
From: William Fleming
Sent: 28/07/2025 10:52:11 AM
To: Council Northernbeaches Mailbox
Subject: TRIMMED: Submission re: 94 Edgecliff Boulevard, Collaroy Plateau
Attachments: 92 Edgecliff Boulevarde, COLLAROY PLATEAU - submission.pdf;

Please find a submission with regard to DA2025/0816 - 94 Edgecliff Boulevarde, Collaroy Plateau.

Kind regards,
Will

William Fleming

BBF Planners - Director



25 July 2025

The General Manager
Northern Beaches Council
Civic Centre
725 Pittwater Road
DEE WHY NSW 2099

Attention: Claire Ryan

**DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION REFERENCE DA2025/0816
DEMOLITION WORKS AND CONSTRUCTION OF A DUAL OCCUPANCY (ATTACHED)
INCLUDING SWIMMING POOLS AND STRATA SUBDIVISION
94 EDGECLIFFE BOULEVARDE COLLAROY PLATEAU**

1.0 INTRODUCTION

I have been engaged by the owners of the neighbouring property at 92 Edgecliff Boulevarde to review the Development Application (DA) lodged for 94 Edgecliff Boulevarde. I have reviewed the submitted documents and understand the concerns raised by my client's.

2.0 BUILDING HEIGHT

The proposal is non-compliant with the 8.5m building height development standard. It is acknowledged that the breach is minor however the proposal is for a new dual occupancy and strict compliance should be expected and can be achieved in this instance.

No relevant environmental planning grounds have been provided and we do not agree with the clause 4.6 which states that:

"The non-compliance relates to a very small portion of the parapet roof form which is a direct result of the previous excavation on site and to provide weather protection."

The non-compliance is coming from the inclusion of a basement parking which has resulted in the ground floor being elevated and increasing the overall height of the dwelling. The site has no significant constraints with regard to topography as evidenced by it not being mapped as

landslip risk area requiring a geotechnical report and the survey showing it has quite a gentle rise from the street to the rear of the property. There are no site constraints preventing compliance with the development standard and the breach is coming from the design choices.

Compliance can be achieved via lowering ceiling heights. Any reduction in height will assist with minimising overshadowing impacts also.

3.0 WALL HEIGHT & BUILDING ENVELOPE

The proposal is non-compliant with both the wall height and building envelope at the front of the site. Again, the SEE claims the breach is in relation to the sloping topography however given the site is not significantly sloping it is not a relevant justification. The breaches are coming from the desire to have a basement level which is causing the increase in height and subsequently the non-compliance with wall height and building envelope. While no number of storeys controls are applicable, the building height, wall height and side boundary envelope controls anticipate a 2 storey development.

If a 3 storey development is to be reasonable in this instance strict compliance with the wall height and envelope control should be strictly enforced. The basement level ceiling heights can be lowered from 2.4m as they are not habitable spaces. The roof form should be redesigned as it has an almost 1m parapet above the first floor ceiling height. If a 3 storey form is desired then internal ceiling heights should be lowered as a consequence to better comply with wall and building envelope controls.

The current design creates significant visual impacts for my client which will be discussed further in this submission.

4.0 BUILDING BULK

The proposed development is excessive in scale and an overdevelopment of the site given the above non-compliances. When viewed from No. 92 it will result in unreasonable visual impacts and creates an overbearing structure. The lack of varying materials to the side elevations resulting in white rendered facades does little to break up the massing and provide visual relief.

Furthermore, the design includes a large void above the ground floor living areas which extend to the first floor which is superfluous and creates unnecessary bulk and scale of the development. It would seem that the only reason for these voids is to create excessively large ceiling heights. The voids should be deleted to reduce the bulk and scale and will provide greater building articulation which will minimise the visual impact when viewed from my client's property. Adequate light is achieved to the ground floor living area without the need for the void and a window could be placed on the ground floor side façade or a skylight included.

5.0 PRIVACY

The windows identified as being W5, W6 and W10 are excessively large measuring 2.1m in height and present an overlooking concern. It is requested that these windows provide greater privacy attenuation either by having obscured glazing or raising the sill heights to be 1.5m from the FFL.

6.0 OVERSHADOWING

While it is accepted that the proposal would achieve compliance with the access to sunlight control, the development will have significant overshadowing in the afternoon which could be improved via strict compliance with the building height, wall height and building envelope controls. The removal of the superfluous void would also assist in improving solar access in the afternoon.

7.0 CONCLUSION

It is my Client's submission that the proposed development will have significant adverse amenity and visual impacts due to the identified non-compliances and superfluous design outcomes. The proposal should be amended to achieve strict compliance with the applicable controls. Strict compliance is reasonably anticipated with new development.

Please don't hesitate to contact me should you have any questions.

Yours faithfully

William Fleming
BBF Town Planners
Director
