

Name: Kim Tan

Address: 1 Adina Road

Curl Curl NSW

21<sup>ST</sup> FEBRUARY 2022

Director - Key Sites Assessments

Attention: Mr Brendon Roberts - Team Leader

Department of Planning, Industry and Environment

Locked Bag 5022,

PARRAMATTA

NSW 2124

Dear Sir,

**RE; MP 10 0159 MOD 1, ROYAL FAR WEST MANLY CONCEPT PLAN MODIFICATION**

**OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSAL**

I am writing in objection to the 'Response to Submissions' dated December 2021 to the approved Part 3a development proposal for the Royal Far West site.

We have no political association with Royal Far West (RFW) and have made no reportable political donations.

Although some improvements have been made to the application, the modifications do NOT go far enough to satisfy our original objections to a vast number of significant issues with the development.

I am listing our objection as follows;

**1 Building C setbacks**

- The increase boundary setback (western boundary adjacent Block C) although much improved (from 1.6m to 3.7m) is well short of the 4.6m approved Part 3a setback. This impacts shadowing and amenity to all the homes of Block no 25 and is 0.9m in excess of the Part 3a approved development.
- The scheme remains short of compliance with the Apartment Design Guide (ADG) requirements.(as required under the Part 3a conditions of approval). The justification in Planners report at P34 that the developer is "unable to achieve the required setback" is not a valid argument as there is ample site with which to develop a compliant scheme. The objectives of the ADG have not been satisfied nor are they close to "deemed to comply" as they result in significant additional overshadowing. Note that no drawings are submitted to indicate what a 'complying ADG' scheme would look like for comparison! Therefore what is the justification or measure for "deemed to comply"? How can this issue be assessed accurately, without a drawn comparison to ADG?

## 2 Height of Building C

- Far from improvement, the overall height has now been generally increased from the previous submission by 0.35m (RL 32 to 32.35 and the Lift over-run also increased 0.65m from RL35.15 to RL35.8 .
- 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 no 25-29 . We request that the height be modified to restore sunlight to our property.
- Note to chamfer the western parapet of Building C (as per the western parapet of Building D ) would reduce effects.

## 3 – Building C privacy from commercial use.

Building C has been redesigned with windows (previously no windows) to face west from commercial levels directly to bedrooms of no 29. No details or screening are given

Our concerns are;

- How is the privacy being managed (screens, fixed windows, etc)?
- How is the occupancy and appropriate commercial usage of these premises being managed? (ie no noise generating uses, hours of operation, Light spill etc)

## 4 Building B issues .

This has been redesigned with a chamfered southern edge to restore some winter sunlight to our property offering some improvement to the previous proposal.

Note 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 shared and private open space and living rooms of GF units of both Blocks 25 and 29, over and above Part 3a approval.
- A new lift tower has been placed to the west of Building B casting additional shadow.

I once make the point that we bought the property for us to retire in. It is astonishing that a supposedly Charitable Organisation can be so blatant in wanting to not meet Regulatory guidelines to satisfy their own avarice. In doing so, knowingly that their development would affect the emotional, economic and living conditions of their neighbours.

I would call the development and the way RFW has approached this development as bullying. And I hope and trust that this Department will amend or disapprove their plans as it stands now which is still not in the best interests of its neighbours and will be rectified accordingly.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kim Tan', with a horizontal line drawn through the middle of the signature.

Kim Tan

Co Owner 10/25 Victoria Parade

Please DO/DO NOT delete my personal information before publication of this submission