

# **RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT - DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION ASSESSMENT REPORT**

DA No. DA2009/0550

Assessment Officer: Shaylin Moodliar

Property Address: Lot 1 in DP 518716, No. 55 Cannons Parade FORESTVILLE

Proposal Description: Construction of a new swimming pool and associated decking and

landscaping

Plan Reference: LPDA 09-257/1 to LPDA 09-257/6 dated March 2009)

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: \$ 47 500				
Are S94A Contributions Applicable?				
Yes No				
Notification Required?	Period of Pu	blic Exhibition?		
Yes No				
Submissions Received?	No. of Submissions: One (1)			
✓ Yes No				
Are any trees impacted upon by the proposed of	development? Yes	No No		
SECTION 1 – CODE ASSESSMENT REPORT				
ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING INSTRUMENT	rs			
WLEP 2000				
Locality: C1 Middle Harbour Suburbs				
Development Definition: Housing Ancillary Development to Housing Other				
Category of Development: Category 1 Category 2 Category 3  Desired Future Character:				
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 E	BFC's (Section 2 As	ssessment Required)		
Category 2 Development Consistency Test	(Section 2 As	ssessment Required)		
Category 3 Development Consistency Test	(Section 2 As	ssessment Required)		

**Built Form Controls:** 



Building Height (overall):	Existing and unchanged
Applicable: Yes No	Proposed:
Requirement:	Complies: Yes No
8.5m	
11.0m	
Other	
Building Height (underside of upper most ceiling):	V
Applicable: Yes No	Existing and unchanged
Requirement:	Proposed:
7.2m	Complies: Yes No
Other	
Front Setback:	V
Applicable: Yes No	Existing and unchanged
Requirement:	Proposed: No proposed development within the front
<b>№</b> 6.5m	yard.
	Complies: Yes No
Other  Is the Corner Allotment / Secondary Street Frontage	Corner Allotment:
control applicable?:	
Yes No	Existing and unchanged
Requirement:	Proposed:m
3.5m	Complies: Yes No
Other	
Housing Density:	E
	Existing and unchanged
Applicable: Yes No Requirement:	Proposed: 1 dwelling / per 714 sqm
п	
1 dwelling per 450sqm	Complies: Yes No
1 dwelling per 600sqm	
Other	
Landscape Open Space:	П
Applicable: Yes No	Existing and unchanged
	<b>Proposed</b> : 45% (322 sqm)
40% (285 sqm)	Complies: Yes No
50% (sqm)	
Other	



Rear Setback:	
Applicable: Yes No	Existing and unchanged
Requirement:	Proposed: 2m
<b>▼</b> 6.0m	Complies: Yes No
Other	Outbuildings:
Outbuildings:	
Requirement:	Existing and unchanged
50% of rear setback	<b>Proposed:</b> 49% (56sqm)
Other	Complies: Yes No
Side Boundary Envelope:	Boundary: Nth Sth Est Wst
Applicable: Yes No	
Requirement:	Existing and unchanged
4m / 45 degrees	or
Г	Fully within Envelope: Yes No
5m / 45 degrees	Minor Breach: Yes No
Other	
	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: 7m (to pool coping)
4.5m	Complies: Yes No
Other	Boundary Nth Sth Est Wst
	Existing and unchanged
	or
	Proposed: Nil
	Complies: Yes No (further assessment)
Other:	



# **General Principles of Development Control:**

CL38 Glare & reflections	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
CL39 Local retail centres	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
CL40 Housing for Older People and People	Complies:
with Disabilities	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Applicable:	res res, subject to condition ino
Yes No	
CL41 Brothels	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
☐ Yes No	Too yourjost to condition.
CL42 Construction Sites	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	res res, subject to condition rec
CL43 Noise	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	res res, subject to condition into
CL44 Pollutants	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	res res, subject to condition into
CL45 Hazardous Uses	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	res res, subject to condition into
CL46 Radiation Emission Levels	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	res res, subject to condition into
CL47 Flood Affected Land	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	res res, subject to condition into
CL48 Potentially Contaminated Land	Complies:
Applicable:	Based on the previous land uses if the site likely to be contaminated?
Yes No	□ <sub>Yes</sub> ▼ <sub>No</sub>
	Is the site suitable for the proposed land use?
	▼ Yes □ No



CL49 Remediation of Contaminated Land	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
☐ Yes No	res res, subject to condition into
CL49a Acid Sulfate Soils	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
☐ Yes No	res res, subject to condition ino
CL50 Safety & Security	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	res res, subject to condition rec
CL51 Front Fences and Walls	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
☐ Yes No	res res, subject to condition into
CL52 Development Near Parks, Bushland	Complies:
Reserves & other public Open Spaces Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
☐ Yes No	
CL53 Signs	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
☐ Yes No	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
CL54 Provision and Location of Utility	Complies:
Services Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
	,
Yes No	
CL55 Site Consolidation in 'Medium Density	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
□ Yes No	res res, subject to condition rec
CL56 Retaining Unique Environmental	Complies:
Features on Site Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	Too youngest to contained.
CL57 Development on Sloping Land	Complies:
Applicable:	
	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	
CL58 Protection of Existing Flora	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
☐ Yes No	res res, subject to condition inc
CL59 Koala Habitat Protection	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No



□ Yes ▼ No	
CL60 Watercourses & Aquatic Habitats	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
☐ Yes No	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
CL61 Views	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
CL62 Access to sunlight	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
CL63 Landscaped Open Space	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
CL63A Rear Building Setback	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
✓ Yes No	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
CL64 Private open space	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
CL65 Privacy	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
✓ Yes □ No	Subject to the swimming pool deck being a minimum of
res no	900mm off the eastern side boundary, the proposed
	development is unlikely to cause an unreasonable direct overlooking of principal private open spaces of the
	surrounding properties.
CL66 Building bulk	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	res res, subject to condition no
CL67 Roofs	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
CL68 Conservation of Energy and Water	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	res res, subject to condition ino
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	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
CL71 Parking facilities (visual impact)	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
CL72 Traffic access & safety	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
☐ Yes No	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
CL73 On-site Loading and Unloading	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
☐ Yes No	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
CL74 Provision of Carparking	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
✓ Yes No	Yes Yes, subject to condition No
CL75 Design of Carparking Areas	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	·
CL76 Management of Stormwater	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	,
CL77 Landfill	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	
CL78 Erosion & Sedimentation	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	res res, subject to condition rec
CL79 Heritage Control	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	res res, subject to condition rec
CL80 Notice to Metropolitan Aboriginal Land	Complies:
Council and the National Parks and Wildlife Service	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Applicable:	1 65 1 65 , SUDJECT TO COTTUITION INC
Yes No	Complian
CL81 Notice to Heritage Council	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	Aborgated.



CL82 Development in the Vicinity of Heritage	Complies:
Items 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
☐ Yes No	·
Schedules:	
Schedule 5 State policies	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	Yes Yes, subject to condition No
Schedule 6 Preservation of bushland	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	Too Too , caspeer to contained.
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	res res , subject to condition into
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 Yes , subject to condition No
Yes 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 development	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
□ Yes No	
Schedule 13 Development guidelines for	Complies:
Collaroy/Narrabeen Beach Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No



☐ Yes ☑ No			
Schedule 14 Guiding principles for development near Middle Harbour Applicable:	Complies:  Yes Yes , subject to condition No		
Schedule 15 Statement of environmental	Complies:		
effects Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No		
Yes No	res res , suspect to containen.		
Schedule 17 Carparking provision	Complies:		
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No		
Yes No	. ,		
Other Relevant Environmental Planning Instru	iments:		
SEPPs: Applicable? Yes No SEPP Basix: Applicable?			
✓ Yes No			
If yes: Has the applicant provided Basix Certificat	ion?		
□ Yes No			
SEPP 55 Applicable?			
▼ Yes □ No			
Based on the previous land uses if the site likely to be contaminated?			
□ Yes Vo			
Is the site suitable for the proposed land use?			
▼ Yes □ No			
SEPP Infrastructure			
Applicable?			
Yes No			
Is the proposal for a swimming pool: Within 30m of an overhead line support structure?			
Yes No			
Yes No Within 5m of an overhead power line ?			
Yes No			
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:	□ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>
☐ Yes No	Yes No
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:	Tyes No
Yes No	Yes No
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	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	□ <sub>Yes</sub> ▼ <sub>No</sub>	Satisfactory
		Satisfactory, subject to condition
		Unsatisfactory
Catchment Management	□ Yes No	Satisfactory
		Satisfactory, subject to condition



			Unsatisfactory
Aboriginal Heritage	□ <sub>Yes</sub> No		Satisfactory
			Satisfactory, subject to condition
			Unsatisfactory
Env. Health and Protection	□ Yes V No		Satisfactory
	100 110		Satisfactory, subject to condition
			Unsatisfactory
NSW Rural Fire Service	▼ Yes □ No		Satisfactory
	Yes No		Satisfactory, subject to condition
			Unsatisfactory
Energy Australia			
	Yes No		Satisfactory
			Satisfactory, subject to condition
			Unsatisfactory
Applicable Legislation/ EPI's /P	olicies:	V	Swimming Pools Act 1992;
EPA Act 1979			SEPP No. 55 – Remediation of Land
_		SEPP No. 71 – Coastal Protection	
3			SEPP BASIX
Local Government Act 1993			SEPP Infrastructure
Roads Act 1993		✓,	WLEP 2000
Rural Fires Act 1997		✓,	WDCP
RFI Act 1948			S94 Development Contributions Plan
Water Management Act 2000			S94A Development Contributions Plan
Water Act 1912			NSW Coastal Policy (cl 92 EPA Regulation)
			Other
SECTION 79C EPA ACT 1979  Section 79C (1) (a)(i) – Have you considered all relevant			
provisions of any relevant environ instrument?	mental planning		Yes No



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



#### **SECTION 2 - ISSUES**

#### **PUBLIC EXHIBTION**

The subject application was publicly exhibited in accordance with the EPA Regulation 2000 and the applicable Development Control Plan.

As a result of the public exhibition of the application Council received submissions from:

Name	Address
David Martin	No. 59 Cannons Parade, Forestville

The following issues were raised in the submissions:

- Stormwater drainage/interference with the main sewer line;
- Tree removal:

The matters raised within the submissions are addressed as follows:

• Stormwater drainage/interference with the main sewer line;

Comment: The submission has raised concern regarding the possibility of stormwater drainage leakage and/or interference with the main sewer line from the proposed swimming pool. The proposed pool is required to be built in accordance with the Built Form Controls. The plans received by the Council on 11 May 2009 show the swimming pool being 2 metres from the adjoining No.59 Cannons Parade rear property boundary, however, given the whole lot of No.55 Cannons Parade is located on the same level than the adjoining properties along Cannons Parade, any possible leakage from erosion of sedimentation from the swimming pool and any property damage is a civil matter to be managed wholly by No.55 Cannons Parade. A condition of consent will be imposed that ensures that approved consent plans are in concurrence with Sydney Water sewer and water mains, stormwater drains and/or easements. Furthermore, the proposed development is considered to meet Clause 76 (Management of Stormwater) of the WLEP 2000.

Tree removal:

**Comment:** The submission has raised concern regarding the possibility of property damage due to the proposed tree removal. The proposed tree removal on the subject site will not adversely affect the adjoining properties and the proposed tree removal will be replaced by a landscaped setting that is compatible with surrounding lands. Furthermore, the proposed development will have selected landscape plantings up to 15 metres in height, which will enhance privacy between dwellings and create a sense of openness in the surrounding the rear yards.

## **MEDIATION**

Has mediation been requested by the objectors?	☐ Yes / ☑ No
Has the applicant agreed to mediation?	Yes / No No N/A
Has mediation been conducted?	□ Yes / □ No ☑ N/A

### **WLEP 2000**

#### **DESIRED FUTURE CHARACTER**

The Middle Harbour Suburbs locality will remain characterised by detached-style housing in landscaped settings interspersed by a range of complementary and compatible uses. The land adjacent to Middle Harbour and occupied by the Mosman Rowing Club will be retained for low-scale recreational use sympathetic to its natural setting. The land occupied by the Killarney Heights Tennis Centre at Lot 841 DP 210006 and land occupied by the Killarney Heights Swim Centre at Lot 854 DP 210006 on Tralee Avenue and the land occupied by Belrose Bowling Club at Lot 2 DP 851739 on Forest Way, will continue to be used only as recreation facilities.

The south-west section of the Killarney Heights High School grounds contains bushland and rock outcrops: this area may be developed for housing. Development in this section will recognise the



bushland outlook, views and privacy enjoyed from residences adjoining the northern and western boundaries of the site and ensure development reasonably maintains these qualities. The retention of existing landscaping is encouraged, where practical.

Future development will maintain the visual pattern and predominant scale of existing detached style housing in the locality. The streets will be characterised by landscaped front gardens and consistent front building setbacks. Unless exemptions are made to the 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 relationship of the locality to the surrounding bushland will be reinforced by protecting and enhancing the spread of indigenous tree canopy and preserving the natural landscape, including rock outcrops, remnant bushland and natural watercourses. The use of materials that blend with the colours and textures of the natural landscape will be encouraged.

Development on hillsides or in the vicinity of ridgetops must integrate with the natural landscape and topography. Development on land which adjoins Middle Harbour shall have regard to the principles contained in Schedule 14.

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 listed in clause 39.

Future development of the environmentally sensitive land shown cross-hatched on the map will be limited to one dwelling per allotment. Such dwelling will be constructed having regard to the constraints, potential instability, visual sensitivity and impact on the water quality of Middle Harbour.

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 Side Setback Built Form Control, as such pursuant to Clause 20(1) a higher test is required.

Accordingly, an assessment of the proposals consistency against the DFC statement is detailed hereunder:

Requirement: The Middle Harbour Suburbs locality will remain characterised by detached-style housing in landscaped settings interspersed by a range of complementary and compatible uses. The land adjacent to Middle Harbour and occupied by the Mosman Rowing Club will be retained for low-scale recreational use sympathetic to its natural setting. The land occupied by the Killarney Heights Tennis Centre at Lot 841 DP 210006 and land occupied by the Killarney Heights Swim Centre at Lot 854 DP 210006 on Tralee Avenue and the land occupied by Belrose Bowling Club at Lot 2 DP 851739 on Forest Way, will continue to be used only as recreation facilities.

Comment: The proposal maintains the existing detached style dwelling as characterised by a landscaped setting, and the subject site is not located near recreational facilities.

Requirement: The south-west section of the Killarney Heights High School grounds contains bushland and rock outcrops: this area may be developed for housing. Development in this section will recognise the bushland outlook, views and privacy enjoyed from residences adjoining the northern and western boundaries of the site and ensure development reasonably maintains these qualities. The retention of existing landscaping is encouraged, where practical.

Comment: The subject property is not located within the aforementioned site. This requirement is not applicable to the current development.

Requirement: Future development will maintain the visual pattern and predominant scale of existing detached style housing in the locality. The streets will be characterised by landscaped front gardens and consistent front building setbacks. Unless exemptions are made to the 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.

Comment: Subject to the swimming pool deck being a minimum of 900mm off the eastern side boundary, the proposed works will maintain the visual pattern and predominant scale of detached style housing by ensuring the works respond to the site and minimise bulk by providing generous setbacks. There are no subdivision works as part of this development.



Requirement: The relationship of the locality to the surrounding bushland will be reinforced by protecting and enhancing the spread of indigenous tree canopy and preserving the natural landscape, including rock outcrops, remnant bushland and natural watercourses. The use of materials that blend with the colours and textures of the natural landscape will be encouraged.

Comment: There are no affected landscape features as part of this proposal. The additional works have been designed to integrate with the natural landscape and step down the slope of the land.

Requirement: Development on hillsides or in the vicinity of ridgetops must integrate with the natural landscape and topography. Development on land which adjoins Middle Harbour shall have regard to the principles contained in Schedule 14.

Comment: The subject property is not located within the aforementioned surroundings. This requirement is not applicable to the current development.

Requirement: 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 listed in clause 39.

Comment: The subject property is not located within or near a local retail centre. This requirement is not applicable to the current development.

Requirement: Future development of the environmentally sensitive land shown cross-hatched on the map will be limited to one dwelling per allotment. Such dwelling will be constructed having regard to the constraints, potential instability, visual sensitivity and impact on the water quality of Middle Harbour.

Comment: The subject property is not located within the aforementioned setting. This requirement is not applicable to the current development.

#### **BUILT FORM CONTROLS**

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

### Description of variations sought and reasons provided:

#### Side Setback Built Form Control

Requirement:

Side Setbacks:  Applicable:  Yes No  900mm  4.5m  Other	Boundary Nth Sth Est Wst  Existing and unchanged or Proposed: 7m (to pool coping)  Complies: Yes No  Boundary Nth Sth Est Wst  Existing and unchanged or Proposed: Nil
	Proposed: Nil  Complies: Yes No (further assessment)

Area of inconsistency with control: The swimming pool decking seeks a nil southern side setback.



Merit Consideration of Non-compliance: In assessing these non-compliant elements of the proposal, it is necessary to consider the objectives of the side setback built form control. Accordingly, compliance with the objectives are addressed below:

Requirement: Ensure that development does not become visually dominant by virtue of its height and bulk

Comment: The non-compliance is due to the proposed swimming pool decking along the eastern side boundary. The proposed nil eastern side boundary breach extends for a total of approximately 8.8m.

The proposed non-compliance is considered to result in visual bulk and will unreasonably dominate the surrounding private open spaces, rather than a design that seeks to enhance a sense of openness on the site and to the surrounding properties by providing a screened deck and maintaining a generous side setback. A condition of consent to have the proposed swimming pool deck 900mm off the eastern side boundary will be imposed.

### Requirement: Preserve the amenity of surrounding land

Comment: The breach is not considered acceptable as it would have a detrimental effect on its adjoining properties in terms of visual or acoustic amenity and swimming pool deck design will detract from the sense of openness and separation afforded by the site. A condition of consent to have the proposed swimming pool deck 900mm off the eastern side boundary will be imposed.

#### Requirement: Ensure that development responds to site topography

Comment: The development seeks to respond to the site topography and maintains compliance with the overall building height.

### Requirement: Provide separation between buildings

Comment: Subject to the swimming pool deck being a minimum of 900mm off the eastern side boundary, the proposed works will maintain an adequate level of separation. Furthermore, the selected landscape design seeks to protect the amenity of the adjoining properties by ensuring no opportunities for overlooking of principle private open spaces.

# Requirement: Provide opportunities for landscaping

Comment: The landscaping provision provides 322sqm of soft landscaped open space. The proposal will thus result in an acceptable level of landscaping for the site.

### Requirement: Create a sense of openness

Comment: Subject to the swimming pool deck being a minimum of 900mm off the eastern side boundary, the proposed works will continue to provide an adequate sense of openness. The minimal addition of built form will not detract from the sense of openness currently afforded by the site.

### 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 proposal is generally consistent with the General Principles of Development Control and accordingly, qualifies 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 is consistent with the Locality's Desired Future Character Statement and accordingly, qualifies 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).

Notwithstanding the above, the proposed development is considered to fail the requirements to qualify for consideration under Clause 20(1). It is for the aforementioned reasons that the variation to the Side Setback Built Form Control (Development Standard) pursuant to Clause 20(1) is not supported.

OTHER MATTERS FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION: None



# **SECTION 3 – SITE INSPECTION ANALYSIS**



Site area 714sqm	
Detail existing onsite structures:	Waterfalls
None	Creeks / Watercourse
None	Aboriginal Art / Carvings
Dwelling	
Detached Garage	Any Item of / or any potential item of heritage significance
Detached shed	Potential View Loss as a result of developmen
Swimming pool	Yes No
Tennis Court	If Yes where from (in relation to site):
Termis Gourt	North / South
Cabana	East / West
Other	North East / South West
Site Features:	North East / South West
None	North West / South East
	View of:
Trees	Ocean / Waterways
Under Storey Vegetation	
Rock Outcrops	Headland Yes No
П	District Views Yes No
Caves	Duahland Vas Na
Overhangs	Bushland Yes No Other:



Bushfire Prone?			proposal		upon	any
▼ Yes No			/ Rights of \	way?		
Flood Prone?	☐ Ye	S	No			
☐ 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?						
□ <sub>Yes</sub> ▼ <sub>No</sub>						
Located within 100m of the mean high watermark?						
□ <sub>Yes</sub> ▼ <sub>No</sub>						
Located within an area identified as a Wave Impact Zone?						
☐ Yes ✓ No						
Any items of heritage significance located upon it?						
□ <sub>Yes</sub> ▼ <sub>No</sub>						
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?						
□ <sub>Yes</sub> ▼ <sub>No</sub>						
Does the development require concurrence?						
☐ 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						



# Site Inspection / Desktop Assessment Undertaken by:

Does the site inspection confirm the assessment undertaken against the relevant EPI's?	▼ 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:

Date: 12 June 2009

Shaylin Moodliar, Development Assessment Officer



# **SECTION 4 – APPLICATION DETERMINATION**

Conclusion:		
The proposal has been considered against the relevant heads of consideration under S79C of the EPA Act 1979 and the proposed development is considered to be:		
Satisfactory Unsatisfactory		
Recommendation:		
That Council as the consent authority		
GRANT DEVELOPMENT CONSENT to the development application subject to:		
<ul><li>(a) the conditions detailed within the associated notice of determination; and</li><li>(b) the consent lapsing within three (3) from operation</li></ul>		
GRANT DEFERRED COMMENCEMENT CONSENT to the development application subject to:		
<ul> <li>(a) the conditions detailed within the associated notice of determination;</li> <li>(b) limit the deferred commencement condition time frame to 3 years;</li> <li>(c) one the deferred commencement matter have been satisfactorily addressed issue an operational consent subject to the time frames detailed within part (d); and</li> <li>(d) the consent lapsing within three (3) from operation</li> </ul>		
REFUSE development consent to the development application subject to:		
(a) the reasons detailed within the associated notice of determination.		
Date: 16 June 2009		
Shaylin Moodliar, Development Assessment Officer		
The application is determined under the delegated authority of:		
Date: 16 June 2009		

Ailsa Prendergast, Team Leader, Development Assessment