
Sent: 28/05/2021 1:32:46 PM
Subject: Attention: Anne-Marie Young Submission re DA2020 - 1597
Attachments: May 2021 submission re DA2020-1597.pdf;

Dear Ms Young,

Please find attached my submission in relation to the amended development proposal DA2020/1597.

Kind Regards,
SA Phillips

Anne-Marie Young
Principal Planner
Northern Beaches Council
PO Box 82
MANLY NSW 1655

10/64-66 Pacific Parade
DEE WHY NSW 2099

28 May 2021

Re: Development application DA2020/1597 - 67 Pacific Parade, Dee Why

Dear Ms Young,

As the owner of a unit located opposite 67 Pacific Parade, I am lodging an objection to the amended boarding house development proposal (DA2020/1597) on a number of grounds. The proposed development is not at all suitable for the site in question and constitutes significant overdevelopment of the site. The development is out of character for the area. Traffic and parking issues raised previously have not been addressed in the amended proposal, and there are building compliance issues which would impact on neighbouring residents.

The proposal to build a 26-room micro apartment 'new generation' boarding house on a 700 square metre house block at 67 Pacific Parade, Dee Why is unlike any other dwellings in the immediate area. It compromises the privacy and amenity of adjacent neighbours, and is completely unsuitable for an area populated by residential apartment blocks with approximately nine apartments on a block of similar size. This type of housing with its external common areas and limited onsite parking will affect the quality of life of nearby residents who are predominantly young families and older single or dual person households. Based on similar 'new generation' boarding houses built in the last few years, it is also unlikely to constitute truly affordable housing, with rents over \$500 per week and higher per square metre rates than traditional apartments.

I note that the amended proposal provides for an underground parking arrangement using a 'car stacker'. These devices are well known for mechanical issues and there are many reported incidences of residents' vehicles being locked out of such car parks due to mechanical failure, creating added competition for available on-street parking. Adding to this is the difficulty in ensuring every new resident with a car parking space is competent in using the access buzzer. With a high turnover of residents in temporary housing, this 'solution' to excessive underground excavation only serves to further prove why the proposed development is not suitable for the site. It also adds no additional car spaces for the development which is of great concern in a residential area where on-street parking is already insufficient to meet demand.

The amended proposal results in all common areas being relocated to the rooftop which overlooks neighbouring properties and faces the street. As the only outdoor space available to residents in otherwise tiny apartments, this would be likely to result in overcrowding and excessive noise which would impact on the reasonable enjoyment of surrounding residents.

Other unsuitable elements of the proposal remain unchanged. The character and amenity of the development is not appropriate for the area. A façade of repetitive window boxes without balconies is out of character with neighbouring properties, as is a street-facing rooftop common area. The proposed development is not in harmony with the natural environment and would reduce the amount of vegetation in the street and its potential to offset the increase in carbon emissions that a development of such increased occupancy density would generate. The increase in soft landscape

cover from approximately 39% to 41.5% is still inadequate to soften the impact of the significant increase in density of units.

Legitimate concerns for public safety, particularly road traffic and pedestrian safety, with an increase in numbers beyond what is normally attributed to similar sized residential blocks in this area, have not been addressed. The issue of vehicles queuing at the entry to the premises, putting both pedestrians and vehicles at risk, has not been adequately addressed. The *Transport Referral Response* acknowledges that such queuing would create “a serious safety concern”. The large increase in the number of bins to be collected in Pacific Parade would also result in traffic congestion and issues with access from driveways when waste removal vehicles are servicing the area. There are already queues of cars waiting to pass these vehicles during the morning peak and a large increase in the number of bins to be collected would exacerbate this situation. The updated traffic report acknowledges that the proposed development site is in an area with “moderate to high” demand for on-street parking and that the development is likely to increase demand by at least one parking space as there is no allocated space for the on-site manager. The proposed development includes a 6 metre driveway but does not clearly identify that this driveway, being larger than the driveway for the existing property, will in fact reduce the number of on-street parking spaces and further exacerbate issues for residents unable to find parking close to their homes.

The amended development proposal is not compliant with the requirements for building setbacks or the building envelope and, as such, will not provide adequate separation between buildings on either side to ensure a reasonable level of privacy, amenity and solar access. The basement excavation is still of concern on such a narrow block. I note that contiguous bore piles, which would further encroach on side setbacks, have not been included on the drawings. Middle units on the western side still lack adequate access to sunlight.

While I understand the need for more affordable housing on the Northern Beaches, approving the building of boarding houses in locations that currently have no such dwellings and where existing parking, traffic and pedestrian safety issues would be exacerbated is not the answer. There are ‘new generation boarding house’ developments currently under construction on Pittwater Road, Dee Why and Warringah Road, Beacon Hill, which are far more suitable locations for developments of this type and density. There have been many recent applications and approvals for boarding houses in this area, including sites at May Road, Fisher Road, Lewis Street, Redman Road and Harbord Road, all less than one kilometre from the proposed site in Pacific Parade. This constitutes overdevelopment of this type of accommodation in the area. I understand that the Northern Beaches Council has a plan for housing variety and affordability into the future, and I urge council not to succumb to pressure to increase the availability of affordable housing in locations where it would constitute much higher density housing and significantly impact the quality of life of neighbouring residents.

If developments such as this are approved in predominantly residential areas, it will permanently alter the character of the Northern Beaches and exacerbate the already difficult situation with on-street parking and traffic flow during peak times in suburbs such as Dee Why. I urge the council to listen to the concerns of the local community and ensure that affordable housing in the form of boarding houses is only approved in suitable, higher density areas on the Northern Beaches. The site at 67 Pacific Parade, Dee Why is not suitable for the proposed development and I urge you to reject the proposal.

Yours faithfully,

SA Phillips