

PUBLIC ADDRESSES

The following people addressed the meeting in relation to this item:

Against the Recommendation:

Terry Murphy
Margaret Tayar
Tom Cameron
Linda Cummings
Tomas Klein
Karen Pitt
Richard Hewitt

In Support of the Recommendation:

Bruce Masson
Robert Magid

M17/12 Decision of the Panel

That further consideration of Development Application No. 142/2011 for construction of a first floor addition to the existing Manly Wharf structure including four (4) restaurant tenancies with plant rooms and changes to the ground floor including two (2) new retail tenancies at Manly Wharf, East Esplanade, Manly be **Refused** for the following reasons:

1. The application does not demonstrate that the vehicular traffic generated by the proposed development can be accommodated by the existing street capacity in the locality.
2. Pedestrian movements and congestion at periods of peak usage of the proposed development and general pedestrian activity in the wharf precinct have not been satisfactorily addressed by the application.
3. Social impacts of the proposed development have not been satisfactorily addressed by the application, in particular the proposed hours of operation are unreasonable and have the potential to create adverse noise impacts on nearby residential areas.
4. The height of the proposed development is in breach of the Manly Cove Development Control Policy 1996 with resulting adverse impacts on public and private views.
5. The proposed development has a adverse impact on the views obtained from a number of existing residential buildings in the vicinity. The proposed development also has an adverse impact on views available from the public domain.
6. The proposed development makes no provision for vehicular parking and this will impact adversely on the parking situation in the nearby streets and parking stations.
7. The proposed development will create additional demand for loading facilities. The proposal reduces the existing loading dock capacity and does not address this issue.
8. The site is unsuitable for the proposed development for the foregoing reasons.
9. The proposed development is not in the public interest.

For the Decision: Stein, Macdonald, Graham and Trotter
Against the Decision: Nil
