

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT - DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION ASSESSMENT REPORT

DA No. DA2009/1130

Assessment Officer: Michael Edwards

Property Address: Lot 26, Sec X, DP 3300074, No. 74 Blandford Street COLLAROY PLATEAU

Proposal Description: Conversion of an existing open carport to a new bedroom & ensuite & creation

of new open carparking spaces on driveway,

Plan Reference: 09045 Sheets 1 – 4, dated 3/8/2009, prepared by BMACO Design Studio

Tian Reference. 03043 Sheets 1 – 4, dated 6		
Report Section	Applicable	Complete & Attached
Section 1 – Code Assessment	▼ Yes No	Yes No
Section 2 – Issues Assessment	Yes No	Yes No
Section 3 – Site Inspection Analysis	Yes No	▼ Yes No
Section 4 – Application Determination	Yes No	▼ Yes □ No
Estimated Cost of Works: \$47,999		
Are S94A Contributions Applicable?		
☐ Yes No		
Notification Required?		
Yes No	✓ 14 days	21 days 30 days N/A
Submissions Received?	-	nissions: No submissions
Yes No		
Are any trees impacted upon by the proposed	development? Tyes	No
RELEVANT BACKGROUND		
There is no background information relevant to	the assessment of this	s application.
PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT		
The application seeks Council's consent for the with ensuite. The provision of two vehicle space building setback area. In this regard, the property boundary.	ces will be provided in	the hardstand area within the front
SECTION 1 - CODE ASSESSMENT REPORT	Г	
ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING INSTRUMENT	тѕ	
WLEP 2000		
Locality: D4 Collaroy Plateau		
Development Definition: Housing Ancill	ary Development to Ho	ousing Other
Category of Development: Category 1 Category 2 Category 3		



Desired Future Character:

'The Collaroy Plateau locality will remain characterised by detached style housing in landscaped settings interspersed by 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. The streets will continue to 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 properties north and east of Edgecliff Boulevard form part of the crests and sideslopes of the Collaroy escarpment. Development in this part of the locality must integrate with the landscape and topography and minimise its visual impact on long distance views of the escarpment. Rock outcrops and indigenous tree canopy will be integrated with new development where possible. The use of materials that blend with the colours and textures of the natural landscape will be encouraged.

Buildings are not to be erected on areas shown cross-hatched on the map due to the land's steep slope, instability and visual sensitivity.

The locality will continue to be served by the existing local retail centres in the areas shown on the map. Future development in these centres 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?	
Yes No		
Category 1 Development with variations to BFC's (Section 2 Assessment Required)		
Category 2 Development Consistency Test (Section 2 Assessment Required)		
Category 3 Development Consistency Test	(Section 2 Assessment Required)	
Built Form Controls:		
Building Height (overall):	▼	
Applicable: Yes No	Existing and unchanged Proposed:m	
Requirement:	Complies: Yes No	
▼ 8.5m		
11.0m		
Building Height (underside of upper most ceiling):	Existing and unchanged	
Applicable: Yes No	Existing and unchanged	
Bowinson	Proposed:m	
Requirement:	Complies: Yes No	
7.2m		
Front Setback:	Existing and unchanged	
Applicable: Yes No	Existing and unortainged	
	Proposed: 7.1m to bedroom wall	



Requirement:	No alteration to existing carport roof
6.5m	Two car spaces within the front building setback.
	Complies: Yes No
Is the Corner Allotment / Secondary Street Frontage control applicable?:	Corner Allotment:
□ _{Yes} ▼ _{No}	Existing and unchanged
Requirement:	Proposed:m
3.5m	Complies: Yes No
Housing Density:	Existing and unchanged
Applicable: Yes No	
Requirement:	Proposed:dwelling / persqm
1 dwelling per 450sqm	Complies: Yes No
1 dwelling per 600sqm Landscape Open Space:	
Applicable: Yes No	Existing and unchanged
Applicable: Tes No	Proposed:% (sqm)
40%	Complies: Yes No
50%	The works are confined to the existing hard-surfaced area and do not result in any reduction to the soft landscaped areas.
Rear Setback:	Existing and unchanged
Applicable: Yes No	
Requirement:	Proposed:m
6.0m	Complies: Yes No
Outbuildings:	Outbuildings:
Requirement:	Existing and unchanged
50% of rear setback	Proposed:%
	Complies: Yes No
Side Boundary Envelope:	
Applicable: Yes No	Boundary: Nth Sth Est Wst
Requirement:	Existing and unchanged or
4m / 45 degrees	Fully within Envelope: Yes No
5m / 45 degrees	Fully within Envelope: Yes No



	Minor Breach: Yes No	
	Complies: Yes No	
	Boundary: Nth Sth Est Wst Existing and unchanged or	
	Fully within Envelope: Yes No	
	Minor Breach: Yes No	
	Complies: Yes No	
Side Setbacks:	Boundary Nth Sth Est Wst	
Applicable: Yes No	Existing and unchanged	
900mm	or Proposed:m	
4.5m	Complies: Yes No	
	Boundary Nth Sth Est Wst Existing and unchanged or Proposed:m	
	Complies: Yes No	
General Principles of Development Control:		
CL38 Glare & reflections	Complies:	
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No	
Yes No	The imposition of conditions of consent would ensure the use of materials with a medium to dark colour so as to reduce excessive solar reflections and glare.	
CL39 Local retail centres	Complies:	
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No	
☐ Yes No	Yes Yes , subject to condition No	
CL40 Housing for Older People and People with Disabilities	Complies:	
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No	
☐ Yes No		
CL41 Brothels	Complies:	
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No	
	Yes Yes , subject to condition No	

☐ Yes ✓ No



CL42 Construction Sites	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	Yes Yes, subject to condition No The imposition of conditions of consent would ensure the appropriate management of the site during construction works.
CL43 Noise	Complies:
Applicable:	
□ Yes No	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
CL44 Pollutants	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
☐ Yes No	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
CL45 Hazardous Uses	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
☐ _{Yes} ☑ _{No}	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
CL46 Radiation Emission Levels	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
□ Yes No	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
CL47 Flood Affected Land	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
□ _{Yes} ▼ _{No}	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
CL48 Potentially Contaminated Land	Complies:
Applicable:	Based on the previous land uses if the site likely to
▼ Yes □ No	be contaminated?
Yes No	□ Yes No
	Is the site suitable for the proposed land use?
	i ·
	Yes No
CL49 Remediation of Contaminated Land	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
□ Yes No	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
CL49a Acid Sulfate Soils	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	. co , casjoot to containe.
CL50 Safety & Security	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	res res, subject to condition. No
CL51 Front Fences and Walls	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
✓ Yes No	
Yes No	The subject site currently provides a front boundary fence of approximately 1200mm in height. The application proposes the replacement of the gates over the driveway with a sliding gate. Notwithstanding no elevation details



	were submitted with the application to identify the finished height of the fence and sliding gate.	
CL52 Development Near Parks, Bushland	Complies:	
Reserves & other public Open Spaces	Yes Yes , subject to condition No	
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No	
Yes No		
CL53 Signs	Complies:	
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No	
Yes No	res res, subject to condition in	
CL54 Provision and Location of Utility Services	Complies:	
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No	
☐ Yes No		
CL55 Site Consolidation in 'Medium Density	Complies:	
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No	
Yes No	Yes Yes, subject to condition No	
CL56 Retaining Unique Environmental	Complies:	
Features on Site	Yes Yes , subject to condition No	
Applicable:	res res, subject to condition rec	
Yes No		
CL57 Development on Sloping Land	Complies:	
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No	
Yes No	Too your condition the	
CL58 Protection of Existing Flora	Complies:	
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No	
Yes No	res res, subject to condition rec	
CL59 Koala Habitat Protection	Complies:	
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No	
Yes No	res res, subject to condition rec	
CL60 Watercourses & Aquatic Habitats	Complies:	
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No	
Yes No	roo , cabjest to condition . Ite	
CL61 Views	Complies:	
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No	
Yes No	res res, subject to condition ino	
CL62 Access to sunlight	Complies:	
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No	
Yes No	. so , subject to condition	
CL63 Landscaped Open Space	Complies:	



A	I
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	The extension of the driveway and carport conversion are
	confined to the existing hard-surfaced area of the site. In this regard, there is no alteration to the quality or
	functionality of the existing provision of Landscaped Open
	Space.
CL63A Rear Building Setback	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
□ Yes No	res res , subject to condition res
	Complies:
CL64 Private open space Applicable:	,
	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	
CL65 Privacy	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
✓ Yes No	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
CL66 Building bulk	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	The conversion of the carport to a habitable room does not
	increase the finished height of the dwelling, maintaining the existing single storey character.
CL67 Roofs	Complies:
Applicable:	· ·
	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	The proposed works include the extension of the roof form over the existing carport in the north-eastern corner so as
	to provide all weather access to the front door of the
	dwelling. The extensions to the roof form maintain the existing roof pitch and form.
CL68 Conservation of Energy and Water	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	
CL69 Accessibility – Public and Semi-Public	Complies:
Buildings	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Applicable:	res res, subject to condition into
Yes No	
CL70 Site facilities	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	res res, subject to condition ino
CL71 Parking facilities (visual impact)	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	Yes Yes, subject to condition No The proposed conversion from a carport to a habitable
Yes NO	room forces the provision of carparking within the front
	building setback area, moving from a complying situation to a non-complying and non-desirable situation.
	While there are no structures proposed to the hardstand
	carparking area, were Council to grant its consent to the proposed development, the provision of carparking in this



	location, creates a situation that has the potential to later seek the construction of a carport or garage structure to an area that Council has essentially deemed appropriate for carparking. The provision of carparking within the front building setback area is not consistent with the established pattern of development within the street. While the applicant has provided justification by referring to other similar examples within the street, a review of these examples indicate that the sites were constrained due to the location of the existing dwelling, restricting the location of carparking elsewhere on-site, or, there is formal carparking behind the front building setback with casual parking within the front building setback area. The development in this instance proposes the permanent provision of carparking within the front building setback area. Such location obscures views of the street from the subject site and adjoining allotments and results in an undesirable precedent, reducing the sense of openness and landscaped settings within the front building setback area. In this regard, the parking facilities contribute to a sense of visual dominance being located right on the front property boundary.
CL72 Traffic access & safety	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
▼ Yes □ No	Yes Yes, subject to condition No The proposed development maintains provision for one (1)
Tes NO	vehicle crossing which is afforded direct access to Blandford Street. While pedestrian and vehicular access is
	combined, the volume and frequency of vehicular
	movements is minimal and will not unreasonably compromise pedestrian safety.
CL73 On-site Loading and Unloading	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
□ Yes No	res res , subject to condition No
CL74 Provision of Carparking	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
▼ Yes □ No	Yes Yes, subject to condition No The proposed development, although resulting in an
Tes NO	undesirable situation with regards to the provision of car parking, the accommodation for two (2) vehicles is
	maintained on-site.
CL75 Design of Carparking Areas	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	The proposed provision of carparking within the front building setback area, being right on the front property
	boundary, is readily apparent when viewed from the street.
	Good urban design would seek to screen the carparking from public view and utilise landscaping as a screening
	device. The proposal also necessitates the widening of the existing
	driveway to provide for the functional manoeuvring of vehicles. This further reduces the sense of a landscaped
	setting to the site which creates a sense of dominance by
CL76 Management of Stammuster	the carparking facilities.
CL76 Management of Stormwater Applicable:	Complies:
	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	
CL77 Landfill	Complies:



Γ	
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	,
CL78 Erosion & Sedimentation	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
▼ Yes □ No	The imposition of conditions of consent would ensure the
100 110	appropriate management of the site to prevent erosion and sedimentation.
CL79 Heritage Control	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	,,
CL80 Notice to Metropolitan Aboriginal Land Council and the National Parks and Wildlife	Complies:
Service	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Applicable:	·
☐ Yes ☑ No	
CL81 Notice to Heritage Council	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	Too Too , outsjoot to containen. The
CL82 Development in the Vicinity of Heritage Items	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	·
CL83 Development of Known or Potential	Complies:
Archaeological Sites Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
	res , subject to condition . No
Yes No	
Schedules:	
Schedule 5 State policies	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	res res , subject to condition into
Schedule 6 Preservation of bushland	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	
Schedule 7 Matters for consideration in a subdivision of land	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
□ Yes No	
Schedule 8 Site analysis	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
▼ Yes □ No	Yes Yes , subject to condition No



Schedule 9 Notification requirements for remediation work	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
□ Yes No	
Schedule 10 Traffic generating development	Complies:
Applicable:	
Yes No	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Schedule 11 Koala feed tree species and	Complies:
plans of management	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	
Schedule 12 Requirements for complying	Complies:
development Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
	res res, subject to condition ino
Yes No	
Schedule 13 Development guidelines for Collaroy/Narrabeen Beach	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
	100 100 , oubject to condition 110
Yes No	
Schedule 14 Guiding principles for	Complies:
development near Middle Harbour	
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	
Schedule 15 Statement of environmental	Complies:
effects	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	
Schedule 17 Carparking provision	Complies:
Applicable:	
▼ Yes □ No	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	
Other Relevant Environmental Planning Instru	ments:
SEPPs: Applicable? Yes No	
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	e?	
Yes No		
SEPP Infrastructure		
Applicable?		
Yes No		
Is the proposal for a swimming pool:		
Yes No		
Within 30m of an overhead line support stru	cture?	
□ Yes No		
Within 5m of an overhead power line ?		
Yes No		
Does the proposal comply with the SEPP?		
Yes No		
REPs: Applicable?: Yes No		
EPA Regulation Considerations:		
Clause 54 & 109 (Stop the Clock)		
Applicable:		
Yes No		
Clause 92 (Demolition of Structures)	Addressed via condition?	
Applicable:	□ _{Yes} □ _{No}	
Yes No	100 110	
Clause 92 (Government Coastal Policy)	Is the proposal consistent with the Goal and Objectives	
Applicable:	of the Government Coastal Policy?	
☐ Yes No	Yes No	
Clause 93 & 94 (Fire Safety)	Addressed via condition?	
Applicable:	□ _{Yes} □ _{No}	
Yes No	165 110	
Clause 94 (Upgrade of Building for	Addressed via condition?	
Disability Access) Applicable:	□ Yes □ No	
Yes No		
Clause 98 (BCA)	Addressed via condition?	
Applicable:	Yes No	
Yes No		



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
Bushland Management	☐ Yes Vo	Satisfactory
		Satisfactory, subject to condition
		Unsatisfactory
Catchment Management	□ _{Yes} ☑ _{No}	Satisfactory
		Satisfactory, subject to condition
		Unsatisfactory
Aboriginal Heritage		Chodiological
- and a grant serving s	Yes No	Satisfactory
		Satisfactory, subject to condition
		Unsatisfactory
Env. Health and Protection	Yes No	Satisfactory
		Satisfactory, subject to condition
		Unsatisfactory
NSW Rural Fire Service		
	Yes No	Satisfactory
		Satisfactory, subject to condition
		Unsatisfactory
Energy Australia	□ Yes No	Satisfactory
		Satisfactory, subject to condition
		Unsatisfactory



Applicable Legislation/ EPI's /Policies:	SEPP No. 55 – Remediation of Land
EPA Act 1979	_
EPA Regulations 2000	SEPP No. 71 – Coastal Protection
Disability Discrimination Act 1992	SEPP BASIX
	SEPP Infrastructure
Local Government Act 1993	W WLEP 2000
Roads Act 1993	WDCP
Rural Fires Act 1997	S94 Development Contributions Plan
RFI Act 1948	S94A Development Contributions Plan
Water Management Act 2000	_
Water Act 1912	NSW Coastal Policy (Cl 92 EPA Regulation)
Swimming Pools Act 1992;	Other
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 releval provisions of any provisions of any draft environmental	nt Yes No
planning instrument	
Section 79C (1) (a)(iii) – Have you considered all relevations of any provisions of any development control plan	
Section 79C (1) (a)(iiia) - Have you considered all relev provisions of any Planning Agreement or Draft Planning Agreement	
Section 79C (1) (a)(iv) - Have you considered all releva provisions of any Regulations?	nt Yes No
Section 79C (1) (b) – Are the likely impacts of the development, including environmental impacts on the	□ Yes No
natural and built environment and social and economic	The proposed development results in
impacts in the locality acceptable?	environmental impact on the natural and
	built environment whereby the development is considered to result in an
	undesirable planning precedent within the established streetscape.
Section 79C (1) (c) – It the site suitable for the	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
development?	Yes No
	The inability to satisfy the Desired Future Character together with inconsistencies
	with the General Principles of
	Development Control, demonstrate that the development is unsuitable for the
	subject site.
Section 79C (1) (d) – Have you considered any submissions made in accordance with the EPA Act or E	EPA ✓ Yes No
Reas?	Yes No



Section 79C (1) (e) – Is the proposal in the public interest?	□ _{Yes} ☑ _{No}
	The inability to satisfy the Desired Future Character together with inconsistencies with the General Principles of Development Control, demonstrate that the development is unsuitable for the subject site and is not in the public interest.

SECTION 2 - ISSUES

WLEP 2000

DESIRED FUTURE CHARACTER

'The Collaroy Plateau locality will remain characterised by detached style housing in landscaped settings interspersed by 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. The streets will continue to 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 properties north and east of Edgecliff Boulevard form part of the crests and sideslopes of the Collaroy escarpment. Development in this part of the locality must integrate with the landscape and topography and minimise its visual impact on long distance views of the escarpment. Rock outcrops and indigenous tree canopy will be integrated with new development where possible. The use of materials that blend with the colours and textures of the natural landscape will be encouraged.

Buildings are not to be erected on areas shown cross-hatched on the map due to the land's steep slope, instability and visual sensitivity.

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

Clause 12(3)(a) of WLEP 2000 requires the consent authority to consider Category 1 development against the locality's DFC statement. Notwithstanding Clause 12(3)(a) only requires the consideration of the DFC statement, however as detailed under the Built Form Controls Assessment section of this report the proposed development results in non-compliances with the Front Building Setback Built Form Control, as such pursuant to Clause 20(1) a higher test is required

Accordingly, an assessment of consistency of the proposed development against the locality's DFC is provided hereunder:

The proposed development is considered to satisfy the applicable DFC statement for the reasons detailed hereunder:

• The proposed development retains the detached style housing character within a landscaped setting.

Notwithstanding, the proposed development is considered to fail the applicable DFC statement for the reasons detailed hereunder:

• The established streetscape comprises landscaped front gardens with consistent front building setbacks. The provision of carparking is generally provided behind the front building setback or front building line, with the exception of a handful of properties where the provision of carparking is within the front building setback area. These examples are considered the result of existing site constraints where there is no provision for on-site carparking, providing limited alternatives for the location of carparking. The existing provision of



carparking on the subject site complies numerically, is behind the front building setback and integrated into the dwelling.

The proposed development, although numerically complying with the setback to the new building works, the provision of carparking within the front building setback area does not maintain the 'status quo' within the streetscape, providing an inconsistent visual pattern, reducing the sense of a landscaped front garden, sense of openness and setting an undesirable precedent.

It is an undesirable planning outcome and poor planning practice to convert a numerically complying and appropriate situation to a non-complying and inappropriate one.

BUILT FORM CONTROLS

As detail within Section 1 (Code Assessment) the proposed development is considered to fails satisfy the Locality's Front Building Setback Built Form Controls, accordingly, further assessment is provided hereunder.

Description of variations sought and reasons provided:

Front Building Setback Built Form Control

Requirement:

Development is to maintain a 6.5m front building setback. The front building setback area is to be landscaped and free of any structures and carparking.

Area of inconsistency with control:

The proposed conversion of the carport to a habitable room results in the provision of carparking within the front building setback area.

Merit Consideration of Non-compliance:

Clause 20(1) stipulates:

"Notwithstanding clause 12 (2) (b), consent may be granted to proposed development even if the development does not comply with one or more development standards, provided the resulting development is consistent with the general principles of development control, the desired future character of the locality and any relevant State environmental planning policy."

In determining whether the proposal qualifies for a variation under Clause 20(1) of WLEP 2000, consideration must be given to the following:

(i) General Principles of Development Control

The development does not satisfy Clauses 51 Front Fences and Walls, 71 Parking Facilities (visual impact), and 75 Design of Carparking Areas of the General Principles of Development Control and accordingly, fails to qualify to be considered for a variation to the development standards, under the provisions of Clause 20(1) (See discussion on "General Principles of Development Control" in this report for a detailed assessment of consistency).

(ii) Desired Future Character of the Locality

The proposal does not satisfy the Locality's Desired Future Character Statement and accordingly, fails to qualify to be considered for a variation to the development standards, under the provisions of Clause 20(1) (See discussion on "Desired Future Character" in this report for a detailed assessment of consistency).

(iii) Relevant State Environmental Planning Policies

The proposal has been considered consistent with all applicable State Environmental Planning Policies. (Refer to earlier discussion under 'State Environmental Planning Policies'). Accordingly the proposal qualifies to be considered for a variation to the development standards, under the provisions of Clause 20(1).



As detailed above, the proposed development does not satisfy the requirements to qualify for consideration under Clause 20(1). It is for this reason that the variation to the Front Building Setback Built Form Control (Development Standard) pursuant to Clause 20(1) is not supported.

SECTION 3 - SITE INSPECTION ANALYSIS



Site area 422.8sqm

Detail existing onsite structures:

None Caves

Dwelling Overhangs

Detached Garage Waterfalls

Detached shed

Swimming pool

Creeks / Watercourse
Aboriginal Art / Carvings

Tennis Court

Any Item of / or any potential item of heritage significance

Cabana

Other: Attached double carport

Potential View Loss as a result of development

Yes No

Site Features: If Yes where from (in relation to site):

None North / South

✓ Trees East / West

Under Storey Vegetation North East / South West

Rock Outcrops North West / South East



View of:
Ocean / Waterways Yes No
Headland Yes No
Bushfire Prone?
☐ Yes No
Flood Prone?
☐ Yes No
Affected by Acid Sulfate Soils
☐ Yes No
Located within 40m of any natural watercourse?
□ Yes 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 ✓ No
Located within 100m of the mean high watermark?
☐ Yes 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 No
Located within an area identified as potential land slip?
☐ Yes No
Is the development Integrated?
☐ Yes No
Does the development require concurrence?
☐ Yes No

District Views	Yes	No
Bushland	Yes	No

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

☐ Yes ✓ No

Have you reviewed the DP and s88B instrument?

▼ Yes □ No

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

☐ Yes ✓ No

It is acknowledged that an easement runs along the southern boundary of the subject site to permit the eave overhang and portion of the adjoining dwelling constructed within the confines of the subject site. Although a portion of the proposed driveway extension falls within the easement, the development does not result in any unreasonable impact on the functionality or suitability of the easement or the structures contained within the easement.



Site Inspection / Desktop Assessment Undertaken by:

confirm the	te inspection <section 3=""> assessment undertaken relevant EPI's <section's< th=""><th>Yes No</th></section's<></section>	Yes No
Are there any additional matters that have arisen from your site inspection that would require any additional assessment to be undertaken?		□ _{Yes} No
		If yes provide detail:
	•	
Signed	Date 8 C	October 2009
Michael Edv	wards, Development Asses	sment Officer
SECTION 4	– APPLICATION DETERMI	NATION
Conclusion	:	
	al has been considered again d the proposed development	ist the relevant heads of consideration under S79C of the EPA is considered to be:
□ Satisfact	ory	
Unsatisfa	actory	
Recommen	dation:	
That Counc	il as the consent authority	
GRA	NT DEVELOPMENT CONSI	ENT to the development application subject to:
	the conditions detailed with the consent lapsing within t	in the associated notice of determination; and hree (3) from operation
GR to:	ANT DEFERRED COMMEN	ICEMENT CONSENT to the development application subject
(b)	limit the deferred commenc one the deferred commenc operational consent subject	in the associated notice of determination; sement condition time frame to 3 years; ement matter have been satisfactorily addressed issue an to the time frames detailed within part (d); and
(d)	the consent lapsing within t	hree (3) from operation



V

REFUSE development consent to the development application subject to:

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

"I am aware of Warringah's Code of Conduct and, in signing this report, declare that I do not have a Conflict of Interest"

Signed Date 8 October 2009

Michael Edwards, Development Assessment Officer

The application is determined under the delegated authority of:

Signed Date 8 October 2009

Steven Findlay, Team Leader, Development Assessment