

---

**Sent:** 25/09/2020 6:10:14 PM  
**Subject:** Objection to Amended Plans for DA2019/1475 Manly Lodge  
**Attachments:** Objection to Amended Plan DA2019 1475 Manly Lodge.docx;

Attention : The General Manager, Northern Beaches Council

Please see the attached objection document.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Kind regards  
William (Bill) Mason  
Unit 1, 18-20 Victoria Parade  
MANLY NSW

0417 748 117

## **Objection to Amended Plans for DA2019/1475 Manly Lodge**

I am the owner of Unit 1 (Ground Floor, adjacent to the proposed café) 18-20 Victoria Pde Manly.

My objection highlights the following :-

1. Increased bulk creating shading and reduction in visual lines of sight;
2. Increased noise;
3. Increased traffic hazard.

### **Objection**

#### **1. Existence of Current Development Consent.**

The current development consent DA 167/2015 for the erection of a 3 story building which already exceeds statutory requirements is sufficient to provide a commercial advantage to the current owners while balancing the needs of residents.

#### **2. Unique Proposal**

Consideration should be given to the fact that the proposal provides for a unique arrangement in terms of a ground floor café/restaurant being located adjacent to ground floor residential premises. Any changes to the current operation of the café/restaurant (including capacity) may have a significant adverse impact to us living in Unit 1, Ground Floor.

#### **3. Increased bulk resulting in shadowing and reduction of sight lines.**

The proposal seeks to rely on the height of a number of existing residential buildings in Victoria Pde as justification for breaching the height restrictions however fails to acknowledge that the majority of examples cited are accompanied by significant set backs alleviating the impact of shadowing and reduction in line of sight.

#### **4. Increased Noise**

The amended proposal

- (a) provides for an increased restaurant area;
- (b) a cascading water feature on the south eastern boundary
- (c) a outdoor seating area at the rear of the building'
- (d) fails to identify the intended operating hours of the restaurant/café.
- (e) fails to provide sufficient accommodation for service vehicles to service the building from within the building structure. Servicing such as waste removal will take place on the street.

### *Café/ Restaurant*

The café presently operates from 6am in the morning. Unlike the adjoining residents which include children, shift workers, and general office workers guest attending the hotel will generally be on holidays. The ability for the residents to have a reasonable night sleep will be significantly impacted in the event that the café/restaurant operates in the evening.

### *Cascading waterfall*

**The Amended DA provides for a cascading water feature immediately adjoining the property boundary of 18-20 Victoria Pde and in very close proximity to our bedroom windows. No information regarding the acoustic impact of the cascading water feature and associated machinery to facilitate the water feature is provided. It is submitted that the water feature and machinery should be enclosed within the premises.**

### *Outdoor seating area*

There is no information regarding the use of the outdoor seating area including hours of accessibility or operation. It is likely that guests arriving from overseas may suffer from jetlag and seek access to these areas during times when the residents in adjoining buildings are asleep.

### *Service Vehicles*

The amended DA fails to provide adequate accommodation and provision for Service Vehicles (including waste removal) to access the building from within the confines of the building. Instead it is proposed that the Service Vehicles will remain on the street (presumably double parked) with the waste receptors transported to the service vehicles. This will result in one or two things:

- (a) increased traffic hazards; or
- (b) waste services being performed off peak (at night) with the potential for increased noise disturbance to neighbours in order to limit traffic hazards.

Provision should be made within the confines of the building to accommodate Service Vehicles.

### *Lighting Plan*

**There is no lighting plan in relation to the outdoor seating area and I am concerned regarding potential light pollution into our bedroom windows at Unit 1, Ground Floor, 18-20 Victoria Pde.**

## **5. Deficient Acoustic Report**

The Acoustic report purports to rely on testing that took place on 11 and 19 June 2015 (a Thursday and Friday) and is more than 5 years old.

The report fails to reference the operation of a café on site for the very reason that no café of any substance was operating at the time.

The report does address the presence of the water feature.

The report does not address potential noise pollution at night arising from guests using the outdoor seating area on the ground floor.

## **6. Inadequate Driveway Width - Traffic Hazzard**

The Manly Lodge is located directly opposite the Manly Public School and a short distance from the roundabout and public cross walks at the corner of Darley Rd and Victoria Pde.

Victoria Pde is used during school hours to drop off and collect school children and is one of only 2 streets with traffic flowing in an easterly direction accessing South Steyne Rd.

The amended proposal provides for a single lane driveway 3.6m wide, far short of the 5.5 metre wide driveway recommended by council.

The failure to provide for a double driveway, is inconsistent with the provision that has been made for the other developments on the southern side of Victoria Pde (see 34-38, 40 and 42-44) and will give rise to traffic delays in Victoria Pde arising from:

- (a) lack of accommodation for service vehicles (delivery and waste management;
- (b) inappropriate accommodation from customers (currently double parking on Victoria Pde, while collecting takeaway and dropping off guests);
- (c) conflict between vehicles entering and exiting the driveway.

The proposed warning system provided in the amended report address only the potential conflict on the driveway itself and does not address the need for vehicles to wait on Victoria Pde while the conflict is resolved.

There should be a traffic assessment to make sure any development is safe for all nearby residents.

Having regard to the multiple issues addressed above and the existence of a current consent order, the amended DA should be rejected.

William Mason

Unit 1/18-20 Victoria Pde.