

Response to DA2021/1508 Development Assessment Report by Norther Beaches Council

I would like to let the Local Planning Panel members know that I disagree with various statements made by the author of the Development Assessment Report of the DA2021/1508 (LOT B DP 389449, 882A Pittwater Road Dee Why NSW 2099).

In particular, when reading the report in its entirety, it becomes quite clear that the “on balance” recommendation to approve the development application as outlined in the Assessment Report is based on a lot of subjective perception / positive judgment by the author, particularly in areas where the application is clearly in breach with existing guidelines, regulations, and legislation.

As such, I urge the Local Planning Panel members to at least defer any decision making with respect to DA2021/1508 until a more balanced, and ideally independent Development Application Assessment Report has been commissioned and finalised.

A bit more background of my reasoning:

With respect to the parking situation (which in my view is still the biggest issue with this application), I would like to point out that the Strata SP76355 (10 Oaks Avenue/880 Pittwater Road, Dee Why NSW 2099; of which I am the current Strata Committee Chair) has **not** been contacted by the developer at all to assess parking options. This Strata is neighbouring directly to the proposed development area. Hence, I don't understand how a statement like “Further investigation of parking provisions in adjacent buildings has also confirmed that it is infeasible to construct below ground parking to serve this development site.” (page 16) can be (blindly) included in such an official report by NB Council.

On subjective perception / positive judgement, sentences such as (by no means exhaustive):

- “Given the inability to feasibly construct any parking on such a narrow site and noting the site's excellent access to high frequency public transport to a range of destinations, close proximity to shops and services and close proximity to Go Get car share pods located within Council's Library carpark, the approval of the development without parking is acceptable.”
- “It is acknowledged that the transition of the area has generated a large volume of construction and associated impacts, however such is the nature of living centrally within the main town centre of an area.”; and
- “Within the constraints of what the site can contribute to the public domain given its minimal size and street presence, it is considered that the proposal is appropriate, visually interesting and complementary to the broader Dee Why Town Centre”.

clearly indicate to me that the author of the assessment is in favour of the project. An independent author might express a very different view, and formulate the sentences above very differently. He/she may also refer to existing literature/articles/decisions etc. to undermine his/her very different view. I also note that the author of this assessment report does not refer to any existing literature/articles/decisions etc to proof his/her very subjective statements above.

Lastly, the author includes a lot of scepticism around the constructability of the proposal in practice. A lot of concerns are already raised in the assessment report (and through the submissions), which indicate that even if this Development Application is approved, there are likely a lot of problems to arise for

the Developer, Council, Transport and Road companies, and the citizens of Dee Why. Hence, as such, given that the entire “on balance” recommendation of this Development Assessment Report is purely subjective and judgemental in the eyes of the author, I don’t understand why this has not weighed into the “on balance” recommendation more negatively.

Thank you for your consideration.
