
Sent: 18/05/2021 2:48:37 PM
Subject: Attn: Anne Marie Young- DA2020/1597 Submission from Southwell
Attachments: DA2020-1597 Southwell Submission 17 May 2021.pdf;

Please see attached submission.

Submission 17/05/2021 regarding Amended DA2020/1597
Proposed Boarding House at 67 Pacific Parade, Dee Why

We are pleased to see some of our original issues have been acknowledged by amended plans, however a number of fundamental concerns remain about the size, affordability and ultimately suitability of this development.

Whilst we still have concerns regarding the depth and extent of the excavation so close to our own building, we are not engineering experts so concede we must rely on the Application Process and imposed Consent conditions to ensure the integrity of our building is not compromised by such a deep excavation next door.

With 26 units and up to 52 people living on a small, single residential block of land, this is an over-development that will not only result in a poor quality of life for those living in the building, but will have an adverse impact to the surrounding properties and residents.

Acoustics and Rooftop Outdoor Space:

The original acoustic report failed to take into consideration the noise impacts of the proposed rooftop communal space on our immediately adjacent L3 apartment at No 65 Pacific Parade. At time of writing this submission, we have microphones on our balconies still measuring ambient noise for an amended report yet to be published.

It is of great concern that we, as interested neighbouring residents, are forced to assess and voice our concerns regarding the noise impact of the amended proposal BEFORE the amended acoustic report is finalised. The short window of only a few days to make comment now will mean we are being asked to do so without crucial information. Given our immediate proximity to the proposed rooftop communal area, this is not satisfactory.

Acoustics are fundamental to this development application, not just for us as immediate neighbours, but in our opinion for the viability of the entire development. Acoustics will be used to determine how many (or how few) of the up to 52 residents will be “allowed” at any one time to enjoy the only fresh air and sunlight available on the premises- on the rooftop communal area- without creating unacceptable levels of noise for surrounding apartments.

- What will be the final limit for number of people on the rooftop deck? Until the amended acoustic report is presented we have little to go on.
- Most single dwellings in the area have small balconies which would normally be used by a few people at a time on perhaps a couple of nights a week. Due to the nature of this development, it is not unreasonable to anticipate the communal rooftop balcony, as the only outdoor space on the premises, to be extremely popular and at (or over) capacity pretty much 7 days and nights a week. This schedule is entirely inconsistent with the nature of this otherwise quiet residential pocket of Dee Why.
- As immediate neighbours to the proposed rooftop outdoor space, the extent to which our amenity of our own balcony will be compromised relies entirely on strict enforcement of we believe to be unrealistic, unenforceable and potentially harmful restrictions. These shoe-box dwellings will be hard enough to live in, but with restricted access for all to sunlight and fresh air...
- We wonder how there will be any effective ongoing enforcement of rooftop limits once this development is operating. We fully expect rooftop limits and therefore noise limits will be regularly exceeded and that complaints will be inevitable. The DA Management Plan's need to include a Public Complaints Procedure confirms our fears. At what point does it become unreasonable to expect weary neighbours to regularly dial in to an ineffective complaints hotline and front up to a quarterly complaints meeting with management ?
- What are the ramifications for the owner if terms and conditions of consent are regularly breached and complaints ignored?
- Especially when the living spaces for each resident in this type of development are so limited, what will be the mental health impacts of rationing out periods of fresh air and sunlight to boarding house residents? Could

this ever possibly be a nice place to live? Has a mental health impact assessment been made? Will this become more like a ghetto than an over-priced boarding house for “young professionals”?

- What alternative is there for those not allowed to go onto the rooftop deck go to get their fresh air and sunlight or have a cigarette?

Is there an expectation that our neighbourhood must become accustomed to the street frontage of the boarding house becoming a “hang out” or “smoker’s corner” for those not allowed onto the rooftop? This would be directly adjacent to our main entry pathway at No 65 and has the potential to create an intimidating gauntlet through which our visitors and neighbours must pass. Could this ever be acceptable to consent authorities? It would not be acceptable to us.

How can any development that cannot provide all residents free access to fresh air and sunlight at all times be appropriate for approval?

Parking and Traffic:

So much time, effort and community money has been invested in recent years to improve the quality of life in the Dee Why basin, particularly around the beach and in the commercial areas, but also via upgrades to surrounding residential footpaths and roadways etc. Dee Why is a busy area with higher densities than surrounding suburbs.

More recently, parking requirements have been much more strict, but there are still many older medium-density developments in the area that do not provide sufficient on-the-premises parking for the number of residents within. This has resulted in a shortage of street parking for local residents and visitors alike.

It is undeniable that a lack of street parking is one of the more critical threats to the maintenance and improvement to quality of life in Dee Why. From about 4pm each afternoon, when people start arriving home from work, it becomes very difficult for residents to find street parking near their homes. The problem is compounded for friends and family who are visiting local residents, especially on weekend evenings.

Our building next door at 65 Pacific Parade is indicative of the more recent developments in the area. On the same sized block of land as the proposed boarding house, we have 9 apartments housing 14 adults. There are 12 car spaces and every one is occupied each night. People visiting us, tradespeople, couriers and other deliveries including evening “uber eats” type food deliveries all compete for the two additional on-site visitors car spaces available.

- **We already have trouble when inviting guests to our homes due to a lack of street parking of an evening on weekends. Guests can often drive around for 30 minutes or more looking for a parking space.**
- **Our 2 visitor’s spaces are already often filled illegally by people living and visiting nearby properties because there are no parking spaces available on the street.**

These problems will become far more frequent if this development proceeds as proposed.

The proposed boarding house development provides only 13 resident car spaces for 26 apartments and up to 52 adults. **We note this allocation is not even sufficient to meet Affordable Housing SEPP Guidelines**, which require a parking space for the resident manager and at least 0.5 spaces per apartment (see snip below).

By my calculations a minimum of at least 14 spaces is required- still woefully below what would be needed to avoid severely impacting surrounding street parking availability.

Parking requirements – Proponents other than Social Housing Providers:

- 0.5 car spaces per boarding room in all locations
- At least one parking space provided for each person employed in connection with the development and who is resident on the site.

** Excerpt from NSW Govt Flyer- "Supporting New Generation Boarding Houses – June 2018*

It is not only the majority of the new boarding house residents who will be forced to negotiate the on-street parking mayhem on a daily basis. Inexplicably, the DA proposes no visitor's parking spaces. A development of this size will most certainly generate a regular flow of tradespeople, couriers and deliveries coming and going throughout each day and into the evenings- all needing parking for varying periods of time. Tradespeople often need onsite parking for extended periods. Deliveries to residential properties have increased dramatically in the past few years due to the boom in online shopping and trend towards home food deliveries such as Uber Eats.

- **Will these delivery people be forced to block the dual access driveway compromising the identified safety issues with the original single lane proposal? Who will police this when the development is up and running?**
- **Or will those unable to find parking next door sneak into our visitor's parking spaces at No 65, exacerbating our existing problem. It is just not acceptable that we will be forced into yet more confrontations with neighbouring vehicles on a daily basis.**

We feel it would be irresponsible to allow a development with such insufficient parking facilities to proceed in this area. It will severely impact street parking across Dee Why, create friction with residents of neighbouring properties, lower the quality of life for many hundreds of nearby residents and de-value all neighbouring properties. This would be a travesty for the sake of a larger profit for a single owner.

Further, we question whether the new dual driveway design will solve the significant prospect of traffic safety issues due to the location of the driveway relative to the crest of the hill to the East and the very short sight distance for both for cars travelling West along Pacific Parade and those entering the street blind from the carpark.

It is a slap in the face for all Dee Why residents to allow further development in the area that wilfully ignores the impact on and worsens the street parking situation in the Dee Why basin.

Affordable Housing:

Our last concern is the very laughable premise that this is an "Affordable" Housing Development. We acknowledge the need for affordable housing and understand there are many concessions available to those proposing developments designed to offer cheaper housing in this city. But surely to enjoy those concessions, the accommodation proposed must be somewhat affordable? Cheaper than average at least!

This proposal estimates the rent for a 25m² unit in this development will be about \$525 per week- not include parking- which will cost extra for those who win the parking space lottery. This rent is similar in overall price but 2 to 4 times the cost per square metre of an average full-sized one bedroom apartment in the suburb.

This development will be able to lay claim to being some of the most expensive residential floorspace per square metre in Dee Why. Given this fact, should a development such as this enjoy the State Government's "Affordable Housing" concessions- which I might add are currently under review due to the rorting of the system by developers motivated only by profit.

We simply cannot believe the "young professional" target market for this accommodation will not come to the same conclusion as we have- that this development is anything but affordable.

Summary:

- Ultimately, we do not think a development proposing to house up to 52 people can ever be appropriate on such a small block of land in an already busy and built-up area.
- The quality of life and mental health of residents living in the boarding house will surely be compromised by the severe lack of sunlight and open-air space, which will need to be rationed out to keep the inevitable noise down to levels acceptable for the amenity of the immediate surrounding neighbourhood.
- The immediate neighbourhood will be in a constant battle to maintain the conditions and restrictions under which the development application was granted in the first place, further antagonising the local community.
- Due to the ridiculous lack of on-site parking associated with this development and the sheer number of potential new residents without a car space, it will become nearly impossible to find nearby on street parking at peak times throughout the wider Dee Why area. The safety issues are self-explanatory.
- There will inevitably be ongoing confrontation with neighbouring properties due to the omission of any visitor or delivery parking spaces.
- We do not believe this development meets in any way the dictionary definition of “affordable”.
- For the sake of the profit of a single owner, the entire Dee Why community will be the poorer for this development.

Sean And Kylie Southwell
9/65 Pacific Parade, Dee Why