



MIKE BAIRD
STATE MEMBER FOR MANLY

Wednesday 30 November 2011

To Whom It May Concern:

I write as Member for Manly to express the strong concerns of my electorate regarding this proposal by Royal Far West.

At a public meeting last Monday night approximately 100 local residents voted unanimously to reject the proposal on the following grounds:

- Gross overdevelopment of the site relative to the current LEP
- Failure to comply with Council's site-specific planning controls
- Out of character with Manly 'village'
- Loss of affordable housing currently provided in the Elsie Hall building
- Adverse impact on views, traffic/parking, public domain and heritage
- Adverse impact on Manly Village Public School

While there is a long-standing connection between Royal Far West and the Manly community and pride for the important service the organisation provides, there is substantial opposition to the significant change proposed on the Royal Far West site, which is an iconic part of Manly.

It is my strong hope that the Planning and Assessment Commission acknowledges the substantial opposition across the community and rejects the current proposal.

I am aware of the increasing enrolments at Manly Village Public School (MVPS) and the challenge of limited space for the students on the current grounds. I am also aware of the suggestions by Manly Council and other parents of students that there is an opportunity for MVPS to potentially utilise part of the Royal Far West grounds. I am happy to look into this suggestion and work with the Minister for Education, Minister for Health and the Royal Far West to try and find a win-win solution. However, the main thrust of this argument is to determine whether any proposed development at Royal Far West brings an opportunity to support the local community through this or similar proposals.

While it is generally agreed the Royal Far West site requires an upgrade, the development must be appropriate for the site and reflect the community's needs. I am hopeful the community's concerns are listened to by the Royal Far West Board and responded to accordingly.

Yours sincerely


MIKE BAIRD MP

Chris King - Submission Details for Sue Sacker

From: Sue Sacker <ssacker@bigpond.net.au>
To: <chris.king@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 12/1/2011 10:27 AM
Subject: Submission Details for Sue Sacker
CC: <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Attachments: RFW submission.pdf



Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Sue Sacker
Email: ssacker@bigpond.net.au

Address:
78 Alexander Street

Manly, NSW
2095

Content:
Hi Chris and Anthony
Here is my submission on the plans.
Kind regards
Sue Sacker

IP Address: cpe-121-210-4-46.mnqy1.cht.bigpond.het.au - 121.210.4.46
Submission: Online Submission from Sue Sacker (object)
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_diary&id=23897

Submission for Job: #4258 MP10_0159 - Royal Far West Concept Plan
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_job&id=4258

Site: #2345 Royal Far West
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_site&id=2345

Sue Sacker

E : ssacker@bigpond.net.au

Powered by [AffinityLive](#): Work. Smarter.

Sue Sacker
78 Alexander Street
Manly
NSW 2095

E: ssacker@bigpond.net.au

Submission to the Department of Planning in regard to the Royal Far West Application Number
MP10_0159

This application is poorly conceived from its commencement and I request that the Department recommend a complete refusal of the application, and that the Committee accept this recommendation.

The Royal Far West Children's Health Scheme (RFW) has been an integral part of Manly since 1924 and, as such, has been strongly supported in many practical ways as well as financially by this community. It has also enjoyed charitable status and the benefits that accrue to charities in NSW and Australia. I believe this includes the waiving of rates.

For many years Manly Council (I was a councillor and Mayor in the 1990's) asked the RFW to provide Council with an indication of its long term plans, with no success. In the mid-1990's the RFW, with much fanfare, converted Drummond House for aged care. I attended the opening. This service, seen as a vital one for our community, was closed down in the last couple of years and the residents evicted. This action has not been seen favourably by many in the community.

We are well aware that health care in NSW has changed over the years and that there are better services for children and their families in the country than there were, perhaps reducing the need for disruptive travel to Sydney. It is known that the RFW responded by engaging more peripatetic staff to visit the country. Telehealth and the use of videoconferencing have also improved the access to medical and allied services for country and isolated families. However the RFW has not publicized the changes to the way it delivers services in the light of these developments. These issues come into play when a charity decides that it will allocate 75% of the gross floor area of its proposed development to money-making and only 25% to its core business and the Department of Education's school.

The Department of Education (DET) built and runs the RFW School, which I am told is partly on the RFW land and partly on DET land.

Some years ago (in the 1990's again) the RFW commenced the use of the old nurses' home, the Elsie Hill building, as an illegal backpackers. The Council determined that this property should be allocated not to backpackers but to low cost longer term accommodation (minimum term 3 months). This service has been an enormous asset to this community, which has lost the majority of its low cost accommodation over the years; SEPP 10 apparently being powerless to stop the attrition. When questioned on the loss of this accommodation, the RFW Board members and planners did not seem at all concerned. A Social Impact Assessment, which has not been done, would flush out these issues.

So now we have an application for a massive overdevelopment of land zoned for special purposes. I am at a loss as to how a charity can seek commercial and residential development of its land without going through a formal rezoning process. I believe that a Part 3A application does away with the need for rezoning, which is very unfortunate. However your assessment processes may well take this into account.

So, in reviewing this application, I would be grateful if you would consider some fundamental questions about land use, social impact, the history of the RFW and Manly and the needs of the Manly Village Public School and the RFW School. My children went to Manly Village Public School (MVPS) from 1985, when we were worried about how small it was with only 200 pupils. I understand it is now creeping up to 600 pupils which is an enormous growth and the need for playground space must be acute. Why would the DET

surrender land to the RFW to offset the use of its land for commercial purposes, when its own school could use the space wisely?

This part of Manly – the block running from Darley Road, along Wentworth Street, to North Steyne has a real 'village' character, housing the MVPS, the RFW School, before and after school care, a music school and importantly the Manly Community Centre, an essential Manly service, renovated by the community with around \$250,000 of community time and money around the year 2000. These, plus the RFW's low cost accommodation, RFW service itself and the aged care when it was in Drummond House, provided a core number of community services as befits land owned by charity and government. This block is a significant part of Manly's social heritage. The RFW plans will severely impact on this section of Manly.

The RFW puts forward the rationale for the development as being twofold: the fact that their buildings are run down and the need for ongoing income to support their work. I accept that the buildings could certainly benefit from renovation and rationalization, but it is an old developers' trick to justify their plans on their failure to maintain their current buildings, so not one I think is totally valid. All charities need to generate income to support their work. I work for one so understand the issues - government grants rarely increase sufficient to the costs of staff and operations and the charity dollar has many more calls on it than it used to have. The RFW has not published its full financial reports, nor seems willing to provide these, so we are not in a position to have a view on their financial needs.

The plans, as concept plans, give us little detail to assess. We are basically offered land use and volume to consider with no idea how the buildings might look when completed. Approval at this stage would leave the community and Council 'on the back foot' when it comes to detailed design stage as it is unlikely that the developer would reduce the bulk and scale once approved. This is why refusal is so important as it will persuade the RFW back to the drawing board and proper consideration of all the issues raised by the community.

The Council has prepared Urban Design Guidelines (UDG) in response to this application, on which I compliment the Council. Unfortunately this has led to the UDG accepting the basic premise of the application – ie overdevelopment and commercialization of the site. The UDG suggests some really good improvements such as a square complimenting Rialto square, public through access, improved setbacks and reduced height and scale of the buildings. The UDG do not seem to go to the heart of the land use issues, which is not satisfactory. My view is that the UDG are flawed and should be taken for what they are – a response to the RFW plans, not stand alone UDG which would address fundamental issues of land use and long term community benefit.

There are some key concerns about the plans which I will list:

- Land use – this is land zone for health use, not commercial or residential use.
- 75% of the gross floor area will not be used for RFW charitable purposes (comment from Urbis to me). This is inconsistent with the zoning and the benefits the charity enjoys, and has enjoyed for many years. Using only 25% of the gross floor area for RFW and the School indicates a very small charitable or educational use of land.
- Part 3A gives the RFW an enormous windfall in commercialization as it bypasses the rezoning process. They are planning zero community benefit from the special purposes zone.
- Use of public land for private gain – the 3 parcels of land belong the DET and should be used for school purposes.
- Internalization of the playground completely shaded.
- Bulk and scale of the buildings, out of keeping with the area.
- Incorporation of the RFW school into a new building with no information as to how much floor area the school will have relates to the space it has now – currently a sizeable building.
- The Heritage Impact Statement is inadequate and the plans crowd the heritage buildings overshadowing them visually and in regards to solar access.

- Overshadowing of the neighbouring residential properties in Victoria Avenue, under construction.
- Overshadowing of the beach.
- Domination of the public space.
- Lack of setbacks
- Increased traffic impact on a crowded town centre.
- View loss from both private and public areas along Wentworth Street.
- The conflict between residential, hotel and health services needs and desires of tenants.
- Hotels do not do well economically in Manly and history shows that many are converted to residential use, or alcohol focused venues, which Manly does not need.
- Lack of a Social Impact Statement
- Loss of affordable housing.

The Public Meeting held this week passed two motions on the proposal. The first called for the proposal to be refused on grounds similar to those outlined above and the second called on the State government to acquire the land and provide integrated planning for the site. While acquisition is unlikely there is a wonderful opportunity for coordinated planning for the whole precinct to benefit the RFW and the MVPS as well as the wider community.

With thanks for the opportunity to comment on the proposal.

Sue Sacker

Chris King - Submission Details for Cathy Griffin

From: Cathy Griffin <griffin.cathy@gmail.com>
To: <chris.king@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 11/4/2011 11:14 AM
Subject: Submission Details for Cathy Griffin
CC: <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Attachments: rfw_submission.pdf



Planning &
Infrastructure

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Cathy Griffin
 Email: griffin.cathy@gmail.com

Address:
 67

Manly, NSW
 2095

Content:

Royal Far West - Caring for Country kids but apparently not the Manly Community

The Royal Far West redevelopment is the single largest redevelopment in Manly and is likely to be the last for some time. Given its importance it would be reasonable to expect genuine community engagement in the development of the proposal of the last remaining iconic site on the beachfront of Manly, particularly as the NSW Government has an interest in a number of the lots on the site and the other entity is an iconic charity the community of NSW has supported over many years.

The RFW has not submitted a Social impact Assessment

The concept design as presented lacks imagination and vision for such an iconic site. There is no doubt that the RFW Charity currently operates in 'outdated and poorly coordinated facilities' and the area should be redeveloped, however what the RFW Charity has proposed is not sympathetic to the community within which it is located.

'Good urban renewal involves building upon the existing strengths of a centre. It retains heritage buildings and allows for high-quality urban design and architecture, and well-designed civic spaces to provide a focus for community activity. A centre's strengths may include cultural, sporting, recreation and parkland facilities. Urban renewal of centres should use these assets to help create attractive and inclusive places.' Draft Centres Design Guidelines

The RFW Charity acquired several sites in the area and the land is zoned special purposes Children's and aged care services. The applicant has not been required to seek approval for a rezoning of the area. The requirement to apply for a 'spot' rezoning would have required the applicant to submit a proposal for a rezoning and included community consultation and exhibition via the local Council.

'Effective community and stakeholder engagement is important when planning for changes to existing centres and the creation of new ones. It should occur throughout the strategic planning process.

While community and stakeholder liaison satisfy statutory requirements, it is also important that these activities are open and allow everyone to get involved to help form the vision and future shape and character of centres.

Community engagement activities can also be a great way to pass on important information to residents. They can learn about the planning process, the need to allow for growth and change within existing urban areas, to meet natural population increases into the future, and how this can be done in the best way.' Draft Centres Design Guidelines

The Community has not had an opportunity to discuss future 'uses' for this land.

The applicant has proposed a 164 room hotel, 32 apartments, RFW Charity operations and commercial premises. The RFW has assumed that the Manly Community wants to replace a publicly owned school with a 164 room hotel on the beachfront.

Despite protestations to the contrary, the RFW has not engaged with the community on the future development of this area prior to the submission of the EA in August 2011. The RFW held information sessions with selected 'stakeholders' in March 2011, however the only issue addressed in the EA when exhibited as a result of these information sessions was a reduction in the height of the building envelope.

Over the years the RFW have changed their use of the site, divesting themselves of the delivery of aged care services and focusing on the delivery of services to children in rural and regional NSW. Even the services delivered to children from remote and regional NSW have changed with the emphasis on short stays in Manly with family or carer for a assessment, treatment and reassessment.

One building, the Elsie Hill block currently operates as a boarding house. This building contains 'below scale' accommodation and is currently the last remaining low cost housing option in the Manly CBD. The RFW has not considered the 'replacement' of this accommodation in accordance with Department of Housing guidelines on the

provision of affordable housing or supported accommodation. Given the charity status of the RFW the community expectations have not been met in so far as consideration has only been given to maximising the property development opportunities to make money.

Strategic Planning Context

Despite the Manly Town Centre being designated as a major tourism and visitor destination there is no business case for the construction of a 164 room hotel in Manly. The RFW will not own and operate the proposed 164 room hotel and consideration has not been given to the social and amenity impacts on the community of the on-selling of this enterprise to a hotel operator. The Manly Liquor Accord or Manly Council Safety Committee has not been consulted with regard to issues that may arise by extending late night venue and trading activities into an area outside the Corso and in close proximity to the residential area. Manly Police and Manly Council currently do not have the resources to manage the issues arising from the late night venues and trading outside the current designated area.

Local Context

The RFW site is also located in close proximity to a Public Primary School, indeed on the same block. This school has expanded its numbers over the past 10 years and is a significant employer. Consideration has not been given to the expansion of this school and the retention of the Dept of Education owned and operated RFW School.

This school, on land which according to the titles is owned and operated by the Department of Education currently operates on the site included by the applicant for redevelopment to a hotel. The applicant has stated that the RFW charity activities will be consolidated to a single location and this includes 'education' but this could mean anything. The delivery of RFW services for the country children has also changed over the years. Children do not appear to stay for the long periods of time as previously. Therefore the educational services delivered by the Department of Education in the Departmental School for the 'children from the country' have also changed accordingly. This does not however mean that the public school should be sold or developed by a private organisation without a discussion with the local community. The local community has been generous in its support of the RFW Charity throughout its history and consideration should now be given to the children in the Manly local community and their needs.

'Owners consent' does not appear to have been given to develop the parcels of land owned by the Department of Education.

The community loses the potential for the existing site to be utilised by the Department of Education for the expansion of the existing Manly Village Public School also in the block. The Manly Village Public School has increased its student numbers from 250 to 600 over the past ten years.

Concept Plan for the Project

The proposed lack of setback along the Steyne and Wentworth Sts blocks the view corridor of the Peninsular apartments which were designed to take advantage of the fact that the RFW School building would remain as the setback and the view corridor would be across the current play ground.

The traffic studies do not appear to account for traffic during morning and afternoon school pickup times, or during 'special events' when the Steyne is temporarily closed, or weekend surf club activities. The Manly Council Wentworth St carpark entrance causes traffic congestion in both Wentworth St and the Steyne during these times and the location of the RFW carpark opposite is ill advised.

Conditions of consent should address conflicts that arise as a result of the location of residential premises above commercial premises. These should specifically address the following:

- * Noise from early morning daily commercial activities such as waste removal, deliveries before 7am,
- * Noise from restaurants open outside standard business hours and operation of licensed premises beyond midnight.
- * Noise from late night venues, including the congregation of patrons before entry and on exit while waiting for transport from the area.
- * Odours from commercial premises, particularly restaurants venting commercial kitchens at the height of the apartments.
- * Anti social activity, including people congregating outside to smoke on the footpath as well as in the rear or 'tradesman entrances' of premises out of normal business hours.

Part 3a of the EP&A Act

The Minister is the consent authority for the project. However there does not appear to be written consent from all the landowners.

Planning Controls and Policies

The site current zoning only permits the use of the land as a 'children's home, educational establishment and various incidental uses. This is why the Manly LEP 1988 does not address the zoning or offer design guidelines for the site. The Manly Council Standard Instrument LEP is currently awaiting approval for exhibition. Manly Council took a proactive approach in developing a master plan to address concerns expressed by the community about the RFW development. This was done with the knowledge that the proposal was for buildings with height in excess of the neighbouring buildings. No plans or concept was available despite the Development being nominated on the DOP Major Projects website. This Manly Council master plan for the area should be taken into account.

Transport and Accessibility

The Draft Centres Design Guidelines also state

'Good centres also have a range of housing options so that a diverse community can live within and around the centre. This includes a variety of housing types and dwelling sizes to cater for a range of households and a mix of private, public and affordable housing options.'

Summary

The proposed redevelopment may well 'serve the growing needs of country kids in NSW'. But in its current form the proposal risks alienating one of the last remaining community use sites on the iconic beachfront of Manly for private commercial gain while returning nothing to the Manly community which has supported the RFW since the 50s.

I request that the Minister reject this proposal.

Regards

Cathy Griffin

IP Address: cpe-121-210-1-107.mnqy1.clt.bigpond.net.au - 121.210.1.107
Submission: Online Submission from Cathy Griffin (object)
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_diary&id=22653

Submission for Job: #4258 MP10_0159 - Royal Far West Concept Plan
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_job&id=4258

Site: #2345 Royal Far West
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_site&id=2345

Cathy Griffin

E : griffin.cathy@gmail.com

Powered by [AffinityLive](#): Work. Smarter.

Royal Far West – Caring for Country kids but apparently not the Manly Community

The Royal Far West redevelopment is the single largest redevelopment in Manly and is likely to be the last for some time. Given its importance it would be reasonable to expect genuine community engagement in the development of the proposal of the last remaining iconic site on the beachfront of Manly, particularly as the NSW Government has an interest in a number of the lots on the site and the other entity is an Iconic charity the community of NSW has supported over many years.

The RFW has not submitted a Social impact Assessment

The concept design as presented lacks imagination and vision for such an iconic site. There is no doubt that the RFW Charity currently operates in 'outdated and poorly coordinated facilities' and the area should be redeveloped, however what the RFW Charity has proposed is not sympathetic to the community within which it is located.

'Good urban renewal involves building upon the existing strengths of a centre. It retains heritage buildings and allows for high-quality urban design and architecture, and well-designed civic spaces to provide a focus for community activity. A centre's strengths may include cultural, sporting, recreation and parkland facilities. Urban renewal of centres should use these assets to help create attractive and inclusive places.' Draft Centres Design Guidelines

The RFW Charity acquired several sites in the area and the land is zoned special purposes Children's and aged care services. The applicant has not been required to seek approval for a rezoning of the area. The requirement to apply for a 'spot' rezoning would have required the applicant to submit a proposal for a rezoning and included community consultation and exhibition via the local Council.

'Effective community and stakeholder engagement is important when planning for changes to existing centres and the creation of new ones. It should occur throughout the strategic planning process.'

While community and stakeholder liaison satisfy statutory requirements, it is also important that these activities are open and allow everyone to get involved to help form the vision and future shape and character of centres.'

Community engagement activities can also be a great way to pass on important information to residents. They can learn about the planning process, the need to allow for growth and change within existing urban areas, to meet natural population increases into the future, and how this can be done in the best way.' Draft Centres Design Guidelines

The Community has not had an opportunity to discuss future 'uses' for this land.

The applicant has proposed a 164 room hotel, 32 apartments, RFW Charity operations and commercial premises. The RFW has assumed that the Manly Community wants to replace a publicly owned school with a 164 room hotel on the beachfront.

Despite protestations to the contrary, the RFW has not engaged with the community on the future development of this area prior to the submission of the EA in August 2011. The RFW held

information sessions with selected 'stakeholders' in March 2011, however the only issue addressed in the EA when exhibited as a result of these information sessions was a reduction in the height of the building envelope.

Over the years the RFW have changed their use of the site, divesting themselves of the delivery of aged care services and focusing on the delivery of services to children in rural and regional NSW. Even the services delivered to children from remote and regional NSW have changed with the emphasis on short stays in Manly with family or carer for assessment, treatment and reassessment.

One building, the Elsie Hill block currently operates as a boarding house. This building contains 'below scale' accommodation and is currently the last remaining low cost housing option in the Manly CBD. The RFW has not considered the 'replacement' of this accommodation in accordance with Department of Housing guidelines on the provision of affordable housing or supported accommodation. Given the charity status of the RFW the community expectations have not been met in so far as consideration has only been given to maximising the property development opportunities to make money.

Strategic Planning Context

Despite the Manly Town Centre being designated as a major tourism and visitor destination there is no business case for the construction of a 164 room hotel in Manly. The RFW will not own and operate the proposed 164 room hotel and consideration has not been given to the social and amenity impacts on the community of the on-selling of this enterprise to a hotel operator. The Manly Liquor Accord or Manly Council Safety Committee has not been consulted with regard to issues that may arise by extending late night venue and trading activities into an area outside the Corso and in close proximity to the residential area. Manly Police and Manly Council currently do not have the resources to manage the issues arising from the late night venues and trading outside the current designated area.

Local Context

The RFW site is also located in close proximity to a Public Primary School, indeed on the same block. This school has expanded its numbers over the past 10 years and is a significant employer. Consideration has not been given to the expansion of this school and the retention of the Dept of Education owned and operated RFW School.

This school, on land which according to the titles is owned and operated by the Department of Education currently operates on the site included by the applicant for redevelopment to a hotel. The applicant has stated that the RFW charity activities will be consolidated to a single location and this includes 'education' but this could mean anything. The delivery of RFW services for the country children has also changed over the years. Children do not appear to stay for the long periods of time as previously. Therefore the educational services delivered by the Department of Education in the Departmental School for the 'children from the country' have also changed accordingly. This does not however mean that the public school should be sold or developed by a private organisation without a discussion with the local community. The local community has been generous in its support of the RFW Charity throughout its history and consideration should now be given to the children in the Manly local community and their needs.

'Owners consent' does not appear to have been given to develop the parcels of land owned by the Department of Education.

The community loses the potential for the existing site to be utilised by the Department of Education for the expansion of the existing Manly Village Public School also in the block. The Manly Village Public School has increased its student numbers from 250 to 600 over the past ten years.

Concept Plan for the Project

The proposed lack of setback along the Steyne and Wentworth Sts blocks the view corridor of the Peninsular apartments which were designed to take advantage of the fact that the RFW School building would remain as the setback and the view corridor would be across the current play ground.

The traffic studies do not appear to account for traffic during morning and afternoon school pickup times, or during 'special events' when the Steyne is temporarily closed, or weekend surf club activities. The Manly Council Wentworth St carpark entrance causes traffic congestion in both Wentworth St and the Steyne during these times and the location of the RFW carpark opposite is ill advised.

Conditions of consent should address conflicts that arise as a result of the location of residential premises above commercial premises. These should specifically address the following:

- Noise from early morning daily commercial activities such as waste removal, deliveries before 7am,
- Noise from restaurants open outside standard business hours and operation of licensed premises beyond midnight.
- Noise from late night venues, including the congregation of patrons before entry and on exit while waiting for transport from the area.
- Odours from commercial premises, particularly restaurants venting commercial kitchens at the height of the apartments.
- Anti social activity, including people congregating outside to smoke on the footpath as well as in the rear or 'tradesman entrances' of premises out of normal business hours.

Part 3a of the EP&A Act

The Minister is the consent authority for the project. However there does not appear to written consent from all the landowners.

Planning Controls and Policies

The site current zoning only permits the use of the land as a 'children's home, educational establishment and various incidental uses. This is why the Manly LEP 1988 does not address the zoning or offer design guidelines for the site. The Manly Council Standard Instrument LEP is currently awaiting approval for exhibition. Manly Council took a pro active approach in developing a master plan to address concerns expressed by the community about the RFW development. This was done with the knowledge that the proposal was for buildings with height in excess of the neighbouring

buildings. No plans or concept was available despite the Development being nominated on the DOP Major Projects website. This Manly Council master plan for the area should be taken into account.

Transport and Accessibility

The Draft Centres Design Guidelines also state

'Good centres also have a range of housing options so that a diverse community can live within and around the centre. This includes a variety of housing types and dwelling sizes to cater for a range of households and a mix of private, public and affordable housing options.'

Summary

The proposed redevelopment may well 'serve the growing needs of country kids in NSW'. But in its current form the proposal risks alienating one of the last remaining community use sites on the iconic beachfront of Manly for private commercial gain while returning nothing to the Manly community which has supported the RFW since the 50s.

I request that the Minister reject this proposal.

Regards

Cathy Griffin

griffin.cathy@gmail.com

0414719513

4/11/2011

PENINSULA RESIDENTS ALLIANCE

433/25 Wentworth St., Manly NSW 2095

Email: hanianorman1@bigpond.com

November 29, 2011

**NSW Department Planning & Infrastructure
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001**

Attention: Mr Chris King

Dear Sir

**Re: Environmental Assessment Exhibition –
Royal Far West Expansion Concept Plan
South Steyne & Wentworth Street, Manly
(MP10-0159)**

At a meeting of Peninsula Residents held on October 31, 2011, it was agreed to organize the Peninsula Residents Alliance in order to highlight within the Manly Community some of the problems relating to the above Royal Far West (RFW) Expansion Concept Plan. Since that initial meeting, we have attended the RFW Open Day on November 2 and the Public Meeting organized by Mr Mike Baird's Office on November 28, neither of which have been able to satisfactorily answer serious questions raised by constituents. We are concerned in regard to the following issues:

- 1. RFW does not in their submission explain how they will apply for the rezoning of the site in question. At the present time it is zoned 5(a) – special uses for children's home, educational purposes, etc. The objective of this zoning is to identify and set aside land required for essential services to the public for community services. Given that the current zoning of the land is essentially for public or community services, any divergence from its current use as a result of rezoning should only be justified on the basis that the replacement use does not divest the community of an attachment to the current purposes and amenity.**

It is a big step in planning to go from this zoning to Residential/Business without proper consultation with the Manly Community.

2. A question continually being asked relates to land owned by the Minister for Education. At the Open Day residents questioned Urbis and RFW personnel, all receiving varied replies – “yes it was RFW land” or “maybe” or “that is being taken care of”.

At the Public Meeting on November 28, the Chairman of RFW stated only “a very small bit” was involved, but calculations reveal that it may be up to 16.34% of the total area.

This is a very serious question to answer because with Manly Village Public School having increased numbers in recent years from 200 to 600, it is essential that they be given the opportunity to use this Department of Education land for their uses rather than it being converted into residential apartments and a hotel.

3. Since 1924, the RFW has been operating as a charity with a mission to build the human capacity of the bush and improving access to specialist health and educational services for children from regional areas under the banner “*caring for country kids*”. The RFW website creates a wonderful illusion of promoting the RFW as some grandiose organisation in Manly overflowing with children rather than being more administrative in style as it operates today.

In reading the Articles of Association which covers this charity, it is interesting to note that nowhere is the word “*Manly*” mentioned. This comes as quite a shock because it means that the RFW could move their headquarters to anywhere, leaving us here in Manly, if this concept plan is permitted to go ahead, with the devastation of our ocean beachfront by this plan.

4. Of all the buildings being planned for this site in this concept plan, the hotel is the most distasteful. At the public meeting, the RFW Chairman outlined how they would only build the hotel, and then lease it to others to run. A hotel on this site is completely unacceptable being situated as it would be next to the Manly Village Public School and the RFW. In recent times, certain Manly hotels have been listed as some of the most violent in New South Wales. Those of use living in the Peninsula are all too aware of this violence.
5. The Peninsula consisting of 162 apartments and more than 400 residents will be seriously affected by this concept plan. Some 60 apartments will lose their ocean view totally. In 1997 Australand engaged architects who were able with great skill to take advantage of the corridor view in Wentworth Street. Many residents have provided the Department with photos illustrating this loss. It was interesting at the Public Meeting that Urbis did not show this devastation of views as they had at the Open Day. It is essential that the open courtyard on the corner of Wentworth St & South Steyne remain as open

space in order to correct this problem. There should be no retail shops as part of the concept plan. This would involve rezoning to business to which we would strongly object.

6. When we first looked at the Concept Plan, we were immediately struck by the lack of consideration to traffic. Was Urbis serious when they told us traffic movements had been checked but in the normal peak hours of 7a to 9am and 5pm to 7pm on weekdays. This is the famous Manly Ocean Beach, so where are the figures for Saturday and Sunday and during the holiday season.

To illustrate the potentially serious problems with traffic we attach relevant photos taken by a resident illustrating that a RFW carpark entrance opposite Rialto Lane where the Manly Council Public Carpark is situated, will result in gridlock. Further to be noted is the pedestrian crossing both in Wentworth Street and South Steyne. Sometimes you will note a gap in traffic. This is caused by traffic banking up because of the pedestrian crossing in South Steyne.

CONCLUSION

We lodge complaint regarding the process in the initial stage when RFW failed to include the Peninsula as a Stakeholder. Our enquiries reveal that RFW provided Cato Counsel with a list of invitees to the Stakeholders meeting on March 31, 2011 which did not include the Peninsula. Therefore under DoP guidelines for consultation this constitutes failure to comply.

We are grateful to the Department for extending the period of exhibition of the RFW Concept Plan, because this extra period has enabled us to more closely examine the ramifications and try to find answers. Sadly our investigation has reinforced the dangers of this Concept Plan for the Manly Community in destroying the village ambience and creating serious future problems. We therefore urge the Department to refuse approval.

Yours faithfully
Peninsula Residents Alliance

Hania Norman
Secretary



