be impacted and managed.

IN THE AMENDED REPORT

- The CTMP incorrectly states that the impact on local parking will be minimal. Parking to adjacent premises will be impeded by the construction activities. The CTMP needs to address how this will be managed.

IN THE AMENDED REPORT

- The CTMP outlines that Traffic Controllers will be present on site but does not provide TCP's to show how they will be used and under what circumstances. These must be provided.

PROVIDED IN THE AMENDED REPORT

- Pg5 advises that when concrete pours are taking place that there will be minimal disruption to pedestrians. On the contrary, the stationing of a concrete truck and concrete pump in Rialto Lane is likely to significantly disrupt pedestrians and vehicular traffic and a TCP showing how it will be managed is required as part of the CTMP.

PROVIDED IN THE AMENDED REPORT

- Pg 5 & 6. section 4a advises that the largest trucks engaged on the project will be up to 8m in length. Section 4b suggests that trucks in excess of 8.8m will be used. Given the small frontage of the site and the restricted nature of Rialto Lane the size of trucks should be minimised and no trucks longer than 8.8m should be used.

CORRECTED

• Figure 4 shows the proposed demolition plan and details to location of skip bins on the site. Given the narrow width of the site and given the size of skip bins the plan is considered unworkable and it is unclear how skip bins would be moved on and off the site. A dimensioned TCP is required.

CORRECTED

5.10 Heritage conservation

Assessment of the proposal by Council's Heritage Officers has raised concerns in relation to the appearance of the facade. While it is likely that these concerns could have been addressed via amendments to the proposal and do not warrant refusal of the application, further issues in relation to Construction Traffic Management mean that Council is not able to support the application based on the information provided.

5.10 Heritage conservation No

6.13 Design excellence No

6.13 Design excellence

The proposed development is generally consistent with the requirements of this clause, with the exception of (4)(i). No detail has been provided relating to materials and finishes to proposed building facade to The Corso, as raised by Council's Heritage Officer. As such, no assessment can be made of the appropriateness of the proposal in relation to standard of design, materials and detailing.

Manly Development Control Plan Built Form Controls

Compliance Assessment

Detailed Assessment

5.1.2 The Corso

The proposed development is non-compliant with this clause due to non-compliances and insufficient information as detailed in the Heritage Officer Comments.

Schedule 2 - Townscape Principles

As per the Schedule 2 - Townscape Principles map, the subject site is in the vicinity of an "Important Corner" and an "Important Pedestrian Link". Due to the insufficient information provided in relation to the proposed facade redevelopment and the required Construction Traffic Management Plan, the proposal is not supported and is recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT Council, as the consent authority APPROVES Development Consent to Development

The application is determined on 02/10/2019, under the delegated authority of:

Anna Williams, Manager Development Assessments