

---

**Sent:** 1/07/2021 5:05:20 PM  
**Subject:** 67 Pacific Parade DA/2021/1597  
**Attachments:** img20210701\_16565691.pdf;

Attention; Anne -Marie Young. Planner.

Please find attached Pdf copy of our submission to the Land and E environment Court Proceedings 2021/43433 re the above DA

Regards Charles yates

Charles Yates

e: [chasbyates@gmail.com](mailto:chasbyates@gmail.com)

m:0417 205 603

**PROPOSED BOARDINGHOUSE  
65 PACIFIC PARADE DEE WHY 2099.**

**DA/2020/1597**

**OBJECTION BY M-R. and C. YATES TO THE REVISED DEVELOPMENT  
APPLICATION**

**SUBMISSION FOR CONSIDERATION BY LAND AND  
ENVIRONMENT PROCEEDINGS NO2021/43433.**

**Friday 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2021.**

**Attention; Acting Commissioner Bindon.**

**Dear Acting Commissioner,**

We herewith submit our objections to the revised Development Application as follows;

**SUMMARY.**

- The proposal remains a one off insertion of a building which does not conform to the regulatory, architectural and social values of the larger neighbourhood.
- The excessive population density has not been reduced.
- The parking and traffic problems have been increased.
- There is no real improvement of conditions for the inhabitants.
- Problems with privacy and acoustics have been merely relocated not reduced.

**GENERAL MODIFICATIONS TO DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION.**

- **GROSS FLOOR AREA** has been reduced by less than 7% overall. More than half of this has been in the reduction in size of the three two level units at the rear upper level. These units are now the same minimal size as all the other original units.
- **THE NUMBER OF BEDROOMS** and beds remain as originally proposed. The deletion of three living spaces to the larger units cannot be seen as an improvement.
- On the same sized site No.65 has potentially 32 beds whereas No.67 has 52 potential beds.
- **PARKING SPACES** No.65 has 12 resident parking spaces plus two visitor spaces. No.67 has 14 resident spaces plus one shared space.
- Allowing for two beds per room No.65 has 1 space for 2.29 beds..No.67 has 1 space for 3.72 beds. Given the shared domestic environment in the neighbourhood this not in any way equitable or acceptable.

- **COMMUNAL OPEN SPACE** has been reduced to 60% of the original. The open space has been moved to the front of the building where the potential acoustic impact has been increased from one unit to four units in No.65. Any change to this design seems to make it worse. There is something wrong here!
- **COMMUNAL INDOOR SPACE** has been reduced to 38% of the original.
- These reductions significantly negatively impact on the already minimal living conditions of the original.
- As predicted in our previous submission economies have been made in the residents conditions to satisfy the developers requirements.

#### **LOWER GROUND FLOOR**

- See comments above re. Number of parking spaces
- Regardless of the changes to the DRIVEWAY ACCESS there is no change to the relationship of the increased number of car accesses in the face of the proximity to the busy corner and the proximity to the blind summit at the traffic lights which continually tempt drivers who ignore the speed limit on Pacific Parade.
- **PARKING ARRANGEMENTS.** Provision of the car stacker facility reduces the extent of excavation to the floor below, however the depth of excavation to the Eastern (higher) side of the site is not reduced. Significant drainage by pumps will still be required. No provision for retaining walls is shown which allows no change to our previous objections that the conditions in the proposed basement subject to uncontrolled water penetration will be sub-optimal.
- The dimension and levels of the car stacker shown in the drawings submitted do not allow for the practical access in and out of the stacker as intended. The only remedy for this shortcoming is an increase in building height which may or not be achievable with the help of a compliant certifier. It does happen you know.
- The traffic report relied on in the parking design calls up an aisle width of 5.8 metres. At No.65 the aisle width is 6.6 metres from retaining wall to the stacker deck, which works well enough however the dimensions of the proposed layout allow no tolerance added to the theoretical swept path diagrams provided in Appendix 2 to the Traffic Report. In this report the multiple turns and decisions required to satisfy the multiple access paths to the stacker unit within the limited length of aisle indicate that parking will not be quick or easy for residents. In short the parking arrangements are theoretical not practical.

#### **DESIGN**

- **ARCHITECTURAL.** There has been a minor increase to the greenery provided to the upper level Communal Open space. The visual improvement effected by this change is minimal. There is no other change to the street presentation values criticised in our previous submission. The project's presentation to the street remain alien and incompatible with its neighbours.
- **BUILDING SIZE.** There has been a reduction in the volume and height at the rear of the building. There is minimal improvement to the environment of

the neighbouring building, at the cost of increasing the percentage of sub-standard units to 100%.

- **HUMAN VALUES.** The amended project includes reductions in living space to some units, reductions in Communal open Space and Communal Indoor Space. These changes are related to changes in parking provisions and other probable Developers conveniences.
- **POPULATION.** Given that No.65 has a potential number of 32 beds and No.67 has a potential of 52 beds the project as proposed is overdeveloped by 75% compared with N0.65. This has not been reduced by the amendments. This over development is not available to the ordinary residents of Dee Why and is being forced upon them without consultation, relief or compensation in a process which favours Developers in a manner which tramples on the rights and aspirations of the surrounding community.

### **CONCLUSION**

- Our original objections still stand, as not having been significantly addressed.
- The revisions have a negative impact on living conditions for residents in the project.
- The revisions have no positive improvement in the functioning of the project.
- The living conditions provided are at odds with the general standard of living in the neighbourhood and provide no improvement visually or socially and no improvement has been made to these living conditions by the amendments .
- There has been no change to the political injustice of the Governmental imposition of the project in the revisions submitted.
- Accordingly we submit that the project does not merit approval.

Yours faithfully

Mary-Rose and Charles Yates

65 Pacific Parade Dee Why

e: [chasbyates@gmail.com](mailto:chasbyates@gmail.com)

m: 0417 205 603