



## Pre-lodgement Meeting Notes

**Application No:** PLM2021/0002  
**Meeting Date:** 4 February 2021  
**Property Address:** 33 & 35 Fairlight Street, Fairlight  
**Proposal:** Demolition works and the construction of a residential flat building

**Attendees for Council:**

- Steve Findlay – Manager Development Assessment
- Tony Collier – Principal Planner
- Adam Croft – Planner
- Dominic Chung – Senior Urban Designer
- Oya Guner – Heritage Advisor
- Ray Creer – Waste Management
- Rezvan Saket – Traffic Engineer

Additional comments provided by:

- Alex Kwok – Senior Development Engineer
- Joseph Tramonte – Senior Landscape Architect

### General Comments/Limitations of these Notes

These notes have been prepared by Council's Development Advisory Services Team on the basis of information provided by the applicant and a consultation meeting with Council staff. Council provides this service for guidance purposes only.

These notes are an account of the advice on the specific issues nominated by the Applicant and the discussions and conclusions reached at the meeting.

These notes are not a complete set of planning and related comments for the proposed development. Matters discussed and comments offered by Council will in no way fetter Council's discretion as the Consent Authority.

A determination can only be made following the lodgement and full assessment of the application.

In addition to the comments made within these Notes, it is a requirement of the applicant to address the relevant areas of legislation, including (but not limited to) any State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP) and any applicable sections of the Manly Local Environmental Plan 2013 and Manly Development Control Plan 2013, within the supporting documentation including a Statement of Environmental Effects, Modification Report or Review of Determination Report.

You are advised to carefully review these notes and if specific concern have been raised or non-compliances that cannot be supported, you are strongly advised to review your proposal and consider amendments to the design of your development prior to the lodgement of any development application.

### SPECIFIC ISSUES RAISED BY APPLICANT FOR DISCUSSION



## Response to Matters Raised by the Applicant

### Height

Refer to comments under Clause 4.3 and 4.6 of the *Manly Local Environmental Plan 2013* and as provided by Council's Senior Urban Designer and Council's Development Assessment Officer under 'Specialist Advice'.

### Floor Space Ratio

Refer to comments under Clause 4.4 and 4.6 of the *Manly Local Environmental Plan 2013* and as provided by Council's Senior Urban Designer and Council's Development Assessment Officer under 'Specialist Advice'.

### Setbacks

Refer to separate comments provided by Council's Urban Designer and Development Assessment Officer later in these Notes under 'Specialist Advice'.

### Built Form

Refer to comments under provided by Council's Senior Urban Designer and Council's Development Assessment Officer under 'Specialist Advice'.

## STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICY No. 65 - DESIGN QUALITY OF RESIDENTIAL APARTMENT DEVELOPMENT

The *State Environmental Planning Policy No. 65 – Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development* (SEPP 65) includes the following clauses which are required to be addressed in the design of the proposal and discussed within the Statement of Environmental Effects:

- Clause 28 - Determination of development applications.
- Clause 30 - Standards that cannot be used as grounds to refuse development consent or modification of development consent.
- Schedule 1 – Design Principles.

Furthermore, the following sections of the associated *Apartment Design Guide* (ADG) are to be satisfactorily incorporated into the design of the development:

- Part 3 – Siting the development.
- Part 4 – Designing the building.

The Statement of Environmental Effects is to include a table detailing compliance with the above-mentioned sections.

**Note:** Pursuant to Clause 50(1A) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000* the Development Application must also be accompanied by a statement by a qualified designer.

## MANLY LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN 2013 (MLEP 2013)



MLEP 2013 can be viewed at <https://www.legislation.nsw.gov.au/view/html/inforce/current/epi-2013-0140>

Part 2 - Zoning and Permissibility	
<b>Definition of proposed development:</b> (ref. MLEP 2013 Dictionary)	<b>Residential Flat Building</b> means “a building containing 3 or more dwellings, but does not include an attached dwelling or multi dwelling housing”.
<b>Zone:</b>	R1 General Residential
<b>Permitted with Consent or Prohibited:</b>	Permitted with Consent

**Note:** SEPP 65 expands on the definition of a residential flat building to include:

- the building concerned is at least 3 or more storeys (not including levels below ground level (existing) or levels that are less than 1.2 metres above ground level (existing) that provide for car parking), and
- the building concerned contains at least 4 or more dwellings.

Clause 6(1) of SEPP 65 stipulates that, “in the event of an inconsistency between this Policy and another environmental planning instrument, whether made before or after this Policy, this Policy prevails to the extent of the inconsistency”. Therefore, given the inconsistency, the definition provided in the SEPP prevails.

Part 4 - Principal Development Standards			
Standard	Permitted	Proposed	Comment
<b>4.3 – Height of Buildings</b>	8.5m	5.7m to 10.0m	<b>Does not comply</b> +1.5m (17.6% variation)
<b>4.4 – Floor Space Ratio</b>	0.6:1 (735.6m <sup>2</sup> )	0.83:1 (1,017m <sup>2</sup> )	<b>Does not comply</b> +281.4m <sup>2</sup> (38.3% variation)

**Note:** Please refer to separate comments provided by Council’s Urban Designer and Development Assessment Officer later in these Notes under ‘Specialist Advice’.

#### Clause 4.6 - Exceptions to Development Standards

Clause 4.6 enables the applicant to request a variation to the applicable Development Standards listed under Part 4 of the LEP pursuant to the objectives of the relevant Standard and zone and in accordance with the principles established by the NSW Land and Environment Court.

A request to vary a development Standard is not a guarantee that the variation would be supported as this needs to be considered by Council in terms of context, impact and public interest and whether the request demonstrates sufficient environmental planning grounds for the variation.

As discussed at the meeting and elsewhere in these Notes (see separate comments provided by Urban Design and Development Assessment under ‘Specialist Advice’) the extent of non-compliance to the floor space ratio is considered to be excessive and indicative of an overdevelopment of the site, particularly given the compounding effect of the other non-compliances identified in these Notes, and is unlikely to be supported if lodged as a DA.



**Note:** Given the degree of non-compliance (i.e. over 10%) and the type of development, the Development Application would be referred to the Design & Sustainability Advisory Panel (DSAP) during the course of assessment and then onto the Northern Beaches Local Planning Panel (NBLPP) for determination. Given the high level of scrutiny that will be given to the proposal by Council's Assessment team, the DSAP and then the NBLPP, you are strongly encouraged to reduce the levels of non-compliance to below 10%, otherwise you run a significant risk of a recommendation for refusal and eventual refusal by the Panel.

### **MANLY DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PLAN 2013 (MDCP 2013)**

Please refer to separate comments provided by Council's Urban Designer and Development Assessment Officer later in these Notes under 'Specialist Advice'.

MDCP 2013 can be viewed at

<https://eservices.northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au/ePlanning/live/Pages/Plan/Book.aspx?exhibit=MDCP>

#### **Specialist Advice**

##### **Development Engineering**

###### Driveway

- A minimum 3.5 m wide driveway crossing shall be installed.
- The crossing is to be designed in accordance with Council's Normal crossing profile.
- Given the proposed location, the power pole shall be required to be relocated.
- A concurrence letter/ information shall be provided from the Energy authority about the relocation.

###### Stormwater

- There is no stormwater plan in this PLM.
- The site is located in Stormwater Zone 1 of Council's Manly Stormwater Zone.
- An on-site stormwater detention system is required.
- The collected stormwater shall be discharged to Clifford Avenue via a drainage easement.
- A detailed stormwater management plan shall be submitted in the Development Application submission.

###### Geotechnical Report

- A significant excavation is proposed in this application.
- A geotechnical investigation and report shall be submitted in Development Application stage.

##### **Landscape**

The proposal is for a residential flat building. Therefore, the Apartment Design Guide (ADG) applies including landscape objectives under Part 3E Deep Soil Zones, Part 4O Landscape Design, and Part 4P Planting on Structures.

The proposal shall additionally satisfy the relevant landscape clauses of the Manly DCP, and in this instance the following:

- 3.3.1 Landscape Design.
- 3.3.2 Preservation of Trees or Bushland Vegetation.
- 3.3.3 Footpath Tree Planting.



### Specialist Advice

- 4.1.5 Open Space and Landscaping.
- 4.1.5.2 Landscaped Area.
- 4.4.5 Earthworks (Excavation and Filling), clause 4.4.5.1.

A Landscape Plan is required to demonstrate that the proposed development satisfies the DCP clauses, including:

#### 3.3.1 Landscape Design

- provide native tree planting to satisfy 4.1.5.2.
- landscaping to provide adequate private open space amenity.
- retain landscape features such as rock outcrops.
- design consideration should be given in tree planting locations to minimise loss of sunlight, privacy, views, and noise for neighbouring properties.

#### 3.3.2 Preservation of Trees or Bushland Vegetation

- promote retention of prescribed (protected) trees over 5 metres in height, excluding Exempt Species.

#### 3.3.3 Footpath Tree Planting

**Note:** if deemed of benefit to Council's urban tree canopy policy, and to satisfy the former Manly Council Tree Management Policy, street tree planting may be included in conditions of consent.

#### 4.1.5 Open Space and Landscaping

- maximise soft landscaped areas and open space at ground level, encourage appropriate tree planting and the maintenance of existing vegetation and bushland.

#### 4.1.5.2 Landscaped Area

- (b) i) soil depth of at least 1m for all landscaped areas either in ground or above ground in raised planter beds.
- (c) minimum number of native trees to be supported within the site in a deep soil zone - 3 trees.

#### Landscape design consideration shall be given to the following

- Retention of existing trees within the site and within the road verge.
- Tree planting shall be provided to the front and rear setback within deep soil to soften the development, to satisfy 3.3.1, and 4.1.5.2, including internal areas where deep soil is available.
- Provision of shrub screen planting for private open space areas, to satisfy 3.4.

#### Any on slab planter or roof gardens shall comply with the following soil depth guidelines

- 300mm for lawn and groundcovers.
- 600mm for shrubs and accents.
- 1m for small trees.



### **Specialist Advice**

Additionally, at least 900mm width shall be provided for planter width to provide adequate soil volume and soil moisture retention for long term growth of planting.

#### 4.4.5. Earthworks (Excavation and Filling), clause 4.4.5.1

- clause 4.4.5.1 states that undisturbed ground level must be maintained within 0.9m of a common boundary.

The site does not contain significant trees and the Statement of Environmental effects (SEE) shall include discussion on the trees and vegetation within the site and within adjoining properties. Should all trees and vegetation be 5 metres or less in height (i.e. Exempt Species), no Arboricultural Impact Assessment is required, and this is to be reported in the SEE.

For prescribed (protected) trees under the DCP, (i.e. 5 metres and over, excluding Exempt Species), An Arboricultural Impact Assessment is required to provide clarification on which trees are to be retained, including tree protection measures, and which trees are to be removed.

The Arboricultural Impact Assessment report shall indicate the impact of development upon the existing trees within the site, and for any existing tree on adjoining properties located 5 metres from the site (building and associated excavation or fill zones).

The report shall be prepared by a qualified Arborist AQF Level 5 and shall cover assessment of excavation and construction impacts upon the SRZ and TPZ, tree protection requirements, and recommendations. Recommendations shall include the setback distance from each tree where no construction impact is to occur to ensure the long term retention of the tree.

Any development impact shall be outside of the structural root zone, and impact to the tree protection zone, for trees retained, shall be limited to satisfy AS4970-2009.

Existing trees and vegetation within adjoining property and within the road verge is not permitted to be impacted upon. Council does not support the removal of street trees unless the street tree is proven to present an arboricultural risk.

No impact to existing trees and vegetation within adjoining properties is acceptable, regardless of species type.

As a general principle, the site planning layout shall be determined following arboricultural investigations and recommendations. Any proposal to remove existing trees of moderate to high retention value will not be supported by Council if an alternative design arrangement is available, as assessed by Council.

#### Landscape concerns (pre-lodgement plans)

Nil, subject to preservation of trees and vegetation not impacted by development, and the provision of a landscape plan that demonstrates compliance with the relevant landscape clauses of the Manly DCP and the Apartment Design Guide.

### **Waste Management**



### Specialist Advice

This proposal does not comply with Council's waste management design guidelines. Specifically:

- The bin storage room is located in a secured basement. – This is not acceptable, the bin room must be at street level and have service access unobstructed by any locked gates, doors, car lifts etc.
- The bin room is only accessible via the car lift. – This is unacceptable, the bin room must be accessible to service staff via a path that is separate to the vehicular access. The bin room must be no further than 6.5metres walking distance from the property boundary with the street.
- The bin storage room on the plans is shown as a shared plant room. – This is not acceptable, no plant or infrastructure such as utility meters, pumps, air conditioning compressors etc is permitted to be located in the bin room.

As this is a multiple occupancy proposal Council will be providing a "wheel out/wheel in" service for the bins.

- The owner's corporation/building occupants are not to place the bins at the kerbside for collection.

Please be advised that it is possible for the bins to be stored in a basement bin room and have a holding bay at street level that meets Council's location and access requirements.

It would be the responsibility of the owner's corporation to transfer the bins between the basement bin room and the holding bay.

### Urban Design

1. The development exceeds the Floor Space Ratio (FSR) control of 0.6:1 with 0.83:1 proposed (i.e.281.4m<sup>2</sup> over).
2. The development exceeds the height limit of 8.5m by up to 1.8m resulting in additional shadow and possible view loss to surrounding residential units on higher ground.
3. The applicant has produced a 3D massing of a complying scheme to demonstrate how the additional floor spaces are distributed. Further comprehensive study should be submitted with the complying scheme to demonstrate how the non-complying proposal with the increased yield would achieve better amenity/ community outcome for the surrounding neighbourhood and proposed residences. This will also provide rationale for the Clause 4.6 Exceptions to Development Standards for the FSR and building height breaches. The study may involve:
  - a. View sharing and amenity impact to be demonstrated/ rationalised using the complying scheme to be compared against.
  - b. Fine tuning and increasing the middle gap between the top two pavilions to make it more compatible to the two houses/complying scheme providing view corridor and relief to the street address.
  - c. View corridors to be maintained, enhanced or 'shared' along the front, side and back boundaries.
  - d. Front entry garden in front of the middle indent providing sunny communal open space for the residences could be explored to 'celebrate' the entrance and freeing up a view corridor from the street level.
  - e. Reducing additional shadow and amenity impact on surrounding neighbours.
4. The proposal indicates deep excavation close to the side boundaries without indicating shoring structure (e.g. Contiguous bore piles which will take away more deep soil area). As such, concern is raised on the amount of deep-soil planting provided for the side boundaries. Deleting the extra car parking proposed will help to increase the basement carpark side



### Specialist Advice

- setbacks/ side boundary landscaping strips. The side boundary excavation of the bottom two floors/ treatment of the high retaining wall should be refined and integrated with landscaping/ rock outcrops to minimise the 'canyon' feeling.
5. The southern rear elevation could explore further breaking down of the 4 storey apartment look, for example, by treating the bottom two floors with a more 'solid and void' using a heavier material finish (e.g. Natural stone) to establish a base for the building. The top two floors can have a lighter look of two pavilions allowing view corridors through.
  6. Raised garden level and fence at the south boundary will affect the amenity of rear neighbours. Privacy screening and integrated landscape approach to minimise impact, without casting additional shadow, will be needed.
  7. Provide a comprehensive schedule and accompanying diagrams to show compliance with the Apartment Design Guideline. It is not possible to confirm compliance by simply referring to the table in the Statement of Environmental Effects.

### Development Assessment

#### Manly Local Environmental Plan 2013 (MLEP)

##### Clause 4.3 - Height of Buildings

The maximum building height for the subject site is 8.5m. The proposed height of 10.4m exceeds this control by up to approximately 1.9m, a variation of **22.35%**. The building height breach relates to the roof pop outs and the southern portion of the upper floor roof. These building elements are particularly relevant to the potential loss of water views over the site to the south, as well as overshadowing impacts to adjoining properties. Where non-compliances directly result in amenity impacts, stricter compliance with the prescribed controls is expected and design alternatives should be explored in this regard. A Clause 4.6 request is required to demonstrate that the development is consistent with the objectives of the control and that there are sufficient environmental planning grounds for the breach.

##### Clause 4.4 - Floor Space Ratio

The Floor Space Ratio (FSR) control for the site is 0.6:1 (735.6m<sup>2</sup>). The proposal indicates an FSR of 0.83:1 (1,017m<sup>2</sup>), a variation of **38.25%** or 281.4m<sup>2</sup>. It is noted that the proposal will benefit from additional gross floor area achieved centrally within the site through the amalgamation Nos. 33 & 35. However, any allowance for FSR non-compliance must demonstrate full compliance with the setback, total open space and landscaped area controls, as well as amenity considerations – particularly views and overshadowing. The proposal is generally well-articulated, however, further verification of compliance with the side setbacks should be provided, particularly at the western boundary (no western elevation provided). Detailed consideration should be given to the Urban Design comments in relation to FSR, and a detailed Clause 4.6 request is required as discussed above (see separate comments earlier in these Notes regarding Clause 4.6).

#### Manly Development Control Plan 2013 (MDCP)

##### Clause 3.4 - Amenity (Views, Overshadowing, Overlooking /Privacy, Noise)

It is noted that the provision of compliant sunlight access to the private open space of the subject site is unlikely due to the topography and orientation of the site. Additional detail is required on the shadow diagrams to differentiate between the shadows cast by the existing/proposed development and those cast by adjoining buildings. Increased setbacks and/or articulation at the southern elevation may be necessary in order to achieve compliance with the control.

The large elevated balconies proposed at the rear of the development are likely to result in privacy/overlooking impacts to the side and rear boundaries due to the proximity of adjoining





### **Specialist Advice**

dwelling. These balconies should incorporate physical screening, planter boxes or similar to maximise privacy. The side-facing windows are suitably designed for privacy.

It is anticipated that the proposal will result in some level of view loss impact over the site to the south. Particular consideration should be given to reducing these impacts in accordance with the advice in these comments and the Urban Design comments.

#### Clause 4.1.1.1 - Residential Density and Dwelling Size

The control requires a minimum of 250m<sup>2</sup> per dwelling, allowing a total of 4.9 units on the subject site. The proposal includes 7 units. Additional units may be permitted where the development demonstrates consistency with the objectives of Clause 4.1.1. Council's concerns relating to the internal amenity of the development and impact to topography are discussed further below.

#### Clause 4.1.4 - Setbacks (front, side and rear) and Building Separation

The front and rear setbacks comply with the requirements of the control. The side setbacks are generally well articulated and appear to be compliant, however further information is required in this regard, as detailed under the FSR discussion above. Further, consideration should be given to exceeding compliance with the side setback controls to offset the additional Gross Floor Area (GFA) and bulk achieved centrally through the site and minimise visual impact to adjoining properties. This is likely to be a significant design consideration as the proposal appears to include retaining walls in excess of 4m in height (adjacent to the ground level courtyards) on the eastern and western side boundaries, which is unacceptable. All excavation and retaining walls must be set back a minimum of 0.9m in accordance with MDCP Clause 4.4.5, as discussed further below.

#### Clause 4.1.5 - Open Space and Landscaping

The proposal indicates compliance with the 55% Total Open Space and 35% Landscaped Area controls. It should be noted that the required landscaped area is calculated as 35% of the *proposed total open space* for the development.

Given the scale of the development and the extent of excavation proposed across the majority of the site, the provision of appropriately located and designed landscaping is critical to reducing the visual impact of the built form.

The landscape design of the development should include particular attention to the objectives and controls under Clause 4.1.5 to mitigate amenity impacts to adjoining properties, specifically downhill properties to the south. The design should incorporate an appropriate selection of screen planting species for boundary planting and planter boxes where necessary.

#### Clause 4.4.5 - Earthworks (Excavation and Filling)

Clause 4.4.5.1(b) states that "*Natural and undisturbed ground level must be maintained within 0.9m of side and rear boundaries*". As discussed, the development appears to include retaining walls in excess of 4m constructed on the eastern and western side boundaries. The design requires revision to comply with this control, and should seek to minimise the extent and depth of necessary excavation. The level of amenity provided to the side courtyards and adjoining bedrooms is also of concern given their depth below natural ground level. Due to the extent of the proposed earthworks, the basement car parking excavation should also be limited to that necessary to achieve compliance with the car parking and storage requirements for the development.

#### Schedule 3 - Part A1 - Parking Rates and Requirements for Vehicles



### Specialist Advice

The development comprises 7 three-bedroom dwellings, requiring a total of 11 resident car parking spaces and 2 visitor spaces. A total of 16 spaces are proposed, exceeding the requirement by 3 spaces. Given the surplus car parking proposed and the proximity of the basement excavation to the side boundaries, the number of spaces may need to be reduced.

### Traffic Engineering

1. The development comprises 7 three-bedroom dwellings, requiring a total of 11 resident car parking spaces and 2 visitor spaces. The proposed 16 spaces satisfy the DCP requirements.
2. At least the first 6.0m of the driveway from the property boundary is to be a minimum 5.5m wide to accommodate a waiting/passing area within the property.
3. The carpark is to be designed in compliance with Australian standards AS2890. In this regard, it is to be taken into consideration that per AS2890.1 – Clause 2.4.2 (d), Single- side aisles: Where there is angle parking on one side of an aisle only and the other side is confined by a wall or other high vertical obstruction, the aisle width shall be increased by 300mm resulting in the aisle width to be increased to 6.1m.
4. Driveway crossovers should be located with consideration given to maximise kerb-side car parking spaces.

**Note:** Details regarding the proposed car lift (i.e. manufacturing specifications) are to be included with a Development Application. The Traffic and Parking Report (also to be submitted with a Development Application) is to address concerns regarding the potential for on-street queuing should the car lift break down.

### Heritage

#### Heritage Listings

The subject site does not contain a listed heritage item under the *Manly Local Environmental Plan 2013*, however the site is currently occupied by two dwellings, dating back to 1920s and the site adjoins a heritage listed item, being Item I2 – All stone kerbs - Manly municipal area.

#### Item I2 – All stone kerbs

Stone kerbs are heritage listed. Sandstone kerbing to streets relating to paving and kerbing of streets in the nineteenth century. Mostly located within Manly Village area and adjacent lower slopes of Eastern Hill and Fairlight.

#### Heritage Comments

The proposal is for the demolition of the existing dwellings on site and the construction of a new building consisting of four apartments and three townhouses with car parking facilities. Both dwellings appear to be in fair condition with sandstone walls and terraces at the rear, therefore, they are considered to be of potential heritage value from a heritage perspective. It may be considered to keep the existing buildings in sections and incorporate into the new design. Heritage recommends an investigation into the significance of these buildings to be done prior to a future Development Application.

Given the potential heritage significance of the existing dwellings, Heritage would require an assessment report into the site, including the building's history and the potential significance of the buildings on the site. The significance assessment should be undertaken against the NSW Heritage Office's criterion for listing.

Also care should be taken to preserve the stone kerbing and it should be salvaged and reused in case of removal.



### Relevant Council Policies

You are advised of the following (but not limited to all) Council's policies available at Council's website:

- Community Participation Plan
- Stormwater drainage for low level properties PDS-POL 135
- Vehicle access to all roadside development: LAP-PL 315

### Documentation to accompany the Development Application

- Lodge Application via NSW Planning Portal
- Statement of Environmental Effects
- Apartment Design Guide Compliance Table
- Clause 4.6 request to vary a Development Standard (Height and FSR)
- SEPP 65 and ADG Compliance Report (Design Principles and Guidelines)
- Design Verification Statement (SEPP 65) signed by the designer/Architect
- Scaled and dimensioned plans:
  - Site Plan
  - Floor Plans
  - Elevations
  - Sections
  - GFA/FSR Calculation/Compliance Plans
  - Height Plane/Blanket Compliance Plans
  - Landscape Calculation/Compliance Plans
  - Detailed Schedule of Colours and Materials (in colour)
- Landscape Plans (including a Schedule of Species to be planted)
- Photomontages of the proposal (in colour and taken from the street, side and rear elevations)
- View Sharing Analysis (depicting view impacts from Nos. 48, 50, and 52 Fairlight Street)
- Certified Shadow Diagrams (depicting shadows cast at 9am, Noon and 3pm on 21 June).
- Cost of works estimate/ Quote
- Survey Plan (including Boundary Identification)
- Site Analysis Plan
- Demolition Plan
- Excavation and Fill Plan
- Waste Management Plan (Construction & Demolition)
- Driveway Design Plan (including long section depicting gradients)
- Erosion and Sediment Control Plan / Soil and Water Management Plan
- Stormwater Management Plan / Stormwater Plans and On-site Stormwater Detention (OSD) Checklist
- BASIX Certificates (to be valid within 3 months of lodging the Development Application)
- NaTHERS Certificates
- Traffic and Parking Report
- Geotechnical Report
- Shoring Plans
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment
- Evidence of a Drainage Easement being granted by neighbouring properties to Clifford Avenue.
- Heritage Assessment
- Manufacturer specifications of the car lift



#### **Documentation to accompany the Development Application**

**Note:** Height poles to determine view loss may need to be erected once the Development Application is submitted to better understand the height and scale and view loss associated with the development. The assessing officer will advise you during the assessment process if required.

*Please refer to Development Application Lodgement Requirements for further detail.*

#### **Concluding Comments**

These notes are in response to a pre-lodgement meeting held on 4 February 2021 to discuss demolition works and the construction of a residential flat building at 33 & 35 Fairlight Street, Fairlight. These notes reference the plans prepared by Platform Architects dated November 2020.

This review has identified a number of issues which require attention prior to the lodging of a Development Application. The issues primarily revolve around the proposed bulk and scale of the development and the significant non-compliance with the Building Height and Floor Space Ratio development standards which indicates the current scheme is an overdevelopment of the site.

As such, the proposal as presented at the pre-lodgement meeting could not be supported in its current form.

As noted, the Development Application will be referred to the DSAP during the course of its assessment and then onto the NBLPP for determination.

#### **Question on these Notes?**

Should you have any questions or wish to seek clarification of any matters raised in these Notes, please contact the member of the Development Advisory Services Team at Council referred to on the front page of these Notes.