
From: DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au
Sent: 12/08/2022 1:49:24 PM
To: DA Submission Mailbox
Subject: Online Submission

12/08/2022

MRS Janette Wall
24 / 24/25-27 VICTORIA PD, MANLY Victoria PDE
Manly NSW 2095
[REDACTED]

RE: DA2022/1000 - 19 - 21 South Steyne MANLY NSW 2095

Unit 24, 25-27 Victoria Pde
Manly NSW 2095

Application #DA2022/1000
Address: Lot 101 DP 1247422 and Lot 100 DP 1276056 19-21 South Steyne and 22
Wentworth St, MANLY

Attn: Development Assessment.

Having read through the application and considered the effects of the proposed structure, we wish to formally declare our objections.
We outline our objections by way of sub-headings.

Solar and Air Access

There currently exists an East-to-West avenue of both air and light flowing through the two buildings to the East, namely the former RFW school and admin buildings. We are concerned that this avenue will be eliminated by the proposed development. This avenue currently provides much valued light and airflow to the private open space and principal living areas to the rear of both 25-27 and 29 Victoria Parade.

There also exists a highly valued and universally appreciated communal space between buildings 25-27 and 29 Victoria Parade, which would also suffer greatly due to the inevitable loss of both air, and light.

In addition to the loss of air/solar flow due to the proposed elimination of the gap, the proposed building elevation of 8 storeys is to be augmented by rooftop services and significant vegetation plantings, which again will be detrimental to solar access, creating a huge negative light impact

Our apartment is located at the front of the building and will be impacted by loss of winter sun . The greatest attraction for us in purchasing this property was the winter sun . This development will reduce out winter sun hours by a minimum of 50%. The loss of light is a major concern and objection

This will impact all apartments on the east side of number 25

These were a bone of contention in previous discussions with the developers, but clearly have

remained in the proposed plans.

Developers have previously shared the winter equinox shadow fall, but we remain unaware of the effects on light and air throughout a calendar year.

We respectfully propose that Council reviews a full set of shadow diagrams prior to granting approval.

Building C (8 storey height) has been raised by approximately 1 meter and west facing walls moved from 4.4m to 1.6m from the boundary for the full length and height of no29. This creates a gloomy canyon effect, devoid of light, greatly reduced sunlight, air and outlook. The building must be repositioned to meet requirements of the conditional Part 3a approval, which showed a minimum of 4.4m and landscaped areas to alleviate the outlook. The increased height is a major concern.

Our apartment is located on the third and fourth floor. Our dining and kitchen windows(third floor) are frosted 30% at the bottom to allow privacy whilst still being able to look out into the courtyard. The additional height will result in loss of privacy . We do not wish to frost the entire window to ensure privacy as it will take away enjoyment of where we live .

The proposed relentless 8 storey western edge of Building C is an over-scaled unbroken wall. There is no significant breaking down of the façade. Noting that the Part 3a approved scheme was lower and articulated along its length providing relief, better visual amenity and privacy. This development will result in South Beach residents becoming reluctant inmates in a fortress type development .

The term fortress was used by a representative of the Royal Far West on the Zoom call

We request careful consideration of concerns raised

Mark and Janette Wall

Mark [REDACTED]

Janette [REDACTED]