
From: DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au
Sent: 7/06/2024 10:20:03 AM
To: DA Submission Mailbox
Subject: TRIMMED: Online Submission

07/06/2024

MR PETER NASS
69 WHISTLER ST
MANLY NSW 2095
[REDACTED]

RE: DA2024/0591 - 71 Whistler Street MANLY NSW 2095

RE: NOTICE OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

APPLICATION NO: DA2024/0591

Our concerns with the application are as follows:

□ The height of the development proposal at 10.7 metres is not consistent with the existing streetscape taking into account the height of adjoining neighbouring houses being No. 69 with a height of 6.5 metres whilst No. 73 appears slightly taller. Furthermore, the neighbouring residences of No. 69 are also of similar height to No. 69 and 73. We note that No. 75 has a DA approved with a proposed height of 9.05 metres; however, the height is consistent with the adjoining two storey apartment block.

Therefore, the overall height variance of No. 71 will be in excess of 3 metres taller than the general streetscape and in our view will deform the current and future streetscape.

The proposed void between Bedroom 2 and the stairs as shown on the First Floor Plan (DA07) unnecessarily increases the height and bulk of the building to the detriment of our adjoining property to the south at No. 69 Whistler Street.

□ The development application is proposing an increase in the floor space ratio in the order of 19.0% by increasing the height to three-stories, which we believe will be the only three storey residence in the immediate vicinity.

□ In this regard the DA submission has provided seven comparable approvals to justify the height and bulk of the application, however we are of the view that five comparable properties are irrelevant in that they are not within Manly precinct and the zonings are not similar. The two most relevant examples are 49 Alexandria Street, where the height and bulk appear to be in accordance with the surrounding streetscape and residences and 15 Pine Street which is a corner block and again the height and bulk are in accordance with existing surrounding residences.

□ In addition to the above we note that the development at 122 Pittwater Road (which was approved in October 2022), having a larger site area of 215 square metres, and a gross floor area (GFA) of 172 m² (FSR of 0.8:1) was required to reduce its height to accommodate the current desired and future characteristics of the streetscape. The floor space ratio (FSR) of buildings on a site is the ratio of the GFA of all buildings within the site to the site area.

□ Also, the subject application is seeking approval for a GFA of 156 m² on a site of 173 m², which appears a larger FSR than that of 122 Pittwater Road.

□ Based on the above, we are of the view that the proposed development has a greater height and bulk than the comparable approvals cited and such contradicts the following statement in the DA's supporting documentation: "The new dwelling remains compatible with the built form in the locality and complies with the building height and number of stories controls. The resulting bulk and scale is of a lesser or consistent scale with surrounding

properties and privacy and solar access are retained for both the subject site and adjoining dwellings."

- The plans lack clarity in regard to the following:

- o The shadow diagram DA 18 gives no indication to the season, whilst DA19 appears to be upside down;

- o The louver windows proposed facing east and west in the walls the southern boundary block work wall (kitchen region) are less than 900 mm from the side boundary so presents a noise/fire source from their kitchen to the neighbouring property;

- o The block wall on the southern side (kitchen /dining/living) appears to be virtually on the boundary. As such we have concerns with the lack of details associated fire rating provisions and noise, and;

- o The first floor, second bedroom building wall appears to be on the boundary line as such again/noise and fire issues are of concern.

- The submission should take into consideration build/render/paint and restoration of the block work which aligns with part of our boundary.

- The submission should take into account the relocation of the sewerage line connection.

The current sewerage connection is through No. 69 Whistler Street and should be relocated.

In conclusion, we are of the view that the application is out of character with the desired and future streetscape characteristics, in that the height and bulk will be well outside the current and future streetscape with the third floor having a pitched roof.

Peter and Kim Nass

69 Whistler Street, Manly

Email: [REDACTED]