

25th September 2020

Northern Beaches Council
PO Box 82
Manly NSW 1655

by email: council@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au

Attention : Renee Ezzy

Dear Renee,

Development Application – DA2019/1475, 22 Victoria Pd, Manly

Thank you for providing Notice of the amended submission. We refer to our original objection dated 20th January 2020. We are owners in the adjoining property 18-20 Victoria Parade.

The amended submission partially addresses some concerns but exacerbates others. We object to the amended submission on the following basis:

Loss of acoustic privacy:

1. 18-20 Victoria Pde has residents who rely on quiet enjoyment at all times of the day (e.g. shift workers, children, professionals working from home). The TTM Acoustic Assessment appears to assume that quiet enjoyment is only required after 10pm. A revised and adequately considered Acoustic Assessment has not been submitted. Further, the Morson Group report dated 22nd July 20 states the amended proposal aims to achieve “more vibrant and lively activity” in the street but it fails to outline how acoustic privacy for nearby residences will be maintained.
2. Drawing DA16 -South Elevation- depicts several rooms on the north west corner of the proposed development with balustrades at their windows. One can only assume the intent is to install operable glass doors at these locations so that they can be opened fully (otherwise there would be no requirement for a balustrade). These windows in many cases are only 5–10m metres from the living areas in 18-20 Victoria Pde. Noise will be generated inside the rooms from guests talking, music/TV noise, vacuum cleaning noise etc. To mitigate against noise pollution to the living areas of 18-20 Victoria Pde we seek the windows are not openable.

Loss of visual privacy:

1. Rooms on the South West corner of the proposed development look directly into balconies & living area of residences on the North West corner of 18-20 Victoria Pde. The Statement of Environmental Effects refers to the use of

“translucent” and “obscured” glass, however, only clear glass is documented on the elevation drawings. We would seek that translucent or obscured glass is used on any windows overlooking our balcony, living areas or bedrooms.

2. The drawings depict metal louvres installed on the articulated window bays to improve privacy to 18-20 Victoria Pde. It is not clear at what angle these will be installed; we would seek these louvres are installed in such a way that hotel guests are unable to view any of our living areas or balconies.
3. Drawing DA30 3D depicts the outdoor area of the proposed ground floor retail café built on the boundary of 18-20 Victoria Pde. Other than a low height boundary fence, there does not appear to be any screening to protect the visual privacy of the apartments in 18-20 Victoria Pde.
4. Drawing DA16 South Elevation depicts two lift lobbies on L3 & L4 of the proposed development. Each lift lobby has windows with direct views of bedrooms in 18-20 Victoria Pde. The lift lobbies will be highly trafficked and even have waiting seating. The proposal does not detail how visual privacy will be maintained to the bedrooms of 18-20 Victoria Pde.

Bulk & scale:

5. Building scale – the scale of the proposed development is inconsistent with the existing streetscape. This allowable floor space ratio for the site is 0.75:1. The floor space ration of the proposed development is 1.5:1.
6. Site coverage – the revised proposal has increased site coverage, dwarfing the site coverage of adjacent buildings.
7. Setbacks – Drawing DA08 Level 1 specifies the distance between the articulated window bay and the site boundary as 1.8m. This is non-compliant, and it should be a minimum of 3m.

Traffic:

8. The proposed development doubles the size of the hotel from 22 rooms to 41 rooms. Consequently, there will close to double the number of passenger set downs and pick-ups of guests arriving by taxi, ride share or minibus. The TTM Traffic Assessment fails to consider these movements or the requirement for a dedicated set down area for the Hotel. Without such a facility vehicle will be forced to “double park” for the set downs & pick-ups. Already on Victoria Pde patrons of Hakan’s café are “double parking” and this creates a hazard and road safety concern. The proposed development would only magnify the problem. Serious consideration should be given to this issue especially given the proximity to the primary school and the number of children in the area.
9. The original Traffic Assessment has not been revised and remains inadequate. It assumes the proposed development *“the traffic generation potential of up to 5 vehicles in the morning and peak periods”*. This figure is unrealistic given that the site proposes 22 new car parks and an increase in rooms from 22 to 41. With such conclusions it is difficult to regard any of the reports prepared by TTM as credible.

Light pollution:

1. Drawing DA16- South Elevation- depicts two common area lift lobbies on L3 & L4 of the proposed development. Each lift lobby has windows with direct views of bedrooms in 18-20 Victoria Pde. No detail has been provided on how these lobbies will be illuminated in the evenings. Our concern relates to light pollution to the bedrooms in 18-20 Victoria Pde. Even with block-out blinds the light generated from the lift lobbies will be difficult to stop coming inside the bedrooms and impacting resident's ability to sleep.

Inadequate Front Set-backs:

1. Front setback are non-compliant with existing planning controls & are inconsistent with the building at 18-20 Victoria St.

Please do not hesitate to contact me by email should you have any queries.

Kind regards,

DocuSigned by:
Kit Middleton
65A88699087E429...
Kit Middleton