



## DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION ASSESSMENT REPORT

<b>Application Number:</b>	DA2020/0188
----------------------------	-------------

<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	Georgia Quinn
<b>Land to be developed (Address):</b>	Lot 3 DP 10223, 49 South Creek Road DEE WHY NSW 2099
<b>Proposed Development:</b>	Alterations and additions to a dwelling house
<b>Zoning:</b>	Warringah LEP2011 - Land zoned R2 Low Density Residential
<b>Development Permissible:</b>	Yes
<b>Existing Use Rights:</b>	No
<b>Consent Authority:</b>	Northern Beaches Council
<b>Land and Environment Court Action:</b>	No
<b>Owner:</b>	Bhabishan Nath Tancev Stephanie Tancev
<b>Applicant:</b>	Bhabishan Nath Tancev

<b>Application Lodged:</b>	28/02/2020
<b>Integrated Development:</b>	No
<b>Designated Development:</b>	No
<b>State Reporting Category:</b>	Residential - Alterations and additions
<b>Notified:</b>	10/03/2020 to 24/03/2020
<b>Advertised:</b>	Not Advertised
<b>Submissions Received:</b>	0
<b>Clause 4.6 Variation:</b>	Nil
<b>Recommendation:</b>	Refusal

<b>Estimated Cost of Works:</b>	\$ 36,500.00
---------------------------------	--------------

### PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT IN DETAIL

This application seeks consent for alterations and additions to a dwelling house.

In particular, the application includes:

- a 1.8m high stone clad and timber front fence;
- a bedroom and bathroom in the attic level; and
- internal alterations to the ground floor bathroom.

### ASSESSMENT INTRODUCTION

The application has been assessed in accordance with the requirements of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 and the associated Regulations. In this regard:

- An assessment report and recommendation has been prepared (the subject of this report) taking into account all relevant provisions of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, and the associated regulations;
- A site inspection was conducted and consideration has been given to the impacts of the development upon the subject site and adjoining, surrounding and nearby properties;
- Notification to adjoining and surrounding properties, advertisement (where required) and referral to relevant internal and external bodies in accordance with the Act, Regulations and relevant Development Control Plan;
- A review and consideration of all submissions made by the public and community interest groups in relation to the application;
- A review and consideration of all documentation provided with the application (up to the time of determination);
- A review and consideration of all referral comments provided by the relevant Council Officers, State Government Authorities/Agencies and Federal Government Authorities/Agencies on the proposal.

## SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT ISSUES

Warringah Development Control Plan - A.5 Objectives

Warringah Development Control Plan - B7 Front Boundary Setbacks

Warringah Development Control Plan - C6 Building over or adjacent to Constructed Council Drainage Easements

## SITE DESCRIPTION

<b>Property Description:</b>	Lot 3 DP 10223 , 49 South Creek Road DEE WHY NSW 2099
<b>Detailed Site Description:</b>	<p>The subject site consists of one (1) allotment located on the southwestern side of South Creek Road.</p> <p>The site is regular in shape with a frontage of 15.2m along South Creek Road and a depth of 50.3m. The site has an area of 770.3m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>The site is located within the R2 Low Density Residential zone and accommodates a dwelling house, a carport and an outbuilding.</p> <p>The site has a cross fall from north to south (ie. front to rear) of approximately 2m.</p> <p><b>Detailed Description of Adjoining/Surrounding Development</b></p> <p>Adjoining and surrounding development is characterised by a mix of low and medium density residential developments with the Pittwater House School being located northwest of the subject site.</p>

Map:



## SITE HISTORY

The land has been used for residential purposes for an extended period of time. A search of Council's records has revealed the following relevant history:

### Development Application DA2010/1193

This application for demolition works and construction of a carport and outbuilding was granted consent under delegation on 24 September 2010. Whilst the subject application does not propose any works to this structure, the provided plans include internal and external plans of such building. Council's Building Assessment team have provided referral comments for the subject application and at such time raised concern in regard to the denoted 'granny flat' as well as the attic level of the dwelling house. Particular concern is raised that the approved outbuilding appears to be being utilised as an unauthorised detached dwelling, and it remains unknown if kitchen facilities have been installed due to lack of detail. Further concern is also raised in regard to the proposed bathroom/ bedroom within the attic level, as the referral body was unable to find any approval for this roof attic to be used for habitable purposes. In turn, this matter has been referred to Council's Building Control team for further investigation.

## APPLICATION HISTORY

The subject application for alterations and additions to a dwelling was lodged with Council on 28 February 2020.

Following a preliminary assessment of the application, Council wrote to the applicant requesting withdrawal of the application on 9 April 2020, outlining a number of issues that would not allow Council to support the application in its current form. The issues related to Council's Drainage Easements, BCA non-compliances and non-compliances with Clauses B7 and D13 of the WDCP.

A response was received from the applicant requesting additional time to provide the information listed within the request for withdrawal. Council granted an additional seven (7) days for such information to be provided. Upon receipt of the additional information, Council's Building Control and Development Engineering Officer's reviewed such information in conjunction with that already provided as part of the application however both referral bodies returned recommendations of refusal. The application has therefore been assessed and determined with the information on hand, by way of refusal.

## ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT ACT, 1979 (EPAA)

The relevant matters for consideration under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979, are:

Section 4.15 Matters for Consideration'	Comments
---	----------

Section 4.15 Matters for Consideration'	Comments
Section 4.15 (1) (a)(i) – Provisions of any environmental planning instrument	See discussion on “Environmental Planning Instruments” in this report.
Section 4.15 (1) (a)(ii) – Provisions of any draft environmental planning instrument	Draft State Environmental Planning Policy (Remediation of Land) seeks to replace the existing SEPP No. 55 (Remediation of Land). Public consultation on the draft policy was completed on 13 April 2018. The subject site has been used for residential purposes for an extended period of time. The proposed development retains the residential use of the site, and is not considered a contamination risk.
Section 4.15 (1) (a)(iii) – Provisions of any development control plan	Warringah Development Control Plan applies to this proposal.
Section 4.15 (1) (a)(iia) – Provisions of any planning agreement	None applicable.
Section 4.15 (1) (a)(iv) – Provisions of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000 (EP&A Regulation 2000)	<p><u>Division 8A</u> of the EP&amp;A Regulation 2000 requires the consent authority to consider "Prescribed conditions" of development consent. These matters have been addressed via a condition of consent.</p> <p><u>Clause 50(1A)</u> of the EP&amp;A Regulation 2000 requires the submission of a design verification certificate from the building designer at lodgement of the development application. This clause is not relevant to this application.</p> <p><u>Clauses 54 and 109</u> of the EP&amp;A Regulation 2000 allow Council to request additional information. Additional information was requested in relation to BCA compliance and various DCP non-compliances.</p> <p><u>Clause 92</u> of the EP&amp;A Regulation 2000 requires the consent authority to consider AS 2601 - 1991: The Demolition of Structures. This matter could be addressed via a condition of consent.</p> <p><u>Clauses 93 and/or 94</u> of the EP&amp;A Regulation 2000 requires the consent authority to consider the upgrading of a building (including fire safety upgrade of development). This clause is not relevant to this application.</p> <p><u>Clause 98</u> of the EP&amp;A Regulation 2000 requires the consent authority to consider insurance requirements under the Home Building Act 1989. This clause is not relevant to this application.</p> <p><u>Clause 98</u> of the EP&amp;A Regulation 2000 requires the consent authority to consider the provisions of the Building Code of Australia (BCA). This matter has been addressed within the Building Assessment referral response and the said non-compliance forms a reason for refusal of the application.</p> <p><u>Clause 143A</u> of the EP&amp;A Regulation 2000 requires the submission of a design verification certificate from the building designer prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate. This clause is not relevant to this application.</p>

Section 4.15 Matters for Consideration'	Comments
Section 4.15 (1) (b) – the likely impacts of the development, including environmental impacts on the natural and built environment and social and economic impacts in the locality	<p>(i) <b>Environmental Impact</b> The environmental impacts of the proposed development on the natural and built environment are addressed under the Warringah Development Control Plan section in this report.</p> <p>(ii) <b>Social Impact</b> The proposed development will not have a detrimental social impact in the locality considering the character of the proposal.</p> <p>(iii) <b>Economic Impact</b> The proposed development will not have a detrimental economic impact on the locality considering the nature of the existing and proposed land use.</p>
Section 4.15 (1) (c) – the suitability of the site for the development	The site is considered unsuitable for the proposed development.
Section 4.15 (1) (d) – any submissions made in accordance with the EPA Act or EPA Regs	See discussion on “Notification & Submissions Received” in this report.
Section 4.15 (1) (e) – the public interest	This assessment has found the proposal to be contrary to the relevant requirements of Clause C6 Building over or adjacent to constructed Council drainage easements and various Building Control matters, and will result in a development which will create an undesirable precedent such that it would undermine the desired future character of the area and be contrary to the expectations of the community. In this regard, the development, as proposed, is not considered to be in the public interest.

## EXISTING USE RIGHTS

Existing Use Rights are not applicable to this application.

## BUSHFIRE PRONE LAND

The site is not classified as bush fire prone land.

## NOTIFICATION & SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

The subject development application has been publicly exhibited in accordance with the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000 and the relevant Development Control Plan.

As a result of the public exhibition of the application Council received no submissions.

## REFERRALS

Internal Referral Body	Comments
------------------------	----------

Internal Referral Body	Comments
Building Assessment - Fire and Disability upgrades	<p>The application has been investigated with respect to aspects relevant to the Building Certification and Fire Safety Department.</p> <p><b>There are objections to approval of the development.</b></p> <p>Note: The proposed development does not comply with some requirements of the BCA. Issues such as outlined below should be resolved prior to issue of Development Consent -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are concerns that the use of the upper level loft / attic as a habitable room does not comply with the min. floor to ceiling height formula under Part 3.8.2.2 (e)(i) of the BCA. I cannot find any approval for this roof attic to be used for habitable purposes. Precise calculations will be required demonstrating compliance and if compliance is achieved the use of this area for habitable purposes should form part of this DA. Alternatively, it should be reverted back to a non habitable attic area.</li> <li>2. The detached structure which was approved under DA2010/1193 as an "outbuilding" appears to be an unauthorised detached dwelling. I cannot determine if there are any kitchen facilities due to lack of detail but all other facilities are provided. The DA plans submitted with DA2020/0188 mention "Granny Flat" several times on plan A2002-EL(B). Has an internal inspection been conducted of both the main dwelling and granny flat?</li> <li>3. If the "Out Building" is being used as a separate dwelling it will firstly be required to be approved as such via a DA for Change of Use and then a Building information Certificate Application will be required for any unauthorised building works.</li> </ol> <p>Until such time as these matters are resolved Building Control can not offer comments for this referral.</p> <p><b>Planner Comment</b></p> <p>The matters relating to potential unauthorised works (ie. the use of the outbuilding as a detached dwelling and the habitable use of the attic level) have been referred to Council's Building Control team for further investigation. The non-compliant floor to ceiling height of the attic level prohibits the approval of such element of this proposal.</p>
NECC (Coast and Catchments)	<p>The proposal is supported for approval without condition.</p> <p>The subject land has been included on the 'Coastal Environment Area' but not been included on the Coastal Vulnerability Area Map under the State Environmental Planning Policy (Coastal Management) 2018 (CM SEPP). Hence, Clauses 13 and 15 of the CM SEPP apply for this DA.</p> <p>On internal assessment the DA satisfies the requirements under clauses 13 and 15 of the CM SEPP.</p> <p>As such, it is considered that the application does comply with the requirements of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Coastal Management) 2018.</p>

Internal Referral Body	Comments
NECC (Development Engineering)	<p>Reference is made to Development Engineering Referral Response dated 3/4/20 and additional information provided by the Applicant.</p> <p><u>Council's Stormwater Assets:</u></p> <p>The revised plans do not satisfactorily address Council's Building Over and Adjacent to Constructed Council Drainage Systems and Easements Technical Specification. In particular, the following matters are raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Footings and permanent structures adjacent to Council's pipe shall be a minimum 1 metre clear of the outside edge of pipe. The zone of influence of the footing is to be a minimum 300mm below the invert of the pipe.</li> <li>• A minimum 3 metre horizontal clearance between permanent obstructions should be demonstrated for Council access requirements.</li> </ul> <p>The proposed application cannot be supported by Development Engineering due to lack of information to address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council's stormwater assets for the development in accordance with clause C6 Building Over or Adjacent to Constructed Council Drainage Easements.</li> </ul>
NECC (Riparian Lands and Creeks)	No objection to the proposal. Approved subject to conditions.

External Referral Body	Comments
Ausgrid: (SEPP Infra.)	The proposal was referred to Ausgrid who provided a response in an email stating that the proposal is acceptable subject to compliance with the relevant Ausgrid Network Standards and SafeWork NSW Codes of Practice.

## ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING INSTRUMENTS (EPis)\*

All, Environmental Planning Instruments (SEPPs, REPs and LEPs), Development Controls Plans and Council Policies have been considered in the merit assessment of this application.

In this regard, whilst all provisions of each Environmental Planning Instruments (SEPPs, REPs and LEPs), Development Controls Plans and Council Policies have been considered in the assessment, many provisions contained within the document are not relevant or are enacting, definitions and operational provisions which the proposal is considered to be acceptable against.

As such, an assessment is provided against the controls relevant to the merit consideration of the application hereunder.

## State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs) and State Regional Environmental Plans (SREPs)

### SEPP 55 - Remediation of Land

Clause 7 (1) (a) of SEPP 55 requires the Consent Authority to consider whether land is contaminated. Council records indicate that the subject site has been used for residential purposes for a significant period of time with no prior land uses. In this regard it is considered that the site poses no risk of contamination and therefore, no further consideration is required under Clause 7 (1) (b) and (c) of SEPP 55 and the land is considered to be suitable for the residential land use.

## SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007

### Ausgrid

Clause 45 of the SEPP requires the Consent Authority to consider any development application (or an application for modification of consent) for any development carried out:

- within or immediately adjacent to an easement for electricity purposes (whether or not the electricity infrastructure exists).
- immediately adjacent to an electricity substation.
- within 5.0m of an overhead power line.
- includes installation of a swimming pool any part of which is: within 30m of a structure supporting an overhead electricity transmission line and/or within 5.0m of an overhead electricity power line.

### Comment:

The proposal was referred to Ausgrid. A standard response has been received raising no objections to the proposal.

## SEPP (Coastal Management) 2018

The site is subject to SEPP Coastal Management (2018). Accordingly, an assessment under the SEPP has been carried out as follows:

### 13 Development on land within the coastal environment area

- (1) *Development consent must not be granted to development on land that is within the coastal environment area unless the consent authority has considered whether the proposed development is likely to cause an adverse impact on the following:*
- (a) *the integrity and resilience of the biophysical, hydrological (surface and groundwater) and ecological environment,*
  - (b) *coastal environmental values and natural coastal processes,*
  - (c) *the water quality of the marine estate (within the meaning of the Marine Estate Management Act 2014), in particular, the cumulative impacts of the proposed development on any of the sensitive coastal lakes identified in Schedule 1,*
  - (d) *marine vegetation, native vegetation and fauna and their habitats, undeveloped headlands and rock platforms,*
  - (e) *existing public open space and safe access to and along the foreshore, beach, headland or rock platform for members of the public, including persons with a disability,*
  - (f) *Aboriginal cultural heritage, practices and places,*
  - (g) *the use of the surf zone.*

### Comment:

The proposed development, consisting of a front fence and internal works only is not considered likely to have an adverse impact referred to above.

- (2) *Development consent must not be granted to development on land to which this clause applies unless the consent authority is satisfied that:*
- (a) *the development is designed, sited and will be managed to avoid an adverse impact referred to in subclause (1), or*
  - (b) *if that impact cannot be reasonably avoided—the development is designed, sited and will be managed to minimise that impact, or*



- (c) if that impact cannot be minimised—the development will be managed to mitigate that impact.

Comment:

The development is designed, sited and will be managed to avoid an adverse impact referred to in subclause (1) above.

## 15 Development in coastal zone generally—development not to increase risk of coastal hazards

Development consent must not be granted to development on land within the coastal zone unless the consent authority is satisfied that the proposed development is not likely to cause increased risk of coastal hazards on that land or other land.

Comment:

The proposed development is not considered likely to cause increased risk of coastal hazards on that land or other land.

### Warringah Local Environmental Plan 2011

Is the development permissible?	Yes
After consideration of the merits of the proposal, is the development consistent with:	
aims of the LEP?	No
zone objectives of the LEP?	Yes

### Principal Development Standards

Standard	Requirement	Proposed	% Variation	Complies
Height of Buildings:	8.5m	1.8m <i>Front fence</i> Bathroom works (internal only) within existing building	N/A	Yes

### Compliance Assessment

Clause	Compliance with Requirements
4.3 Height of buildings	Yes
6.4 Development on sloping land	Yes

### Warringah Development Control Plan

#### Built Form Controls

Built Form Control	Requirement	Proposed	% Variation*	Complies
B5 Side Boundary Setbacks	0.9m <i>Southeast</i>	2.2m <i>Planter box</i>	N/A	Yes
	0.9m <i>Northwest</i>	3.9m <i>Planter box</i>	N/A	Yes
B7 Front Boundary Setbacks	6.5m	0.4-1.4m <i>Planter boxes</i>	Up to 93.9% (6.1m)	No
D1 Landscaped Open Space (LOS) and Bushland Setting	40%	Unchanged from existing	N/A	N/A

Compliance Assessment

Clause	Compliance with Requirements	Consistency Aims/Objectives
A.5 Objectives	No	No
B5 Side Boundary Setbacks	Yes	Yes
B7 Front Boundary Setbacks	No	Yes
C4 Stormwater	Yes	Yes
C5 Erosion and Sedimentation	Yes	Yes
C6 Building over or adjacent to Constructed Council Drainage Easements	No	No
C7 Excavation and Landfill	Yes	Yes
C8 Demolition and Construction	Yes	Yes
C9 Waste Management	Yes	Yes
D3 Noise	Yes	Yes
D6 Access to Sunlight	Yes	Yes
D7 Views	Yes	Yes
D8 Privacy	Yes	Yes
D9 Building Bulk	Yes	Yes
D10 Building Colours and Materials	Yes	Yes
D12 Glare and Reflection	Yes	Yes
D13 Front Fences and Front Walls	Yes	Yes
D14 Site Facilities	Yes	Yes
D20 Safety and Security	Yes	Yes
E6 Retaining unique environmental features	Yes	Yes
E10 Landslip Risk	Yes	Yes

Detailed Assessment**A.5 Objectives**

The revised plans provided pursuant to the request for withdrawal letter do not satisfactorily address stormwater concerns, therefore the application cannot be said to achieve environmentally sustainable development for the community of Warringah. This in turn will form a reason for refusal of the application.

**B7 Front Boundary Setbacks**Description of non-compliance

The proposed development comprises two (2) 500mm high planter boxes that are adjoined to the front fence. In turn, the planter boxes are sited within the front setback area thereby contravening the requirements of the Control.

Merit consideration:

With regard to the consideration for a variation, the development is considered against the underlying Objectives of the Control as follows:

- *To create a sense of openness.*

Comment:

The planter boxes will remain unseen as viewed from the streetscape, due to them being sited

behind the solid 1.8m high front fence. The planter boxes are to be filled with vegetation, which furthermore enhances the sense of openness of the site.

- *To maintain the visual continuity and pattern of buildings and landscape elements.*

Comment:

The planter boxes would not create contrast nor interrupt the visual continuity and pattern of buildings or landscape elements, due to them being 500mm high and in turn unseen as viewed from the streetscape perspective.

- *To protect and enhance the visual quality of streetscapes and public spaces.*

Comment:

The planter boxes would not hinder the visual quality of the streetscape or public spaces. The provision of additional landscape treatment within such planter boxes would enhance the aesthetics of the site and the wider streetscape.

- *To achieve reasonable view sharing.*

Comment:

No views or vistas would be hindered as a result of the planter boxes.

Having regard to the above assessment, it is concluded that the proposed development is consistent with the relevant objectives of WLEP 2011 / WDCP and the objectives specified in s1.3 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979. Accordingly, this assessment finds that the proposal is supported, in this particular circumstance.

## **C6 Building over or adjacent to Constructed Council Drainage Easements**

### Merit consideration

With regard to the consideration for a variation, the development is considered against the underlying Objectives of the Control as follows:

- *To ensure efficient construction, replacement, maintenance or access for emergency purposes to constructed public drainage systems located within private property.*

Comment:

Council's Development Engineer has reviewed the proposed development and raised objections due to a lack of information. No survey information regarding Council's pipeline asset that burdens the site was provided in support of the application. In turn, Council wrote to the applicant requesting additional information in regards to this matter. Additional information was provided, however Council's Development Engineer again is unable to support the proposed development due to non-compliances with Council's Building Over and Adjacent to Constructed Council Drainage Systems and Easements Technical Specification.

Having regard to the above assessment, it is concluded that the proposed development is inconsistent with the relevant objectives of WLEP 2011 / WDCP and the objectives specified in s1.3 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979. Accordingly, this assessment finds that the proposal is not supported,

in this particular circumstance.

In consideration of the proposal and the merit consideration would the development maintain the ability for the development to be consistent with the:	
• objectives of the DCP?	NO
• zone objectives of the LEP?	NO
• objectives of the LEP?	NO
• objects specified in s1.3 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979?	NO

Based on a merit consideration, the circumstances of this application / site and an assessment of the proposal against the underlying objectives of the clause, is:	
• Consistency with the control unreasonable?	NO
• Consistency with the control unnecessary?	NO
• Is the variation acceptable?	NO

This will form a reason for refusal of the application.

## THREATENED SPECIES, POPULATIONS OR ECOLOGICAL COMMUNITIES

The proposal will not significantly effect threatened species, populations or ecological communities, or their habitats.

## CRIME PREVENTION THROUGH ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN

The proposal is consistent with the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design.

## CONCLUSION

The site has been inspected and the application assessed having regard to all documentation submitted by the applicant and the provisions of:

- Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979;
- Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000;
- All relevant and draft Environmental Planning Instruments;
- Warringah Local Environment Plan;
- Warringah Development Control Plan; and
- Codes and Policies of Council.

This assessment has taken into consideration the submitted plans, Statement of Environmental Effects, all other documentation supporting the application and public submissions, in this regard the application is not considered to be acceptable and is recommended for refusal.

In consideration of the proposal and the merit consideration of the development, the proposal is considered

to be:

- Inconsistent with the objectives of the DCP
- Inconsistent with the zone objectives of the LEP
- Inconsistent with the aims of the LEP
- Inconsistent with the objectives of the relevant EPIs
- Inconsistent with the objects of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979

It is considered that the proposed development does not satisfy the appropriate controls and that all processes and assessments have been satisfactorily addressed.

## RECOMMENDATION

THAT Council, as the consent authority REFUSE Development Consent to Development Application No DA2020/0188 for the Alterations and additions to a dwelling house on land at Lot 3 DP 10223,49 South Creek Road, DEE WHY, for the reasons outlined as follows:

1. Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iv) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 the proposed development is inconsistent with the provisions of the Building Code of Australia.
2. Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 the proposed development is inconsistent with the Clause 1.2 Aims of The Plan of the Warringah Local Environmental Plan 2011.
3. Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 the proposed development is inconsistent with the provisions of Clause A.5 Objectives of the Warringah Development Control Plan.
4. Pursuant to Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 the proposed development is inconsistent with the provisions of Clause C6 Building Over or Adjacent to Constructed Council Drainage Easements of the Warringah Development Control Plan.

In signing this report, I declare that I do not have a Conflict of Interest.

**Signed**



**Georgia Quinn, Planner**

The application is determined on 13/05/2020, under the delegated authority of:



**Matthew Edmonds, Manager Development Assessments**