From: Peter Keen

Sent: 25/01/2022 2:40:05 PM

To: Council Northernbeaches Mailbox
Cc: Maxwell Duncan; Louise Kerr

Subject: DA2021/2257; Lot 1 DP 1034722 and Lot 100, Lot 101 & Lot 102 DP

1069144 42 North Steyne and 75 The Corso MANLY

Attachments: Objection 42 The Steyne DA.docx;

Attention Mr. Maxwell Duncan

Dear Sir,

My name is Peter Keen and I own and reside at 707 Pacific Waves , 9-15 Central Avenue , Manly. I attach my objection to DA2021/2257.

I would appreciate if you could acknowledge receipt of my objection. Kind Regards,

Peter Keen

Director

axiaoffice com au

 25 January 2022

Peter Keen Unit 707, 9-15 Central Ave. MANLY NSW 2095

Mr Maxwell Duncan Norther Beaches Council 1 Belgrade Street, MANLY NSW

OBJECTION: DA2021/2257; Lot 1 DP 1034722 and Lot 100, Lot 101 & Lot 102 DP 1069144 42 North Steyne and 75 The Corso MANLY

I object to the above development application on the following grounds:

- The Hotel Steyne is a heritage site. 41 The Steyne has been a functionally integral part of the hotel since its construction, and therefore should not be demolished.
- The floor space ratio proposed for 41 The Steyne far exceeds Council guidelines. The developer submits that under utilised floor space can be transferred from the hotel, demonstrating 41 The Steyne is part of the hotel and therefore a heritage site.
- The improvement to the roof scape does reduce some visual obstruction from my unit, but the increased height of the roof to accommodate the penthouse, has a much greater impact by eliminating my filtered views of the Southern end of Manly beach.
- The height and floor space also breach stipulations by Land & Environment Court to protect the views from Pacific Waves.
- Breaching both height and floor space ratios does not deliver better outcomes on environmental planning and public benefit grounds; they simply make the project more profitable.
- Installation of a second lift to service the penthouse only, will result in further visual obstruction.
- The balconies on the new building encroach on public space.
- The 28 page "Building and Construction Methodology Report" includes photos of the 2 loading zones (total of 3/4 parking spaces) in Henrietta Lane, saying "existing loading zones can be used to stand smaller construction vehicles and to direct construction traffic". The photos do not represent usage on a typical day. The loading zone outside the Steyne Hotel is almost always occupied, often double parked, by vehicles servicing the Steyne Hotel and other nearby businesses. I quite often need to squeeze between large trucks to access Pacific Wayes from the Corso.
- The development application does not address in any detail what procedures will be implemented to ensure off street parking in Henrietta Lane is always accessible.
- The 23-page Traffic and Parking Assessment Report uses the RMS Guidelines and Technical
 Direction (based on extensive surveys of a wide range of land uses) to conclude there will be
 13.1 less traffic movements per hour in the morning and 9.5 less in the afternoon, despite
 the development including 15 additional car parking spaces. That maybe statistically correct,
 but it simply does not make sense.
- Public access to the beachfront through 42 The Steyne has been eliminated.

	A new entrance to the Steyne Hotel from Henrietta Lane will cause more noise for Pacific Waves residents. This will occur from young people queuing on weekends to gain access, and noisy late-night departures.
Yours Ti	ruly,
Peter Ke	een