

NEVILLE & LISLE FORTESCUE

632/25 Wentworth St., Manly NSW 2095

Telephone: 02 9976 6094

Email: n4tescue@bigpond.net.au

November 3, 2011

NSW Department Planning & Infrastructure
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Attention: Major Projects Assessment

Dear Sir,

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

We acknowledge your letter dated 19 September 2011 advising of the above Concept Plan and make the following objection and comments:

1. We wish to lodge complaint regarding process in the initial stage.
On page 1 of the Overview, in the 3rd paragraph it is stated:

“...It has also facilitated consultation sessions with other key stakeholders on the project...”

Turning to the Stakeholder Consultation Report, we learn on page 5

“In accordance with DoP guidelines for consultation, key stakeholders were identified as individuals and groups directly impacted by the proposal or likely to have an interest in the local or regional impacts of the proposal.”

The question now arises as to why representatives of the Peninsula Owners Corporation (Strata Plan # 63767), the major stakeholder were not invited to the group briefing sessions held on Thursday, 31 March, 2011? Under the DoP guidelines, this constitutes failure to comply.

On reading the Stakeholder Consultation Report, we immediately contacted Cato Counsel for explanation. It would appear that Royal Far West (RFW) provided the list of invitees, and in their wisdom decided we were not to be invited.

Yet under another section of the report under the heading "*Pictures – site & surroundings*" photos of the Peninsula are shown in exhibits 12, 13 & 14 which clearly indicate knowledge of our presence right opposite RFW in Wentworth Street.

2. We can only assume this reluctance to engage with residents is due to the impact on Peninsula apartments facing Wentworth Street. Every apartment loses ocean view in a devastating or moderate fashion.
3. It is important to explain the history of the Peninsula. It was formerly the Manly Council public open car park in Wentworth Street. In 1997 Manly Council issued a document "*Wentworth Street Development Site – Urban Design Controls*" which set forth the guidelines to be used by the developer, which was ultimately named as Australand. Reading these Guidelines today, Australand met these guidelines, but Australand went further. They did not build just any building, but their architects using skill and imagination were able to provide that every apartment facing Wentworth Street, i.e. from the Darley Road corner of Wentworth St to the South Steyne end of Rialto Lane, had views of Manly Beach/Ocean. Just looking at the building, it would be easy not to comprehend this remarkable achievement. Photographs provided by various owners will confirm this fact.

Whilst our apartment No. 632 is not situated on Wentworth Street, we, and everyone else and their visitors in Peninsula Beachside, when proceeding out through our foyer on to Wentworth Street, and looking left, enjoy the holistic corridor view of the ocean. (see attached photo) Under these plans, this will disappear.

Such was the success of the Peninsula, that when Premier Bob Carr launched the NSW Department of Planning Pattern Book, the Peninsula was shown as an illustration of good design.

4. The Wentworth Street view corridor must be preserved not only for Peninsula residents but also for the wider community, and in fact for all visitors who make their way to Manly's world famous iconic ocean beach on South Steyne. When you drive or walk down Wentworth Street, you are immediately captivated by this wide scenic view of the ocean which also includes the historic Wishing Well Pavillion on the promenade.

Under this planned concept, this is lost to the Manly community, but worse, we are faced with a large residential apartment block with retail shops on the corner of Wentworth St & South Steyne which cuts in half

or in some instances completely eliminates the ocean/sky view. This decision is neither imaginative, holistic nor acceptable.

5. At this stage on the corner of Wentworth Street & South Steyne, there is a playground which enables this vista to be enjoyed by all. We believe that part of this playground should continue to be an open corner of the site; otherwise the beauty of Manly Beach is diminished.
6. In Manly Council October Urban Design Guidelines, they nominate there should be a public domain opportunity – Plaza space opposite Rialto Square. We do not agree with this proposal. Rather we request that the corner of Wentworth St & South Steyne be a public space. Not only will this continue the corridor view in Wentworth Street, but also overcome a potential safety hazard if development is permitted to the boundary. At this corner there are two pedestrian crossings – one across Wentworth Street and the other South Steyne. If retail shops are permitted, this will further complicate what is an already a very busy intersection.
7. There should be no retail shops in this location. There are limits to retail development in Manly and the emphasis must remain on The Corso. We would need a feasibility study on the viability of say another 12 retail outlets. There is a further hazard because this part of South Steyne is an extension of the beach with the result there is heavy pedestrian & vehicular traffic.
8. The traffic comments demonstrate complete lack of understanding of the area. It appears traffic movements have been checked, but in the normal peak hours of 7am to 9am and 5pm to 7pm on weekdays. This is laughable. This is the famous Manly Ocean Beach, so where are the figures for Saturday and Sunday? Also no mention is made of the peak time at 3.00 pm on weekdays when the Manly Village School closes for the day.

A proper traffic analysis must be undertaken immediately to consider all aspects of traffic management. We should point out that no consideration has taken place which includes Rialto Lane. This services not only the Peninsula residential/retail carpark (western end) and Manly Council carpark (eastern end), but also retailers/restaurants on The Corso and South Steyne. Throughout the day there is continual movement of delivery trucks and motor vehicles. When this traffic enters Wentworth Street (eastern/ocean end), proceeding either to the left or the right, under the RFW plan, it will immediately come into contact with the RFW carpark traffic directly opposite. Permanent gridlock. (see photos.)

9. **Parking arrangements.** It is noted there will be a car park, but this is not nearly big enough. Bear in mind there is no room available in the Manly Council Peninsula carpark. It already has maximum patronage without adding RFW. Users include Coles supermarket shoppers, Village Public School, restaurant diners, visitors to the beach, etc.
10. **It is incongruous to consider a hotel on this site.** It is offensive to believe this can be acceptable even in this day and age, situated as it is close by – next door to the Manly Village Public School and the planned RFW buildings for *“caring for country kids”*. Much is always made of the history of RFW, and as we write this hotel comment we must reflect that the founder of RFW was in fact a Methodist Minister, and such a building would never have been contemplated or acceptable to him under any circumstance.
11. **We attended the RFW Open Day on November 2.** This was disappointing as there was considerable confusion. For instance, does RFW have control over the NSW Department of Education site or doesn't it. The inference was that they do, but then again, they don't. We do not believe that the NSW Education Building and courtyards should become a commercial benefit to RFW. Bear in mind that the Manly Village School is bursting at the seams through numbers which from observance will not decrease in the foreseeable future, and they should be offered the opportunity of utilizing this valuable space if not required for RFW education requirements.

CONCLUSION.

Yesterday at the Open Day, we were asked the question by Cato Counsel that surely we would have realized when we purchased our apartment that the RFW site would be developed? Obviously the answer is yes, but on whose conditions – the Manly community or the whims of RFW.

We realize the important work done by RFW since 1924, but we regret one senses they are using the public's sympathy and support for their work under a veil of acceptability, which will not benefit the Manly community either now, or into the future. Had this Concept Plan involved plans for buildings for RFW work with country children, there would presumably not be such a major problem. Unfortunately the plans appear to be more related to a commercial proposition and profit – hotel, residential apartments, and retail shops greatly increasing the population of the area which is already overcrowded.

Department of Planning & Infrastructure

November 3, 2011

Page 5

Little consideration has been given to the fact that the Manly CBD is on an isthmus which creates considerable limitations on development and any plan must be sympathetic to the natural and built environment.

Yours faithfully

Neville Fortescue

Lisle Frances Fortescue

Note: Neville Fortescue was elected member of the Peninsula Owners Corporation Executive Committee at the 1st AGM held in December 2000.
On his retirement in 2002 due to ill health, Lisle Fortescue accepted the vacant position and continues to be member.

Dear Mr King

On 30 November, on behalf of the Manly Village Public School P&C Association I sent in our submission. I sent it through the website link but cannot see it on the Department of Planning website. Attached is our submission. Because our school is severely impacted by the proposed development I want to ensure that our concerns are taken into account when this proposal is assessed.

Regards

Julie Beagley

VP MVPS P&C Association.

Royal Far West Proposal - Submission

We oppose the proposed development of the Royal Far West for the following reasons:

1. **Visual Impact** - the *Visual Impact* within the Manly Village Public School (MVPS) school grounds would be *HIGH* (using the rating scale in the proposal). The proposed 8 storey administration building would run along the boundary behind the MVPS library. Such an imposing building would totally overwhelm the school and playground. There would also of course be privacy issues where the upper storey windows allow views into the playground.
2. **Department of Education Land** - within the proposed development are 3 tracts of Department of Education land. How has this land become part of the development? The roll of MVPS has increased from 250 to over 600 in the past 10 years. With the school bound to take pupils living within the catchment area the space to student ratio will get progressively less as the school roll continues to increase. Before the new BER hall was built the playground area was small. Now with the hall built it is even smaller. Logically if RFW has no use for the Department of Education land as a school, it should be made available to MVPS and/or could be shared with the RFW.
3. **Lack of Community Consultation** - the *Stakeholder Consultation Report* specifies that consultation must be undertaken in accordance with the *DoP Guidelines for Major Project Community Consultation 2007*. This document actually specifies P&Cs. Apparently 6 community consultations to discuss the proposed development have been held. MVPS P&C was not invited to any. Our school shares a boundary with RFW so for us to be left out of the consultation process is clearly a contravention of the DoP Guidelines. How could we have been overlooked when we are clearly the most affected by the development?
4. **Increase in Traffic** - the proposed new buildings (164 room hotel, administration block, retail outlets and apartments) would mean an increase in traffic entering or leaving RFW. Many of the MVPS children walk or ride bikes to school. This increase in traffic would add to the hazards for the children going to and leaving the school grounds.
5. **Impact on MVPS Physical Education** - because MVPS has such a small playground, it takes advantage of what the surrounding areas have to offer. MVPS children frequently go to the ocean beach or run/walk around the block as part of PE. Sadly these activities would have to be curtailed with this development which includes shops, apartments and a hotel.
6. **Vehicular Access** - the "primary vehicular access point" for the proposed development lines up with the entry/exit of the Council carpark. As any local would affirm, it takes courtesy and patience when exiting the carpark; adding another entry/exit directly opposite would exacerbate an already chaotic situation. Most of the cars exiting RFW would be visitors to Manly and would be unlikely to follow the courtesy rules that the locals observe.
7. **How long will it take?** - realistically a development of this magnitude and scale will take many years. There will be huge noise concerns for teachers and children. There will be heavy machinery entering and exiting the building site; a hazard for children going to or leaving school. Possibly the buildings slated for demolition will contain asbestos.
8. **Another Licensed Premise** - we are concerned that the 5 star hotel will have a public bar associated with it. Manly has enough problems with the current licensed premises. For one to be so close to a school is of major concern to us. Is it even legal to have one so close to a school?

Submitted by: Manly Village Public School P&C