

**APPENDIX 1**  
**CLAUSE 4.6 – FLOOR SPACE RATIO**  
**(Clause 4.4 MLEP 2013)**

**Prepared**  
**May 2025**

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

**46 BUNGALOE STREET, BALGOWLAH**

**FOR THE DEMOLITION OF THE MAJORITY OF THE EXISTING STRUCTURES AND THE  
CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW DWELLING, GARAGE & SWIMMING POOL**

**VARIATION OF A DEVELOPMENT STANDARD REGARDING COUNCIL'S MAXIMUM FLOOR SPACE  
RATIO AS DETAILED IN CLAUSE 4.4 OF THE MANLY  
LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN 2013**

**For:** Proposed demolition of the existing structures and the construction of a new dwelling, garage and swimming pool  
**At:** 24 Ogilvy Road, Clontarf  
**Owner:** David and Christine LaRose  
**Applicant:** David and Christine LaRose  
C/- Vaughan Milligan Development Consulting

## **1.0 Introduction**

This written request is made pursuant to the provisions of Clause 4.6 of Manly Local Environmental Plan 2013. In this regard, it is requested Council support a variation with respect to compliance with the maximum floor space ratio development standard as described in Clause 4.4 of the Manly Local Environmental Plan 2013 (MLEP 2013).

This submission has been prepared to address the provisions within Section 35B of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2021, and as discussed within this Written Request, will demonstrate the grounds on which the proposal considers the matters set out in Clause 4.6(3)(a) and (b) of the MLEP 2013.

The relevant maximum floor space control in this locality is 0.4:1 or for this site with an area of 470.1m<sup>2</sup>, the maximum gross floor area is 188.04m<sup>2</sup> and is considered to be a development standard as defined by Section 4 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act.

The proposed development will see the demolition of the majority of the existing structures and the construction of a new dwelling, garage and swimming pool which will have a total gross floor area of 227.95m<sup>2</sup> or a floor space ratio of 0.484:1, and therefore the extent of the variation from the control will be 39.91m<sup>2</sup> or 21.22%.

It is noted that the Council's Manly Development Control Plan 2013 Amendment 14 and in particular Clause 4.1.3.1 provides exceptions to the FSR control where the lot is less than

minimum required lot size under Council's LEP Lot Size Map and the development satisfies the LEP Objectives and the DCP provisions.

In this instance the site is noted as being Area "R" on the Lot Size Map and the minimum lot size in the locality is 750m<sup>2</sup>. The DCP allows for the floor area to be assessed against the minimum lot size of 750m<sup>2</sup>, which in this instance allows for a permissible floor area of 300m<sup>2</sup>.

When considered against the minimum lot area of 750m<sup>2</sup>, the proposed development will present a total floor area of 227.95m<sup>2</sup> or an FSR of 0.3:1, which comfortably complies with the control.

#### **Is clause 4.4 of MLEP a development standard?**

- (a) The definition of "development standard" in clause 1.4 of the EP&A Act means standard is fixed in respect of an aspect of a development and include:

*"(d) the cubic content of floor space of a building."*

- (b) Clause 4.4 relates to floor space of a building. Accordingly, clause 4.4 is a development standard.

The controls of Clause 4.4 are considered to be a development standard as defined in the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979.

## **2.0 Authority to vary a Development Standard**

In September 2023, the NSW Government published amendments to Clause 4.6 of the Standard Instrument which change the operation of the clause across all local environmental plans, including the Pittwater LEP. The changes came into force on 1 November 2023.

The principal change is the omission of subclauses 4.6(3)-(5) and (7) in the Standard Instrument Principal Local Environmental Plan.

The following changes have been made as a result of this:

- Clause 4.6(3) was amended such that the requirement to 'consider' a written request has been changed with an express requirement that the consent authority 'be satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated' that compliance with the development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary.
- Clause 4.6(4)(a)(ii) was amended such that the requirement that the consent authority must be satisfied that the proposed development in the public interest has been removed.
- Clause 4.6(4)(b) & 5 amended such that the requirement for concurrence from the Planning Secretary has been removed.

The objectives of clause 4.6 of the LEP, as amended, seek to recognise that in the particular circumstances of this case strict application of development standards may be unreasonable or

unnecessary. The clause provides objectives and a means by which a variation to the development standard can be achieved as outlined below:

*Clause 4.6 Exception to development standard*

*(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.*

*(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.*

*(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.*

**Note—**

The [Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2021](#) requires a development application for development that proposes to contravene a development standard to be accompanied by a document setting out the grounds on which the applicant seeks to demonstrate the matters in paragraphs (a) and (b).

*(4) The consent authority must keep a record of its assessment carried out under subclause (3).*

*(5) (Repealed)*

*(6) Development consent must not be granted under this clause for a subdivision of land in Zone RU1 Primary Production, Zone RU2 Rural Landscape, Zone RU3 Forestry, Zone RU4 Primary Production Small Lots, Zone RU6 Transition, Zone R5 Large Lot Residential, Zone C2 Environmental Conservation, Zone C3 Environmental Management or Zone C4 Environmental Living if—*

- (a) the subdivision will result in 2 or more lots of less than the minimum area specified for such lots by a development standard, or*
- (b) the subdivision will result in at least one lot that is less than 90% of the minimum area specified for such a lot by a development standard.*

**Note—**

When this Plan was made it did not include all of these zones.

*(7) (Repealed)*

*(8) This clause does not allow development consent to be granted for development that would contravene any of the following—*

- (a) a development standard for complying development,*
- (b) a development standard that arises, under the regulations under the Act, in connection with a commitment set out in a BASIX certificate for a building to which [State Environmental Planning Policy \(Building Sustainability Index: BASIX\) 2004](#) applies or for the land on which such a building is situated,*
- (c) clause 5.4,*
- (caa) clause 5.5.*
- (ca) clause 6.15,*
- (cb) a development standard on land to which clause 6.19 applies.*

### **3.0 Purpose of Clause 4.6**

The Manly Local Environmental Plan 2013 contains its own variations clause (Clause 4.6) to allow a departure from a development standard. Clause 4.6 of the Standard Instrument is similar in tenor to the former State Environmental Planning Policy No. 1, however the variations clause contains considerations which are different to those in SEPP 1. The language of Clause 4.6(3)(a)(b) suggests a similar approach to SEPP 1 may be taken in part.

There is recent judicial guidance on how variations under Clause 4.6 of the Standard Instrument should be assessed. These cases are taken into consideration in this request for variation.

In particular, the principles identified by Preston CJ in *Initial Action Pty Ltd vs Woollahra Municipal Council* [2018] NSWLEC 118 have been relied on in this request for a variation to the development standard.

### **4.0 Objectives of Clause 4.6**

The objectives of Clause 4.6 are as follows:

- (a) To provide an appropriate degree of flexibility in applying certain development standards to particular development, and*
- (b) To achieve better outcomes for and from development by allowing flexibility in particular circumstances.*

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.*

Clause 4.4 (the FSR development standard) is not excluded from the operation of clause 4.6 by clause 4.6(8) or any other clause of MLEP.

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 FSR development standard pursuant to clause 4.4 of MLEP which specifies an FSR of 0.4:1, which allows for a gross floor area of 188.04m<sup>2</sup>.

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) is administrative and requires the consent authority to keep a record of its assessment of the clause 4.6 variation.

Clause 4.6(6) relates to subdivision and is not relevant to the development.

Clause 4.6(8) is only relevant so as to note that it does not exclude clause 4.4 of MLEP from the operation of clause 4.6.

## **5.0 The Nature and Extent of the Variation**

- 5.1 This request seeks a variation to the FSR development standard contained in clause 4.4 of MLEP.
- 5.2 Clause 4.4 of MLEP specifies an allowable gross floor area for a site in this part of Clontarf 0.4:1 or for this site with an area of 470.1m<sup>2</sup>, the allowable gross floor area is 188.04m<sup>2</sup>.
- 5.3 The proposal has a calculable gross floor area of 227.95m<sup>2</sup> or FSR of 0.484:1.
- 5.4 The total non-compliance with the FSR control is 39.91<sup>2</sup> or 21.22%, which is a breach to the control.
- 5.5 When assessed against a minimum lot area of 750m<sup>2</sup>, the proposal presents an FSR of 0.3:1, which comfortably complies with the floor space ratio control.

## **6.0 Relevant Caselaw**

- 6.1 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.*

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

1. Is clause 4.4 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 consistent with the objectives of clause 4.4 and the objectives for development for in the R2 zone?



## **7.0. Request for Variation**

### **7.1 Is compliance with clause 4.4 unreasonable or unnecessary?**

- (a) This request relies upon the 1st way identified by Preston CJ in *Wehbe*.
- (b) The first way in *Wehbe* is to establish that the objectives of the standard are achieved.
- (c) Each objective of the FSR standard and reasoning why compliance is unreasonable or unnecessary is set out below:

***(a) to ensure the bulk and scale of development is consistent with the existing and desired streetscape character,***

The objective of Clause 4.4(1)(a) seeks to ensure buildings, by virtue of their height and scale are consistent with the desired future streetscape character of the locality.

The proposal provides for a new dwelling which is intended to provide for a development outcome that benefits the surrounding neighbours by maintaining a compatible bulk and scale and preserving existing view sharing opportunities.

The compatible building form with a low profile roof and earthy external finishes are considered to suitably reduce the visual bulk of the dwelling.

Further, the modulation of the front façade, together with the retention of the existing side setbacks at the street elevation and complementary external finishes will ensure the development minimises the visual impact when viewed from the surrounding public and private areas.

The proposal will be consistent with and complement the existing style of single dwelling housing within the locality and as such, will not be a visually dominant element in the area.

***(b) to control building density and bulk in relation to a site area to ensure that development does not obscure important landscape and townscape features,***

The proposal will not see the loss of any significant vegetation. The built footprint of the existing dwelling will stand clear of the drainage easement which burdens the site and still maintain opportunity for further screening planting. The proposal is supported by a comprehensive Landscape Plan prepared by Contour Landscape Architecture. The proposal is not considered to have any significant visual impacts to the nearby foreshore area.

***(c) to maintain an appropriate visual relationship between new development and the existing character and landscape of the area,***

The site is considered to be sufficient to provide for the proposed works, with the dimensions of the lot to be unchanged.

The proposal will retain an appropriate area of soft landscaping, and the site will maintain an appropriate balance between the landscaping and the built form.

On the basis that the proposal maintains an acceptable level of landscaped area, the site is considered to maintain an appropriate balance between the site's landscaping and the built form.

***(d) to minimise adverse environmental impacts on the use or enjoyment of adjoining land and the public domain,***

The proposed works are wholly contained within the site and will not result in any adverse impacts for any adjoining land.

***(e) to provide for the viability of Zone E1 and encourage the development, expansion and diversity of business activities that will contribute to economic growth, the retention of local services and employment opportunities in local centres.***

The site is not located within a business zone and by providing for the construction of a new dwelling, garage and swimming pool, is not contrary to the viability of any local business activity.

**7.2 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. 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]*

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

The low pitch roof form further introduces modulation and architectural relief to the building's facade, which further distributes any sense of visual bulk.

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

- The proposed new dwelling will introduce modulation and architectural relief to the design of the new building, which promotes good design and improves the amenity of the built environment (1.3(g)).
- The proposed new dwelling will maintain the general bulk and scale of the existing surrounding dwellings and maintains architectural consistency with the prevailing development pattern which promotes the orderly & economic use of the land (cl 1.3(c)).
- Similarly, the proposed new dwelling will provide for improved amenity within a built form which is compatible with the streetscape of Ogilvy Road which also promotes the orderly and economic use of the land (cl 1.3(c)).
- The proposed new works which exceed the gross floor area control and FSR standard of 0.4:1 are considered to promote good design and enhance the residential amenity of the buildings' occupants and the immediate area, which is consistent with the Objective 1.3 (g) of the EPA Act.

The above environmental planning grounds are not general propositions. They are unique circumstances to the proposed development, particularly the provision of a building that provides sufficient floor area for future occupants and manages the bulk and scale and maintains views over and past the building from the public and private domain.

These are not simply benefits of the development as a whole, but are benefits emanating from the breach of the floor space ratio control.

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.*

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.

### **7.3 Is the proposed development consistent with the objectives of clause 4.4 and the objectives of the R2 Low Density Residential zone?**

- (a) Section 4.2 of this written request suggests the 1<sup>st</sup> test in *Wehbe* is made good by the development.
- (b) Each of the objectives of the R2 Low Density Residential Zone and the reasons why the proposed development is consistent with each objective is set out below.

I have had regard for the principles established by Preston CJ in *Nessdee Pty Limited v Orange City Council* [2017] NSWLEC 158 where it was found at paragraph 18 that the first objective of the zone established the range of principal values to be considered in the zone.

Preston CJ found also that *“The second objective is declaratory: the limited range of development that is permitted without or with consent in the Land Use Table is taken to be development that does not have an adverse effect on the values, including the aesthetic values, of the area. That is to say, the limited range of development specified is not inherently incompatible with the objectives of the zone”*.

In response to *Nessdee*, I have provided the following review of the zone objectives:

It is considered that notwithstanding the compatible form of the proposed new dwelling will be consistent with the individual Objectives of the R2 Low Density Residential Zone for the following reasons:

- ***To provide for the housing needs of the community within a low-density residential environment.***

As found in *Nessdee*, this objective is considered to establish the principal values to be considered in the zone.

Dwelling houses are a permissible form within the Land Use table and is considered to be specified development that is not inherently incompatible with the objectives of the zone.

The R2 Low Density Residential Zone contemplates low density residential uses on the land. The housing needs of the community are appropriately provided for

in this instance through the proposed new dwelling which will provide for an appropriate level of amenity and in a form, and respect the predominant bulk and scale of the surrounding dwellings.

The compatible form and scale of the new dwelling will meet the housing needs of the community within a single dwelling house which is a permissible use in this low-density residential zone.

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

The subject proposal relates to a residential dwelling and this provision is therefore not relevant.

The proposed new dwelling will not see any significant or adverse impacts on the views enjoyed by neighbouring properties.

The works will not see any adverse impacts on the solar access enjoyed by adjoining dwellings.

The general bulk and scale of the dwelling as viewed from the public areas in Ogilvy Street from the surrounding private properties will be largely maintained.

## 8.0 Conclusion


This development proposes a departure from the maximum floor space ratio control of 0.4:1 for this locality, with the proposed new dwelling to provide a maximum floor space ratio of 0.484:1.

As discussed, it is noted that the Council's Manly Development Control Plan 2013 Amendment 14 and in particular Clause 4.1.3.1 provides exceptions to the FSR control where the lot is undersized and is less than minimum required lot size under Council's LEP Lot Size Map, where the development satisfies the LEP Objectives and the DCP provisions.

In this instance the required minimum lot size in the locality is 750m<sup>2</sup> and when calculated against this required lot size, the development prescribes a FSR of 0.3:1, which comfortably complies with the control when considered against the FSR control for undersized allotments.

Accordingly, we are of the view that the proposal is consistent with the objectives of the development standard.

In summary, the proposal satisfies all of the requirements of clause 4.6 of MLEP 2013 and the exception to the development standard is reasonable and appropriate in the circumstances of the case.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading 'Vaughan Milligan'. The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

**VAUGHAN MILLIGAN**

*Town Planner*