

# Dee Why Town Centre Planning Controls

Submissions via 'Yoursay Northern Beaches'

Gateway Public Exhibition - Saturday 24 February to Sunday 25 March 2018

Suburb	Submission
DEE WHY, NSW	<p>The proposed lane between Pacific Pde and Oaks Ave Dee Why (Site C) must be for pedestrian and cycle use only. Motor vehicles use should not be encouraged in this area. The local foot paths need upgrading and widening, to make Dee Why Centre pedestrian friendly. The area is well serviced by public transport, we do not want to encourage more cars.</p>
ELANORA HEIGHTS, NSW	<p>I understand that Council has received a planning proposal that seeks to amend the Warringah Local Environmental Plan 2011 (WLEP 2011) to permit residential accommodation on the first floor, and medical centres and office premises on the ground floor at 884-890 Pittwater Road, Dee Why, known as 'Site B' of the Dee Why Town Centre. Why do they think they are above the law and that local planning regulations do not apply to them? Allowing this would be the tip of the iceberg, where plans that have been put in place for the benefit of the community are thrown out the window at the whim of big developers. Do not allow this on principle! If the Environmental Plans are wrong they need to be changed by due process of law, with public consultation etc ... not varied to suit developers. I can't believe council is even considering this breach of regulations.</p>
CURL CURL, NSW	<p>Following are brief comments on the Planning Proposal and amended DCP: Agree with: "Introducing floor space ratio controls across the Dee Why Town Centre" "Prohibiting variation of development standards on key sites" Heritage "A new DCP Section entitled 'Civic Centre Site' with the following requirements for any future developments: g. Retains and respects the heritage significance of Dee Why Public Library and retains the view corridors to and from the Library." Comment: The Civic Centre building is not specifically mentioned even though it has architectural significance. The proposed curtilage for the Civic Centre precinct does not maintain views of heritage items within the precinct. The planning proposal would allow building development to obscure views of the Civic Centre building and Pacific Lodge. Pacific Lodge and surrounds has been a notable landmark within Dee Why for many decades and its visual prominence has been respected in previous planning controls. Similarly, the distinctive architectural features of the Civic Centre have remained visible from Pittwater Road. In the DCP apply 'retain view corridors' to the other items of built heritage i.e. Civic Centre building and Pacific Lodge. Proposed Amendments to Warringah DCP 2011 General development controls Objectives Re views: "To retain view lines of the Long Reef landscape, the coastline and landscaped ridgeline." Comment: Retain views to and from the coastline and landscape ridgeline to the west of DYTC. Re employment: Comment: If car parking above ground, at least two floors should be allocated to commercial use to achieve employment objective. Excavation may be constrained by the high water table in DYTC. Key Sites A &amp; B e. Provides community facilities Comment: Agree with this proposal, although community facilities are not specified. Key Site C a. Provides a new roadway to facilitate a north-south connection from Oaks Avenue to Pacific Parade. b. Provides a new roadway which facilitates two-way vehicle movements. c. Incorporates pedestrian verges in the roadway which have direct sight lines and are well lit. d. Incorporates spaces for outdoor seating in the roadway Comment: This road way will be dominated by two way traffic. It will be an unpleasant and polluted environment for pedestrians and is no substitute for the amenity of the existing pedestrian link. This well used arcade and pedestrian thoroughfare should be retained, as it provides a traffic free environment incorporating retail uses and complementary seating. Key Site E New pedestrian link between Fisher Road and St David Avenue. Comment: A safe pedestrian link that is landscaped and separated from vehicular access required for service and delivery vehicles. Civic Centre Site Requirements 1a. Maintains a minimum front building setback consisting of ii. Nil from St David Avenue Comment: A building with nil setback does not allow a wide setback for pedestrian use or landscaping. Car Parking Requirements Comment The proposed car parking requirements are less than the required general provisions. A drawback is that overflow parking associated with new apartments will take up limited space in public streets and car parks. Proximity to public transport does not reduce dependency on cars to travel to other locations. Key Site E Comment Previous height controls for DYTC have been responsive to topography. Tall buildings on the higher land will have a greater visual impact on surrounding areas, including views from the ridge area to the west. A lower height should be retained for higher land within DYTC. Key Site F Justify and explain the inclusion of Key Site F? Comment Key Site F should be incorporated into Key Site E, as it is an integral part of the same block. The FSR of 5.86 for the standalone Key Site F is not justified. The proposal relies on the approved tall towers on Site B as a benchmark for a new height standard in the surrounding sites of the Dee Why Town Centre (DYTC). However, the tall towers approved on Site B in 2008 were intended as a one off concession to create an open air plaza. In 2008 residents raised the legitimate concern that the towers would establish a precedent, but this argument was dismissed on the basis of a clause in the LEP that would expressly confine the height increase to the footprint of the towers. The FSR for the proposed 15 storey building (5.86) would be well above the proposed (4.0) limit for DYTC. As indicated in the master plan proposal an LEP amendment to increase building height would be subject to a cap on floor space. The draft Master Plan did not propose an increase in the floor space within DYTC. Nor did it suggest non-compliance with build-to-lines or podium heights, which were to be maintained at a human-scale. The building would not be perceived as a 'bookend', but as an excessively tall building that visually dominates its surrounds. The vertical façade of the 15-storey building would present as a straight, dominant edge that would be intimidating when viewed from nearby vantage points. Given that works have commenced on an approved 9 storey building on Site F the proposed FSR of 5.86 should be revised to conform with other lots fronting Pittwater Road in Key Site E.</p>

Suburb	Submission
DEE WHY, NSW	<p>Regarding the Planning Proposal and amended Development Control Plan for Dee Why Town Centre, I am writing to advise my objection to the proposed development standard for the new Key Site C (Woolworths site). The proposed new maximum building height of 46 metres (12 storeys above ground level) will have significant visual impact for many of the existing residents of the area. It will also significantly restrict, and in some cases substantially remove, the existing views over Long Reef golf course, Dee Why beach, and the ocean, from many of the apartments to the west of the proposed site. In particular, it will severely affect the views from the upper levels of (i) Dee Why Grand; (ii) 23-29 Pacific Parade; and 16-22 Sturdee Parade. It is my view that these impacts substantially outweigh any apparent benefits of the proposal.</p>
DEE WHY, NSW	<p>Overall, i agree with the concept of extending the same Dee Why Town Centre planning rules to adjacent central blocks which are in need of redevelopment in a similar manner to provide design consistency. Ok to trade off some extra height of 3m for more public space at the ground level , but the actual % increase in public space needs to be fully quantified i.e prior plan gave x sqm and new plan gives y sqm which is a % increase of ? Otherwise the developer gets a benefit at minimal or unclear actual benefit to the community.</p> <p>Fundamentally i disagree with the new roads in the plan. We go from the current old Dee Why arcade where - for all its faults - people hang out having coffee , chatting, using it as a cut thru away from the traffic of the roadsides, to a situation where that actual space is a "shared" road between cars and pedestrians. Poor pedestrians will have no chance. Both those new roads should be pedestrianised laneways with nil car traffic if you want anyone to walk anywhere in the new Town Centre. We should not be building new roads in the middle of Dee Why but looking to reduce thru traffic via one way systems , traffic calming and easy diversions into carparks at the edges of the main precinct.</p>
MANLY, NSW	<p>With regard to the Draft DCP for Dee Why Town Centre , and specifically on the Civic Centre Site I note that there does not appear to be any plan to improve accessibility to the Civic Centre and Town Hall which is currently woeful. Perhaps some effort could be put into the matter for the future.</p> <p>The writer would be happy to meet or make suggestions.</p>
BEACON HILL, NSW	<p>we need to get the road capacity increased to meet current requirements before we build further dwellings. Warringah and pittwater roads and surrounding areas are clogged to capacity. We have to sort out current issues before adding more regards Kate</p>

Suburb	Submission
DEE WHY, NSW	<p>Re your ref 2018/124498 Dee Why Town Centre Planning Controls - Planning Proposal and Development Control Plan.</p> <p>Att'n Mr Neil Cocks Manager, Strategic and Place Planning.</p> <p>The letter for this reference lists 8 items to consider but there is very little detail about what they are really trying to say. E.G. "A 3m increase in overall height in exchange for a one storey reduction in podium height. " Most new developments don't have a podium so does this just mean developments will get a one floor increase in height?</p> <p>"Special provisions for four new key sites in exchange for community infrastructure." What's the point of a new road through the Woolworths site when roads in the area are often clogged and will be much moreso when the Meriton site is finished.</p> <p>"Floor Space Ratio" standards to monitor and restrict development is also vague. Does it infer there will be more open space for community or environment?</p> <p>Of particular concern is :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Reduced car parking rates for new development." The last thing Dee Why needs is less car parking spaces as the streets are filled (over filled) with illegally parked vehicles in streets at night and often during the day.</li> <li>2. "Car share spaces for larger developments" As above mentioned the last thing we need is shared parking. We need more spaces in developments. Most developments, particularly where apartments are included have vehicles from those sites occupying "visitor only" parking spaces as well as parking on lawns or garden space (if they have any such space.)</li> </ol> <p>Over recent years Dee Why's street trees have been gradually reduced in number in most streets but trees have not been replaced. Apart from general environment concerns trees have always been a natural and desirable part of Dee Why's attraction. How many new developments remove trees, including very large old trees, and replace them with concrete? All of them. Where is the shade protection, the bird and animal habitat, protection from heavy rainfall? Gone. The council has no plans to replace street trees for some years at least.</p>
WESTON, ACT	<p>I do not agree with the proposal to reduce the amount of car parking for new developments. This is supposedly in recognition of good public transport links, but there is insufficient street parking in Dee Why presently and this proposal would worsen the situation. The absence of any train or ferry access to Dee Why will continue to make residents and visitors car dependent. The popularity of Dee Why beach will also place increasing pressure on street parking. Also, as accommodation in Sydney is very expensive, the number of people living in each dwelling is likely to increase, placing increased pressure on car parking.</p>
LANE COVE, NSW	<p>I do not agree with additional height in the site F and E area of St Davids Avenue and Pittwater Rd Dee Why, unless adequate provision is made for access to the rear of all of these properties. I believe this may well be an opportunity to ensure that indications made by council a number of years ago that the community would benefit from rear access in this strip and that this access is to be available for all adjoining properties..</p> <p>The building of 697-701 is built right on the boundary of 695 and this I understood was allowed on the basis that a rear access would be possible, as council had made available a parcel of land to promote same.</p> <p>if access is available from the rear of 697-701 as promoted by council in past I will consent provided it is passed onto all properties. At this point not all parties appear not to be allowed the same privileges.</p> <p>Any additional height allowances should be passed onto all affected sites.</p>

Suburb	Submission
DEE WHY, NSW	<p>I am writing to advise my objection to the proposed development standard for the Site C (Dee Why Market) site.</p> <p>The suggested 46 metres height (12 storeys above ground level) will have a major environmental impact to a huge number of existing dwellings in the Dee Why basin. It will also significantly restrict views over Long Reef golf course, Dee Why beach, and the ocean, from many apartments to the west and south of the proposed site. In particular, it will severely affect the views from the upper levels of (i) Dee Why Grand; (ii) 23-29 Pacific Parade; and 16-22 Sturdee Parade.</p> <p>I would also like to object to the increase in building heights from 21m to 24m for the remaining sites as this will mean Dee Why becomes a forest of sky scrapers and numerous existing views will be blocked. The existing height limits are already being tested constantly as developers try to maximise density and profits. Views, breezes and population density will all be negatively affected.</p>
DEE WHY, NSW	<p>I am objecting too the council's proposed revised development height limits for certain buildings in Dee Why town centre, and in particular for the current Woolworths site which will totally block views and is right in line with my current view from Dee Why Grand to Long Reef / beach. The "eye sore" that is the new Meriton development should be a lesson learnt re over developing the Dee Why area. To approve further major developments of this size will make Dee Why the new "ghetto" of the Northern Beaches, our roads right now cannot handle the traffic with the additional cars are Dee Why central will become a grid lock. Please do not allow this revised height limits to go ahead.</p>
DEE WHY, NSW	<p>Regarding the Planning Proposal and amended Development Control Plan for Dee Why Town Centre, I am writing to advise my objection to the proposed development standard for the new Key Site C (Woolworths site). The proposed new maximum building height of 46 metres (12 storeys above ground level) will have significant visual impact for many of the existing residents of the area. it will severely affect the views from the upper levels of Dee Why Grand;.</p>