

---

**From:** Helen Monks  
**Sent:** 27/02/2024 1:41:19 PM  
**To:** Council Northernbeaches Mailbox  
**Subject:** TRIMMED DA 2023/1832

As briefly discussed today by phone with the assessor we note the following fundamental problems with the application:

1. Additional submissions note that stormwater disposal needs to be addressed in more detail, particularly once proposed/existing rainwater tanks overflow. There is currently no description of how stormwater will be disposed of after that point, despite there being downhill neighbours (already struggling with a wet, spring-fed, south-facing slope below a non-compliant drainage line that is shown as "existing" on plans) and no public system to discharge the waters into.
2. Additional submission also note that the sewage management system is too close to the house, and non-compliant /too close to the downhill boundaries. This is a matter of significant public health concern. The State's guidelines are explicit about setbacks from boundaries: this proposal is non-compliant on that point as well as in relation to the distance from the proposed residences on site.
3. There is a fundamental lack of information about what vegetation is found in the proposed 15m APZ (presumed to be an IAPZ) to the north. P.2 of the Natural Environment Referral Response (26/2/24) refers to biodiversity mapping which includes that area, and states that a BDAR may be required. In addition, the bushfire consultant (23/2/24) notes that no survey of tree trunks in that area has been undertaken, so no description has been made and no assessment is possible about required removal of trees to create the APZ. To address both requirements (BDAR or not; APZ creation involving tree removal or not), a flora/fauna survey which includes a survey of trees within the APZ is required. Then the BDAR question can be answered, as well as the (conflicting) need for apparent tree removal for APZ creation.
4. Both the bushfire hazard assessment (original, and response of 23/2/24) and the biodiversity response (3/1/24 and 26/2/24) ignore the landscape proposal, which introduces additional bushfire hazard. The hazard will increase on the subject site, as well as for 2 downhill neighbours. In particular, it is assumed in both reports that no additional plantings will be installed, although they clearly are. In addition, the proposed plantings are integral to the proposal – intended to provide mutual privacy protection between 3 properties as well as to improve the aesthetics of the 3 storey tower. This set of conflicts also needs to be explicitly resolved by the applicants.

Regards  
Dr Helen Monks  
Certified Environmental Practitioner (no. 256)  
Director, Town Planner  
Highlight Consulting  
Member of Central Coast Town Planners  
[www.highlightconsulting.com.au](http://www.highlightconsulting.com.au)  
PO Box 4105  
Wagstaffe NSW 2257  
P: [REDACTED]  
Integrated town planning and property services  
And find me on LinkedIn

Highlight Consulting acknowledges the traditional custodians of the land and waterways in this region: the Guringai, Dharug, and Darkinjung people and their leaders past, present and emerging.