

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT - DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION ASSESSMENT REPORT

Development Application No.DA2009/0608

Assessment Officer: Kevin Short

Property Address: Lot 36, DP 8389, No.99 Wyndora Avenue Freshwater

Proposal Description: Alterations and additions to a dwelling house including a deck and fence. Plan Reference: Drawings A01A Issue 01 by Matthew Power dated 01.05.2009.

Note: The submitted drawings depicted levels which were taken by the applicant. These do not represent the correct relative heights levels of the site, however, the plans are to scale and the works relate to a replacement deck structure only. Therefore, the submitted plans can be used to allow for an accurate assessment of the proposed development against the WLEP of 2000.

Report Section	Applicable	Complete & Attached
Section 1 – Code Assessment	✓ Yes	▼ _{Yes} □ _{No}
Section 2 – Issues Assessment	✓ Yes No	Yes No
Section 3 – Site Inspection Analysis	✓ Yes	Yes No
Section 4 – Application Determination	🔽 Yes 🗆 No	Yes No

Estimated Cost of Works: \$95, 000.00 Are S94A Contributions Applicable?

□ _{Yes} <a>✓ No

Notification Required?

Yes No

Period (of Publi	c Exhibition?
----------	----------	---------------

<				
	14 days	 21 days	30 days	N/A

Submissions Received?

□ _{Yes} ☑ _{No}

Are any trees impacted upon by the proposed development? $\hfill \eqref{eq:second}$ Yes $\hfill \eqref{eq:second}$ No

Note: A small tree is within close proximity to the north-west corner of the proposed deck. Council's Landscape Officer has reviewed the proposal and raises no concern to the developments impact on this tree.

SECTION 1 - CODE ASSESSMENT REPORT

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING INSTRUMENTS

WLEP 2000

Locality: H1 Freshwater Beach

Development Definition:	Housing	Ancillary Developme	nt to Housing	Other
Category of Development:	Category	1 Category 2	Category 3	

Desired Future Character: : H1 Freshwater Beach

The Freshwater Beach locality will remain characterised by detached style housing in landscaped settings interspersed by existing apartment style housing and a range of complementary and compatible uses.

Future development will maintain the visual pattern and predominant scale of existing detached style housing in the locality except for the Harbord Diggers Club. The streets will be characterised by landscaped front gardens and consistent front building setbacks. Unless exemptions are made to the housing density standard in this



locality statement, any subdivision of land is to be consistent with the predominant pattern, size and configuration of existing allotments in the locality.

The locality contains hillsides and elevated landforms, prominent coastal headlands and cliffs and remnant vegetation. These elements will be protected from development that would detract from their visual and natural qualities, presenting in some parts of the locality a constraint to further development.

The Harbord Diggers Club will continue to cater for the recreational and leisure needs of the community. If the existing approved building and carparking areas are to be expanded, regard must be had to any approved and detailed masterplan for the site. Such a masterplan is to address issues such as views, visual impact, natural features, management of traffic and impact upon the amenity of the locality.

The locality will continue to be served by the existing local retail centre shown on the map. Future development in this centre will be in accordance with the general principles of development control provided in clause 39.

Category 1 Development with no variations to BFC's (Section 2 Assessment not required)

Is the development considered to be consistent with the Locality's Desired Future Character Statement?

Building Height (overall):	
	Existing and unchanged
Applicable: Yes No	Dwelling: 6.2m
Requirement:	
· _ ·	Complies:
8.5m	
0.500	
Building Height (underside of upper most ceiling):	T
	Existing and unchanged
Applicable: Yes No	
	Proposed: 4.0m
Requirement:	
	Complies: Yes No
7.2m	
7.200	
Front Setback: Wyndora Avenue.	Existing: 5.6m to dwelling.
	Proposed: Nil setback to the proposed carport.
Applicable: Yes No	Note: The proposed carport will have an unacceptable
	and unnecessary impact on the existing streetscape. In
Requirement:	addition, existing site constraints do not warrant a
	variation to the front setback standard as existing access to the site is provided by Raffo Lane and off street
6.5m	parking is provided on site under the existing balcony.
0.011	Given the above, the proposed carport (and driveway off
	Wyndora Avenue) is not supported and a condition has
	been imposed on the consent for these elements to be
	deleted as part of approved plans. Subject to this
	condition of consent, the proposed development is
	compliant with the front setback control.
	This was conveyed to the Applicant on 4 August 2009.
Secondary Street Frontage: Raffo Lane.	E D
	This was conveyed to the Applicant on 4 August 2009. Complies: Yes No
Secondary Street Frontage: Raffo Lane.	E D
Yes □ _{No}	E D
	Complies: Yes No

Built Form Controls: H1 Freshwater Beach



	Existing and unchanged: 17.3m to existing dwelling.
Housing Density: Applicable: Yes No	
Landscape Open Space: Applicable: Yes No	Existing and unchanged 148m ² (29%)
₩ 40% (205.2m)	Note: Subject to a condition of consent to delete the carport and driveway as part of the development, the existing landscaped open space of the site will not change as a result of the proposed development. Therefore, the development satisfies the requirements of the control as the proposed development is within the existing building platform.
Rear Setback: Applicable: Yes No	Note: The rear setback is not applicable in this instance given the lot has two (2) street frontages.
Side Boundary Envelope: Applicable: Yes No Requirement: 4m / 45 degrees 5m / 45 degrees	Boundary: Nth Sth Est Wst Existing and unchanged Fully within Envelope: Yes No Complies: Yes No Boundary: Nth Sth Est Wst
	Existing and unchanged Fully within Envelope: Yes No Complies: Yes No
Side Setbacks: Applicable: Yes No	Boundary Nth Sth Est Wst Existing and unchanged: 1.34m
900mm 4.5m	Complies: Yes No
	Boundary Nth Sth Est Wst Existing and unchanged: 1.39m Complies: Yes No



General Principles of Development Control:

CL38 Glare & reflections	Complies:
Applicable:	▼ Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	Yes Yes, subject to condition No
CL39 Local retail centres	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition
✓ _{Yes} □ _{No}	Yes Yes, subject to condition No
CL40 Housing for Older People and People with Disabilities	Complies:
Applicable:	\square Yes \square Yes , subject to condition \square No
└ _{Yes} ✓ _{No}	
CL41 Brothels	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
└─ _{Yes} I No	res res, subject to condition into
CL42 Construction Sites	Complies:
Applicable:	└─ _{Yes} ▼ _{Yes} , subject to condition
Yes No	
CL43 Noise	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition
Yes No	
CL44 Pollutants	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
└─ _{Yes} IV _{No}	
CL45 Hazardous Uses	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
└─ _{Yes} I✓ _{No}	
CL46 Radiation Emission Levels	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	
CL47 Flood Affected Land	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
└─ _{Yes} I✓ _{No}	
CL48 Potentially Contaminated Land	Complies:
Applicable:	Based on the previous land uses if the site likely to be contaminated?
Yes No	□ _{Yes} ☑ _{No}
	Is the site suitable for the proposed land use?
	▼ _{Yes} □ _{No}



CL49 Remediation of Contaminated Land	Complies:
Applicable:	\square Yes \square Yes , subject to condition \square No
□ _{Yes} ▼ _{No}	res res, subject to condition no
CL49a Acid Sulfate Soils	Complies:
Applicable:	
□ _{Yes} ^I _{No}	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
CL50 Safety & Security	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	
CL51 Front Fences and Walls	Complies:
Applicable:	✓ Yes , subject to condition No
▼ _{Yes} □ _{No}	Note: A 1.4m to 1.6m masonry front fence with steel strips
	is proposed. The design of the fence is supported as it will provide visual interest to Wyndora Avenue and will not
	detract from the existing streetscape.
CL52 Development Near Parks, Bushland	Complies:
Reserves & other public Open Spaces	\square Yes \square Yes , subject to condition \square No
Applicable:	
└ _{Yes} ☑ _{No}	
CL53 Signs	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Ves , subject to condition No
□ _{Yes} ▼ _{No}	res res, subject to condition into
CL54 Provision and Location of Utility	Complies:
Services	·
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	
CL55 Site Consolidation in 'Medium Density	Complies:
Applicable:	\square Yes \square Yes , subject to condition \square No
Tes No	
CL56 Retaining Unique Environmental	Complies:
Features on Site	\square Yes \square Yes , subject to condition \square No
Applicable:	res res, subject to condition No
Yes No	
CL57 Development on Sloping Land	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
└─ _{Yes} 🔽 _{No}	
CL58 Protection of Existing Flora	Complies:
Applicable:	✓ Yes , subject to condition No
	Yes Yes , subject to condition No



▼ Yes □ No	
CL59 Koala Habitat Protection	Complies:
Applicable:	
	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	
CL60 Watercourses & Aquatic Habitats	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition
Yes Vo	
CL61 Views	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition
Ves No	Note: The proposed dwelling is acceptable in relation to the
Yes No	requirements view sharing.
CL62 Access to sunlight	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition
Yes No	Yes Yes, subject to condition No
	O a martine a
CL63 Landscaped Open Space	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	
CL63A Rear Building Setback	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
□ _{Yes} ▼ _{No}	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
CL64 Private open space	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Ves No	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
	Compliant
CL65 Privacy Applicable:	Complies:
	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	Note: A 2.2m high privacy screen is proposed adjacent to
	the eastern elevation of the proposed ground floor deck which will prevent direct and close overlooking of the
	adjoining property, No.97 Wyndora Avenue. Notwithstanding, the height of the privacy screen is
	considered excessive as it will cause the overall built form
	of the dwelling to be bulky. Accordingly, a condition has been imposed on the consent to ensure the height of the
	privacy screen does not exceed 1.6m above the ground
	floor level.
	This was conveyed to the applicant on 7 August 2009.
CL66 Building bulk	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition
Yes No	
CL67 Roofs	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition
Yes No	



CL68 Conservation of Energy and Water	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes , subject to condition No
Ves No	Yes Yes, subject to condition No
CL69 Accessibility – Public and Semi-Public	Complies:
Buildings	\square Yes \square Yes , subject to condition \square No
Applicable: 🔽 Yes 🔽 No	
CL70 Site facilities	Complies:
Applicable:	▼ Yes Yes , subject to condition No
▼ _{Yes} □ _{No}	Yes Yes, subject to condition No
CL71 Parking facilities (visual impact)	Complies:
Applicable:	
Ves Vo	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Note: This issue has been discussed previously in the report where it was concluded that the carport component of the proposed development was to be deleted by a condition of consent as it is not compliant with the front building line control for the locality.	
CL72 Traffic access & safety	Complies:
Applicable:	└─ _{Yes} ▼ Yes , subject to condition
Yes No	Yes Yes, subject to condition No
CL73 On-site Loading and Unloading	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
└ _{Yes} ✓ _{No}	Yes Yes, subject to condition No
CL74 Provision of Carparking	Complies:
Applicable:	▼ Yes └ Yes , subject to condition └ No
Ves No	Note: A site inspection revealed that the site contains
Yes No	two (2) off-street carparking spaces.
CL75 Design of Carparking Areas	Complies:
Applicable:	└─ Yes ▼ Yes , subject to condition └─ No
□ _{Yes} ▼ _{No}	Yes Yes, subject to condition ino
Note: This issue has been discussed previously in the	
report where it was concluded that the carport component of the proposed development was to be	
deleted by a condition of consent as it is not compliant	
with the front building line control for the locality.	Complies:
CL76 Management of Stormwater Applicable:	·
	Yes Ves , subject to condition No
Yes No	
CL77 Landfill	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition
□ _{Yes} ▼ _{No}	
100 110	



CL78 Erosion & Sedimentation	Complies:
Applicable:	└─ Yes Ves , subject to condition └─ No
Yes No	
CL79 Heritage Control	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition
└ _{Yes} ✓ _{No}	res res, subject to condition into
CL80 Notice to Metropolitan Aboriginal Land	Complies:
Council and the National Parks and Wildlife Service	└── _{Yes} └── _{Yes} , subject to condition └── _{No}
Applicable:	
└─ _{Yes} ₩ _{No}	
CL81 Notice to Heritage Council	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
□ _{Yes} I _{No}	Yes Yes, subject to condition No
CL82 Development in the Vicinity of Heritage	Complies:
Items	Yes Yes , subject to condition
Applicable:	
Yes No	
CL83 Development of Known or Potential	Complies:
Archaeological Sites Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
└ _{Yes} ▼ _{No}	

Schedules:

Schedule 5 State policies	Complies:
Applicable:	\square Yes \square Yes , subject to condition \square No
Yes No	Yes Yes, subject to condition No
Schedule 6 Preservation of bushland	Complies:
Applicable:	$\square_{ m Yes}$ $\square_{ m Yes}$, subject to condition $\square_{ m No}$
└ _{Yes} ✓ _{No}	Yes Yes, subject to condition No
Schedule 7 Matters for consideration in a	Complies:
subdivision of land	\Box Yes \Box Yes , subject to condition \Box No
Applicable:	Yes Yes, subject to condition No
└── Yes Vo	
Schedule 8 Site analysis	Complies:
Applicable:	\square Yes \square Yes , subject to condition \square No
Yes No	Yes Yes, subject to condition No
Schedule 9 Notification requirements for	Complies:
remediation work	$\square_{ m Yes}$ $\square_{ m Yes}$, subject to condition $\square_{ m No}$
Applicable:	Yes Yes, subject to condition No



└ _{Yes} ✓ _{No}		
Schedule 10 Traffic generating development	Complies:	
Applicable:	\square Yes \square Yes , subject to condition \square No	
└─ _{Yes}	Yes Yes , subject to condition No	
Schedule 11 Koala feed tree species and plans of management	Complies:	
	Yes Yes , subject to condition No	
Applicable: Yes Vo		
Schedule 12 Requirements for complying	Complies:	
development Applicable:	\square Yes \square Yes , subject to condition \square No	
Yes No		
Schedule 13 Development guidelines for Collaroy/Narrabeen Beach	Complies:	
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No	
□ _{Yes} ^I _{No}		
Schedule 14 Guiding principles for	Complies:	
development near Middle Harbour Applicable:	\square Yes \square Yes , subject to condition \square No	
Yes No		
Schedule 15 Statement of environmental effects	Complies:	
Applicable:	\square Yes \square Yes , subject to condition \square No	
└─ _{Yes} IV _{No}		
Schedule 17 Carparking provision	Complies:	
Applicable:	✓ Yes Yes , subject to condition No	
Yes No	Note: The subject site contains two (2) off-street carparking spaces off Raffo Lane, and therefore, the existing carparking arrangement is satisfactory in addressing the requirements of this schedule.	

Other Relevant Environmental Planning Instruments:

SEPPs: Applicable? ✓ Yes No SEPP Basix: Applicable? ✓ Yes No If yes: Has the applicant provided Basix Certification? ✓ Yes No

SEPP 55 Applicable?

▼ _{Yes} □ _{No}

Based on the previous land uses if the site likely to be contaminated?



□ _{Yes} ▼ _{No}

Is the site suitable for the proposed land use?

✓ Yes □ No

SEPP Infrastructure Applicable?

Applicable

✓ Yes □ No

Is the proposal for a swimming pool: No. Within 30m of an overhead line support structure?

□_{Yes} ▼_{No}

Within 5m of an overhead power line ?

□ _{Yes} No

Does the proposal comply with the SEPP?

▼ _{Yes} □ _{No}

REPs: Applicable?: Ves Ves

EPA Regulation Considerations:

Clause 54 & 109 (Stop the Clock) Applicable:	
└ _{Yes} ▼ _{No}	
Clause 92 (Demolition of Structures) Applicable: Ves No	Addressed via condition?
Clause 92 (Government Coastal Policy) Applicable:	Is the proposal consistent with the Goal and Objectives of the Government Coastal Policy?
Clause 93 & 94 (Fire Safety) Applicable: Yes No	Addressed via condition?
Clause 94 (Upgrade of Building for Disability Access) Applicable:	Addressed via condition?
Clause 98 (BCA) Applicable: Yes No	Addressed via condition?



REFERRALS

Referral Body/Officer	Required	Response
Development Engineering	₩ _{Yes} □ _{No}	Satisfactory
		Satisfactory, subject to condition
		Unsatisfactory
Landscape Assessment	₩ _{Yes} □ _{No}	Satisfactory
		Satisfactory, subject to condition
		Unsatisfactory



Applicable Legislation/ EPI's /Policies:

- EPA Act 1979
- EPA Regulations 2000
- Disability Discrimination Act 1992
- Local Government Act 1993
- Roads Act 1993
- SEPP No. 55 Remediation of Land
- SEPP No. 71 Coastal Protection
- SEPP BASIX
- SEPP Infrastructure
- WLEP 2000
- □ wdcp
- S94A Development Contributions Plan

SECTION 79C EPA ACT 1979

Section 79C (1) (a)(i) – Have you considered all relevant provisions of any relevant environmental planning instrument?	▼ _{Yes} □ _{No}
Section 79C (1) (a)(ii) – Have you considered all relevant provisions of any provisions of any draft environmental planning instrument	▼ _{Yes} No
Section 79C (1) (a)(iii) – Have you considered all relevant provisions of any provisions of any development control plan	▼ _{Yes} □ _{No}
Section 79C (1) (a)(iiia) - Have you considered all relevant provisions of any Planning Agreement or Draft Planning Agreement	□ _{Yes} □ _{No} ▼ _{N/A}
Section 79C (1) (a)(iv) - Have you considered all relevant provisions of any Regulations?	▼ _{Yes} □ _{No}
Section 79C (1) (b) – Are the likely impacts of the development, including environmental impacts on the natural and built environment and social and economic impacts in the locality acceptable?	▼ _{Yes} No
Section 79C (1) (c) – It the site suitable for the development?	▼ _{Yes} □ _{No}
Section 79C (1) (d) – Have you considered any submissions made in accordance with the EPA Act or EPA Regs?	▼ _{Yes} No
Section 79C (1) (e) – Is the proposal in the public interest?	▼ _{Yes} □ _{No}



SECTION 2 – ISSUES

N/A.

SECTION 3 – SITE INSPECTION ANALYSIS



Site area: 513m²

Detail existing onsite structures:

□ _{None}

Dwelling

Detached Garage

Detached outbuilding

Site Features:

✓ Trees

Under Storey Vegetation

Rock Outcrops

Potential View Loss as a result of development

□ _{Yes} ▼ _N

Bushfire Prone?

□ _{Yes} <a>

✓ No



Flood Prone?

Affected by Acid Sulfate Soils

Located within 40m of any natural watercourse?

□ _{Yes} <a>

 No

Located within 1km landward of the open coast watermark or within 1km of any bay estuaries, coastal lake, lagoon, island, tidal waterway within the area mapped within the NSW Coastal Policy?

□ _{Yes} <a>✓ No

Located within 100m of the mean high watermark?

□ _{Yes} <a>

 No

Located within an area identified as a Wave Impact Zone?

□ _{Yes} 🗹 _{No}

Any items of heritage significance located upon it?

□ _{Yes} 🗹 _{No}

Located within the vicinity of any items of heritage significance?

□ _{Yes} <a>

✓ No

Located within an area identified as potential land slip?

□ _{Yes} <a>✓ No

Is the development Integrated?

□ _{Yes} <a>

 No

Does the development require concurrence?

└ Yes ^I No

Is the site owned or is the DA made by the "Crown"?

Have you reviewed the DP and s88B instrument?

Does the proposal impact upon any easements / Rights of Way?

□ _{Yes} 🔽 _{No}

<u>Site Inspection / Desktop Assessment Undertaken by:</u> Kevin Short, Development Assessment Officer, on 30 July 2009.



Are there any additional matters that have arisen from your site inspection that would require any additional assessment to be undertaken?	Yes No Note: A site inspection revealed an outbuilding is within the secondary setback to Raffo Lane. A review of Council records has not revealed any Council approval for the building. Further, recent works have occurred to the outbuilding, however, these appear to be minor and within the scope of exempt development.
	A review of Council records also revealed that the existing first floor balcony, located off the northern elevation of the dwelling, was approved by Council (DA988/1971) with parking beneath in 1971. Notwithstanding that the approved parking area is to be converted to a ground floor deck area, the driveway is used as an existing tandem parking space.

Signed

Date

Kevin Short, Development Assessment Officer

SECTION 4 – APPLICATION DETERMINATION

Conclusion:

The proposal has been considered against the relevant heads of consideration under S79C of the EPA Act 1979 and the proposed development is considered to be:

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

Recommendation: APPROVAL

That Council as the consent authority

- GRANT DEVELOPMENT CONSENT to the development application subject to:
 - (a) the conditions detailed within the associated notice of determination; and
 - (b) the consent lapsing within three (3) from operation

 \Box

 \Box

GRANT DEFERRED COMMENCEMENT CONSENT to the development application subject to:

- (a) the conditions detailed within the associated notice of determination;
- (b) limit the deferred commencement condition time frame to 3 years;
- (c) one the deferred commencement matter have been satisfactorily addressed issue an operational consent subject to the time frames detailed within part (d); and
- (d) the consent lapsing within three (3) from operation

REFUSE development consent to the development application subject to:

(a) the reasons detailed within the associated notice of determination.

 $[\]checkmark$



Signed

Date

Kevin Short, Development Assessment Officer

The application is determined under the delegated authority of:

Signed

Date

Lashta Haidari, Acting Team Leader, Development Assessment