
Sent: 21/01/2021 12:55:06 PM
Subject: Online Submission

21/01/2021

MISS Nicole Crkvencic
19 / 63 Pacific PDE
Dee Why NSW 2099
nicolecrk@hotmail.com

RE: DA2020/1597 - 67 Pacific Parade DEE WHY NSW 2099

20/01/2021

MISS Nicole Crkvencic & MR Tim Anderson
19/63 Pacific PDE DEE WHY NSW 2099
nicolecrk@hotmail.com

RE: DA2020/1597 - 67 Pacific Parade DEE WHY NSW 2099

I am writing to you as the owners of 19/63 Pacific Parade and wish to lodge our objection to the proposed development at 67 Pacific Parade. Although we support the addition of low-cost housing, the development as outlined below is not compliant with numerous planning requirements and would cause negative impacts on neighbouring residents with significant loss of amenity.

1) Compliance with Affordable Renting Housing SEPP

The development relies on numerous parts of the Affordable Housing SEPP to be exempt from normal planning requirements, however several of the proposed boarding rooms are too large for the development to be considered a boarding house.

Clause 30(1) of the Affordable Renting Housing SEPP states;

A consent authority must not consent to development to which this Division applies unless it is satisfied of each of the following-

(b) no boarding room will have a gross floor area (excluding any area used for the purposes of private kitchen or bathroom facilities) of more than 25 square metres,

Rooms L301, 302 & 303 can be characterised as loft style one-bedroom apartments and have a gross floor area of 35.7m² over 2 levels (including kitchen and bathroom facilities) as indicated on the plans. Deducting the approximate scaled area allocated for kitchen and bathroom facilities, the three loft apartments each have a gross floor area of at least 29m². Therefore, the development as currently proposed is not in compliance with the Affordable Housing SEPP requirements for boarding houses and should be rejected by council.

2) Parking

As the development is classified as a "boarding house", they are currently exempt from adhering to standard parking guidelines and instead only require "0.5 parking spaces per unit". As they do not comply with the requirements of a boarding house as stated above, they cannot

use the above standards. As Pacific Parade is one the busiest streets in Dee Why, street parking is difficult to come by already. This high-density building with only 13 car spaces and no visitor spots for up to 52 residents will only exacerbate the problem. On top of this, the driveway proposed is larger than the current driveway, leading to the elimination of 1 car space and further pressure on the already struggling capacity.

3) Noise

The acoustic engineer determined that the proposed development was predicted to generate noise levels above the acceptable noise limit at 4 locations (within the properties of 63 & 65 Pacific Parade & 1-5 The Crescent), primarily due to the common area and open terrace at the rear of Level 1.

The various control options proposed, including limiting the number of residents within various communal areas, are likely to be difficult to enforce and will represent an ongoing compliance and monitoring issue for nearby residents and council alike. As such I believe that it is not appropriate to approve a development with such noise generating outdoor communal areas within a small residential block, especially when there are outdoor areas situated at the rear of the block affecting 3 neighbouring properties.

4) Setbacks

The proposed development does not comply with the side and basement setback requirements and side boundary building envelope requirements. This non-compliance creates numerous issues for neighbouring residents including privacy, sunlight, and shading concerns. Additionally, as the basement excavation extends almost to the boundary line in some areas, there are potential structural and geotechnical concerns for neighbouring properties.

We are not against providing accommodation for disadvantaged persons but given all the practical considerations that we have listed above we don't believe that the location of this boarding house is suitable for this locality. We are concerned that this proposed development will further increase the noise and road safety issues in the area and would like to see the Council addressing these issues before considering any high-density approvals. Thank you for considering our objections to the proposed development.

Yours sincerely,
Nicole Crkvencic and Tim Anderson
Unit 19/63 Pacific Parade