



From: 
Sent: 5/10/2021 6:19 AM
To: "Council Northernbeaches Mailbox"
<Council.Northernbeaches@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: OBJECTION TO DA2021/1508 — 882A PITTWATER ROAD, DEE WHY
Attachments: DA2021-1508.pdf

Good afternoon,

Please find attached my objection letter to the DA2021/1508 - 882A PITTWATER ROAD, DEE WHY.

I would be grateful if you could redact my personal details.

Best regards,



ALL PERSONAL INFORMATION TO BE REDACTED

Northern Beaches Council
725 Pittwater Road
Dee Why NSW 2099

5 October 2021

Application No: DA2021/1508
Address: 882A Pittwater Road DEE WHY NSW 2099

To Whom It May Concern,

After spending a considerable time reviewing all the documents related to this development application, I am firmly opposed for the following reasons.

1. PARKING:

It is sufficient for the proposed development to be rejected outrightly as the development is non-compliant with Clause 29 Assessment Matters of the SEPP ARH. Also, the Warringah DCP (2011) indicates a that a **minimum requirement of 16 car spaces be provided for the proposed development**: being 5 for commercial/retail spaces (1 space per 40m² commercial and 1 space per 23.8m² Retail), 10 resident spaces and 1 manager's space.

There is no clarification as to:

- Parking for customers and staff for the coffee shop on the ground floor,
- Access for deliveries to the coffee shop on ground floor,
- Parking for commercial premises on ground floor (>27sqm) – for clients and staff,
- Parking for commercial premises on first floor (>75sqm) – for clients and staff,
- Loading/unloading access for deliveries for commercial premises on the ground and first floor.

All of the above will add to the worsening traffic problems in Dee Why, which will deteriorate once the Havana development (corner Oaks and Pittwater) is completed.

Clause 30 of the SEPP provides Standards for boarding houses and states:

- (1) *A consent authority must not consent to development to which this Division applies unless it is satisfied of each of the following—*
- (h) *at least one parking space will be provided for a bicycle, and one will be provided for a motorcycle, for every 5 boarding rooms.*

The proposal does not provide any motorcycle spaces for residents of the boarding house, resulting in a shortfall of 3.2 spaces. Twenty bicycle spaces should be provided and due to space constraints only seventeen bicycle spaces are proposed to service the development.

Justification for the shortfall include:

- constrained layout of the site,
- no reasonable or feasible opportunity to provide vehicular access to the site,
- prohibitive cost (which would be passed on to the boarding house tenants).

The developers are delusional if they believe that the boarding house tenants will not own cars. Since the COVID outbreak, there is hesitancy to use public transport and it is quite visible in Dee Why that cars are the preferred mode of transport. This can be seen by the amount of cars parked and car spaces provided in the apartment buildings in the area (Meriton, 701 Pittwater Road, Oaks Avenue apartments, Havana etc.)

There is mention in the *Traffic and Parking Impact Assessment* that "...a Right of Way carriageway will be established at some stage in the future providing alternative access for the site..." Again the developer is delusional as the site is surrounded by 3 solid brick walls.

2. DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION

Commercial Space

There is no evidence that the commercial space is affordable as stated. The ground and first floor levels of the development fall short of the six metre setback that is considered desirable.

On Level 2, the building is setback six metres from the rear property boundary, with the external balcony attached to the rear of the building forward of this. I do not agree that this will not be a highly trafficked area. Also, the door to the external balcony will constantly be open for air circulation as there are no other mechanisms that allow for fresh air. Any conversations/meetings/telephone calls will create adverse noise in this area which is immediately surrounded by many residential apartments.

Noise

The Acoustics Report has very clearly indicated that restrictions will need to be put in place to limit noise from the boarding house communal area. Considering there will be 34 occupants in the boarding house, the communal area is limited to a maximum 18 people in the BBQ area. How will this be policed, especially if boarders have guests?

Also, other restrictions include keeping the bi-fold doors of the indoor communal living room on level 7 (adjacent to the external BBQ area) closed at all times, and no music to be played outdoors in the BBQ area. How will surrounding residents ensure that all restrictions are enforced?

Affordable Housing

There is no evidence in any of the documents that the development provides affordable housing within the Town Centre. No research has been provided as to the weekly rent rate to corroborate that the development is financially viable as affordable housing. It is probable this has not been included as the development cost is highly unlikely to be recouped by affordable housing. **WILL THIS BE THE IMPETUS TO PUSH FOR A FUTURE BACKPACKERS HOSTEL IN A COUPLE OF YEARS?**

Clause 29 (2) *Assessment Matters* of the *SEPP ARH* also states that each boarding room has a gross floor area (excluding any area used for the purposes of private kitchen or bathroom facilities) of at least 12 square metres in the case of a single boarding room. Room 5.01 does not comply.

Solar Access

The communal room will not receive a minimum of 3 hours direct sunlight between 9am and 3pm in midwinter which is required in Clause 29 (2) *Assessment Matters*. Furthermore, the proposed building will block all winter sunlight and most summer sunlight for the apartments in 10 Oaks Avenue/880 Pittwater Road. The only apartments that are guaranteed winter sunlight are the top floors of units 31 and 32 of 10 Oaks Avenue.

Miscellaneous

On page 24 of the *Statement of Environmental Effects*, states:

....and having regard to the narrow site composition, the balcony for those rooms on the southern side of the building are forward of this distance. However, angular screening is proposed up to Level 7 to ensure that adequate privacy is achieved to the east and south of the site...

Balconies on the south side are inappropriate, and probably an error. However, this has not been picked up by anybody.

Page 37 of the of the *Statement of Environmental Effects* also states:

- that the proposed floor space ratio exceeds that permitted on the land,
- The proposed communal open space area measures 44m² and based on a site area of 233.7m², the required communal open space required is 46.74m²
- The proposed building does not comply with the minimum building separation distances specified in the *Apartment Design Guide*.

Accessibility

The *BCA Access Provisions Report* states that the ground floor commercial tenancy is not accessible for someone in a wheelchair as there are stairs and 110mm hinge side clearance is required for entry. The outdoor area is also required to be accessible. The bathrooms in the commercial tenancies are not accessible and in accordance with AS 1428.1. How will these issues be resolved?

Waste disposal

Due to no alternative access via neighbouring buildings, Council employees will collect the building's refuse from Pittwater Road. ***This will cause serious endangerment to everyone*** in this area including:

- ***Passengers and public transport employees:*** There are two major bus stops within 10 metres of the front of the site, the B-Line bus stop to the north, and the Manly/Chatswood/North Sydney/Warringah Mall bus stop at the southern end. There are many passengers at all times of the day waiting for and getting off buses. This proposal continuously reminds us that Dee Why Town Centre benefits from direct access to the high-frequency trunk route bus services on Pittwater Road and that there are 20 buses per hour – one bus every 3 minutes – transiting within 10 metres of the front of the site. When waste collection is being undertaken by council employees, buses will bank up on Pittwater Road creating further mayhem in an already congested thoroughfare.
- ***Residents/commercial tenants/Australia Post employees:*** The letterboxes are located at the entrance of the waste removal ramp. The main entrance is also within 3 metres of the waste removal ramp entrance.
- ***Coffee shop customers/workers:*** The ground floor cafe is within 1 metre of the waste removal ramp entrance. Customers will be in the path of council workers removing the bins to be emptied into the garbage truck parked illegally in the bus lane. This is a recipe for disaster – customers waiting and holding hot beverages in the path of council employees in a rush.

Construction Management

There will be no parking for site workers as there is no parking available within the site boundaries. Therefore, all staff are to use surrounding off-street parking facilities. Again, the developers are delusional if they believe that site workers will use public transport to travel to and from the site, considering the need for tools and equipment.

There will be no vehicle site access or movements within the site. The proposed "Works Zone" will heavily impact the safety of all involved including local residents, passengers waiting and using public transport, as well as foot traffic in the area. Traffic will also be heavily impacted with buses forced to bank up in an already congested Pittwater Road. How will heavy equipment and materials be delivered to the site?

Being an immediate neighbour to this proposed development, I have already endured six years of demolition and construction issues from Meriton and the Havana development including dust, noise and excessive traffic congestion. I urge you to reject this proposal outright due to bad planning.

Regards

