



8 Dec 2021

The General Manager

Strathfield Council
65 Homebush Rd,
Strathfield 2135

Attn: Development Assessment Officer

Subject: Compliance Report
Property: 20 Myee Ave, Strathfield
DA No: DA 2021/153

Dear Sir/Madam,

We have made all necessary amendments to our plans the following is how we have addressed the issues raised by council:

1. Pursuant to Section 4.15 (1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979

- a) Driveway crest has been designed to be at RL22.80 in accordance with the flood report recommunication.
- b) The proposed modern appearance does not match the older style homes in the street, nor should it attempt to mimic the external finish appearance that is recommended. The overall building height has been reduced to now comply with the allowed maximum building height under the LEP/DCP (refer to section drawing).

The proposed house has a bold design continuous throughout all facades, when viewed in its entirety provides a well-articulated building. The client and the architect both agreed that this consistent approach to the building as a whole not just as a façade plus roof will be employed. The scale of the building, heights of floors, functions of the house which are familiar and are not foreign to the local area, and therefore the house proposes to be compatible.

The planning principles established in Project Ventures Constructions v Pittwater Council establishes the principle that new infill development does not necessarily need to be the same in order to be compatible. This judgement serves to reinforce the proposition that flat, pitched and parapet roofs are able to co-exist in harmony even though they are different. The proposed built form has a residential character and style and in our opinion will complement the area. The site is not within an identified conservation area and therefore some flexibility should be available to an applicant in terms of the design.

The subject site orientation runs East to west (frontage facing west), thus casting the majority of the shadows onto the south adjoin property. The overall building height has been reduced and also a building cut out on the first floor south elevation has been introduced to further assist in reducing the over shadowing to the south adjoin dwelling.

2. Pursuant to Section 4.15 (1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979

- a) It should be noted that throughout Myee street, are a number of relatively outdated dwellings which eventually, will be demolished and made way for more contemporary modern-style dwellings such as the one we are proposing, and this aspect has been noted by council, in that Myee street is in fact, a road in state of transition. Furthermore the overall internal height has been reduced to 5.8m and a larger cut out on the first floor towards the south boundary has been introduced to assist in solar access towards adjoining property.
- b) The front fencing overall height is 1.4m above NGL and solid components is now 0.7m high
- c) The site runs west to east, these site do have trouble providing solar access to southern adjoining dwelling. Solar access diagrams have been provided showing solar access to living areas of the adjoining dwelling.
- d) The minimum 43% (331.7m²) deep soil area has now been provided.
- e) Screening shrubs landscaping has been provided between the swimming pool and property boundary.

3. Pursuant to Section 4.15 (1)(b) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, the proposed development is likely to have an adverse impact on the following aspects of the environment:

- a) The site runs west to east, these site do have trouble providing solar access to southern adjoining dwelling. Solar access diagrams have been provided showing solar access to living areas of the adjoining dwelling.

4. Pursuant to Section 4.15 (1)(c) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, the site is not considered suitable for the proposed development for the following reasons:

- a) Flooding and overshadowing requirements have been addressed and mentioned in letter above
- b) Flooding and overshadowing requirements have been addressed and mentioned in letter above

We trust the provided information now satisfies council's request.
If you have any further questions please let me know.

Yours Faithfully,



Rod Zoabi
Master of Architecture
Director