
Sent: 17/05/2021 9:13:37 PM
Subject: Council submission - Graham
Attachments: Council submission - Graham.docx;

Attention: Ms Anne-Marie Young

ATT: Anne-Marie Young

Principal Planner

Northern Beaches Council

17 May 2021

Dear Ms Young,

RE: Amended Plans

DA2020/1597 - 67 Pacific Parade DEE WHY NSW 2099

We maintain our strong objection to the proposed overdevelopment of 67 Pacific Parade, Dee Why. Our key concerns have not changed and have been raised in our previous letter dated 27 January.

While the short-time frame provided for comment will noticeably reduce the number of submissions made by our community, one could safely assume our shared concerns are still current and valid, particularly as the amended plans have overall, ignored the concerns of Council and neighbouring residents. I urge you to take these into account when assessing these new plans.

At its core, the plans still represent an overdevelopment of a narrow site and its boundaries, with inadequate landscaping (41.5% vs 50%), attempts to exploit space (i.e. deeper excavation), and no consideration to the traffic issues, preserving established trees or incorporating noise-control provisions. A car stacker of 13 spaces for a development with 26 units, and with no visitor parking, is not a solution to a well-established parking issue in our street, and actually raises even more concerns regarding its use, safety, carpark exhaust/waste and building management.

For context, our apartment is located on level 1 of 1-5 The Crescent, in the centre, facing west onto the site. We have just two windows to our apartment (our living area, and our bedroom), both of which face onto the site. The proposed development would essentially entirely remove the already limited indirect sunlight we do receive of each day of an afternoon. As such, the plans non-compliance with building setbacks is a major concern for us and you can clearly see in the *Shadow Diagrams – Plan View (21 June)* that it would completely overshadow our apartment from 1pm onwards when we so desperately rely on this light. Like so many others, we now work from home during the week and need privacy, natural light and airflow, to maintain our physical and mental health and wellbeing. This factor alone would significantly reduce the enjoyment of our property.

Further to this, we are intrigued by the choice of garden/tree species designed along the very narrow (2m) boundary fence. They may be 'fast-growing' in theory, but all species still require full or partial sunlight to grow (Full:80%-100% & Partial: 50-80%). There is simply no opportunity for full or partial sunlight, even on a good day, as clearly shown in their own illustrations. Further to this, the illustrations they've included of the trees on our site are no where near indicative of their actual height or coverage. So essentially, the plants will not grow or thrive down our side (particularly as the supply size stated is too small), and due to the site's side setbacks and boundary envelope controls, we will be facing onto a frosted glass screen, placed two metres in front of a concrete building, that has removed our light. There will be very little greenery. It is such shame to see 30+

fully grown, mature vegetation all proposed to be removed still, regardless if the species is not protected, because they provide not only guaranteed coverage and privacy in some parts, but they are the habitat for various wildlife including a family of at least four native kookaburras that visit us daily.

With short stay boarding houses, there is an increased likelihood of anti-social behaviour, noise, and nuisance, particularly in common areas which will impact the amenity of surrounding properties and our neighbourhood. This type of development is just not suitable for this site as it will cause atypical noise at all hours, as well as antisocial drinking and smoking behaviours at all hours (day and night). There is just nothing stopping this from happening and it's near impossible to do so. Why would anyone on holiday care about neighbouring residents or show any respect in how the property is used? From our interpretation of the plans, the lobby area, the building's only lift, waiting area/bench and stairs are all directly opposite us on our level, and yet we have no idea how this building will be managed except that a "manager will be on site 24/7". As the intention of the development is to develop, manage and potentially sell it as a business, rather than a strata building with individual residential apartments, the nature and overdevelopment of the site are key issues that needs to be clarified for our peace of mind.

In summary, we believe this proposal will disrupt the basic rights of neighbouring residents and should not be approved.

We appreciate Council considering our submissions and continuing to keep us informed.

Kind regards,

Mr and Mrs Graham

5/1-5 The Crescent

Dee Why NSW 2099