
Sent: 18/01/2021 11:11:29 AM
Subject: Online Submission

18/01/2021

MR Jeremy Ford
6 / 55 Pacific PDE
Dee Why NSW 2099
jezfordnext@gmail.com

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

OBJECTION 1: Affordable housing? Really?

The proposal seems to duck all manner of council development regulations (including required setbacks & parking spaces) by claiming to be an affordable housing development. But is it? The proposed rental level of \$500-\$525 for a 25m2 unit is a bit rich under the NSW definitions of affordable housing.

Definitions from <https://www.facs.nsw.gov.au/providers/housing/affordable/about>:

- "Affordable housing is housing that is appropriate for the needs of a range of very low to moderate income households", and "As a rule of thumb, housing is usually considered affordable if it costs less than 30% of gross household income."
- "People earning more than 50% but less than 80% of the NSW or Sydney median income are described as earning a low income... People described as being on a moderate income are those earning between 80-120% of the NSW or Sydney median income."

From

https://quickstats.censusdata.abs.gov.au/census_services/getproduct/census/2011/quickstat/LC

The 2011 ABS Census data found that the median HOUSEHOLD income (average 1.9 people per household) for Sydney is \$1639 per week.

So the rents should be <30% x (50% to 120%) of \$1639, a rental range of \$245.85 to \$590. The proposed rents therefore exclude anyone but the highest of moderate income owners, and then only when there are two people in the unit - two people in a 25m2 apartment, heaven help them!!

Surely this development proposal should have its "affordable housing" pretensions refused - unless rents are reduced to range from \$245.85/week up to the suggested levels.

OBJECTION 2: Parking - 13 spaces for 52 people!

The development proposes 52 people to live there, cited as "young professionals" who are (judging from those young professionals who rent in our strata) more likely to have two cars than one, and absolutely not none, and with only 13 car spaces between 52 of them, this is insane. There is ZERO available on-street parking on Pacific Parade - visitors to our property often spent 20 minutes looking for a nearby park and have to walk 5-10 minutes back from where they do find one. (Sometimes they give up and go home.) This is an entirely unsuitable level of parking provision for an already densely populated area.

OBJECTION 3: Water: Ever since the large development on the corner of Delmar Parade and Carew Street (immediately south of this new development), the water flow through the stormwater drop and calvert passing through 57 Pacific Parade has increased dramatically, and our groundwater level, we believe from overspill, has increased and regularly seeps into our garage areas at 55 Pacific Parade. The likelihood of increased groundwater levels was recently confirmed to us by Council's stormwater team, which checked the calvert for leaks (we are most grateful for their thorough work). Other areas regularly flood, including the Telstra pit to the right of the driveway of 55 Pacific Parade.

The new development will further reduce ground suitable to absorb rainfall on this block, while increasing runoff from covered areas, and - with 26 new units and 53 new people - massively increase wastewater. Ask your stormwater and sewage teams what they think the result will be, and where all that water will end up given systems are already over capacity .

OBJECTION FOUR: Tree 1 as described in the arborist's report - please ensure the recommended replacement actually takes place, and is of suitable size. Council's own arborist might confirm this appraisal as the bottlebrush looks pretty good to us. In particular, even if removed, the developer's own report recommends a replacement "of a species endemic and suitable to the site able to reach a similar or greater size in height and crown spread of the existing tree".

Sadly I have witnessed a number of developments where such advice is simply ignored and Council afterwards is left with a fait accompli. This replacement should be monitored throughout the proposal, made compulsory for certification to be given, AND rechecked prior to habitation, as these things have a habit of being removed after approval.

Indeed one might ask - if they're really planning to replace it with a tree of similar or greater size, why do they need to remove the original?

Anyway, since I gather this development as submitted is ignoring many of the suggestions from Council in its pre-assessment, hopefully you're going to take great care on this one, and knock it back for a more conventional development of six to eight units, with one car space per unit. This developer is using the 'affordable housing' label to bypass your own regulations in the hunt for profit. Please knock it back, and take great care on whatever they send as a second proposal, given this one seems absurd enough to be a Trojan horse for a slightly less extreme second submission.

In summary, while we love Dee Why, east of Pittwater Road it is already congested, over-populated, overparked, and rubbish-strewn (these new clean-up procedures really aren't working in such a high-density population). Such a densely-packed, carspace-starved development as this is entirely unsuitable.

Please feel free to contact me for further comment.