

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 8/10/2021 9:01 PM
To: "DA Submission Mailbox" <DASubmission@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au>
Cc: "Council Northernbeaches Mailbox"
<Council.Northernbeaches@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au>; "Adam Mitchell"
<Adam.Mitchell@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: DA2021/1508 (882A Pittwater Road, Dee Why) - Objection submission
Attachments: 20211008-204246.pdf

Dear NB Council

Please find attached my objection to the DA2021/1508 in respect of the proposed development on 882A Pittwater Road, 2099 Dee Why.

I wish to make this submission anonymously. As a result, kindly redact my full name as well as my e-mail address (incl. of the entire FROM: line that contains my name as well as my email address when pdfing and uploading this email).

Kind regards,

[REDACTED]

*** ALL PERSONAL INFORMATION TO BE REDACTED ***

Objection to DA2021/1508

I am an owner of an unit at 880 Pittwater Road, 2099 Dee Why. I am lodging my objection to the proposed development outlined in the DA2021/1508 ("the Proposal"). **I urge Northern Beaches Council to reject the Proposal in its entirety.**

The proposed site is not suitable for the proposal outlined in DA2021/1508.

I also acknowledge and fully support the objection submission to Council, dated 5 October 2021, 0619am with names withheld. This objection submission outlines the significant number of violations contained in the Proposal, which demonstrates complete contempt for not only the relevant legislation and regulations, but also for the nearby owners of adjacent building. Indeed, it is not clear what benefit the Proposal offers to Dee Why and the Northern Beaches Council.

There are two distinct issues that need be addressed with respect to this Proposal :

1. The request to build a 9-storey building; and
2. The request to use part of that said building as a boarding house.

Major adverse impacts identified on the existing 880 Pittwater Road / 10 Oaks Avenue buildings:

Impact on natural light / sunlight, especially in relation to my own unit

With the development of the Meriton, my patio has completely lost access to direct sunshine / natural light from early morning until late afternoon (as the Meriton's large walls prohibit sunlight shining on my patio from North-Easterly direction). On the North-Westerly side, natural light coming onto my patio and to one of my bedrooms will further diminish once the Havana building is completed. These two constructions already had a massive negative impact on my enjoyment of my property.

The "last" remaining natural light falling onto my outdoor patio is through the open space of the Pittwater Road 882A land. If a multistorey building were to be built on the Pittwater Road 882A land, I would be robbed the last remaining way of having the sun shining on my patio which in turn also lightens up my apartment. All plants on my patio will presumably perish in short time and my patio will look like a deserted cemetery. With this proposed development, I would essentially live in a dark and cold dungeon-like jail. In other words, this proposed development does by no means improve the quality of living for 880 Pittwater Road / 10 Oaks Avenue owners/tenants but in contrast actually adversely affects the quality of living.

Ongoing and persistent exposure to ongoing construction sites rather than being able to enjoy the quality of life in Dee Why

The area around 880 Pittwater Road / 10 Oaks Avenue has been subject to constant noisy developments for years.

- Firstly, the development of Meriton's lighthouse went on for years which put a massive burden on the Owner's Corporation.
- Secondly, we are now exposed to the construction site of Havana for several months. The constant noise and related dust have adversely impacted the quality of living for many residents of 880 Pittwater Road/10 Oaks Avenue for several years now.

Enough is enough, we do not need another adjacent development starting soon. Note that I deliberately refrain from mentioning all other nearby developments that were ongoing over the past years and also indirectly impacted us.

Key concerns identified with the proposed development:

I do remember the low-density neighbourhood of Dee Why back in the days and I have seen how Dee Why transformed to a high-density building community where anonymity is more the norm than the exception. The colossal development of Meriton's Lighthouse represents the flagship for this new Dee Why and has surely transformed Dee Why in a way than no other development has. At the same time, I note that other large constructions are still ongoing such as the Havana (just next door to 880 Pittwater Road / 10 Oaks Avenue, sic!) and Delmar, to name a few.

Having said that, the Proposal takes this approach to yet another level by suggesting to now explore the concept of micro buildings that make use of the so called sub-divided flat concept that we know from many Asian cities. This concept is defined by having no character and by providing no amenity for residents in the living premises. This definitively goes a few steps too far and it would be a disgrace if Northern Beaches Council accepts this proposal as the Northern Beaches Council would effectively support substandard living conditions for people requiring boarding houses given the planned size of rooms that go as low as 16 m² as per the plans provided. I don't think that there is any argument that holds that would lead the B4 Objectives to be satisfied in that circumstance.

More broadly, I am unable to find a single reason how this proposed development under the Proposal would improve Dee Why as all it does is add to Dee Why town centre being overcrowded and people being subject to despicable living conditions as if we were a slum – this is deprivation of life at its best.

Lastly, while this is pure speculation on my end, I would think that the greedy developers purposely propose the use of a boarding house as that is probably the only way that they see to maximise profit out of this proposal since:

- "high end", expensive flats probably won't fly and more importantly sell given the very limited and cramped space available to build something in between high density without being able to offer parking; and
- It would presumably take years for commercial spaces to lead to a breakeven.

Specifically, I would like to refer to a few very specific observations that explain why I recommend to the Northern Beaches Council to reject the proposal in its entirety:

Visual murder of Dee Why's architectural charm

The submitted architectural plans suggest that the 882A Pittwater Road building will be "fitted" into the narrow-space between the existing Meriton building (890 Pittwater Road) and the 880 Pittwater Road building. Looking at the plans, this is rather being cramped than being nicely fitted. Essentially, Dee Why becomes to a poorly planned high-density area with what we call "subdivided shoe box flats" in cities like Tokyo/Hong Kong/Beijing/Shanghai (or any other historic mega city in China) just without any charm. If this DA was approved, it could set a precedent for the visual murder of Dee Why's current albeit already battered architectural charm.

Missing parking facilities for owners and tenants

The DA has no provision for dedicated car parking (neither via a dedicated garage nor via dedicated off-street parking) but at the same time has proposed 20 boarding rooms, office space and commercial shops. This causes a massive problem because it immediately creates a need for permanent parking in the vicinity from a minimum of 20 spaces which will spill over to the adjoining carparks or kerbside parking causing additional congestion to the already daily congestion and wild west that we are used to on especially Pacific Parade, Oaks Avenue, and Howard Avenue.

I refer to the other submissions which exactly point out how the parking situation outlined in the Proposal is non-compliant with existing legislation.

As mentioned in another submission, it seems quite clear that the developers are attempting to benefit from the profits from the development while transferring the congestion issue to the community in a despicable manner.

General safety fears in the event of an emergency

Some documents uploaded on the NB Council DA submission website indicate that:

- This 9 storey building will not have a passenger elevator;
- This 9 storey building will not have ramp access on each single floor;
- This 9 storey building will only have a walking access via Pittwater Road and will not have any rear access;
- This 9 storey building will not have a driveway access at all; and
- The developers seek some sort of dispensation for certain fire audit matters as the building site is too small to fulfill the entire code.

I greatly fear that in the event of an emergency (such as fire, earthquake, bomb explosion etc) this building design is not fit and proper to provide the maximum support to its occupants, especially where they are older or require wheelchair support or are disabled in some sort of form.

Use as a boarding house

- Looking at the detailed plans, I am of the view that the proposed boarding house rooms are similar to the concept of subdivided flats in Hong Kong (or in other Asian cities). These rooms are tiny if realised that way and will not offer any comfort and surely not offer any quality of living for residents, they are sub-standard at best.
- I also note that there seems to be a lack of flow-through ventilation (other than mechanical ventilation which will create noise and adversely affect 880 Pittwater Road), lack of natural light, and lack of any outdoor facilities.
- Whilst not clear to me from the plans (I am not an architect), I would assume that the rooms would have windows in Southern direction (otherwise living conditions would be truly despicable which would be a valid reason to reject The Proposal). Such windows would directly expose my patio and living room to the eyes of the residents of the boarding house rooms. To me, this is an unacceptable breach of my privacy rights. I note that the current Meriton walls do not have any windows into southern direction and hence we benefit from full privacy.

Potential adverse impact on neighbourhood caused by residents of the boarding house

I am reading with great concern that this building is expected to be used as boarding house. With all due respect, Dee Why town centre does not need another boarding house (application), while I note that NB Council has recently approved a boarding house on May Road which is close-by. The proposed location is already a high density location where it makes absolutely no sense to build another 9 storey building (which by the way would be higher than the neighbouring Meriton building) for 20+ boarding house units (without even providing parking).

These sort of clientele (with low disposable income and maybe even debts and criminal minds) might also bring more problems into Dee Why, notably just where the B-Line stops, i.e. a rapid transit bus stop that is highly frequented. Having a boarding house literally in front of an important bus stop to me is like an invitation for trouble. Some elderly people who have been local residents for decades already live in fear due to the increasing crime rates and antisocial behaviour problems at the Northern Beaches. A boarding house would certainly not help to reduce such feelings.

Assuming that none of tenants of the 20+ boarding house units will own a car (which is probably another ridiculous assumption of this entire application as it does not provide any solution how the parking problem will be solved for each resident / shop / office tenant who has a car that he/she will bring into Dee Why), then the boarding house tenants might use the B-Line which is already overcrowded and in peak times, one has to wait several buses until one can hop on a bus.

In terms of infrastructure considerations (other than parking which are addressed explicitly), I would also question how children that are subject to public school are accommodated in this planning for instance. Our public schools are currently overcrowded since Dee Why has become a high-density area and schools have not properly been expanded to accommodate this development. So, how would these children be accounted for?

Lastly, I would also like to point out that boarding house tenants can also be very transient. Hence, they are presumably not interested in becoming part of the community and engage in local matters. Consequently, there is likely no community benefit in having these people at 882A Pittwater Road.

Concerns how the construction of the proposed development in the Proposal is executed

Given the narrow site directly neighbouring to a rapid transit bus lane, I wonder how a 9-storey building like this could even be constructed in practice. We are currently seeing how the Havana developers are struggling and they have access to much bigger space in comparison to the 882A Pittwater Road land.

In particular:

- How can the developers guarantee that access to 880 Pittwater Road & the ANZ bank is not impaired in any way at any time during the construction site?
- Where do all the tradies/ construction worker park (they surely won't arrive via public transport)?
- Where would a crane be put up if needed?
- How would building material be delivered on a daily basis without negatively impacting the rapid transit bus lane and the pedestrian way and more importantly the entrance to 880 Pittwater Road?

Concerns in respect of the day-to-day life if the construction of the proposed development in the Proposal goes ahead

I refer to my concerns raised above as it relates to parking issues and as it relates to the potential behaviour of the residents of the boarding house

In addition, I would like to point out that it is unclear to me:

- How retail or residential deliveries for this building will work as the building has no dedicated drop off area / garage area whereas 880 Pittwater Road has a shared garage and drop-off area with 10 Oaks Avenue while 890 Pittwater Road has access to the overall Meriton garage complex.
- How the moving in or moving out of people in the boarding house will be accounted for, especially where the movement of large goods is required. Will moving vans/trucks simply stop and block the rapid transit bus lane in addition to Pittwater Road being a highly densely vehicle trafficked road?
- How waste & garbage collection will work in practice, similar to the points raised above.
- How the additional traffic will be managed that presumably will be mainly affecting Oaks Avenue & Howard Avenue which are already subject to major traffic congestion today (and it supposedly will not become any better once the construction of the forthcoming Havana building will have been completed)

*** ALL PERSONAL INFORMATION TO BE REDACTED ***