
Sent: 27/01/2020 10:55:03 PM
Subject: Application Number: DA2019/1475 - 22 Victoria Parade, Manly

Dear Northern Beaches Council,

This is a letter of comment regarding the proposed development of the Manly Lodge site at 22 Victoria Parade, Manly, DA2019/1475.

I am an owner at Unit 5/28 Victoria Parade which is located in the north-west corner on level 1 of the building. The west side of the unit faces number 22 and enjoys significant light and even sky views from the kitchen and bedroom located on that side. This will be lost as a result of the proposed development. The DA submission negates the amenity of these windows. A small point in relation to my unit. More broadly, the fact is the DA submission reads as a dialogue of rule exceedance, a discounting of the amenity of light, space or air to existing buildings; and a disregard for the application of calculated requirements. It makes statements about traffic movement, parking, deliveries and general operating load that are simply incorrect.

My concerns of this development are:

- front set back is inadequate.
- rear depth at height is excessive. Overshadowing Ashburner Street properties and extending side impact on adjacent properties. Yes, side amenity is very important to unit owners.
- mechanical equipment located at ground level - should be located within the building or a significant setback. Victoria Parade is a busy and at times noisy street. It is, however, a residential street and is quiet during the evening and night. Will this mechanical equipment be heard by neighbouring residents? Hotel guests tend to live behind closed windows with air-conditioning operating 24/7. Residents in buildings such as Number 28 live with open windows and no mechanical noise from a/c units.
- side projections encroach on building lines
- over height
- suites located on roof level together with entertainment space. Yes, some properties have equivalent height but these are small areas such as the stair well on Number 28 and they are not used as primary living spaces. More living space, more suites, more exceedance of rules.
- mechanical equipment located higher again - not detailed, only noted. Will this present more noise issues?
- the rooftop living space is inappropriate if it were to proceed which I believe it should not - this level is highly exposed to strong wind and intense heat and unpleasant cold. The vegetation on the loggia will not survive.
- the relief provided on the western side is not considered warranted on the eastern side.

There is an opportunity here for Council to enforce the well considered planning rules. How is it that one developer considers a property viable or not viable based on planning rules while another developer considers the rules are there to be challenged and why is it that Council allows them to get away with this? An obvious and rhetorical question. The rules are there to maintain the amenity of our environment, to retain the character of what we love about Manly. Sure, there is overdevelopment in parts, but this does not justify the destruction of what we have remaining. If Council allows the dialogue of this DA submission to be applied to all situations then we will be swamped with wall to wall buildings overshadowing our lives and increasing congestion and noise eroding our sanity.

Regards,
Michael Grundy