Sent: 23/01/2020 9:13:48 AM Subject: Online Submission

23/01/2020

MS Amber Glenister 12 / 25 - 27 Victoria Parade PDE MANLY NSW 2095 amberglenister@gmail.com

RE: DA2019/1475 - 22 Victoria Parade MANLY NSW 2095

Thurs 23rd Jan 2020

Amber Glenister and David Govier Owner / Occupier Unit 12, 25-27 Victoria Parade Manly 2095

RE: DA2019/1475 - 22 Victoria Parade MANLY NSW 2095

Dear Sir / Madam,

I am writing in strong opposition to the proposed design for the redevelopment of the Manly Lodge. Though I am not in opposition with the idea of a redesign in principle, the current vision for redevelopment loses the character and vibrancy of the current building and, as such, is unacceptable. Having carefully read through the relevant documents, my objections are to the following aspects:

## 1. Design:

- a. This is my primary concern having read the design statement, I understand that Victoria Parade is a mix of different architectural styles that tend to reflect the year they were constructed. However, the existing Manly Lodge currently provides the street with one of its strongest points of character and I believe you have an obligation to retain that. It surprises me that, unlike many buildings which are knocked down and rebuilt, there is no reference to the original character of the building in the new design. In fact, it is in stark opposition to the colloquial character of the original building, and much of the street in general. Much larger than the existing building, the new design is an imposing wall of boxes, lacking nuance and any distinguishing features reflecting the heritage of the original building, the Manly area, or the beachside nature of the location. It bears the hallmarks of a basic accommodation franchise, rather than a unique boutique experience in a beautiful beachside suburb.
- b. The existing building also has the café at the front with curb-side tables. This creates a wonderful atmosphere on the street a meeting point for the local community and tourists alike, and the removal of this charming street-side café will be a significant loss to the local community. Simply replacing this with a retail shop is not sufficient.
- c. The Manly Lodge branding / signage is bland in style and overbearing in its prominence. This design flaw is indicative of the overall vision characteristic of a budget commercial franchise rather than a vibrant beachside community with a rich history.

d. The size is too big. The planned design is triple the capacity of the existing boutique hotel. This will create an upsurge of foot traffic, vehicle traffic, noise that will considerably affect the residential community and atmosphere of the street.

## 2. Landscaping:

a. This point also relates to the overall design and aesthetic of the building. While some of the features and trees planned for the side and back of the building have been considered, the front façade of the building is important and demands further consideration. At the very least, some tall trees included at the front of the building would offset the imposing nature of the design. There is no indication of any such consideration in the plan.

## 3. Street traffic / parking:

- a. The traffic impact statement is unrealistic and I question how independent it is. The summary even points out that it is generally agreed that the RMS guide to Traffic Generating Developments do not adequately address trip generation for hotel developments. So, given that the guidelines are lacking, this report, also appears to be lacking. The report says the traffic impact will be 'negligible' but a 49-unit hotel and shop on a small suburban street with both customer and service vehicles accessing it every day will clearly be far from negligible. Victoria Parade is already a very busy street and the traffic from vehicles and, in particular, service vehicles has a significant impact on the quality of living on the street. There is also the important considerations of the junior school directly across the road, with young children coming and going. Hence, I strongly believe this report needs to be reviewed.
- b. From what I can tell, the plan does not meet the minimum parking requirements. The council requires a minimum one space per unit (49 in total) and you are providing just 19. This is not adequate, but more importantly is testament to the fact that the size of the hotel you are planning to build on this space is simply too big.

## 4. Height:

a. From what I understand - the design you have proposed is beyond the current height regulations. If the building design was more in keeping with a boutique beachside hotel, that would be less of a concern. However, the imposing nature of the intended design is only amplified by increasing height.

I would be happy to provide further community consultation on this project. My objections as stated earlier are not to development in principle, but to ensuring that any development on the street adds to its overall appeal. Doing so benefits not only the local community and its residents, but would also ensure the future success of Manly Lodge.

Regards,

Amber Glenister & David Govier Owner Occupiers