

**Four Towns  
Planning**

*Planning and property consultant*

**WRITTEN REQUEST PURSUANT TO  
CLAUSE 4.6 OF MANLY LOCAL  
ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN 2013**

**VARIATION OF A DEVELOPMENT  
STANDARD REGARDING HEIGHT OF  
BUILDINGS AS DETAILED IN CLAUSE 4.3  
OF MANLY LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL  
PLAN 2013**

**Demolition Works, Construction of a  
Dwelling House and Associated Works**

**15 Baltic Street,  
Fairlight NSW 2094**

✉ [mathew@fourtowns.com.au](mailto:mathew@fourtowns.com.au)

☎ 0425232018

[www.fourtowns.com.au](http://www.fourtowns.com.au)

PO Box 361, Balgowlah NSW 2093

**This report has been prepared to support a Development Application under the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*.**

**Report prepared by:**

Mathew Quattroville  
Director – Four Towns Pty Ltd

**Report prepared for:**

Redsquire Pty Ltd

**12 December 2024**

***Disclaimer***

*This report has been prepared with due care and thoroughness by Four Towns Pty Ltd. The statements and opinions are given in good faith and in confidence that they are accurate and not misleading. In preparing this document, Four Towns Pty Ltd has relied upon information and documents provided by the Client or prepared by other Consultants. Four Towns Pty Ltd does not accept responsibility for any errors or omissions in any of the material provided by other parties.*

**© Four Towns Pty Ltd**

*NOTE: This document is the property of Four Towns Pty Ltd (trading as Four Towns Planning). This document is Copyright, no part may be reproduced in whole or in part, without the written permission of Four Towns Pty Ltd.*

## **Introduction**

This written request under Clause 4.3 of the Manly Local Environmental Plan 2013 (**MLEP 2013**) accompanies a Development Application seeking consent for demolition works and construction of a new dwelling house and associated works at 15 Baltic Street, Fairlight, being Lot 14 Sec B within Deposited Plan 4449.

The written request is made pursuant to Clause 4.6 MLEP 2013 and requests a variation to height of buildings as detailed under Clause 4.3 of Manly Local Environmental Plan 2013.

Clause 4.3 of MLEP 2013 notes:

*(2) The height of a building on any land is not to exceed the maximum height shown for the land on the Height of Buildings Map.*

The site has a maximum building height provision of 8.5m. The proposal will result in a maximum height of 9.026m. It is noted that the breach is the result of the sloping nature of the site, and existing man-made changes.

The proposed works are reasonable within the context of the site and surrounding development and will not result in excessive bulk and scale. It is submitted that there is more than enough justification and precedence within the area to support the breach.

The following assessment of the variation to Clause 4.3 – Building Height development standard, has taken into consideration the recent judgement contained within Merman Investments Pty Ltd v Woollahra Municipal Council [2021] NSWLEC 1582, Initial Action Pty Ltd v Woollahra Municipal Council [2018] NSWLEC 118, Baron Corporation Pty Limited v Council of the City of Sydney [2019] NSWLEC 61, and RebelMH Neutral Bay Pty Limited v North Sydney Council [2019] NSWCA 130.

In this regard, it is requested Council support a variation with respect to compliance with the maximum height of buildings as described in Clause 4.3 of the MLEP 2013. The nature and extent of the contravention is as follows:

<b>Requirement</b>	8.5m
<b>Proposed</b>	9.026m
<b>Is the planning control in question a development standard?</b>	Yes
<b>Is the non-compliance with to the clause requirement a numerical/or performance based variation?</b>	Numerical
<b>If numerical enter a % variation to requirement</b>	6.19%

## **Manly Local Environmental Plan 2013**

### **2.1 Clause 2.2 and the Land Use Table**

Clause 2.2 and the Land Zoning Map provide that the subject site is zoned R1 – General Residential (the R1 zone) and the Land Use Table in Part 2 of MLEP 2013 specifies the following objectives for the R1 zone:

- **To provide for the housing needs of the community.**

Comment: The proposed development is for the construction of a new dwelling which provides a new modern dwelling from the existing derelict building. The proposal will ensure a high-quality dwelling which contributes to the ongoing provision of housing in the Fairlight area.

- **To provide for a variety of housing types and densities.**

Comment: The proposal maintains the use of the site as a dwelling house which is a permissible land use with the R1 zone.

- **To enable other land uses that provide facilities or services to meet the day to day needs of residents.**

Comment: Not applicable – the proposal is for a permissible residential land use on the site.

## 2.3 Clause 4.6 – Exceptions to Development Standards

Clause 4.6(1) MLEP 2013 provides:

- (1) *The objectives of this clause are as follows:*
  - (a) *to provide an appropriate degree of flexibility in applying certain development standards to particular development,*
  - (b) *to achieve better outcomes for and from development by allowing flexibility in particular circumstances.*

The latest authority in relation to the operation of clause 4.6 is the decision of Chief Justice Preston in *Initial Action Pty Ltd v Woollahra Municipal Council* [2018] NSWLEC 118 (“*Initial Action*”). *Initial Action* involved an appeal pursuant to s56A of the Land & Environment Court Act 1979 against the decision of a Commissioner.

At [90] of *Initial Action* the Court held that:

*“In any event, cl 4.6 does not give substantive effect to the objectives of the clause in cl 4.6(1)(a) or (b). There is no provision that requires compliance with the objectives of the clause. In particular, neither cl 4.6(3) nor (4) expressly or impliedly requires that development that contravenes a development standard “achieve better outcomes for and from development”. If objective (b) was the source of the Commissioner’s test that non-compliant development should achieve a better environmental planning outcome for the site relative to a compliant development, the Commissioner was mistaken. Clause 4.6 does not impose that test.”*

The legal consequence of the decision in *Initial Action* is that clause 4.6(1) is not an operational provision and that the remaining clauses of clause 4.6 constitute the operational provisions.

Clause 4.6(2) of MLEP 2013 provides:

- (2) *Development consent may, subject to this clause, be granted for development even though the development would contravene a development standard imposed by this or any other environmental planning instrument. However, this clause does not apply to a development standard that is expressly excluded from the operation of this clause.*

Clause 4.3 is not excluded from the operation of clause 4.6 by clause 4.6(8) or any other clause of the MLEP 2013.

Clause 4.6(3) Of MLEP provides:

*(3) Development consent must not be granted to development that contravenes a development standard unless the consent authority is satisfied the applicant has demonstrated that—*

*(a) compliance with the development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances, and*

*(b) there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify the contravention of the development standard.*

The proposed development does not comply with the prescribed height of buildings for residential accommodation in the Zone R1, as prescribed under Clause 4.3 of the MLEP 2013, however strict compliance is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances of this case and there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening the development standard. The relevant arguments are set out later in this written request.

### **3. Relevant Caselaw**

The grounds of objection are based upon the various tests of the recent judgements in the *NSW Land and Environment Court Case Merman Investments Pty Ltd v Woollahra Municipal Council [2021] NSWLEC 1582*, *Wehbe v Pittwater Council (2007) 156 LGERA 446*; *[2007] NSWLEC 827*, *Initial Action Pty Ltd v Woollahra Municipal Council [2018] NSWLEC 118*, *Baron Corporation Pty Limited v Council of the City of Sydney [2019] NSWLEC 61*, and *RebelMH Neutral Bay Pty Limited v North Sydney Council [2019] NSWCA 130*.

The relevant steps identified in *Initial Action* (and the case law referred to in *Initial Action*) can be summarised as follows:

1. Is Clause 4.3 of MLEP 2013 a development standard?
2. Is the consent authority satisfied that this written request adequately addresses the matters required by clause 4.6(3) by demonstrating that:
  - (a) compliance is unreasonable or unnecessary; and
  - (b) there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening the development standard?

### **4. Request for Variation**

#### **4.1 Is Clause 4.3 of MLEP 2013 a development standard?**

- (a) The definition of “development standard” in clause 1.4 of the EP&A Act includes:

*“(c) the character, location, siting, bulk, scale, shape, size, height, density, design or external appearance of a building or work”*

- (b) Clause 4.3 relates to the height of building. Accordingly, Clause 4.3 is a development standard.

#### **4.2 Is compliance with Clause 4.3 unreasonable or unnecessary?**

This request relies upon the First method identified by Preston CJ in *Wehbe*. The first way in *Wehbe* is to establish that the objectives of the standard are achieved.

In determining a merit-based assessment of the building height for the proposed development, due consideration has been given to the above objectives and the planning principles set by the Land and Environment Court of NSW, Planning Principle – floor space ratio (*Salanitro-Chafei V Ashfield Council* (2005) NSWLEC 366) and *Project Venture Developments v Pittwater Council* (2005) NSW LEC 91).

It is acknowledged that the purpose of Clause 4.6 is to provide an appropriate degree of flexibility in applying certain development standards. In this regard, site topography should be considered when assessing the proposed height of buildings for the site. Given the proposed application is relatively minor and consistent with the built form character of the area, Council's assessment should be focused on this numerical allowance as opposed to the variation to the specific standard.

By providing flexibility the subject proposal is capable of achieving a better development and design outcome which adequately caters for enhanced housing options for the residential needs within the Northern Beaches LGA, in particular the Fairlight precinct.

### **The First Method**

The proposal is consistent with the objectives of Clause 4.3.

#### **4.3 Height of buildings**

*(1) The objectives of this clause are as follows—*

*(a) to provide for building heights and roof forms that are consistent with the topographic landscape, prevailing building height and desired future streetscape character in the locality,*

*(b) to control the bulk and scale of buildings,*

*(c) to minimise disruption to the following—*

*(i) views to nearby residential development from public spaces (including the harbour and foreshores),*

*(ii) views from nearby residential development to public spaces (including the harbour and foreshores),*

*(iii) views between public spaces (including the harbour and foreshores),*

*(d) to provide solar access to public and private open spaces and maintain adequate sunlight access to private open spaces and to habitable rooms of adjacent dwellings,*

*(e) to ensure the height and bulk of any proposed building or structure in a recreation or environmental protection zone has regard to existing vegetation and topography and any other aspect that might conflict with bushland and surrounding land uses.*

*(2) The height of a building on any land is not to exceed the maximum height shown for the land on the [Height of Buildings Map](#).*

**Comment:** It is acknowledged that the proposed development does not comply with clause 4.3 (2) and accordingly there is a requirement to submit a Clause 4.6 Variation. This Clause 4.6 seeks an exemption to the development standard as prescribed under the MLEP2013 and demonstrates that compliance with the provisions of clause 4.3 (2) is both unreasonable and unnecessary and the proposed development meets the required steps that are set out in the relevant NSW Land and Environment Court decisions to justify that the standard can be varied to achieve the subject proposal.

The development standard in Clause 4.3 (2) of the MLEP2013, is amendable to variation. The purpose of this Clause 4.6 is to vary the Height of Building as a building height referable to the building to give Council the power to grant development consent to the non-compliant purposes. This proposition is reinforced by the following:

Clause 4.3 (2) states:

*(2) The height of a building on any land is not to exceed the maximum height shown for the land on the Height of Buildings Map.*

The Height of Building Map sets a maximum Height of Building control of 8.5m. For the purpose of calculating Height of Building, the MLEP2013 provides the following definition:

Building height is defined as follows:

**building height** (or **height of building**) means—

*(a) in relation to the height of a building in metres—the vertical distance from ground level (existing) to the highest point of the building, or*

*(b) in relation to the RL of a building—the vertical distance from the Australian Height Datum to the highest point of the building,*

*including plant and lift overruns, but excluding communication devices, antennae, satellite dishes, masts, flagpoles, chimneys, flues and the like.*

**ground level (existing)** means the existing level of a site at any point.

The Height of Building in clause 4.3(2) of the MLEP2013 is a development standard in accordance with the definition set out below:

Development standards' is defined in section 1.4 of the EP&A Act 1979 as:

**development standards** means provisions of an environmental planning instrument or the regulations in relation to the carrying out of development, being provisions by or under which **requirements are specified or standards are fixed** in respect of any aspect of that development, including, but without limiting the generality of the foregoing, requirements or standards in respect of:

*(c) the character, location, siting, bulk, scale, shape, size, height, density, design or external appearance of a building or work,*

Despite the variation to the Height of Building control which occurs as a result of the topography of the land, the proposed development is considered to be in keeping with the desired future character of the locality. The proposal has been strategically designed to minimise the impact and bulk and scale of the project. The project architect has worked tirelessly to design a new modern high-end development that meet the sites constraints and the existing bulk and scale of the area; therefore, the proposal will not result in any unreasonable visual impact on the Baltic Street streetscape.

The proposed development will not result in any unreasonable impacts on adjoining properties in terms of views, privacy or overshadowing. Therefore, this written submission is considered to be compliant with the Statutory Provisions prescribed both under MLEP2013 and the provisions of Clause 4.6 which permit a variation to a development standard. It is noted it is consistent with the approval granted through the case *Merman Investments Pty Ltd v Woollahra Municipal Council* [2021] NSWLEC 1582 is that the distorted height plane creates reasonable environmental planning ground that justifies the contravention of the height standard.

In determining the building heights of the development, it is important to understand the definitions of building height and ground level (existing) and also relevant case law from the NSW Land and Environmental Court.

The court now considers the definition of “ground level (existing)” *Merman Investments Pty Ltd v Woollahra Municipal Council* [2021] NSWLEC 1582, which insists that the ground level (existing) is measured from the **excavated** ground level (within the footprint of the existing building) to the highest point of the proposal directly above. It is noted that the Court accepted (at [74]) that there is an ‘environmental planning ground’ that may justify the contravention of the height standard under ‘clause 4.6’ when the prior excavation of the site (within the footprint of the existing building) distorts the maximum building height plane. This falls hand in hand with the original leading cases *Bettar v Council of the City of Sydney* [2014] NSWLEC 1070 and *Stamford Property Services Pty Ltd v City of Sydney & Anor* [2015] NSWLEC 1189.


It is noted that common-sense should prevail from the new court case “Merman Investments Pty Ltd” with the fact that many height planes are now going to be distorted creating an argument which goes hand in hand with the original court cases relating to the extrapolated levels of a site through ‘Bettar’.

As a result of the above, it is determined that the maximum building above ground level (existing) is 9.026m for the proposed development. This results in a 0.526m variation or 6.19%. The Development Application is supported by a Clause 4.6 Variation to Development Standard report. The proposed breach relates to the front component of the dwelling and a portion where the excavated ground level distorts the height plane.


It is noted that the building height flows from 6.7m at the rear of the site to the maximum 9.026m which is consistent with the topography of the southern side of Baltic Street. It is noted that the breach is the result of the sloping nature of the site and several existing man-made level changes which distort the existing ground level. If the natural ground level was applied, the proposed variation would be consistent with other approvals granted in the area. It is noted that if the natural ground level was applied, the proposal would achieve compliance with the 8.5m building height control for the majority of the building footprint. Regardless, the natural topography of the site makes compliance with the building height impractical, and therefore unreasonable for Council to enforce. The bulk and scale and three storey appearance of the southern side of Baltic Street is also retained. The proposal is supported and in our opinion is consistent with the objectives of the Clause, as outlined below:

(a) [to provide for building heights and roof forms that are consistent with the topographic landscape, prevailing building height and desired future streetscape character in the locality,](#) This objective relates to streetscape character and in this regard the proposed dwelling has been designed to be consistent with the three-storey bulk and scale of Baltic Street. The height, bulk, scale of the development, as reflected by floor space, are entirely consistent with the built form characteristics established by the enclave of surrounding development in this precinct noting the topography of the southern side of Baltic Street. It is our considered opinion that the proposal is consistent with the intent and approvals granted in the area, therefore confirming that the proposal is consistent with the prevailing building height, roof forms and the future streetscape of the locality. In this regard, the excerpt below shows that the proposed ridge height (albeit above the 8.5m height limit) is lower than both adjoining properties at 13 and 17 Baltic Street:





The proposed breach relates to the front component of the dwelling and a portion where the excavated ground level distorts the height plane, noting that the rear façade is 6.7m. The resulting variation is due to the natural topography and existing man-made changes which hinders the development when assessed with the ground level (existing) definition. If the merits of the ‘Bettar’ Court Case are utilised, the natural ground level enables a variation with that consistent with other developments.



The proposal is consistent with the conclusions reached by Senior Commissioner Roseth in the matter of Project Venture Developments v Pittwater Council (2005) NSW LEC 191, in that I have formed the considered opinion that most observers would not find the proposed development by virtue of its roof form and building height, and in particular the non-compliant building height elements, offensive, jarring or unsympathetic in a streetscape context nor having regard to the built form characteristics of development within the sites visual catchment. The proposal is consistent with this objective notwithstanding the variation to the building height.

(b) to control the bulk and scale of buildings,

The proposal has been strategically designed to minimise the impact and bulk and scale of the project. The project architects have worked tirelessly to design a new modern high-end dwelling that meet the sites constraints and the existing bulk and scale of the area. The proposal has been designed to be compatible with the existing streetscape (noting the existing three-storey bulk and scale either side of the subject site) while accommodating a bulk and scale that is complementary to the natural environment. The first floor has been designed with varying and large side setbacks which reduces the bulk and scale and accommodates a dwelling that blends in with the streetscape. As assessed within objective (a) the proposal is consistent with the streetscape of Baltic Street, which therefore dictates the bulk and scale for the locality.

(c) to minimise disruption to the following—

(i) views to nearby residential development from public spaces (including the harbour and foreshores),

Having inspected the site and its surrounds I am of the opinion that the building form and height of the proposed development, in particular that associated with the building height breaching elements, has been appropriately located within the site to minimise disruption of views to nearby residential development and from surrounding public spaces. The proposal is consistent with this objective notwithstanding the proposal variation to the building height.

(ii) views from nearby residential development to public spaces (including the harbour and foreshores),

Having regard to the view sharing principles established by the Land and Environment Court of NSW in the matter of Tenacity Consulting v Warringah [2004] NSWLEC 140 as they relate to an assessment of view impacts, I am satisfied that the proposed building height variation will not give rise to any unacceptable public or private view affectation. Whilst the proposal seeks a variation to the building height standard, view impacts have been minimised and a view sharing outcome achieved. The proposal is consistent with this objective notwithstanding the proposed building height variation.

(iii) views between public spaces (including the harbour and foreshores),

The building form and height has been appropriately distributed across the site such that the proposed variation to the building height will have no impact on views between public spaces. The proposal is consistent with this objective notwithstanding the proposed variation to the building height.

(d) to provide solar access to public and private open spaces and maintain adequate sunlight access to private open spaces and to habitable rooms of adjacent dwellings,

The application is accompanied by shadow diagrams drawings DA19 to DA23 which depict the impact of shadowing on the neighbouring properties. The shadow diagrams demonstrate that the proposed development, in particular the non-compliant building height elements, will not cast shadows on the adjoining neighbours living room windows and private open space areas with compliant levels of solar access maintained between 9am and 3pm on 21st June. The proposal is consistent with this objective notwithstanding the building height breaching elements proposed.

(e) to ensure the height and bulk of any proposed building or structure in a recreation or environmental protection zone has regard to existing vegetation and topography and any other aspect that might conflict with bushland and surrounding land uses.

Not applicable – the site is not located within a recreation or environmental protection zone.

The extent of the breach associated are appropriately described both quantitatively and qualitatively as minor. The non-compliant elements of the proposed development do not result in any unreasonable impacts upon the amenity of adjoining sites or the wider public domain.

Consistent with the findings of Commissioner Walsh in *Eather v Randwick City Council* [2021] NSWLEC 1075 and Commissioner Grey in *Petrovic v Randwick City Council* [202] NSW LEC 1242, the particularly small departure from the actual numerical standard and absence of impacts consequential of the departure constitute environmental planning grounds, as it promotes the good design and amenity of the development in accordance with the objects of the EP&A Act. Overall, there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening the development standard.

It is our professional opinion that the building by virtue of its height, bulk and scale, is consistent with the locality and desired character of the area. We have formed the considered opinion that the project is a sympathetic design and development with a bulk and scale consistent with the existing and future character of the area. The proposal is not offensive, or unsympathetic in a streetscape context nor the context from Baltic Street, and therefore the variation can be supported by Northern Beaches Council.

#### **4.3 Are there sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening the development standard?**

There are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening the development standard. Whilst there is no requirement that the development comply with the objectives set out in clause 4.6(1) it is relevant to note that objective (b) provides:

*“to achieve better outcomes **for and from** development by allowing flexibility in particular circumstances.”*

It should be noted at the outset that in *Initial Action* the Court held that it is incorrect to hold that the lack of adverse impact on adjoining properties is not a sufficient ground justifying the development contravening the development standard when one way of demonstrating consistency with the objectives of a development standard is to show a lack of adverse impacts.

There is an absence of environmental harm arising from the contravention and positive planning benefits arising from the proposed development as outlined in detail above. From a planning perspective, there is sufficient grounds to justify the variation to the height of buildings development standard for the following reasons:

1. Historical excavation and site disturbance
2. Topography of the site
3. Characterisation of the development
4. Streetscape Appearance
  - The sites topography and existing man-made excavation distorts the height plane for the site. If the natural ground level was taken, the proposal would substantially comply with the building height control.
  - The proposed development responds to the existing and desired future character of the locality. Furthermore, the subject proposed new dwelling will sit lower than the ridge lines of the adjoining neighbours to the east and west at 13 and 17 Baltic Street. It's our opinion that

the proposal will integrate into the existing streetscape and pattern of development within Baltic Street.

- The development does not result in any unnecessary or undue bulk or visual impacts on adjoining properties and is of a scale that is compatible with the existing and surrounding buildings. The streetscape analysis completed within the Statement of Environmental Effects notes numerous recent approvals with a variation to the building height and properties three storeys in height.
- The amenity impacts to neighbouring residential properties, arising from the non-compliant building height, is negligible. Adjoining properties will continue to receive suitable solar access, privacy impacts are suitably minimised, and views are reasonably maintained.
- The building height breach is minor (when assessed from the natural ground level) and would relate to only a small portion of the proposed development only, which will largely be indiscernible when viewed from Baltic Street.
- The proposal is consistent with the stance Council has taken on developments within Fairlight noting numerous approvals granted for variations to the building height control for the following developments:
  - DA2024/0040 – 18 Wattle Avenue Fairlight – 8.8% variation
  - DA2024/0864 – 4 Jamieson Avenue Fairlight – 7% variation
  - MOD2024/0155 – 9 Francis Street Fairlight – 15.3% variation
  - DA2023/1583 - 38 Francis Street Fairlight – 17.4% variation

Having regard to *Initial Action Pty Ltd v Woollahra Municipal Council* [2018] NSWLEC 118, and further to the proposal's consistency with the above strategic and statutory environmental planning provisions, the proposal is consistent with the following objectives under Section 1.3 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (the Act):

*(c) to promote the orderly and economic use and development of land; and  
(g) to promote good design and amenity of the built environment,*

1. In response to (c), the proposal will facilitate the orderly and economic use and development of the land in a manner that is desired by the planning controls because it will facilitate the renovated dwelling consistent with approvals in the immediate area. In considering the contrary (refusal of the DA), retention of the building in its current form would not promote the orderly and economic use and development of land in the manner that council's strategic and statutory planning provisions seek. Retention of the building in its current form makes no advancement towards achieving the goal of creating functional development opportunities.

2. In response to (g) the proposal has been designed to promote good design and amenity of the built environment, with a consistent built form retained for Baltic Street as per recent approvals.

As outlined above, it is considered that in many respects, the proposal will provide for a better planning outcome than a strictly compliant development. At the very least, there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening the development standard.

Based on the above, it has been demonstrated that there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify the proposed height of buildings non-compliance in this instance.

## 5 Conclusion

Pursuant to clause 4.6(3), the consent authority is satisfied that the applicant's written request has adequately addressed the matters required to be demonstrated by subclause (3) being:

- (a) that compliance with the development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances of the case, and*
- (b) that there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening the development standard.*

As such, I have formed the highly considered opinion that there is no statutory or environmental planning impediment to the granting of a height of buildings variation in this instance.