
Sent: 22/10/2019 8:20:02 AM
Subject: Online Submission

22/10/2019

MR Douglas McMillan
E602 / 8-28 The Corso - Corsoleil The Corso ST
Manly NSW 2095
doug.mcmillan@outlook.com

RE: DA2019/0997 - 50 East Esplanade MANLY NSW 2095

1. The architectural drawings show conflicting information.

On drawing S96 08A the roof levels are shown as RL24.25 for the left overrun, RL 22.70 for the western portion of the roof and RL23.582 for the central portion of the roof. Whereas on Section AA which is taken through the centre portion of the roof the RL of the roof is shown as RL 22.7 and not RL 23.582.

On Section BB which is taken just north west of grid E, the mid level of the roof is shown as RL23.05 and not RL 23.582.

Further the section is wrongly showing that No 8-28 The Corso is considerably lower than roof level in No 6 The Corso whereas where the section is taken is at the deck of unit E502 at RL 23.06.

These obvious inconsistencies raise suspicion that what is proposed is presented in the best possible light for the development.

2. The previous approval was for a four level development. From my perspective the Section 96 application appears to be pushing the boundaries in the following ways: -

a) The typical floor to floor height of 6 The Corso is 3.3m. If the centre position of the roof is to be at RL 23.582 then the floor to roof plant area is 4.68m i.e. A fifty percent increase on the typical floor to floor height.

b) The working hours requested are well outside Council's normally allowed hours.

c) The screen around the roof mounted plant is at RL24.25. If the RL of the centre portion of the plant area is at RL23.58 then the screen only extends about 0.7m above plant area level and will only screen very low AC units.

Will Council impose a minimum height on AC equipment?

3. The Construction Methodology shows two options for the vehicles to enter the site from the front, neither of which are definitive.

If construction vehicles are to come off the Whistler St and Corso corner to access the site through the proposed sliding gate in the Class A hoarding then detailed access path drawings showing all the impediments to vehicle movement should be shown i.e.: -trees, light poles, Telstra phone stand, Manly Council obelisk, water features, seating etc.

The current indicative drawings could be interpreted to indicate that heavy trucks travel westward on the Corso and pass between the proposed hoarding and the very large Fig tree roughly is in line with the common boundary of No 6 and No 8-28 The Corso (this tree is shown on architectural Section AA as a spindly tree whereas in actual fact it has a trunk of 0.9 m diameter approximately with relatively lower branches. Not only would this be impossible if vehicles were not to track over the root zone of the fig tree but it would temporarily block off pedestrian access in front of the construction site and this should not be allowed as it would cause very great pedestrian interference especially at peak times.

If construction vehicles are to come westward off Whistler St/Corso corner and travel down the centre of what is now a pedestrian precinct, then the vehicles would have to pass between two palm trees in front of the construction site so as to be able to turn into the site. Such a

manoeuvre is not possible without moving some of the fixed objects in the area.
In summary what has been presented to date is hopelessly inadequate to enable proper assessment of what is proposed.

Yours sincerely,

Doug Mcmillan.

Consulting Structural and Civil Engineer.