

Mr Chairman

Re Mod2020/0037 46 Victoria Parade

Finishes

We object to the undisclosed finishes and ask for your support to document that the finishes and colours on the walls to ground level from the fire stairs to the southern boundary be finished in the same fashion as all the apartments on the western elevation ie painted render. If the covered driveway is to go ahead then all western facing walls be finished in the same manner.

Further that the transition beam platform be sloped so as to not puddle and stain and be finished in the same manner as the walls.

We understand that there are to be gardens on the proposed driveway roof but cannot determine from the drawings as to where they are. We tried to contact the Developer but with no response. So in addition to the finishes can there be no gardens on the western end of the driveway roof.

We believe this objection and request is consistent with the DA and gives some amenity to our building and our retirement home rather than the current plastic with concrete blemished wall and puddling transition beam on the western boundary.

Rationale

Let us look at the history. As you are aware the first application for the development did not meet local conditions and was rejected on 22 grounds. OK then the LEC approved the Development but put in conditions as a recognition of the oversized nature of the development. They required a cut out on the roof for sunlight access to the rear apartments at 42 Victoria Parade and a set back providing driveway access at the southern boundary.

We have only sought to maintain the amenity required by the Court contained in these conditions. We have been bad mouthed at hearings and in the community for delaying the building yet it was 2 hearings ago that the Developer stood in this forum and stated that all conditions would be met.

Frustration of Condition 1

The Developer has build a blast wall prior to addressing the Conditions in the DA to deal with Ausgrid. Namely Condition 105 that required Ausgrid approval prior to development. There are no safety issues with the existing Ausgrid

building. Ausgrid advise that they do not require a blast wall and it frustrates their access. In fact early in the Development the first Developer was looking to buy the Ausgrid substation and put the electrics in the building. Now we have an application for a driveway roof and Ausgrid has to make sure security is met in that no one can access the substation roof.

Sunlight access

In regards to the sunlight there is a cut out on level 4 however the work done is not in accordance with the approved drawings and there is a unapproved wall and the height is above the approved height. Further condition 80 has not been met as no DA has been provided nor considered for the ventilation/ducting on the roof.

Graham Butson

5/42 Victoria Parade Manly