
Sent: 30/05/2021 12:13:31 PM

Subject: Objection to Amended Development application DA2020/1597 - 67 Pacific Parade, Dee Why

For attention of: Anne-Marie Young, Principal Planner

Dear Ms Young

As the owner of a unit at 6 The Crescent in Dee Why, 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 and 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 neighbouring homes 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 two-person households.

Based on similar 'new generation' boarding houses built in the last few years, it is also unlikely to be 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' which is an impractical solution for a high-turnover building and does not address the issue of excessive underground excavation. 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 negatively surround residents.

Other unsuitable elements of the proposal have not been addressed. The character 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.

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 Dee Why.

The site at 67 Pacific Parade, Dee Why is not suitable for the proposed development and I urge you to reject the proposal.

Yours sincerely

Diane Christensen