

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

DA No. DA2009/1296

**Assessment Officer: Phil Lane** 

Property Address: Lot 38, Sec M, DP 33000, No. 26 Idaline Street Collaroy Plateau Proposal Description: Construction of a new dwelling following demolition of existing

structures

Plan Reference: 1/2 266 09, 2/2 266 09 & Landscape Plan



No. 26 Idaline Street, Collaroy Plateau

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: \$ 475000.00
Are S94A Contributions Applicable?

Are 594A Contributions Applicable?				
	Yes No			
	Warringah Section 94A Development Contributions Plan			
	Contribution based on total development cost of	\$	475,000.00	



Contribution - all parts Warringah	Levy Rate	Contribution Payable	Council Code
Total S94A Levy	0.95%	\$4,513	6923
S94A Planning and Administration	0.05%	\$238	6924
Total	1.0%	\$4,750	

Notification Required?	Period of Public Exhibition?
Yes No	14 days 21 days 30 days N/A
Submissions Received?	No. of Submissions: 1
Yes No	
Are any trees impacted upon by the proposed developm	ent? Yes No
SECTION 1 – CODE ASSESSMENT REPORT	
ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING INSTRUMENTS	
WLEP 2000	
Locality: D4 Collaroy Plateau	
"The Collaroy Plateau locality will remain characterised settings interspersed by a range of complementary and	
Future development will maintain the visual pattern and housing in the locality. The streets will continue to be cl and consistent front building setbacks. Unless exempted standard in this locality statement, any subdivision of lar pattern, size and configuration of existing allotments in the statement of the s	naracterised by landscaped front gardens ons are made to the housing density and is to be consistent with the predominant
The properties north and east of Edgecliff Boulevard for Collaroy escarpment. Development in this part of the loand topography and minimise its visual impact on long outcrops and indigenous tree canopy will be integrated use of materials that blend with the colours and textures encouraged.	cality must integrate with the landscape listance views of the escarpment. Rock with new development where possible. The
Buildings are not to be erected on areas shown cross-has slope, instability and visual sensitivity.	atched on the map due to the land's steep
The locality will continue to be served by the existing locality. Future development in these centres will be in acceptable development control provided in clause 39."	
Development Definition: Housing Ancillary Devel	lopment to Housing Other
Category of Development: Category 1 Category	2 Category 3
Draft WLEP 2009 Permissible or Prohibited Land use	e: Permissible
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 Yes No	the Locality's Desired Future Character Statement?
Category 1 Development with variations to BFC's  Category 2 Development Consistency Test	(Section 2 Assessment Required)
Category 3 Development Consistency Test  Built Form Controls:	(Section 2 Assessment Required)
Building Height (overall):  Applicable: Yes No  Requirement:  8.5m  11.0m  Other	Existing and unchanged Proposed: 7.2m  Complies: Yes No
Building Height (underside of upper most ceiling):  Applicable:  Yes No  Requirement:  7.2m  Other	Existing and unchanged  Proposed: 6m  Complies: Yes No
Front Setback:  Applicable:  Yes No  Requirement:  6.5m  Other	Existing and unchanged  Proposed: 8m  Complies: Yes No
Is the Corner Allotment / Secondary Street Frontage control applicable?:  Yes No Requirement:  3.5m  Other	Corner Allotment:  Existing and unchanged  Proposed:m  Complies: Yes No



Housing Density:  Applicable:  Yes  No  Requirement:  1 dwelling per 450sqm  1 dwelling per 600sqm  Other	Existing and unchanged  Proposed: 1 dwelling / per 417.3sqm  Complies: Yes No
Landscape Open Space:  Applicable:  Yes  No  40% (167sqm)  50% (sqm)  Other	Existing and unchanged  Proposed: 40% (167sqm)  Complies: Yes No
Rear Setback:  Applicable: Yes No  Requirement:  6.0m  Other	Existing and unchanged  Proposed: 12.65m  Complies: Yes No
Outbuildings:  Requirement:  50% of rear setback  Other	Outbuildings:  Existing and unchanged  Proposed:%  Complies: Yes No
Side Boundary Envelope:  Applicable:  Yes  No  Requirement:  4m / 45 degrees  5m / 45 degrees  Other	Boundary: Nth Sth Est Wst  Existing and unchanged or  Fully within Envelope: Yes No  Minor Breach: Yes No  Complies: Yes No (Clause 20)



	Boundary: Nth Sth Est Wst  Existing and unchanged or  Fully within Envelope: Yes No  Minor Breach: Yes No  Complies: Yes No (Clause 20)
Applicable: Yes No  900mm 4.5m Other	Boundary Nth Sth Est Wst  Existing and unchanged or Proposed: 0.9m  Complies: Yes No  Boundary Nth Sth Est Wst  Existing and unchanged or Proposed: 0.9m  Complies: Yes No
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 Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
☐ Yes No	
CL41 Brothels	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	Yes Yes , subject to condition No



CL42 Construction Sites	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
CL43 Noise	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
CL44 Pollutants	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	
CL45 Hazardous Uses	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
☐ Yes ☑ No	res res, subject to condition in
CL46 Radiation Emission Levels	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	res res, subject to condition ino
CL47 Flood Affected Land	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	res res, subject to condition ino
CL48 Potentially Contaminated Land	Complies:
Applicable:	Based on the previous land uses if the site likely to be contaminated?
Yes No	Yes No
	Is the site suitable for the proposed land use?
	Yes No
CL49 Remediation of Contaminated Land	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	res res, subject to condition rec
CL49a Acid Sulfate Soils	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	res res, subject to condition in
CL50 Safety & Security	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	res res, subject to condition in
CL51 Front Fences and Walls	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
✓ Yes No	res res, subject to condition INO
163 140	Comment: The proposed fence will complement the existing streetscape, by its varied use of materials and maximum height of 1.629m.



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	
CL54 Provision and Location of Utility	Complies:
Services	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
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	. 55 , 555 jook to contained.
CL56 Retaining Unique Environmental	Complies:
Features on Site	•
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
☐ Yes No	
CL57 Development on Sloping Land	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
CL58 Protection of Existing Flora	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
□ Yes No	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	
CL59 Koala Habitat Protection	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
☐ Yes No	. 30 100 , Subject to contained 110
CL60 Watercourses & Aquatic Habitats	Complies:
Applicable:	
	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes 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	, ,



CL63 Landscaped Open Space	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	res res, subject to condition into
CL63A Rear Building Setback	Complies:
Applicable:	
✓ Yes No	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
CL64 Private open space	Complies:
Applicable:	
	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	
CL65 Privacy	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	
CL66 Building bulk	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
✓ Yes No	Yes Yes, subject to condition No
CL67 Roofs	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	res res, subject to condition rec
CL68 Conservation of Energy and Water	Complies:
Applicable:	
	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	
CL69 Accessibility – Public and Semi-Public	Complies:
Buildings	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Applicable:	Yes Yes, subject to condition No
□ <sub>Yes</sub> ▼ <sub>No</sub>	
CL70 Site facilities	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
▼ <sub>Yes</sub> □ <sub>No</sub>	163 163 , Subject to condition 140
	Compliant
CL71 Parking facilities (visual impact)	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes 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
□ <sub>Yes</sub> ▼ <sub>No</sub>	res res , subject to condition No
res NO	



CL74 Provision of Carparking	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
	Yes Yes, subject to condition No
Yes No	
CL75 Design of Carparking Areas	Complies:
Applicable:	
	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	,
	<u> </u>
CL76 Management of Stormwater	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	res res, subject to condition into
Yes No	
CL77 Landfill	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	
CL78 Erosion & Sedimentation	Complies:
Applicable:	
	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	
CL79 Heritage Control	Complies:
Applicable:	
Applicable.	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	,
	a .:
CL80 Notice to Metropolitan Aboriginal Land	Complies:
Council and the National Parks and Wildlife Service	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Applicable:	res res, subject to condition ino
Yes No	
CL81 Notice to Heritage Council	Complies:
Applicable:	
	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	
	Complies:
CL82 Development in the Vicinity of Heritage 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	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
,	1



Schedule 6 Preservation of bushland Applicable:	Complies:
	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	
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 plans of management	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	
Schedule 12 Requirements for complying development	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
□ <sub>Yes</sub> No	
Schedule 13 Development guidelines for	Complies:
Collaroy/Narrabeen Beach Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
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 effects	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
☐ Yes No	
Schedule 17 Carparking provision	Complies:
Applicable:	Yes Yes , subject to condition No
Yes No	. 35 . 35 , Subject to Condition 140



# Other Relevant Environmental Planning Instruments: SEPPs: Applicable? ✓ Yes No SEPP Basix: Applicable? ▼ Yes □ No If yes: Has the applicant provided Basix Certification? Ves □ No SEPP 55 Applicable? ▼ Yes □ No Based on the previous land uses if the site likely to be contaminated? ☐ Yes No Is the site suitable for the proposed land use? ✓ Yes □ No **SEPP Infrastructure** Applicable? ▼ Yes □ No Is the proposal for a swimming pool: Within 30m of an overhead line support structure? ☐ Yes ✓ No Within 5m of an overhead power line? ☐ Yes ✓ No Does the proposal comply with the SEPP? ▼ Yes □ No REPs: Applicable?: 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



Clause 92 (Government Coastal Policy) Applicable:	Is the proposal consistent with the Goal and Objectives of the Government Coastal Policy?
Yes No	Yes No
Clause 93 & 94 (Fire Safety)	Addressed via condition?
Applicable:	✓ 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	1.00

# **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 No	Satisfactory
		Satisfactory, subject to condition
		Unsatisfactory
Natural Environment	Yes No	Satisfactory
		Satisfactory, subject to condition
		Unsatisfactory
Aboriginal Heritage	□ <sub>Yes</sub> ☑ <sub>No</sub>	Satisfactory
		Satisfactory, subject to condition
		Unsatisfactory



Env. Health and Protection	□ Yes No	Satisfactory
		Satisfactory, subject to condition
		Unsatisfactory
NSW Rural Fire Service	□ <sub>Yes</sub> ☑ <sub>No</sub>	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		SEPP No. 71 – Coastal Protection
EPA Regulations 2000	<b>~</b>	SEPP BASIX
Disability Discrimination Act 1992	<b>V</b>	SEPP Infrastructure
Local Government Act 1993	<b>~</b>	WLEP 2000
Roads Act 1993	<b>~</b>	WDCP
Rural Fires Act 1997		S94 Development Contributions Plan
RFI Act 1948		S94A Development Contributions Plan
Water Management Act 2000	_	NSW Coastal Policy (cl 92 EPA Regulation)
Water Act 1912		Other (Draft WLEP 2009)
п		
Swimming Pools Act 1992;		
SECTION 79C EPA ACT 1979		
Section 79C (1) (a)(i) – Have you considered all relevar provisions of any relevant environmental planning	nt	Yes No
instrument?  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		Yes No
plan  Section 79C (1) (a)(iiia) - Have you considered all relevant		
provisions of any Planning Agreement or Draft Planning Agreement		Yes No N/A
Section 79C (1) (a)(iv) - Have you considered all relevant provisions of any Regulations?		Yes No
Section 79C (1) (b) – Are the likely impacts of the development, including environmental impacts on the		✓ Yes No
natural and built environment and social and economic impacts in the locality acceptable?		
Section 79C (1) (c) – It the site suitable for the development?		▼ Yes No
development?		TES INC
Section 79C (1) (d) – Have you considered any	:PA	
		Yes No



# **DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING INSTRUMENTS:**

# Draft Warringah Local Environmental Plan 2009 (Draft WLEP 2009)

Definition: Dwelling House: means a building containing only one dwelling.

Land Use Zone: R2 Low Density Residential

Permissible or Prohibited: Permissible

Additional Permitted used for particular land – Refer to Schedule 1: Not applicable

Principal Development Standards: Not applicable

Development Standard	Required	Proposed	Complies	Clause 4.6 Exception to Development Standard
Height of Buildings:	8.5m	<b>7.2</b> m	Yes	Not Applicable

The proposed development is consistent with the aims and objectives of the Draft WLEP 2009.



## **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	
Dorothea Gray	No. 24 Idaline Street, Collaroy	

The following issues were raised in the submissions:

- Relocation of the building further from the southern boundary;
- Solar access;
- Recessing the first floor;
- Western and eastern elevations are mislabelled;

The matters raised within the submissions are addressed as follows:

Relocation of the building further from the southern boundary;

**Comment:** The proposed dwelling is located the required 900mm from the southern boundary in accordance with the Side Setback Built Form Control for the D4 Collaroy Plateau Locality within WLEP 2000. Additionally, the block is only 10.67m wide and only 417sqm in area and thus limits the footprint for development.

Given the above the application does not warrant refusal.

Solar access;

**Comment:** Issues were raised in relation to solar access to the adjoining building to the south (No. 24 Idaline Street). Within the WLEP 2000 under Clause 62 'Access to sunlight' the provision for solar access is related to the principal private open space of adjoining properties. The proposed development will satisfy this requirement.

Given the above the application does not warrant refusal.

Recessing the first floor;

**Comment:** Recessing the first floor will have minimal benefits and limit the width of the building, which is only 8.865m in width. The building is generally compliant with all controls with the expectation of the side boundary envelope built form control with the encroachment of the parapet along the southern and northern elevations. These encroachments are not contained within the mainly living spaces (habitable) of the proposed dwelling. Additionally, the building is well articulated with varying setbacks and good fenestration, which complements both the streetscape and adjoining properties.

Given the above the application does not warrant refusal.

Western and eastern elevations are mislabelled;

Comment: This has also being identified and amended plans have been received.



#### **MEDIATION**

Has mediation been requested by the objectors?	Yes / No
Has the applicant agreed to mediation?	Yes / Vo No
Has mediation been conducted?	□ <sub>Yes</sub> / ▼ No

#### **BUILT FORM CONTROLS**

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

## Description of variations sought and reasons provided:

#### Side Boundary Envelope

**Required:** "Buildings must be sited within an envelope determined by projecting planes at 45 degrees from a height of 5 metres above natural ground level at the side boundaries".

**Proposed:** The proposal does not comply with the side boundary envelope control determined by a projecting plane at 45 degrees from a height of 5 metres above natural ground level on the southern and northern side boundaries. The encroachment is a maximum of 600mm on the southern elevation and a maximum of 300mm on the northern elevation were the building steps down towards the front of the proposed building (approximately 7.3m from the front of the building).

### Response:

In assessing this non-compliant element of the proposal, it is necessary to consider the merit considerations of the Side Boundary Envelope Built Form Control. Accordingly, compliance with the merit considerations are addressed below:

# Ensure that development does not become visually dominant by virtue of its height and bulk.

Comment: When viewed from the street-front, the proposed dwelling presents as two storey dwelling and sits comfortably with adjoining buildings and buildings within the vicinity. The proposal is consistent with the visual pattern and therefore allows the development to integrate with the streetscape and the landscape.

In this regard, when viewed from either the street-front or from afar, the dwelling does not present as a visually dominant structure.

# Ensure that development responds to site topography.

*Comment:* The dwelling minimises the excavation to the natural landform. Notwithstanding, the dwelling is considered to provide a consistent pattern of development and integration with the site topography.

## Provide separation between buildings.

Comment: The proposed building on the both the northern and southern elevations provide numerically compliant side setbacks (0.9m). Notwithstanding, the bulk of the dwelling complies with the development standard and the articulated design with substantial front and rear setbacks providing an appropriate sense of building separation.



## Provide opportunities for landscaping.

Comment: The subject site provides a numerically compliant provision of landscaped open space and the non-compliance with the side boundary envelope do not restrict the provision of soft landscaping in that were the proposed development to incorporate landscape plantings along both side elevations of the dwelling.

#### Create a sense of openness.

Comment: The proposal is considered to be of a similar architectural scale to adjoining dwellings and of a similar visual bulk and is considered acceptable in terms of the General Principle for Building Bulk. Additionally, the proposal provides adequate separation between buildings creating a sense of openness.

Therefore, the variation to the Side Boundary Envelope Built Form Control is supported under Clause 20 of WLEP 2000.

# 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 Clause/s of 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).

As detailed above, the proposed development is considered to satisfy the requirements to qualify for consideration under Clause 20(1). It is for this reason that the variation to the Side Boundary Envelope Built Form Control (Development Standard) pursuant to Clause 20(1) is Supported.



# **SECTION 3 – SITE INSPECTION ANALYSIS**



Site area 417.3 sqm	Trees
Detail existing onsite structures:	
п	Under Storey Vegetation
None	Rock Outcrops
Dwelling	Caves
Detached Garage	Overhangs
Detached shed	Waterfalls
Swimming pool	Creeks / Watercourse
Tennis Court	Aboriginal Art / Carvings
Cabana	Any Item of / or any potential item of heritage
Other (Carport)	significance
Site Features:	Potential View Loss as a result of development
None	Yes No
	If Yes where from (in relation to site):



North / South  East / West  North East / South West  North West / South East  View of:	Ocean / Waterways  Headland  Yes  No  Yes  No  District Views  Bushland  Other:  No
Bushfire Prone?  Yes No Flood Prone?  Yes No Affected by Acid Sulfate Soils	Does the development require concurrence?  Yes No Is the site owned or is the DA made by the "Crown"?  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	Have you reviewed the DP and s88B instrument?  Yes No  Does the proposal impact upon any easements / Rights of Way?  Yes No
Located within 100m of the mean high watermark?  \[ \begin{align*}             \text{Yes} & \begin{align*}                 \text{No} \\                 \text{Located within an area identified as a Wave Impact Zone?} \[ \begin{align*}                 \text{Yes} & \begin{align*}                 \text{No} \\                 \text{Any items of heritage significance located upon it?} \[ \begin{align*}                 \text{Yes} & \begin{align*}                 \text{No} \\                 \text{Located within the vicinity of any items of heritage significance?} \[ \begin{align*}                 \text{Yes} & \begin{align*}                 \text{No} \\                 \text{Located within an area identified as potential land slip?} \[ \begin{align*}                 \text{Yes} & \begin{align*}                 \text{No} \\                \text{Integrated?} \\                 \text{Yes} & \text{No} \\                 \text{No} \\                 \text{No} \\                 \text{No} \\                 \text{No} \\                 \text{No} \\                 \text{No} \\                \text{No} \\                \text{No} \\                 \text{No} \\                 \text{No} \\                 \text{No} \\                 \text{No} \\                 \text{No} \\                 \text{No} \\                 \text{No} \\                 \text{No} \\                 \text{No} \\                 \text{No} \\                \text{No} \\                 \text{No} \\	



# Site Inspection / Desktop Assessment Undertaken by:

Does the site inspection <section 3=""> confirm the assessment undertaken against the relevant EPI's <section's &="" 1="" 2="">?</section's></section>	Yes No	
Are there any additional matters that have arisen from your site inspection that would require any	□ <sub>Yes</sub> ▼ <sub>No</sub>	
additional assessment to be undertaken?	If yes provide detail:	
Signed	Date 23 December 2009	
Phil Lane, Senior Development Asses	sment Officer	
SECTION 4 – APPLICATION DETERMI	NATION	
Conclusion:		
The site has been inspected and the application assessed having regard to the provisions of Section 79C of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979, the provisions relevant Environmental Planning Instruments including Warringah Local Environment Plan 2000, Draft Warringah Local Environmental Plan 2009 and the relevant codes and policies of Council and the proposed development is considered to be:		
✓ Carinta state		
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>		
"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 23 December 2009	
Phil Lane, Senior Development Asses	sment Officer	
The application is determined under the	delegated authority of	
Signed	Date 23 December 2009	

Rodney Piggott, Team Leader, Development Assessment