

**From:** [Thomas Cotter](#)  
**To:** [Brendon Roberts](#)  
**Subject:** Objection to the proposal for - MP 10\_0159 MOD 1, Royal Far West MANLY Concept Plan Modification  
**Date:** Tuesday, 15 February 2022 10:53:20 AM

---

Hi Brendon (or whom it may concern),

**Topic; Objection to the proposal for - MP 10\_0159 MOD 1, Royal Far West MANLY Concept Plan Modification**

More specifically, our objection to the 'Response to Submissions' dated December 2021 to the approved Part 3a development proposal for the Royal Far West site.

We are concerned neighbouring residents of Southbeach apartments at 25-27 Victoria Parade, Manly. We have already made an objection to the original plans, and although some improvements have been made to the application since the initial proposal, we still have issues.

These issues are as follows;

- Building B – this building directly backs onto our apartment and courtyard. Our objections remain;
- The application as a Part 75 W modification, particularly in regard location of Building B, (being substantially the same as the Part 3a submission) has not been adequately addressed in the Planners 'Response to submissions' - see page 27. We believe this remains an issue for the development and the Dept of Planning to consider the legal requirement for compliance and appropriate planning pathway.
- Building B casts shadow onto communal land as indicated. (Planners report page 32 of the Planners report is incorrect suggesting there is no communal land on Blocks 25—29).

*"In relation to communal open space, we note that No. 31 and No. 29 Victoria Parade currently do not have any communal open space areas with what is referred to within the request for RTS prepared by the Department as "communal open space" on No. 25 - 29 Victoria Parade either common circulation spaces providing ground level access to the ground floor level apartments or north facing private open space associated with the rear apartments as depicted in Figure 5 over page."*

- There is 'communal shared open space' on title as indicated. Building B will overshadow this.
- Building B casts shadow to our private courtyard and living rooms area, over and above Part 3a approval.
- A new lift tower has been placed to the west of Building B casting additional shadow.
- The removal of the gap between Building A and Building B results in the overshadowing the communal and private areas noted above.
- Building C concerns are as follows:
  - The increase boundary setback (western boundary adjacent Block C) i.e. 3.7m is short of the 4.6m approved Part 3a setback. This impacts shadowing and amenity to our apartment and others within our block.
  - Height of Building C – the overall height has now been generally increased from the previous submission. Additional plant to the roof will also generate additional height (not identified

graphically, but noted in the report). All of these factors further impact shadowing the block .

We request that the height be modified to restore sunlight to our property.

Thanks for your time. Look forward to seeing further adjustments to the plans.  
Regards, Thomas Cotter.