
From: Charles Yates
Sent: 16/09/2024 7:12:51 AM
To: Council Northernbeaches Mailbox
Subject: TRIMMED: Fwd: DA2024/1009. 67 Pacific Pde Dee Why: OBJECTION

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Charles Yates** [REDACTED]
Date: Tue, 10 Sep 2024, 6:38 pm
Subject: Fwd: DA2024/1009. 67 Pacific Pde Dee Why: OBJECTION
To: <council@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au>

Re DA2024/1009

I emailed the attached message to Council on 28th August however I have been advised that it has not appeared on the list of submissions.

On checking I have found that my system has Council's address with the 'w' in 'nsw' missing, resulting in the email being lost in cyberspace.

I would be most grateful if my submission could be included in Council's consideration. I understand late submissions will still be accepted as noted in Council's Guide to submissions. I hope it will as my error was in good faith.

yours

Faithfully

Charles Yates

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Charles Yates** [REDACTED]
Date: Thu, 29 Aug 2024 at 22:43
Subject: DA2024/1009. 67 Pacific Pde Dee Why: OBJECTION
To: <council@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au>

My Wife and I are owners of Unit 1 No 65 Pacific Parade situated down slope and to the West of the subject property..

We bought this property accepting that we were going to live in a medium density environment i.e., the surrounding developments would be of a similar nature. Similar in size, function and density. We believe that the proposal seeks to impose population and traffic impact on the community that are not acceptable or viable.

The previous application on No 67 and the current application both seek to exceed the surrounding property parameters in all respects.

Comparison of the proposal and No 65.

Note that No 65 Pacific Parade, Dee Why NSW 2099 is similar in concept to nearly all of the surrounding buildings.

No 67 No 65

Level Cars.Units. Bedrooms: Cars.Units Bedrooms

Basement 3 - - 14 - -
Ground 6 1 2 - 2 3
Level 1 6 1 3 - 3 5
Level 2 - 2 6 - 3 5
Level 3 - 2 6 - 1 3
Level 4 - 2 5 - - -
Level 5 - 1 3 - - -
TOTALS 15 9 25 14 9 16

The plans for No 67 show two visitors car parking for 25 bedrooms.
 No 65 provides two visitor car parks for 16 bedrooms.

No 67 shows 15 car spaces for 25 bedrooms.
 No 65 provides 14 car parks for 16 bedrooms. No 67 shows an increase of 56% over the bedrooms provided in No 65 on the same sized block in what should be a similar building height and envelope envelope.

The above figures show that the proposed development is in excess of current population density and comparatively deficient in parking provision relative to the neighbouring property.

Building Envelope

We object to the proposal on the following :

The previously approved envelope and approval process should be regarded as irrelevant because that proposal was conceived in response to State Government sponsored provision of Social Housing with special conditions applying and with limits on Council's approval powers.

The current proposal greatly exceeds the original envelope for the sole reason of providing a greater volume of saleable real estate product with minimal Social Housing result .

The excessive height of the proposal will be a disruption to the continuity of building heights from the lower levels of Pacific Parade to the West over the brow of the hill at the Crescent falling to the East and be detrimental to the general visual environment.

Council should only approve this project if it complies with current COMMUNITY standards .

Traffic

If this proposal is built as submitted it will disproportionately impact on traffic density on an already busy major access road. Access to properties adjacent is subject to difficulty caused by proximity to the summit or Pacific Parade at the intersection with The Crescent limiting oncoming traffic visibility and the non effectiveness of non enforced speed limits in the area.

Drainage

Both Nos 67 and 65 are subject to overland stormwater flows from The Crescent Reserve upslope and to the South of these properties.

Given that No 65 already has issues with the above affecting its basement levels and that the proposed development with much more extensive excavations with no specific drainage provisions indicated will be equally affected.

We submit that Council should be a partner in dealing with this issue to make the proposed development part of a solution to this problem and not a contributor to the problem.

In conclusion we object to the current proposal because it seeks to disrupt the built form of the surrounding Community without any compensating benefit.

Yours faithfully

Charles and Mary-Rose Yates

Charles Yates

e: [REDACTED]

m: [REDACTED]