
Sent: 24/11/2023 11:36:53 AM
Subject: DA2023/0386: 207-217 Pittwater Road Manly

I am the owner and occupier of 6 Golf Parade Manly. I refer to my earlier submission dated 22 May 2023 and note that Council has now made available a number of further documents including the acoustic report dated 8 August 2023. I maintain my objections to the proposal and make the following further submissions:

Noise.

The acoustic report endeavours to assess existing noise levels and compare them with anticipated noise generated by the proposal. In this exercise, choice of the "reference location" is all-important in determining existing noise levels; it is the foundation upon which all the other calculations are based. But the reference location does not, as the proponent asserts, "represent residential properties exposed to the site." Rather, it is close to Pittwater Road where traffic noise is far higher than that experienced in Golf Parade where my property, No.6, is largely shielded from traffic noise by the existing garage building.

A summary of predicted noise levels is provided in Attachment 4. The report asserts that a satisfactory outcome will be achieved if 17 specified recommendations are adopted. But there is nothing to say *why* the suggested measures should prove sufficient. Furthermore, no information is given as to what equipment will be installed in the vehicle wash plant room which will immediately adjoin my property and which is of particular concern to me. It is merely stated (at 5.2.1) that such plant will "include" water pressure and treatment pumps. The equipment should be specified now, and not at some later stage, such as a "CC acoustic design review," and a fresh Attachment 4 produced with the relevant figures. I note that Attachment 4, as it stands, seems to suggest that no attempt will be made to abate noise produced by the roof mounted exhaust fans (which appears to be considerable).

Council's Health Referral Response dated 1 November 2023 states that it is "anticipated" that acoustic compliance can be achieved by adoption of the 17 recommendations. But Council seems merely to have adopted the recommendations without demur. There is, for example, no discussion of possible alternative measures which might be preferable, or of additional measures which might be taken, or of the requirements which are normally imposed when approving a car wash.

Pollution, fumes etc.

I still await advice as to how my concerns are to be addressed. These concerns are only increased by reference in the acoustic report to the roof mounted exhaust fans. Where will the exhaust then go? A vent equal in height to the sewer vent located to the rear of 10 Golf Parade suggests itself as a possibility.

Excessive Height.

So far as can be divined from the plans supplied to date, the exit way and its southern and western walls are unnecessarily high. It is not as if the exit way will need to accommodate any overhead cleaning machinery. If the proposal is to proceed, then the exit way should be reduced to a height no greater than that necessary to allow the egress of cars and SUVs, but not higher vehicles such as commercial vans, with a boom at the entrance to the car wash to

ensure that this is so. This would go some way to protecting my interests whilst still allowing the overwhelming majority of vehicles to use the car wash.

Robert Ellis.