

## **Clause 4.6 variation request - Height of buildings (clause 4.3 MLEP 2013)**

### **1.0 Introduction**

This clause 4.6 variation has been prepared having regard to the Land and Environment Court judgements in the matters of *Wehbe v Pittwater Council* [2007] NSWLEC 827 (*Wehbe*) at [42] – [48], *Four2Five Pty Ltd v Ashfield Council* [2015] NSWCA 248, *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.

### **2.0 Manly Local Environmental Plan 2013 (“MLEP”)**

#### **2.1 Clause 4.3 - Height of buildings**

Pursuant to Clause 4.3 of Manly Local Environmental Plan 2013 (MLEP) the height of a building on the subject land is not to exceed 8.5 metres in height. The objectives of this control 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.*

Building height is defined as follows:

**building height** (or **height of building**) means the vertical distance between ground level (existing) and 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 is defined as follows:

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

The maximum proposed building height is measured at 9.13m which equates to a variation of 630mm or 7.41% variation.

## 2.2 Clause 4.6 – Exceptions to Development Standards

Clause 4.6(1) of MLEP provides:

(1) *The objectives of this clause are:*

The decision of Chief Justice Preston in *Initial Action Pty Ltd v Woollahra Municipal Council* [2018] NSWLEC 118 (“Initial Action”) provides guidance in respect of the operation of clause 4.6 subject to the clarification by the NSW Court of Appeal in *RebelMH Neutral Bay Pty Limited v North Sydney Council* [2019] NSWCA 130 at [1], [4] & [51] where the Court confirmed that properly construed, a consent authority has to be satisfied that an applicant’s written request has in fact demonstrated the matters required to be demonstrated by cl 4.6(3).

*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 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.*

This clause applies to the clause 4.3 Height of Buildings Development Standard.

Clause 4.6(3) of MLEP provides:

*(3) Development consent must not be granted for development that contravenes a development standard unless the consent authority has considered a written request from the applicant that seeks to justify the contravention of the development standard by demonstrating:*

*(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.*

The proposed development does not comply with the height of buildings provision at 4.3 of MLEP which specifies a maximum building height however strict compliance is considered to be unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances of this case and there are considered to be sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening the development standard.

The relevant arguments are set out later in this written request.

Clause 4.6(4) of MLEP provides:

*(4) Development consent must not be granted for development that contravenes a development standard unless:*

*(a) the consent authority is satisfied that:*

*(i) the applicant's written request has adequately addressed the matters required to be demonstrated by subclause (3), and*

*(ii) the proposed development will be in the public interest because it is consistent with the objectives of the particular standard and the objectives for development within the zone in which the development is proposed to be carried out, and*

*(b) the concurrence of the Director-General has been obtained.*

In *Initial Action* the Court found that clause 4.6(4) required the satisfaction of two preconditions ([14] & [28]). The first precondition is found in clause 4.6(4)(a). That precondition requires the formation of two positive opinions of satisfaction by the consent authority. The first positive opinion of satisfaction (cl 4.6(4)(a)(i)) is that the applicant's written request has adequately addressed the matters required to be demonstrated by clause 4.6(3)(a)(i) (*Initial Action* at [25]).

The second positive opinion of satisfaction (cl 4.6(4)(a)(ii)) is that the proposed development will be in the public interest because it is consistent with the objectives of the development standard and the objectives for development of the zone in which the development is proposed to be carried out (*Initial Action* at [27]). The second precondition is found in clause 4.6(4)(b). The second precondition requires the consent authority to be satisfied that the concurrence of the Secretary (of the Department of Planning and the Environment) has been obtained (*Initial Action* at [28]).

Under cl 64 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2021*, the Secretary has given written notice dated 5 May 2020, attached to the Planning Circular PS 20-002, to each consent authority, that it may assume the Secretary's concurrence for exceptions to development standards in respect of applications made under cl 4.6, subject to the conditions in the table in the notice.

Clause 4.6(5) of MLEP provides:

(5) *In deciding whether to grant concurrence, the Director-General must consider:*

- (a) *whether contravention of the development standard raises any matter of significance for State or regional environmental planning, and*
- (b) *the public benefit of maintaining the development standard, and*
- (c) *any other matters required to be taken into consideration by the Director-General before granting concurrence.*

Clause 4.6(6) relates to subdivision and is not relevant to the development. Clause 4.6(7) is administrative and requires the consent authority to keep a record of its assessment of the clause 4.6 variation. Clause 4.6(8) is only relevant so as to note that it does not exclude clause 4.3 of MLEP from the operation of clause 4.6.

### 3.0 Relevant Case Law

In *Initial Action* the Court summarised the legal requirements of clause 4.6 and confirmed the continuing relevance of previous case law at [13] to [29]. In particular the Court confirmed that the five common ways of establishing that compliance with a development standard might be unreasonable and unnecessary as identified in *Wehbe v Pittwater Council* (2007) 156 LGERA 446; [2007] NSWLEC 827 continue to apply as follows:

17. *The first and most commonly invoked way is to establish that compliance with the development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary because the objectives of the development standard are achieved notwithstanding non-compliance with the standard: Wehbe v Pittwater Council at [42] and [43].*

18. *A second way is to establish that the underlying objective or purpose is not relevant to the development with the consequence that compliance is unnecessary: Wehbe v Pittwater Council at [45].*

19. *A third way is to establish that the underlying objective or purpose would be defeated or thwarted if compliance was required with the consequence that compliance is unreasonable: Wehbe v Pittwater Council at [46].*

20. *A fourth way is to establish that the development standard has been virtually abandoned or destroyed by the Council's own decisions in granting development consents that depart from the standard and hence compliance with the standard is unnecessary and unreasonable: Wehbe v Pittwater Council at [47].*

21. *A fifth way is to establish that the zoning of the particular land on which the development is proposed to be carried out was unreasonable or inappropriate so that the development standard, which was appropriate for that zoning, was also unreasonable or unnecessary as it applied to that land and that compliance with the standard in the circumstances of the case would also be unreasonable or unnecessary: Wehbe v Pittwater Council at [48]. However, this fifth way of establishing that compliance with the development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary is limited, as explained in Wehbe v Pittwater Council at [49]-[51]. The power under cl 4.6 to dispense with compliance with the development standard is not a general planning power to determine the appropriateness of the development standard for the zoning or to effect general planning changes as an alternative to the strategic planning powers in Part 3 of the EPA Act.*

22. *These five ways are not exhaustive of the ways in which an applicant might demonstrate that compliance with a development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary; they are merely the most commonly invoked ways. An applicant does not need to establish all of the ways. It may be sufficient to establish only one way, although if more ways are applicable, an applicant can demonstrate that compliance is unreasonable or unnecessary in more than one way.*

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 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

3. Is the consent authority satisfied that the proposed development will be in the public interest because it is consistent with the objectives of clause 4.3 and the objectives for development for in the zone?

4. Has the concurrence of the Secretary of the Department of Planning and Environment been obtained?

5. Where the consent authority is the Court, has the Court considered the matters in clause 4.6(5) when exercising the power to grant development consent for the development that contravenes clause 4.3 of MLEP?

#### **4.0 Request for variation**

##### **4.1 Is clause 4.3 of MLEP a development standard?**

The definition of “development standard” at 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,*

Clause 4.3 MLEP prescribes a height provision that relates to certain development. Accordingly, clause 4.3 MLEP is a development standard.

##### **4.2A Clause 4.6(3)(a) – Whether compliance with the development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary**

The common approach for an applicant to demonstrate that compliance with a development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary are set out in *Wehbe v Pittwater Council* [2007] NSWLEC 827.

The first option, which has been adopted in this case, is to establish that compliance with the development standard is unreasonable and unnecessary because the objectives of the development standard are achieved notwithstanding non-compliance with the standard.

##### **Consistency with objectives of the height of buildings standard**

An assessment as to the consistency of the proposal when assessed against the objectives of the standard is 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,*

Response: The dwelling proposes a new first floor level which will present as 2 storeys to the street. The height of the dwelling when viewed from the street is measured at 7.87m with the area of non-compliance isolated to the rear where the land slopes down and includes existing excavated lower levels. The dwelling is consistent with prevailing building heights and the streetscape character.

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

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

Response: This objective is explanatory of the purpose of the height of building standard. The objective is not an end in itself. By fixing different upper limits for the height of buildings on land in different areas by means of the building height map the clause does seek to control bulk and scale of buildings. The establishment of upper limit for height is not the end to be achieved by the clause rather it is a means to achieve the other objectives of the standard that are dealt with above and below (*Baron Corporation Pty Limited –v- the City of Sydney Council [2019] NSWLEC 61* at [48]-[49]).

Notwithstanding, the works will present as a predominately 2 storey dwelling and is consistent with the floor space ratio control which reflects its reasonableness with regard to bulk and scale.

Consistent with the conclusions reached by Senior Commissioner Roseth in the matter of *Project Venture Developments v Pittwater Council (2005) NSW LEC 191* I have formed the considered opinion that most observers would not find the proposed development by virtue of its bulk and scale 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 achieves this objective.

- (c) *to minimise disruption to the following:*

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

Response: No views will be impacted to public spaces.

The proposal achieves this objective.

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

Response: No views will be impacted from public spaces.

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

Response: No views are impacted between public spaces.

The proposal achieves this objective.

*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,*

Response: The shadow diagrams provided within the architectural set demonstrate that the building height breaching portion of the development will not give rise to any unacceptable shadowing impact to adjoining properties.

The proposal achieves this objective.

*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.*

Response: This objective is not applicable.

Having regard to the above, the non-compliant component of the building will achieve the objectives of the standard to at least an equal degree as would be the case with a development that complied with the building height standard. Given the developments consistency with the objectives of the height of buildings standard strict compliance has been found to be both unreasonable and unnecessary under the circumstances.

#### **4.2B Clause 4.6(4)(b) – Are there sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening the development standard?**

In Initial Action the Court found at [23]-[24] that:

*23. As to the second matter required by cl 4.6(3)(b), the grounds relied on by the applicant in the written request under cl 4.6 must be “environmental planning grounds” by their nature: see Four2Five Pty Ltd v Ashfield Council [2015] NSWLEC 90 at [26]. The adjectival phrase “environmental planning” is not defined, but would*



refer to grounds that relate to the subject matter, scope and purpose of the EPA Act, including the objects in s 1.3 of the EPA Act.

24. The environmental planning grounds relied on in the written request under cl 4.6 must be “sufficient”. There are two respects in which the written request needs to be “sufficient”. First, the environmental planning grounds advanced in the written request must be sufficient “to justify contravening the development standard”. The focus of cl 4.6(3)(b) is on the aspect or element of the development that contravenes the development standard, not on the development as a whole, and why that contravention is justified on environmental planning grounds.

25. The environmental planning grounds advanced in the written request must justify the contravention of the development standard, not simply promote the benefits of carrying out the development as a whole: see *Four2Five Pty Ltd v Ashfield Council* [2015] NSWCA 248 at [15]. Second, the written request must demonstrate that there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening the development standard so as to enable the consent authority to be satisfied under cl 4.6(4)(a)(i) that the written request has adequately addressed this matter: see *Four2Five Pty Ltd v Ashfield Council* [2015] NSWLEC 90 at [31].

Sufficient environmental planning grounds exist to justify the height of buildings variation which include:

- The steep topography makes strict compliance with the building height standard challenging in this instance while providing for reasonable alterations and additions relating to a new first floor level. The existing subfloor void and lower level laundry and bathroom to the rear result in the rear portion of the dwelling exceeding the 8.5m standard, as shown on the section drawings below.





Image 1: Section C which is taken through the centre of the dwelling



**Image 2: Section D taken through the southern side of the dwelling**

- As seen above, the existing ground floor level is elevated above existing ground level with the rear previously excavated to accommodate the wet areas and sunroom. The predominate breach is occurring above the existing excavated level.
- When extrapolating an 8.5m height plane from natural surveyed levels the breach would be minor and confined to the top of the roof pitch. The bulk of the dwelling would conform with the control.
- As mentioned, the existing ground floor is raised above ground level which makes providing for a reasonable first floor addition that strictly complies challenging. The design incorporates a pitch roof to reflect the existing roof form and represents good design principles. The floor to ceiling heights within the first floor level are modest measuring 2.45m which demonstrates a concerted effort to minimise the dwellings overall height.
- No adverse amenity impacts with regard to privacy, overshadowing or view loss occur due to breaching elements of the new works.

In this regard, I consider the proposal to be of a skilful design which responds appropriately and effectively to the above constraints by appropriately distributing floor space, building mass and building height across the site in a manner which provides for appropriate streetscape and residential amenity outcomes.

Such outcome is achieved whilst realising the reasonable development potential of the land.

The proposed development achieves the objects in Section 1.3 of the EPA Act, specifically:

- The proposal promotes the orderly and economic use and development of land (1.3(c)).
- The development represents good design (1.3(g)).
- The building as designed facilitates its proper construction and will ensure the protection of the health and safety of its future occupants (1.3(h)).

It is noted that in *Initial Action*, the Court clarified what items a Clause 4.6 does and does not need to satisfy. Importantly, there does not need to be a "better" planning outcome:

*87. The second matter was in cl 4.6(3)(b). I find that the Commissioner applied the wrong test in considering this matter by requiring that the development, which contravened the height development standard, result in a "better environmental planning outcome for the site" relative to a development that complies with the height development standard (in [141] and [142] of the judgment). Clause 4.6 does not directly or indirectly establish this test. The requirement in cl 4.6(3)(b) is that there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening the development standard, not that the development that contravenes the development standard have a better environmental planning outcome than a development that complies with the development standard.*

There are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening the development standard.

#### **4.3 Clause 4.6(a)(iii) – Is the proposed development in the public interest because it is consistent with the objectives of clause 4.3A and the objectives of the R2 Low Density Residential zone**

The consent authority needs to be satisfied that the proposed development will be in the public interest if the standard is varied because it is consistent with the objectives of the standard and the objectives of the zone.

Preston CJ in *Initial Action* (Para 27) described the relevant test for this as follows:

*“The matter in cl 4.6(4)(a)(ii), with which the consent authority or the Court on appeal must be satisfied, is not merely that the proposed development will be in the public interest but that it will be in the public interest because it is consistent with the objectives of the development standard and the objectives for development of the zone in which the development is proposed to be carried out. It is the proposed development’s consistency with the objectives of the development standard and the objectives of the zone that make the proposed development in the public interest.*

*If the proposed development is inconsistent with either the objectives of the development standard or the objectives of the zone or both, the consent authority, or the Court on appeal, cannot be satisfied that the development will be in the public interest for the purposes of cl 4.6(4)(a)(ii)."*

As demonstrated in this request, the proposed development it is consistent with the objectives of the development standard and the objectives for development of the zone in which the development is proposed to be carried out.

Accordingly, the consent authority can be satisfied that the proposed development will be in the public interest if the standard is varied because it is consistent with the objectives of the standard and the objectives of the zone.

#### **4.4 Secretary's concurrence**

By Planning Circular dated 20 May 2020, the Secretary of the Department of Planning & Environment advised that consent authorities can assume the concurrence to clause 4.6 request except in the circumstances set out below:

- Lot size standards for rural dwellings;
- Variations exceeding 10%; and
- Variations to non-numerical development standards.

The circular also provides that concurrence can be assumed when an LPP is the consent authority where a variation exceeds 10% or is to a non-numerical standard, because of the greater scrutiny that the LPP process and determination s are subject to, compared with decisions made under delegation by Council staff.

Concurrence of the Secretary can therefore be assumed in this case.

#### **5.0 Conclusion**

Pursuant to clause 4.6(4)(a), 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.

**Yours Sincerely**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'William Fleming', written in a cursive style.

**William Fleming  
BS, MPLAN  
Boston Blyth Fleming Pty Ltd  
Director**