
Sent: 28/01/2021 4:32:52 PM
Subject: Submission for: DA - 67 Pacific Parade Dee Why

28 January

To Whom it May Concern

We are writing as we are extremely concerned about the DA application for 67 Pacific Parade, Dee Why. We are owners in the neighbouring property Unit10/1-5 The Crescent, Dee Why.

We are extremely concerned at the lack of available parking, at the lack of green living space, at the proximity of the new building to boundaries, at the extremely concerning rock excavation causing damage and cracking to our building, the solar problems to many units in our block and to all the social problems connected to this submission. I am also most concerned about the social emotional dangers of this model. We note that there are also many aspects of the DA which do not follow regulations.

Please find below the letter prepared by Miss Holly de Jong and Mr Leo Carson. They explain all of the above and more in detail, we submit that we wholeheartedly agree with this letter and it's very concerning details. We hope and expect it will be given the utmost grave attention. It is vital that any new buildings that claim to be for low cost housing pay attention to the needs of the people using them and the community around them to ensure positive happy communities.

Cordially
Marc and Sharon Boin

*Miss Holly de Jong and Mr Leo Carson
6/1-5 The Crescent
Dee Why NSW 2099*

*RE: DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION – DA2020/1597 – 67 PACIFIC PARADE, DEE WHY,
NSW, 2099*

28/01/21

*Dear Ms Anne-Marie Young,
We refer to application DA2020/1597 and write to lodge our objections and concerns regarding the development application.*

LOCAL CONTEXT AND AMENITY

The proposal presents a “co-living boarding house” aimed at keeping tenants longer than 90 days. In actuality, the size and type of units proposed, and lack of outdoor amenity provided to each tenant is more likened to a hotel room and short-term stays.

Given the current demographic in Dee Why, which consists of long-term couples, young families and retirees, the proposed apartment rental value of \$500-\$525/week is not considered affordable for those on a single income or studying. It is evident that the “affordability” only relates to expatriates on higher incomes or interstate travellers which again offer only short-term tenancies. This model does not support the existing demographic of Dee Why. Affordable housing for single parents and retirees would deem more appropriate. The proposed units are not appropriate for this demographic either.

Undoubtedly the availability of the apartments for the demographic considered in the Economic Analysis relies on two incomes, either from a couple or an individual with secondary support. With this in mind, the approximate 25sqm provided in each unit does not support healthy living and could potentially increase domestic disputes. Every council and or planning authority should be particularly aware and mindful of this given the current COVID-19 crisis. For instance, the complete disregard of providing private outdoor areas for the apartments is outrageous and abhorrent.

The number of parking spaces proposed is another key issue of concern given that potentially 52 people could be living at this address at any one time. Pacific Parade is one of the busiest streets in Dee Why and is a constant issue for residents. The 13 spaces proposed is not sufficient to cater for the 26 units. Furthermore, the increase in traffic generated from this over-development is of great concern in terms of public safety, noise emission and parking availability.

PROPOSED BUILT FORM AND SCALE

The proposed development has numerous non-compliances with the Affordable Rental Housing (ARH) SEPP 2009 as well as the Warringah Local Environment Plan (LEP) 2011 which has a significant impact on neighbouring property outlook and solar access.

In particular, the 2m side setbacks proposed are well under the 4.5m stipulated in the Warringah LEP 2011 and the 2.5m setback required under the ARH SEPP 2009. The Statement of Environmental Effects justifies this as though it is similar to the recently approved and constructed 65 Pacific Parade, however, 1-5 The Crescent is set back by 4.5m at most with further setbacks provided through facade articulations and residential private open space. Given that many of the apartments from 1-5 The Crescent have western orientations, the impact on their outlook and solar access is significantly undermined. Furthermore, the actual proposed landscape plan indicates a 2m set back with 400mm – 600mm spoon drain surrounding the base of the building leaving a landscaped corridor of only 1.6m wide. Coupled with this, there is no articulation in the eastern façade, with zero opportunity for varied landscaping. In no way will or can, there ever be a substantial landscaped area which therefore considerably affects the outlook and solar access for neighbouring properties.

Similarly, the Warringah LEP 2011 maps indicate a 50% landscaped area to be provided on-site. The proposal offers 35% and while this is above the stipulated ARH SEPP 2009 requirement of only 20%, the landscape area is not considered landscape given the width is under the 2.5m minimum requirement. A significant redesign is required to make this landscape proposal acceptable. The ability to look to nature, be with nature and maintain effective natural amenity across the northern beaches is a fundamental element of planning and paramount in ensuring the mental health and wellbeing of residents.

The non-compliance with the Warringah LEP 2011 height plane is a clear indication of overdevelopment on a slender site which is not suitable for cramming 26 one-bedroom apartments. Units L207, 301 and 303 do not sit within the height plane and further restrict solar access to both adjoining neighbours on the west and eastern boundaries.

More than half of the units proposed offer no cross ventilation which goes against the environmentally sustainable design objectives of the SEPP 65 – Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development, Warringah LEP 2011 and DCP provisions and general passive design principles. The single window for outlook often with restricted louvres is of great concern as it does not promote the wellbeing of the tenants within them and could considerably increase the occurrence of domestic disputes and or suicide.

Furthermore, other apartments are provided with openable window with the second opening onto a shared access corridor, this will result in cross-contamination of air between units and a additional strain on mechanical air conditioning systems that will generate noise, heat and

excessive power to use, and ultimately expensive bills to the tenants.

Total reliance on air conditioning is evident for all of the apartments which is a major planning issue. Recent updates to the National Construction Code (NCC) 2019, in-particular Section J have been put in place to reduce the reliance on mechanical heating and cooling. The proposed dark colour of the metal cladding does not promote a reduction in solar heat gain as the rating is well over the acceptable 0.45 solar absorbency value. It is not evident the thickness of external walls will be sufficient to offer no thermal bridging within the facades and one can only assume JV3 modelling will need to accompany any potential future Construction Certificate (CC) application.

The current Warringah LEP 2011 zoning provisions stipulate a 3-storey height limit. The proposed development is 5-storeys with additional basement parking. This clearly indicates the over-development of the site. The 2.9m floor to floor allowance between floors offers no margin for building error, limited flexibility in internal fit-out and no opportunity to provide sufficient acoustic treatment between tenancies which could have a considerable impact on the tenants within the building.

The lower ground of the rear common area is not appropriate. Again, a single orientation, with complete reliance on mechanical ventilation and genuine potential for mould accumulation does not encourage the health and well-being of the residence. Given the present building industry and a constant battle with maintaining quality building standards, one can only imagine how troublesome this space could eventually become. It is essential that planning authorities ensure that indoor environmental air quality can be provided in the first instance and then be maintained.

Lastly, the extent of excavation is of great concern. The excavation into bedrock could have a considerable impact on adjoining property foundations and increase the risk of cracking. We suggest a dilapidation report is provided at the developer's cost to mitigate any potential

impact that may be a result of the constructions works.

We urge you to review the proposed application, taking into account all the concerns presented above and carefully consider any re-submissions made by the developer.

*Kind Regards,
Holly de Jong and Leo Carson*

Sharon Ellison Boin
0404 129 406
(+61 404 129 406)