

---

**Sent:** 24/05/2021 8:00:42 AM  
**Subject:** Submission for Application Number: DA2020/1597

Dear Anne-Marie Young,

We are owners of a unit situated at 65 Pacific Parade Dee Why and wish to maintain our position of objection to the proposed boarding house development at 67 Pacific Parade, Dee Why - DA2020/1597 for the following reasons:

#### Overdevelopment

Even after some changes have been done to the original proposal, this development is still out of proportion with its site and surroundings. The site is too narrow for such a development, and boundary limits issues are still present. The objection still stands.

#### Excavation Risks

Given the close proximity of this project to our building block it is of great concern for us that vibrations during construction would cause significant damage to our property. This risk has not been addressed by the amended proposal – the proposal does not offer a proper mitigation to it, and it is of great concern for us. The objection still stands.

#### Aesthetics

The large building comes close to Pacific Pde, and its design is totally out of character with the surrounding residential area in Pacific Pde. This has not been addressed by the amended proposal. The objection still stands.

#### Parking

Parking is grossly insufficient given the congested nature of street parking in the area. The proposed amendments did not address this issue; on the contrary, the addition of car stackers and changes in the driveway will generate further issues and queues on the street for cars going in and out.

Parking space in Dee Why is still limited, especially at evenings and nights, when vehicles are parked not just legally filling street spaces but also on corners, no parking/stopping places, and even visitor's parking spaces of buildings in the area, including ours. This issue has worsened over the last few months. The objection still stands.

#### Traffic

The impact on traffic and traffic safety cannot be overlooked. The location of this site is at the top of the hill. Traffic coming from both sides of Pacific Parade as well as from The Crescent will be affected. The objection still stands.

#### Loss of Natural Light

Given its large footprint, the development would significantly reduce the sunlight to neighbouring buildings. In addition, living conditions for residents are still far from ideal – almost no natural in those tiny rooms. The objection still stands.

#### Privacy

Privacy to neighbouring residences would be compromised, which would affect the quality of life of its residents, and represent a restriction of the right of quiet enjoyment of the place of residence.

This proposal still includes a communal open space area which is totally unacceptable in a residential neighbourhood in my opinion. With not enough space and sunlight coming into the

tiny rooms, residents will rely on the communal spaces in order to try to keep some sanity, which will generate noise and smoke and violation of privacy for as long as the areas are open for use. Who guarantees enforcement of the Plan of Management? Complaints can be useless so this will most likely generate numerous issues and police reports by neighbours. The objection still stands.

#### Noise

The communal area would be a major noise concern as residents gather and socialise. The amended proposal means a smaller communal area, but the issue still remains (or even worsens) with such a high number of residents. The location of the communal area still negatively affects neighbouring properties.

With up to 52 residents/ visitors and the targeted demographic a party atmosphere would be the normal every day and night. This will undoubtedly cause constant noise to carry to all neighbouring buildings, and it is not keeping with the current quiet, residential environment. We strongly request that any development of this type should not include a communal outdoor space at all, however, at the very least, we would suggest it be re-positioned to a location where privacy and noise issues with neighbours are not a concern. The objection still stands.

#### Health

Smoking is still permitted in outdoor areas, which given the number of people that would be using these areas during day and night would cause toxic smoke to invade our balconies and open spaces and even penetrate into our units. There are people with respiratory conditions living in our building. This would cause further health issues for them. Their windows would be required to remain shut, limiting considerably the quality of life and enjoyment of clean air into our properties. The objection still stands.

We still strongly believe this development is absurd and ridiculously disproportionate to its surroundings and our original objections stand. The amended plans are a collection of quick fixes and patches in an effort to make the project meet regulations, but tries to fit the square peg in the round hole and fails miserably in my opinion.

We look forward to this proposal being dismissed once and for all.

Kind regards.

E. Fritz