
Sent: 25/04/2023 4:35:48 PM
Subject: Objection - DA2023/0299-29-35 Reddall St Manly NSW 2095

Dear Council

Objection - DA2023/0299-29-35 Reddall St Manly NSW 2095

I wish to strongly object to the DA submission referred to above.

The DA submission does not appear to comply with LEP / DCP requirements in the following areas listed below and the development of these 5 dwellings would negatively impact on neighbouring properties, traffic flow and parking in the area nor complement the existing streetscape and heritage of the area.

Subdivision

DCP control 4.4.8.2 (a) stipulates that new subdivisions must complement the prevailing subdivision pattern and respecting the patterns of traditional streetscapes and open space as well as both built and natural heritage.

This submission does not meet this standard due to:

Increasing density compared to surrounding dwellings

Proposing much smaller lots than the surrounding areas

Proposing a battle axe arrangement for a dwelling

The Subdivision requires extensive excavation impacting the topography

Basement Parking

DCP 4.4.5.2 - basement parking is to be contained in the footprint of the building.

The basement breaches the footprint in a number of areas regarding Lots 1, 2 and 5.

Foreshore Scenic Protection

The proposed development's non compliance with the front setback requirements outlined below dramatically reduces open space to support the planting of trees endemic to the area and has a negative impact on the visual amenity to this streetscape and area.

Preservation of Trees – 15 trees are proposed to be removed. Is the development's proposed landscaping sufficient?

Front Setbacks

Breach of the minimum front setback required to building Lots 1, 2 and 3

A minimum front setback of 6M is required when a prevailing building line cannot be established.

The proposed front setbacks for Lots 1, 2 and 3 are between 3.2M and 4.3M breaching the required minimum of 6M

Breach of the minimum front setback required to building Lot 4

The proposed front setbacks for Lot 4 on College St breaches the required minimum of 6M

Rear Setbacks

Breach of the minimum rear setback required to building on all 5 Lots

Side Setbacks

Lot 1 - the side setbacks does not meet the minimum side setback controls on the southern boundary

Difference 0.9M – 1.3M

Lot 3 – the side setbacks does not meet the minimum side setback controls on the northern boundary

Difference 0.8M

Wall Heights / number of storeys

The submission is non compliant with the Wall height DCP control 4.1.2.1 and number of Stories DCP control 4.1.2.2

Swimming Pools

Height above Ground DCP 4.1.9.1

The proposed swimming pools are elevated higher than the compliance set of no greater than 1M above the the natural ground level.

Environment Impact Statement

Clause 6.2 (3) (g)

Issue of LEP development consent cannot be approved until an assessment is undertaken to determine whether the excavation sediment will cause adverse impact on the environmentally sensitive Cabbage Tree Aquatic protected marine reserve. The Statement of environment effects must also address the impact the development will have on the endangered long nose bandicoot where these concerns are raised.

Yours sincerely

Jude Furniss
Cliff St, Manly
Property Owner