
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 22/04/2022 1:14:52 PM
To: DA Submission Mailbox
Subject: Online Submission

22/04/2022

MR Peter Matthews
46 Mactier ST
Narrabeen NSW 2101
[REDACTED]

RE: DA2022/0535 - 48 Mactier Street NARRABEEN NSW 2101

Northern Beaches Council
PO Box 82
Manly NSW
1655 Australia

Attention Mr Nick England
22 April 2022

RE: Development Application DA2022/0535 Proposed Secondary Dwelling at 48 Mactier Street, Narrabeen.

Dear Nick,

We write to you to voice our concern over the proposed Development Application for 48 Mactier Street, Narrabeen DA2022/0535

Overall there are multiple mistakes pertaining to the application being copied from another project and re-used for this proposal. There are many errors and omissions throughout all documents with references to redundant street names and controls which are not relevant to this site as well as basic required information omitted from the proposal. This makes it very hard to get a true idea of the proposal as it doesn't seem that all controls have been taken into consideration when proposing the granny flat at 48 Mactier Street, Narrabeen.

We see the landscape department has already commented on the application, noting that 2 of the proposed trees to be removed have not be commented on by the arborist. This is just one example of the incomplete nature of the proposal.

The survey, site plan, floor plans and elevations are supposed to show the neighbouring building outlines including windows so that it can be determined where the proposed building sits in relation to neighbouring buildings. The survey doesn't pick up the windows or even the rear of the building at number 46 Mactier Street. So it cannot be determined if the bedroom windows are offset from the neighbouring building as the Development Control Plan stipulates. It is noted that the survey also does not show the rear townhouse locations which are also directly impacted by this proposal.

Since the fall of the land is diagonal, dropping from the south east corner of the block towards the north west corner of the block, it is concerning to note that there is no retaining wall shown on the site plan along the eastern boundary. However on the South Elevation it is noted that there is a retaining wall shown. Which is it? It would be very helpful to understand what exactly is being built and will the land be retained adequately. If there is a retaining wall there will the Syzygium 'Cascade' shown on the landscape plan still be able to be planted?

It is concerning to note that the undercroft area of the deck is about 3.3 meters. Buildings should be designed so that they fit with the shape of the land. The Development Control Plan states: On sloping land, the height and bulk of development (particularly on the downhill side) is to be minimised, and the need for cut and fill reduced by designs which minimise the building footprint and allow the building mass to step down the slope. If the building stepped down the land the impact on 46 Mactier Street would be lessened.

The Statement of Environmental Effects seems to be extremely vague and has multiple mistakes that do not correlate to the drawings. For example:

- The site coverage says 33% on page 3 but on the site plan it says the site coverage is 69.8%.
- The total floor area permissible says 380m² is permissible but they are proposing 441.63m². This does not make sense?
- The rear setback is proposed at 5 meters. But the Development Control Plan stipulates 6 meters.
- Private open space is supposed to be directly off the living areas and be reasonably flat. The space they have provided is very sloped and is not directly off the living areas, accessed by multiple steps and not visible from the living area.
- General accessibility refers to Harley Crescent- there is no Harley Crescent in the vicinity.
- Access and Traffic: states that the granny flat will be used by a family member and not generate any traffic or parking issues. Even though this may be the case in the immediate future, this will certainly not be the case for the life of the granny flat. There is every chance that the granny flat could be rented out to a two car family or even two couples who have four cars, who will then have to park on the already overcrowded and busy streets surrounding the property. There is no legal parking on the street directly outside the property. The Development Control Plan states in Appendix 1 Carparking requirements that there must be 2 car spaces provided per dwelling for a dwelling house and dual occupancy. There is currently a single car garage with room to park another car in front of it. It would be beneficial to all surrounding neighbours if there was provision for car spaces as per the control. The access to the granny flat is also not described or designed. It is a long walk from the street and the last part of the access is currently a sloping block of land. Where will the access be and will this add to the hard stand area that is already maximised.

We would also like to raise concerns over Privacy Views and overshadowing. We have lived at 46 Mactier Streets for 38 years and over that time all of our lake views have been completely built out except for our bedroom view. The granny flat is single story, however it is elevated by over 3 meters and so it will directly impact on all the neighbours privacy. The deck and living areas will look into the bedrooms of the townhouses to the west and the bedroom windows seems to be directly opposite the bedroom windows of number 46 Mactier Street. As per our previous comment about the vague survey detail, there is not enough information on the plans and elevations to show how the windows will impact on the bedrooms of number 46 Mactier Street.

The Development Control Plan states: 1. Building layout should be designed to optimise privacy for occupants of the development and occupants of adjoining properties.

2. Orientate living areas, habitable rooms and windows to private open space areas or to the street to limit overlooking.

3. The effective location of doors, windows and balconies to avoid overlooking is preferred to the use of screening devices, high sills or obscured glass.
 4. The windows of one dwelling are to be located so they do not provide direct or close views (ie from less than 9 metres away) into the windows of other dwellings.
 5. Planter boxes, louvre screens, pergolas, balcony design and the like are to be used to screen a minimum of 50% of the principal private open space of a lower apartment from overlooking from an upper apartment.
- Therefore we ask that more information be provided and consideration be taken about how high the granny flat sits above the natural ground.

Also, due to the fact that the elevations do not show the outline of the neighbouring properties, the building envelope or the building height line, it is hard to understand how the proposed granny flat will block the current lake, and district views from the bedrooms of number 46 Mactier Street. More information is requested to understand the levels in relation to the levels of 46 Mactier Street. This information is a standard requirement to be presented within a Development Application and it is feared that no consideration for the views at 46 Mactier Street have been taken into consideration with the design of the proposed granny flat. The Development Control Plan States in relation to views: Development shall provide for the reasonable sharing of views.

The proposal also lacks adequate information about the finishes and materials. The proposal does determine that the granny flat will be clad in fibre cement cladding however colours are not stipulated. The Development control plan states:

1. In highly visible areas, the visual impact of new development (including any structures required to retain land) is to be minimized through the use of appropriate colours and materials and landscaping.
2. The colours and materials of development on sites adjoining, or in close proximity to, bushland areas, waterways or the beach must blend in to the natural landscape.
3. The colours and materials used for alterations and additions to an existing structure shall complement the existing external building façade.
4. The holiday/fisherman shack character of the waterfront of Cottage Point is to be enhanced by the use of building materials which are sympathetic to the small timber and fibro cottages currently in existence on the waterfront. All buildings visible from the water are to utilise materials such as weatherboard, fibre cement, corrugated steel and timber. The use of masonry is discouraged.

Note

A schedule of colours and materials is to be submitted with all development applications. It is noted that all surrounding dwellings and buildings including the subject site are built from brick and therefore the Statement of Environmental Effects states incorrectly that the 'granny flat will use similar materials and colours therefore will have no impact on the streetscape'.

In conclusion, this is a poorly presented development application which is incomplete, inaccurate and does not provide adequate information to understand how 46 Mactier Street and surrounds are impacted by this granny flat proposal. It is requested that inconsistencies and omissions be corrected, resubmitted and renotified so that we and the surrounding neighbours have a clear understanding of the Development Application Proposal.

Yours Sincerely,

Peter and Alison Matthews
Owners of,

46 Mactier Street Narrabeen