
Sent: 17/01/2021 7:20:31 PM
Subject: DA2020/1597 67Pacific Pde Dee Why
Attachments: Northern Beaches Council 67 Pacific Pde 1.docx;

Attention Anne-Marie Young
Principal Planner

Dear Anne-Marie,

Please see the attached letter and note my objection to the DA2020/1597 development application.

Regards,

Des Mullen
17/64 Pacific Pde
Dee Why

Northern Beaches Council

Att'n Anne-Marie Young

Principal Planner

Re Proposed development of a Boarding House

At 67 PACIFIC Pde, Dee Why

D.A. 2020/1597

Dear Anne-Marie,

I am in receipt of your letter of 12 January 2021 and wish to lodge my objections as I believe it is vastly out of proportion for that location for many reasons. It is noted in your document that this is in a medium density residential area.

I comment as follows:-

D.A. notes:-

Arboriculture Impact Assessment.

Re Point 5 Observations.

The photos show a fairly dense green space exists on the site. There is greenery with some native trees but only one tree native to this area. This large local tree has been trimmed but the earthworks could destroy the roots. The arborist says it has been partially ruined by trimming to avoid spill onto adjacent property. No mention that an arborist could treat it to bring it back to being a respectable shape and size tree.

Point 6 Site survey DA0007

Tree 1 is the only Native tree, a *Callistemon Viminalis*. The stated recommendation is "Remove" the tree.

So no greenery would be left on site.

Appendix 7:

Image 6.

This shows a very bland new building closely fronting Pacific Pde. This image is totally out of character with the surrounding residential area in Pacific Pde. It indicates overdevelopment of the relatively small single block of land.

Lack of sufficient onsite parking:-

Typically in Dee Why a block of this size would accommodate about 8 to 10 apartments. The proposal is for 25 units. They might be smaller than average but 25 would typically mean about 25 to about 50 people living within. Even with only 25 residents this would generally mean between 22 to 28 vehicles parked via those residents. Any Dee Why residents would be aware of that.

The proposal includes only 13 vehicle parking spaces. That is grossly under requirements. But it lists No visitor spaces. A 25 unit development would typically require about 6 or more visitor vehicle spaces.

3.2.1 The document states that there is “capacity to accommodate 14 and 12 parking vehicles in Pacific Pde”. Sorry, that is already filled by existing residents. The document states “12 and 11 vehicles around the corner in The Crescent”. Sorry those spaces are already filled with existing resident vehicles. It is obvious that the document writer has not visited the areas mentioned nor cares about current or new residents’ parking issues.

The document does not state that such a development will remove two existing street parking spaces. The existing driveway is a single one. The proposed driveway is a double thereby eliminating one street space. But as the current driveway isn’t active it is used, albeit illegally, as a street parking space.

Parking space in Dee Why is so limited that, especially at night, vehicles are parked not just legally filling street spaces but also on corners, no parking spaces, no stopping spaces and no standing spaces. The development application says they can use about 40 street spaces? I think this alone is sufficient to reject the proposal.

The general area around the site has residents aged from a few months to over 80 years. There are many children. As noted in the D.A. there is a

council playground nearby in The Crescent. Children are quite active here. Older folk not so active and a bit slower to move. More vehicle movement and lack of parking would increase safety hazards. Large garbage trucks and buses use Pacific Pde several times a week already creating traffic hazards.

The proposed double driveway to the development's small amount of site parking includes red and green stop/go control lights so that vehicles can wait while another one enters or leaves. With 25 units and 13 parking spaces for residents and none for visitors I can see a frequent jamming of waiting/queueing vehicles. That would create a safety issue particularly for pedestrians and passing vehicles on Pacific Pde.

The Pacific Pde/The Crescent intersection near the site has traffic lights. The intersection is on the crest of a hill in Pacific Pde. Vehicles speed up to avoid getting a red light. Some vehicles simply speed, particularly at night. If any vehicle was waiting wholly or partially on Pacific Pde to use the development's driveway this could require a difficult emergency stopping.

Figure 1 Pacific Pde all parking filled, typical day.



Figure 2 The Crescent, on a quiet day.



Figure 3, Pacific Pde on a quiet day. West view.



Figure 4, Pacific Pde East view on a quiet day.

The include pics show that all existing street parking in Pacific Pde and The Crescent are full even without the proposed 25 unit complex.

Anne-Marie I trust you will note my objections to the listed application.
Please contact me if you have any queries on this submission.

Regards,

Des Mullen

17/64 Pacific Pde