# Memo

**Development Assessment** 

To: Development Determination Panel

From: Sarah McNeilly Planning Consultant

Date: 26 May 2020

Subject: REV2020/0012 – 5 Birdwood Avenue, Collaroy

Reference is made to the Review of Determination Assessment report prepared for the Review of Development Application DA2019/0616 for the regularisation of the use of an existing building as a secondary dwelling, carparking and front fence. A supplementary email was provided by the owner/applicant on 21 May 2020.

The issues raised in this document are addressed below.

 Objections raised by No.3 (Mr Neville Stanford / Bentag) were assessed as being not relevant.

## Comment

It is agreed that the particular items listed in this objection did not have planning merit with regard to the assessment of the key issues being landscaped area and front setback.

• It would appear that the previous objections raised by No.3 (Mr Neville Stanford / Bentag) to our Review Documentation were also assessed as being not relevant.

## **Comment**

The objections raised in the previous assessment are not the subject of this application.

 As per Council's notification advice, multiple submissions by the one owner are to be treated as one submission. It would appear however that No.3 has been included as two submissions. Hence the total number of objections should be 2 not 3.

# **Comment**

The original report included a submission from Mr Neville Stanford noting him as the owner of 1/3 Birdwood Avenue, Collaroy. The second submission states that he is the owner of all units within the block. Accordingly, it has been included as a separate submission.

However, it is agreed that it is a submission by the same person.

 Given that all of No.3's objections within both of his submissions Mr Hunt's Review documentation (as well as his former submission to our DA) have been assessed as not relevant to the DA then should this negate his submissions or comment be provided to this effect.

#### Comment

All comments provided by objectors are required to be addressed.

• It should be noted that the 4 in favour are all residents of Birdwood Avenue and also supported our original DA. It is also noted that No.9-11 is vacant and has a DA in for a major redevelopment as Seniors Housing. As such, of the current full time resident owners of Birdwood Avenue 4 out of the total six individually owned

properties in our street (excluding ourselves and the vacant land) support our development.

## Comment

It is noted in the report that there are supporting letters for the application.

• In addition, this remaining objector is listed as Confidential which does not provide any opportunity to address those objections nor their relevance. Is it possible to summarise their objections deemed relevant.

### Comment

The issues of the confidential objector have been included in the report.

 I am also of the opinion that No.3's submission contains comments of a personal defamatory nature that also implicate Council that have been posted on Council's publicly available website.

# Comment

This is not a matter relevant to the planning assessment.