
From: Matthew Neville
Sent: 28/05/2025 1:04:13 PM
To: Council Northernbeaches Mailbox
Subject: TRIMMED: Attn: Nick England - Objection - DA 2025/0371 - 21 Elvina Ave, Newport
Attachments: 21 Elvina_Elevation non-compliances.pdf;

Dear Mr England

I write to lodge my objections to DA 2025/0371 for 21 Elvina Ave, Newport.

Overall, this DA represents a clear over development of the site and runs contrary to the desired future character of this Newport locality. It does not comply with the Newport DCP or LEP.

In detail my objections include;

1) Pittwater LEP 7.2 EARTHWORKS

With respect, the Statement of Environmental Effects states that “minor excavation for footings is proposed below the existing site levels”. This is untrue, firstly the Lower Ground Floor level is proposed at RL 19.000 which is 780mm below the existing floor level of 19.78 (by survey). The excavation within the existing floor plate will likely be over 1.0m - 1.5m to allow for the bottom of the new slab / footings. Outside the existing floor plate, particularly both the south eastern and south western corners, excavation will be approximately 3.5m - 4.0m deep again allowing for the bottom of the new slab / footings. Excavation is exacerbated by the 9.1m long garage and games room. If the garage was a standard 6.0m long and the games room deleted, this would reduce excavation and the overall bulk of the proposal

2) Pittwater, Newport Locality DCP - D10.1 CHARACTER AS VIEWED FROM A PUBLIC PLACE

The proposal appears as a three storey dwelling to the streetscape and is not softened by landscaping, as proposed landscaping is low lying. The building is not secondary to the natural landscape as viewed from the street and therefore dominates it. This is against the objectives of this control, specially:

- *Buildings do not dominate the streetscape and are at 'human scale'. Within residential areas, buildings give the appearance of being two-storey maximum.*
- *The visual impact of the built form is secondary to landscaping and vegetation*
- *The bulk and scale of buildings must be minimised.*
- *Landscaping is to be integrated with the building design to screen the visual impact of the built form. In residential areas, buildings are to give the appearance of being secondary to landscaping and vegetation.*

3) Pittwater, Newport Locality DCP - D10.11 BUILDING ENVELOPE

Both the side elevations breach the building envelope which is a major contributor to the bulking form of the building. Please see attached marked up plan showing the extent of the non-compliances. If the building was articulated as it rises vertically, it would lessen the mass

of the building and would comply with the building envelope control both objectively and numerically.

4) Pittwater, Newport Locality DCP - D10.13 LANDSCAPED AREA - ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE LAND

The Statement of Environmental Effects states the proposal achieves 670m² or 74% of landscaped area and complies, however;

- This is in contrast to the Landscape Designers calculations which state: 557m² or 62%.
- The proposal actually achieves 520.3m² as the 19.4m² cannot be included in whole as it has an external stair above it. The portion that can be counted is 3.6m². The total landscape area therefore equals 523.9m² or 58% and therefore does not comply. Whilst this is minor, it is expected that a new dwelling must comply with the numerical controls of the DCP. The site is large enough for this to numerically comply, therefore by not doing so the development contributes to the overall overdevelopment of the site.

5) LEVELS

The proposed garage level is set 650mm higher than the existing driveway level, which does not currently work. If the driveway is to be redesigned, we request that the applicant submit a driveway profile diagram that complies with Pittwater DCP 21 Appendix 10 - Driveway Profiles.

6) BALUSTRADE TO ROOF

The roof in front of the first floor indicates glass balustrading down both the eastern + western sides. It is also noted on the Roof Plan (A111), that this roof is to be concrete and non-trafficable. Why would one require balustrades on a non-trafficable roof? This raises concerns that if consent is granted, this roof could easily become an extension of the first floor Balcony equating to a 7.5m x 15m (112.5m²) roof terrace. We ask that Council places conditions on any approval that the balustrading be deleted and the roof is to be non-trafficable.

Matt Neville
10 Elvina Ave, Newport

