


Sent: 24/08/2021 3:40:21 PM
Subject: DA 2021/1032
Attachments: 20210824_152843.jpg;

Tom Prosser

Dear sir

Tom we employed an architect to help us understand the building rules ...the reasons for the foreshore protection line and existing use rights with old buildings particularly along Clareville Beach... Would you please add clause H2 to The Architects submission that we have emailed to you in relation to number 8 delecta Avenue Clareville

21:08:24 retention front building.pdf - Read-only

**H1: ABSENCE OF ELEVATIONS OF ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS TO EXISTING HOUSE:**

The Respondents object to the absence of drawings regarding the proposed alterations and additions to the north west and south east elevations of the existing house.

The Ground floor General Arrangement Plan (DA-100), and the First Floor General Arrangement Plan (DA-101), show that the openings and fenestration in the above mentioned walls are proposed to be altered.

The alterations to openings in these facades and the proposed fenestration, and all other detailing, such as balustrading are not shown.

As this development fronts onto an important public reserve within a sensitive and beautiful environment, the resolution of facade treatments should be well considered and illustrated in the DA documents.

In the absence of this information in a development application, the owner and designer of the development are be provided with a free hand during the construction certificate stage without public consultation, and then into construction.

H2: RETENTION OF EXISTING BUILDING:

The respondents and the writer were surprised from an aesthetic perspective that the existing house is proposed to be retained. They believe that for a site of this quality and value the creation of a new and more beautiful building would provide much greater amenity and benefit.

This is not only an aesthetic argument but an economic one as well, where it is often the case that renovation cost of existing building fabric, and the cost of new building work, can be approximately equivalent.

The existing building contravenes the Pittwater Foreshore Building, but retaining the existing building as a means of retaining the forward position of this building is seen by the Respondent's as a loss of aesthetic and architectural opportunity. Where a new building observed the common building line established by the adjacent houses, it would most likely provide much greater opportunity for better spaces, and more beautiful facades and forms than the retention of the existing building could ever afford.

