

This is a submission regarding The Development Proposal

DA 2019/1475 for 28 Victoria Parade Manly.

My husband + I are joint owners of unit 2/28-32 Victoria Pde Manly
 I wish to submit a list of observations and objections to
 The proposed development. (demolition + Construction) of the
 Manly Lodge Hotel

No 28 Victoria Parade is an Art Deco building - built
 in circa 1936.

1) Privacy - This will be compromised on the western side of
 No 28, affecting 8 of the 16 units Also loss of views.

2) Noise - Since buying our unit in 2006 we have been
 subjected to constant noise as a result of -
 a) demolition and construction of No's 25, 27, 29,
 + 49 - Construction of Manly Village Public school
 Hall - Repairs + upgrading of No 14 + No 28.

No 31 is being demolished as I write 16/1/20.

b) This has resulted in dust, debris, vibration from
 pile driving etc.

c) noise from extra traffic, trucks carry debris away
 + bringing materials in, cement trucks, cranes etc.

d) it's noted that the 5 storey building (includes roof)
 will close at 10 pm. As this fails to occur in
 existing venues this can not be ^{guaranteed} ~~guaranteed~~
 (noise at W/E's in summer often continues to
 1 + 2 am (drums).

3) Light / Shade -

a) No 28 V.Pde. will also suffer from loss of light
 down the west side of the building. Units 1, 2, 3, 4
 all have marine grade security screens which already



reduces the amount of light, the building at No 22 will only add to loss of light and air in units 1 + 3.

b) Examination of the shade cover appears to be for No 22 not 28 or 20 or other neighbours.

4) Height + size: Neither the height or size of the proposed new building is in keeping with the surrounding buildings. The Boutique Hotel currently in situ blends in with the surrounding streetscape of mainly residential buildings.

5) Boundary Fence: It appears from the drawings of No 22 there is no dividing fence between No 28 + No 22's

Further to this, the proposal (drawings No DAO3, DAO6, DAO8) is for Vehicle Entry and access ramp to a basement carpark/waste room/store adjacent to No 28's driveway. The driveway is to provide access for 22 cars + 10 motor cycles spaces. This is completely unacceptable as it will create additional traffic noise ^{times} to units 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 15 + 17. (if past experience is anything to go by also to hotel guests using our car park believing the driveway belongs to the hotel)

Should the building proceed may I suggest the access ramp would be better positioned on No 22's existing driveway + street cross-over. Also the distance between 22 + 20 is 6.58 metres compared to 3.85 metres between 28 + 20.

6) Building at No 28:- There appears to be no reference or drawings a) showing the below ground level Electrical

Switch board room in No 28. This is situated below the fire exit door + the fire escape stairs to the roof. It measures 2.32 metres wide, 4.35 metres long + 2.24 metres high (approx) (so is 2.24 below ground level beside the entrance to fire door + the driveway during only No 22's existing wall)

3.

b) Safety of No 28 building:- In light of the fact when No's 25, 27 & 29 were being constructed, pile drivers were used to drill down to bedrock. As No 28 is not built on piles & has no curtain wall it shook (as in an earth tremor) (this caused the china in No 28 unit 2 to rattle & fall over with a breakage)

For the above reasons I am personally extremely concerned about the welfare & safety of the building at No 28, particularly with respect to the below ground level Electrical Switch Board room, and its proximity to the proposed driveway to the underground car park. I would want a thorough investigation before any final decision is made to the integrity of No 28 VP. to allay my concerns. - (Also Gas metres at carpark end of driveway in No 28, so obviously gas pipes)

7) Time Frame:- ~~There~~ No reference is given for proposed commencement if approval is granted. Neither for the length of expected demolition & construction.

8) Garages & trees :- What type of trees & what type of roots & leaf systems

9) There ^{appears to be} no mention of any assessment to surrounding buildings re cracks & other faults before the built or after. This would require a proper survey by the owners of the Manly Lodge Hotel at their expense not the owners of the surrounding buildings.

Thankyou for allowing me to have my say

yours faithfully

C. L. Engle.