

**Clause 4.6
Principal Development Standards
Northern Beaches Council –
Warringah Local Environmental Plan 2011**

Applicant's Name: Mr. and Mrs G Wood

Site Address: 1126 Pittwater Road, Collaroy

Proposal: Proposed swimming pool and alterations and additions to existing building.

1) Name of the applicable development Standard:

Warringah Local Environment Plan 2011

2) Relevant Clause under Warringah LEP 2011

Clause 4.3: Height of Buildings

- (1) *The objectives of this clause are as follows—*
- (a) *to ensure that buildings are compatible with the height and scale of surrounding and nearby development,*
 - (b) *to minimise visual impact, disruption of views, loss of privacy and loss of solar access,*
 - (c) *to minimise any adverse impact of development on the scenic quality of Warringah's coastal and bush environments,*
 - (d) *to manage the visual impact of development when viewed from public places such as parks and reserves, roads and community facilities.*
- (2) *The height of a building on any land is not to exceed the maximum height shown for the land on the [Height of Buildings Map](#).*
- (2A) *If the [Height of Buildings Map](#) specifies, in relation to any land shown on that map, a Reduced Level for any building on that land, any such building is not to exceed the specified Reduced Level.*

3) Nature of the variance from the Development Standard

The LEP map identifies the site as having a height control of 8.5m. The proposal is to extend the existing roof ridge to provide cover to the existing first floor deck. This results in a total height of 8.8m to the east elevation. This proposal exceeds the standard by 300mm or approximately 3.5%

Clause 4.6 Objection to a Development Standard– 1126 Pittwater Road, Collaroy

grech architects pty. ltd.
trading as stephen grech & associates, architects.
Nominated architects – stephen grech reg no 6259
suite 7, 121 – 123 military road, neutral bay 2089 t 02 9953 8886
e info@grecharchitects.com.au

4) Stated Objectives in the Development Standard

The objectives stated in the LEP that are relevant to this specific site and proposal is as follow:

- (a) to ensure that buildings are compatible with the height and scale of surrounding and nearby development,*
- (b) to minimise visual impact, disruption of views, loss of privacy and loss of solar access,*
- (c) to minimise any adverse impact of development on the scenic quality of Warringah's coastal and bush environments,*
- (d) to manage the visual impact of development when viewed from public places such as parks and reserves, roads and community facilities.*

5) How objectives are met if the Development Standard is varied.

- (a) the proposal simply extends and maintains the existing roof height which is marginally lower than the immediate neighbour to the north side. Further north is a 3 storey building which is higher again than the proposal. To the south side is an 8 storey apartment building which is significantly higher than the allowable 8.5m height limit. The proposal therefore compatible with the height and scale of the surrounding and nearby development.*
- (b) the proposal seeks to extend an existing roof line to provide cover over an existing terrace. The terrace is in the same line as the existing terrace to the northern neighbour thus the proposal does not impact any existing views. The roof structure does not impact privacy and as it is located to the south of the only adjoining neighbour will not cause any additional overshadowing.*
- (c) the proposed roof extension will sit in the same line as the existing roof and will therefore not have any visual impact from the coastal environment.*
- (d) the proposal is not visible from the main road and as the proposal is above an existing structure the impact when viewed from Ramsay Street is minimal.*

6) Is compliance with the standard unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances of the case?

The proposal involves extending an existing roof which is numerically very close to compliant (representing a variance of less than 5%). Significantly, although the proposal represents a height non compliance it is still lower than the immediate neighbour and significantly lower than the large apartment buildings to the south.

A compliant roof would create avoidable and unnecessary difficulties in construction and flashing to the existing roof for no benefit.

Accordingly, the proposal is considered worthy of Council's support and approval.