

Name: Richard Ladlow
Address: 9 / 25-27 Victoria
Parade Manly, NSW, 2095
Date 18th February 2022

Director - Key Sites Assessments
Attention: Mr Brendon Roberts - Team Leader
Department of Planning, Industry and Environment
Locked Bag 5022,
PARRAMATTA
NSW 2124

Online application at;
http://majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au/index.pl?action=view_job&job_id=10672

Dear Sir,

RE; MP 10_0159 MOD 1, ROYAL FAR WEST MANLY CONCEPT PLAN MODIFICATION

OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSAL

I write by way of objection to the 'Response to Submissions' dated December 2021 to the approved Part 3a development proposal for the Royal Far West site.

I 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, there remains privacy, noise and overshadowing concerns for the revised proposal.

The reasons for our objection are 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 Ground Floor 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. This appears to be connected upto the lift height with the CKK building closing the existing gap between the buidings above level 1.
- A re-iteration from previous correspondence would be that the rear of CKK level G has produced some terrible acoustic outcomes from a very poor decision during Stage 1 to install industrial metal shutters for the waste and laundry services bays which are accessed very frequently. See my previous submission.
- (As an aside could this situation with the metal shutters please be rectified during the proposed Building B works, this is a really poor but easily remedied problem that just needs fixing and we live with the consequences of this ridiculous design choice to this day. This would be of negligible cost and go along way in my view to turn the tide of negative feelings toward RFW that this situation has caused).
- Being mindful of the lessons to be learnt from above, please design in a much more considerate way to neighbours and please do not continue with any industrial metal shutters or similar or locate noisy mechanical equipment at the rear or roof of the proposed Building B.
- The services described above should be re-located to the new proposed large car park.

Yours sincerely,

Richard Ladlow

Owner of Unit 9 / 25-27 Victoria Parade, Manly