

---

**From:** DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au  
**Sent:** 31/01/2025 3:17:22 PM  
**To:** DA Submission Mailbox  
**Subject:** Online Submission

31/01/2025

MR roy mcleod  
- 75 myola RD  
Newport NSW 2106  
[REDACTED]

**RE: DA2024/1670 - 77 Myola Road NEWPORT NSW 2106**

We, Roy and Leslie McLeod own and live at 75 Myola Road. Here are our comments regarding DA2024/1670.

1. The increased driveway concreting around the new dwelling will generate additional surface stormwater, and the plan does not appear to show adequate disbursement of the additional stormwater. This additional stormwater is likely to flow down the driveway onto our property. There needs to be some mitigant to prevent this happening, eg a drain grating across the grannyflat hardstand or a raised hump.

Currently the driveway stormwater flows via the granny flat parking hardstand onto our property. We have spent thousands of dollars on infrastructure, to manage the deluge of water. However particularly during heavy rainfall, this stormwater overwhelms our infrastructure with water and sediment. It flows onto our driveway and under our house around our foundations. This also impacts our downstream neighbours. This issue was raised by us to the council when the new driveway was being built, but our objection was dismissed without any action.

2. In our opinion, the scale, bulk, design, positioning & materials of the new third dwelling, only 3 meters from the heritage house, will dominate the old house and diminish its heritage value.

The build materials, other than the stone facade of the Northern ground floor wall, are at odds with the heritage materials. Painted cement panels and anodized Black aluminium windows frames will be a contradiction. We feel that more can be done to reduce the dominance of the new over the old. For example, move the new dwelling further away from the heritage dwelling, planting trees to separate them and to extend the stone facade to the whole new dwelling and also to use windows frames of a similar colour and material to the old.

The heritage report, particularly the seemingly AI written conclusion, is incongruent with the likely actual heritage impact of the new dwelling. It is clearly deceptive in that it attempts to disguise the severe impact. It is unfortunate that a heritage report can be so biased.

The statements in the HIS conclusion are fluffy words designed to mask the real impact. For example this following statement is ungrounded and meaningless window dressing: "the proposed pavilion would not weaken the interpretability or legibility of Bungania. It would remain readily comprehensible 'in the round' as a peculiar and singular instance of early 20th-

century DIY activity".

Also the following nonsensical statement has no real bearing on the true situation: "None of its core form or fabric would be lost. Nor would the scale or design language of the addition conflict with the cottage, with a generous degree of separation between the new and the old established, along with several architectural gestures that would establish a pleasing dialogue between the two development phases at the place."

It is also clearly supposition to claim without any factual basis, that: "the relationship between Bungania and the addition would not be defined by dominance but rather by reciprocity."

3. It seems obvious to us that this is a major new third dwelling that is being passed off as an extension to the existing heritage home, which is unlikely to be acceptable.