

APPLICATION FOR MODIFICATION ASSESSMENT REPORT

Application Number:	Mod2019/0246
----------------------------	--------------

Responsible Officer:	Catriona Shirley
Land to be developed (Address):	Lot 20 DP 9500, 10 Halesmith Road MONA VALE NSW 2103
Proposed Development:	Modification of Development Consent N0436/11 granted for secondary dwelling and alterations and additions to an existing dwelling
Zoning:	R2 Low Density Residential
Development Permissible:	Yes
Existing Use Rights:	No
Consent Authority:	Northern Beaches Council
Land and Environment Court Action:	No
Owner:	Natalie Amanda Digby-Bennet Brett Digby-Bennet
Applicant:	Brett Digby-Bennet

Application Lodged:	24/05/2019
Integrated Development:	No
Designated Development:	No
State Reporting Category:	Residential - Alterations and additions
Notified:	03/06/2019 to 17/06/2019
Advertised:	Not Advertised
Submissions Received:	2
Clause 4.6 Variation:	Nil
Recommendation:	Approval

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT IN DETAIL

The application seek the approval for a double carport in the location of the previously approved double garage. The proposals double carport continues the previously approved 0.0m front setback, is smaller in size than the previously approved garage, and has a more open style presentation to Halesmith Road.

The application is also seek retrospective approval for the covered portico on the northern elevation of the ground floor of the dwelling house.

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

Pittwater 21 Development Control Plan - C1.3 View Sharing

Pittwater 21 Development Control Plan - C1.4 Solar Access

Pittwater 21 Development Control Plan - D9.1 Character as viewed from a public place

Pittwater 21 Development Control Plan - D9.6 Front building line

SITE DESCRIPTION

Property Description:	Lot 20 DP 9500 , 10 Halesmith Road MONA VALE NSW 2103
Detailed Site Description:	The site is identified as Lot 20 within DP 9500, known as 10 Halesmith Road, Mona Vale. The site is located within the R2 Low Density Residential zone within the Pittwater Local Environment Plan 2014. The site is regular in shape and has a size area of 806sqm. The site is a corner allotment on the corner of Halesmith Road and Rednal Street. The subject site is located on the southern side of Halesmith Road with a primary street frontage of 15.24m to Halesmith Road and a secondary frontage of 41.14m to Rednal Street. The site is relatively flat and currently holds a single two storey brick and timber clad dwelling. The characteristic of adjoining dwellings include one and two storey dwellings and a four storey apartment block to the east, within a landscaped setting.

Map:



SITE HISTORY

A search of Northern Beaches Council's records has revealed the following relevant development applications:

- Development Application **N0436/11** for a secondary dwelling and alterations and additions to an existing dwelling was determined by The Pittwater Council Application Determination Panel on the 24 May, 2012.
- Modification Application **N0436/11/S96/1** for a secondary dwelling and alterations and additions to an existing dwelling (changes to doors, windows, roof over upper floor deck and skylights) was approved by Pittwater Council on the 17 May, 2013.
- Modification Application **N0436/11/S96/2** for a secondary dwelling and alterations and additions to an existing dwelling (removal of existing approval of secondary dwelling and relocation of garage closer to a dwelling house) was approved by Pittwater Council on the 12 August, 2014.
- Modification Application **N0436/11/S96/3** for a secondary dwelling and alterations and additions to a existing dwelling (changes to windows) was approved by Northern Beaches Council on the 7 February, 2017.
- Development Application **N0439/10** for construction of a new carport was approved by Pittwater Council on the 27 September, 2010.

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT ACT, 1979 (EPAA)

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

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 and is attached taking into all relevant provisions of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 and associated regulations;

- A site inspection was conducted and consideration has been given to the impacts of the development upon all lands whether nearby, adjoining or at a distance;
- Consideration was given to all documentation provided (up to the time of determination) by the applicant, persons who have made submissions regarding the application and any advice given by relevant Council / Government / Authority Officers on the proposal;

In this regard, the consideration of the application adopts the previous assessment detailed in the Assessment Report for Development Application N436/11, in full, with amendments detailed and assessed as follows:

The relevant matters for consideration under Section 4.55(1A) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979, are:

Section 4.55(1A) - Other Modifications	Comments
A consent authority may, on application being made by the applicant or any other person entitled to act on a consent granted by the consent authority and subject to and in accordance with the regulations, modify the consent if:	
(a) it is satisfied that the proposed modification is of minimal environmental impact, and	Yes The modification, as proposed in this application, is considered to be of minimal environmental impact.
(b) it is satisfied that the development to which the consent as modified relates is substantially the same development as the development for which consent was originally granted and before that consent as originally granted was modified (if at all), and	The development, as proposed, has been found to be such that Council is satisfied that the proposed works are substantially the same as those already approved under Development Application N0436/11.
(c) it has notified the application in accordance with: (i) the regulations, if the regulations so require, or (ii) a development control plan, if the consent authority is a council that has made a development control plan under section 72 that requires the notification or advertising of applications for modification of a development consent, and	The application has been publicly exhibited in accordance with the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000, Pittwater Local Environment Plan 2011 and Pittwater 21 Development Control Plan.
(d) it has considered any submissions made concerning the proposed modification within any period prescribed by the regulations or provided by the development control plan, as the case may be.	See discussion on "Notification & Submissions Received" in this report.

Section 4.15 Assessment

In accordance with Section 4.55 (3) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, in determining an modification application made under Section 4.55 the consent authority must take into consideration such of the matters referred to in section 4.15 (1) as are of relevance to the development the subject of the application.

The relevant matters for consideration under Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979, are:

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	None applicable.
Section 4.15 (1) (a)(iii) – Provisions of any development control plan	Pittwater 21 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)	Division 8A of the EP&A Regulation 2000 requires the consent authority to consider Prescribed conditions of development consent. These matters have been addressed via a condition in the original consent. Clauses 54 and 109 of the EP&A Regulation 2000, Council requested additional information and has therefore considered the number of days taken in this assessment in light of this clause within the Regulations. No Additional information was requested. Clause 92 of the EP&A Regulation 2000 requires the consent authority to consider AS 2601 - 1991: The Demolition of Structures. This matter has been addressed via a condition in the original consent. Clauses 93 and/or 94 of the EP&A Regulation 2000 requires the consent authority to consider the upgrading of a building (including fire safety upgrade of development). This matter has been addressed via a condition in the original consent. Clause 98 of the EP&A Regulation 2000 requires the consent authority to consider insurance requirements under the Home Building Act 1989. This matter has been addressed via a condition in the original consent. Clause 98 of the EP&A Regulation 2000 requires the consent authority to consider the provisions of the Building Code of Australia (BCA). This matter has been addressed via a condition in the original consent.
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	(i) Environmental Impact The environmental impacts of the proposed development on the natural and built environment are addressed under the Pittwater 21 Development Control Plan section in this report. (ii) Social Impact The proposed development will not have a detrimental

Section 4.15 'Matters for Consideration'	Comments
	social impact in the locality considering the character of the proposal. (iii) Economic Impact The proposed development will not have a detrimental economic impact on the locality considering the nature of the existing and proposed land use.
Section 4.15 (1) (c) – the suitability of the site for the development	The site is considered suitable 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	No matters have arisen in this assessment that would justify the refusal of the application 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 process council is in receipt of 2 submission/s from:

Name:	Address:
Mrs Kim Margaret Biddulph	5 / 5 Albert Street NARRABEEN NSW 2101

The following issues were raised in the submissions and each have been addressed below:

- View Loss
- Overshadowing
- Conversion to a secondary dwelling
- Landscape area

The matters raised within the submissions are addressed as follows:

- ***There is concern that the carport will obstruct views from No.1 Rednal Street from the front terrace area.***

Comment:

It was determined from a site inspection that there is no significant or unreasonable view loss as

a result of the carport.

Therefore, it is considered that this issue has been addressed and does not warrant amendment or refusal of the modification application.

- ***There is concern that there will be additional overshadowing to No.1 Rednal Street from the carport.***

Comment:

The proposal will result in no additional overshadowing impacts to the adjoining properties of No.1 Rednal Street.

Therefore, it is considered that this issue has been addressed and does not warrant amendment or refusal of the modification application.

- ***There is concern that the carport will be converted to a secondary dwelling.***

Comment:

The modification application is for the construction and use of this area as a carparking facility. Any change to the built form or use of this area would require a new development application to be submitted.

Therefore, it is considered that this issue has been addressed and does not warrant amendment or refusal of the modification application.

- ***There is concern that the site does not comply with the minimum required landscape area.***

Comment:

There is no change to the previously approved landscape open space area.

Therefore, it is considered that this issue does not warrant refusal of the modification application.

REFERRALS

Internal Referral Body	Comments
NECC (Bushland and Biodiversity)	The proposed modification will not impact biodiversity values, therefore no further assessment or consent conditions required.
NECC (Coast and Catchments)	The application has been assessed in consideration of the Coastal Management Act 2016, State Environmental Planning Policy (Coastal Management) 2018 and also against requirements of the Pittwater LEP 2014 and Pittwater 21 DCP. 12 Development on land within the coastal vulnerability area <i>Development consent must not be granted to development on land that is within the area identified as "coastal vulnerability area" on the Coastal Vulnerability Area Map unless the consent authority is</i>

Internal Referral Body	Comments
	<i>satisfied that:</i> (a) <i>if the proposed development comprises the erection of a building or works—the building or works are engineered to withstand current and projected coastal hazards for the design life of the building or works, and</i> (b) <i>the proposed development:</i> (i) <i>is not likely to alter coastal processes to the detriment of the natural environment or other land, and</i> (ii) <i>is not likely to reduce the public amenity, access to and use of any beach, foreshore, rock platform or headland adjacent to the proposed development, and</i> (iii) <i>incorporates appropriate measures to manage risk to life and public safety from coastal hazards, and</i> (c) <i>measures are in place to ensure that there are appropriate responses to, and management of, anticipated coastal processes and current and future coastal hazards.</i> <u>Comment:</u> The subject land has not been included on the Coastal Vulnerability Area Map under State Environmental Planning Policy (Coastal Management) 2018 (CM SEPP) and in regard to CM SEPP the proposed development is unlikely to cause increased risk of coastal hazards on the subject land or other land As such, it is considered that the application does comply with the requirements of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Coastal Management) 2018.
NECC (Development Engineering)	The modification is recommend approval. No additional conditions are to be applied.
NECC (Riparian Lands and Creeks)	This application does not increase impervious area, and therefore does not trigger stormwater controls under Pittwater 21 DCP B5.8 and the SEPP (Coastal Management) 2018 (Coastal Environment Area).
Parks, reserves, beaches, foreshore	There is no objection or conditions to be applied to the proposed modification.

External Referral Body	Comments
Ausgrid: (SEPP Infra.)	The proposal was referred to Ausgrid. No response has been received within the 21 day statutory period and therefore, it is assumed that no objections are raised and no conditions are recommended.

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. No response has been received within the 21 day statutory period and therefore, it is assumed that no objections are raised and no conditions are recommended.

SEPP (Coastal Management) 2018

The subject site is identified as being located within the Coastal Use Area under the provisions of SEPP (*Coastal Management*) 2018. Upon review of the application, Council can be satisfied of the matters prescribed by Clauses 13, 14 and 15 of this policy.

Pittwater Local Environmental Plan 2014

Is the development permissible?	Yes

After consideration of the merits of the proposal, is the development consistent with:	
aims of the LEP?	Yes
zone objectives of the LEP?	Yes

Principal Development Standards

Development Standard	Requirement	Approved	Proposed	% Variation	Complies
Height of Buildings:	8.5m	8.5m	No change to overall height of the dwelling house 4m Carport 3m Awning	- - -	Yes Yes Yes

Compliance Assessment

Clause	Compliance with Requirements
1.9A Suspension of covenants, agreements and instruments	Yes
4.3 Height of buildings	Yes
5.10 Heritage conservation	Yes
7.1 Acid sulfate soils	Yes
7.2 Earthworks	Yes

Pittwater 21 Development Control Plan

Built Form Controls

Built Form Control	Requirement	Approved	Proposed	Complies
Front building line	6.5m	15.7m dwelling	13.2m Awning	Yes
Secondary Front building line	3.25m	0m Garage	0.m Carport	Yes
Side building line	2.5m Southern	0.5m - 11.65m	7.0m Carport	Yes
	1m Western	1.95m - 2.9m	2.23m Awning 12.13m Carport	Yes Yes
Building envelope	3.5m	Within envelope	Within envelope	Yes
	3.5m	Within envelope	Within envelope	Yes
Landscaped area	50%	62.3% (502.2sqm)	no change	Yes

Compliance Assessment

Clause	Compliance with Requirements	Consistency Aims/Objectives
A1.7 Considerations before consent is granted	Yes	Yes
A4.9 Mona Vale Locality	Yes	Yes
A5.1 Exhibition, Advertisement and Notification of Applications	Yes	Yes
B5.10 Stormwater Discharge into Public Drainage System	Yes	Yes

Clause	Compliance with Requirements	Consistency Aims/Objectives
B6.1 Access driveways and Works on the Public Road Reserve	Yes	Yes
B6.2 Internal Driveways	Yes	Yes
B6.3 Off-Street Vehicle Parking Requirements	Yes	Yes
C1.3 View Sharing	Yes	Yes
C1.4 Solar Access	Yes	Yes
D9.1 Character as viewed from a public place	Yes	Yes
D9.2 Scenic protection - General	Yes	Yes
D9.3 Building colours and materials	Yes	Yes
D9.6 Front building line	Yes	Yes
D9.7 Side and rear building line	Yes	Yes
D9.11 Landscaped Area - Environmentally Sensitive Land	Yes	Yes

Detailed Assessment

C1.3 View Sharing

In determining the extent of potential view loss to adjoining and nearby properties and whether the proposal demonstrates view sharing, the four (4) Planning Principles outlined within the *Land and Environment Court Case of Tenacity Consulting Pty Ltd Vs Warringah Council (2004) NSWLEC 140*, are applied to the proposal.

One (1) submission was received, which raised concern regarding view loss.

There was no view loss assessment under the original DA or the subsequent modification applications, therefore a detailed view loss assessment was undertaken from the one storey dwelling house at No.1 Rednal Street.

It was determined via a site visit that there are no significant views affected by the proposal from No.10 Halesmith Road, Mona Vale.

The view loss assessment is undertaken below.

Step 1. Nature of the views affected

"The first step is the assessment of the views to be affected. Water views are valued more highly than land views. Iconic views (e.g. of the Opera House, the Harbour Bridge or North Head) are valued more highly than views without icons. Whole views are valued more highly than partial views, e.g. a water view in which the interface between land and water is visible is more valuable than one in which it is obscured".

Comment to Step 1:

The effected views from the front elevated veranda of the one storey dwelling house consists of a minor area of district views to the north of the tree line, a water glimpse, and the upper portion of boat masts.

Step 2. What part of the affected property are the views obtained

"The second step is to consider from what part of the property the views are obtained. For example the protection of views across side boundaries is more difficult than the protection of views from front and rear boundaries. In addition, whether the view is enjoyed from a standing or sitting position may also be

relevant. Sitting views are more difficult to protect than standing views. The expectation to retain side views and sitting views is often unrealistic”.

Comment to Step 2:

The views from property are obtained over the northern side boundary, and also over No.2B Rednal Street dwelling house roof-line on the opposite side of Rednal Street. The views to the north are obtained from the front elevated terrace. The identified views are from a standing position only.



Photo 1. Views to the north from front balcony of No.1 Rednal Street.

Step 3. Extent of impact

“The third step is to assess the extent of the impact. This should be done for the whole of the property, not just for the view that is affected. The impact on views from living areas is more significant than from bedrooms or service areas (though views from kitchens are highly valued because people spend so much time in them). The impact may be assessed quantitatively, but in many cases this can be meaningless. For example, it is unhelpful to say that the view loss is 20% if it includes one of the sails of the Opera House. It is usually more useful to assess the view loss qualitatively as negligible, minor, moderate, severe or devastating”.

Comment to step 3:

It is considered that the modified development will involve some impact upon the small corridor of district views from the front terrace area. It is considered that the view loss from the front terrace will be a small area of distant tree canopy vegetation, upper boat masts and water glimpse. The view loss impact is considered to be **minor**.

Step 4. Reasonableness of the proposal that is causing the impact

“The fourth step is to assess the reasonableness of the proposal that is causing the impact. A development that complies with all planning controls would be considered more reasonable than one that breaches them. Where an impact on views arises as a result of non-compliance with one or more planning controls, even a moderate impact may be considered unreasonable. With a complying proposal, the question should be asked whether a more skilful design could provide the applicant with the same development potential and amenity and reduce the impact on the views of neighbours. If the answer to that question is no, then the view impact of a complying development would probably be considered acceptable and the view sharing reasonable.”

Comment to Step 4:

Of relevance to the view sharing analysis, the development is compliant with the building height standard, however the proposal has been found to exhibit non-compliance with the Front Building Line built form control under P21 DCP.

However, this element of non-compliance was previously approved and the change from a garage to a open style carport will increase a sense of openness within the secondary front setback. It is considered that the non-compliance's not cause unreasonable view loss.

In view of the above and the Tenacity Planning Principal, it is considered that the modified proposal and consequent minor view loss is reasonable in this circumstance.

Conclusion

The current view lines, are extremely vulnerable to any form of development on this and neighbouring properties.

The proposal's compliance with the building height standard combined with previously approved setbacks ensure reasonable view sharing is provided in this instance.

Having regard to the above assessment, it is concluded that the proposed development is consistent with the relevant objectives of PLEP 2014 / P21 DCP 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.

C1.4 Solar Access

The modified proposal has been designed in a manner that does not unreasonable nor detrimentally create additional overshadowing to adjoining and nearby properties.

D9.1 Character as viewed from a public place

The open style carport, and portico improve the presentation of the built form to the Halesmith Road and Rendal Street streetscape.

The carport is open in style, provides a reduced bulk and scale of the built form, which is less visually dominate when viewed from the street or neighbouring properties.

The portico is an improved architectural feature that reflects the establish built form character of the dwelling house, and provides weather protection for the occupants.

In this regard the modified built form improves the presentation to the streetview and continues to sit comfortably with adjoining residential development. On balance, the proposal is considered consistent

with the desired future character of the locality.

D9.6 Front building line

There is no change to the previously approved carparking setback to Rednal Street.

The proposed carport will be located over the previously approved garage footprint, attached to the dwelling house, and is open in structure. Thus, it will improve the sense of openness in the front setback.

The proposed open style carport is designed sympathetically to compliment the style of the dwelling house. The carport will improve the facade and carparking arrangement onsite. In this regard the visual quality of the streetscape is maintained.

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.

POLICY CONTROLS

Northern Beaches Section 7.12 Contributions Plan 2019

Section 7.12 contributions were levied on the Development Application.

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;
- Pittwater Local Environment Plan;
- Pittwater 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, and does not result in any unreasonable impacts on surrounding, adjoining, adjacent and nearby properties subject to the conditions contained within the recommendation.

In consideration of the proposal and the merit consideration of the development, the proposal is considered to be:

- Consistent with the objectives of the DCP
- Consistent with the zone objectives of the LEP
- Consistent with the aims of the LEP

- Consistent with the objectives of the relevant EPIs
- Consistent with the objects of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979

It is considered that the proposed development satisfies the appropriate controls and that all processes and assessments have been satisfactorily addressed.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT Council as the consent authority grant approval to Modification Application No. Mod2019/0246 for Modification of Development Consent N0436/11 granted for secondary dwelling and alterations and additions to an existing dwelling on land at Lot 20 DP 9500, 10 Halesmith Road, MONA VALE, subject to the conditions printed below:

A. Add Condition No.1A - Modification of Consent - Approved Plans and supporting Documentation to read as follows:

The development must be carried out in compliance (except as amended by any other condition of consent) with the following:

a) Modification Approved Plans

Architectural Plans - Endorsed with Council's stamp		
Drawing No.	Dated	Prepared By
Site Plan	17/10/2019	Unauthored
North and East Elevation	25/09/2019	Unauthored
South and West Elevation	25/09/2019	Unauthored

b) Any plans and / or documentation submitted to satisfy the Conditions of this consent.

Reason: To ensure the work is carried out in accordance with the determination of Council and approved plans.

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

Signed



Catriona Shirley, Planner

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



Steven Findlay, Manager Development Assessments