

APPENDIX TWO

Clause 4.6 – Exceptions to Development Standards

FLOOR SPACE RATIO

Clause 4.6 of the Manly Local Environmental Plan 2013 (MLEP 2013) permits departures from development standards in certain circumstances. In this case, it is necessary to consider if compliance with the development standard is consistent with the aims of the policy and, in particular, does compliance with the development standard tend to hinder the attainment of the objects specified in section 1.3 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (EP&A Act)* being:

- (a) to promote the social and economic welfare of the community and a better environment by the proper management, development and conservation of the State's natural and other resources,*
- (b) to facilitate ecologically sustainable development by integrating relevant economic, environmental and social considerations in decision-making about environmental planning and assessment,*
- (c) to promote the orderly and economic use and development of land,*
- (d) to promote the delivery and maintenance of affordable housing,*
- (e) to protect the environment, including the conservation of threatened and other species of native animals and plants, ecological communities and their habitats,*
- (f) to promote the sustainable management of built and cultural heritage (including Aboriginal cultural heritage),*
- (g) to promote good design and amenity of the built environment,*
- (h) to promote the proper construction and maintenance of buildings, including the protection of the health and safety of their occupants,*
- (i) to promote the sharing of the responsibility for environmental planning and assessment between the different levels of government in the State,*
- (j) to provide increased opportunity for community participation in environmental planning and assessment.*

The aims and objectives of Manly LEP 2013 Clause 4.6 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.*

Under Clause 4.6(3) and (4) of the MLEP 2013, consent for a development that contravenes a development standard must not be granted unless the consent authority is satisfied that:

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

(4)(a)(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,

These matters, along with case law judgements from the NSW Land and Environment Court, are addressed below.

It is of interest that the consent authority specifies a number of development standards that cannot be varied under Clause 4.6, listed in Clause 4.6(8). Clause 4.4 – Floor Space Ratio is not one of the standards excluded, it must therefore be assumed that the standard for FSR, is one of the development standards that can have an appropriate degree of flexibility applied under clause 4.6.

1. Environmental Planning Instrument Details (Manly LEP 2013)

1.1 What is the name of the environmental planning instrument that applies to the land?

Manly Local Environmental Plan 2013 (MLEP 2013)

1.2 What is the zoning of the land?

R1 – General Residential

1.3 What are the objectives of the zone?

- *To provide for the housing needs of the community.*
- *To provide for a variety of housing types and densities.*
- *To enable other land uses that provide facilities or services to meet the day to day needs of residents.*

1.4 What is the development standard being varied?

Cl 4.4 of the Manly Local Environmental Plan 2013, Floor Space Ratio

1.5 Under what clause is the development standard listed in the environmental planning instrument?

Cl 4.4 of the Manly Local Environmental Plan 2013

1.6 What are the objectives of the development standard?

(1) The objectives of this clause are as follows:

- (a) to ensure the bulk and scale of development is consistent with the existing and desired streetscape character,*
- (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,*
- (c) to maintain an appropriate visual relationship between new development and the existing character and landscape of the area*

- (d) *to minimise adverse environmental impacts on the use or enjoyment of adjoining land and the public domain,*
- (e) *to provide for the viability of business zones 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.*

1.7 What is the numeric value of the development standard in the environmental planning instrument?

The numeric value of the Floor Space Ratio development standard applicable to the subject site is a maximum of 0.45:1.

1.8 What is proposed numeric value of the development standard in your development application?

The numeric value of the development standard in this development application is a maximum 0.46:1 (292.6). An additional 6.27m² is proposed.

1.9 What is the percentage variation (between your proposal and the environmental planning instrument)?

The percentage variation sought is 1.3%

2. NSW Land and Environment Court Case Law

Several key Land and Environment Court (NSW LEC) judgements have refined the manner in which variations to development standards are required to be approached. The key findings and direction of each of these matters are outlined in the following discussion.

2.1 Wehbe v Pittwater [2007] NSW LEC 827

The decision of Justice Preston in *Wehbe v Pittwater [2007] NSW LEC 827*, (expanded on the findings in *Winten v North Sydney Council*), identified 5 ways in which the applicant might establish that compliance with a development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary. It was not suggested that the five ways were the only ways that a development standard could be shown to be unreasonable or unnecessary.

The five ways outlined in *Wehbe* include:

- 1. The objectives of the standard are achieved notwithstanding non-compliance with the standard (First Way).*
- 2. The underlying objective or purpose of the standard is not relevant to the development and therefore compliance is unnecessary (Second Way).*
- 3. The underlying object or purpose would be defeated or thwarted if compliance was required and therefore compliance is unreasonable (Third Way).*

4. *The development standard has been virtually abandoned or destroyed by the Council's own actions in granting consents departing from the standard and hence compliance with the standard is unnecessary and unreasonable (Fourth Way).*

5. *The zoning of the particular land is unreasonable or inappropriate so that a development standard appropriate for that zoning is also unreasonable and unnecessary as it applies to the land and compliance with the standard would be unreasonable or unnecessary. That is, the particular parcel of land should not have been included in the particular zone (Fifth Way).*

In the Micaul decision Preston CJ confirmed that the requirements mandated by SEPP 1 (as discussed in Wehbe) are only relevant in demonstrating that compliance with a development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary for the purpose of Clause 4.6(3)(a).

2.2 Four2Five Pty Ltd v Ashfield Council [2015] NSW LEC

In the matter of *Four2Five Pty Ltd v Ashfield Council [2015] NSW LEC*, initially heard by Commissioner Pearson, upheld on appeal by Justice Pain, it was found that an application under Clause 4.6 to vary a development standard must go beyond the five (5) part test of *Wehbe V Pittwater [2007] NSW LEC 827* and demonstrate the following:

1. Compliance with the particular requirements of Clause 4.6, with particular regard to the provisions of subclauses (3) and (4) of the LEP;
2. That there are sufficient environment planning grounds, particular to the circumstances of the proposed development (as opposed to general planning grounds that may apply to any similar development occurring on the site or within its vicinity);
3. That maintenance of the development standard is unreasonable and unnecessary on the basis of planning merit that goes beyond the consideration of consistency with the objectives of the development standard and/or the land use zone in which the site occurs;
4. All three elements of clause 4.6 have to be met and it is best to have different reasons for each but it is not essential.

3 Randwick City Council v Micaul Holdings Pty Ltd [2016] NSWLEC 7

In *Randwick City Council v Micaul Holdings*, the Court allowed a departure from development standards, provided the processes required by clause 4.6 are followed, a consent authority has a broad discretion as to whether to allow a departure from development standards under clause 4.6, even where the variation is not justified for site or development specific reasons.

Preston CJ noted that *the Commissioner did not have to be satisfied directly that compliance with each development standard was unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances of the case, but only indirectly by being satisfied that the appellant's written request had adequately addressed the matter in clause 4.6(3)(a) that compliance with each development standard was unreasonable or unnecessary.*

4 Zhang v City of Ryde

Commissioner Brown reiterated that clause 4.6 imposes three preconditions which must be satisfied before the application could be approved:

1. *The consent authority must be satisfied that the proposed development will be consistent with the objectives of the zone;*

2. The consent authority must be satisfied that the proposed development will be consistent with the objects of the standard which is not met; and

3. The consent authority must be satisfied that the written request demonstrates that compliance with the development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances and there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening the development standard.

It is only if all of these conditions are met that consent can be granted to the application, subject to an assessment of the merits of the application.

The Commissioner applied the now familiar approach to determining consistency with zone objectives by considering whether the development was antipathetic to the objectives.

In contrast to four2five, the reasons relied on to justify the departure from the standards in this case were not necessarily site specific.

3. Consideration

The following section addresses the provisions of clause 4.6 of the MLEP 2013 together with principles established in the NSW Land and Environment Court Case Law outlined above.

Clause 4.6(3)(A) - Is compliance with the development standard unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances of the case (and is a development which complies with the development standard unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances of the case)?

In order to demonstrate that compliance with the development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary, in the circumstances of the case, the Five (5) Part Test established in *Winten v North Sydney Council* and expanded by Justice Preston in *Wehbe v Pittwater* [2007] NSW LEC 827 is considered: b

The five ways outlined in *Wehbe* include:

3.1 Five (5) Part Test - *Wehbe v Pittwater*

1. *The objectives of the standard are achieved notwithstanding non-compliance with the standard (First Way).*

The objectives of the standard are:

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

The proposal will result in a building of comparable scale to neighbours. The minor breach is minimal and the dwelling still allows for suitable landscaped area and private open space with all works within the existing footprint.

(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 bulk and scale is suitable for the area and the site. The development as proposed has a similar scale to neighbours and it will be a compatible and appropriate addition to the streetscape.

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

The proposal is appropriate and consistent with the character and landscape of the area. The sloping site and extensive landscaping of the site allows for the minor variation to have a negligible impact.

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

The proposal will not have any adverse environmental impacts and is suitable for in regards to the streetscape.

- (e) to provide for the viability of business zones 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.**

2. The underlying objective or purpose of the standard is not relevant to the development and therefore compliance is unnecessary (Second Way).

This exception to development standards request does not rely on this reason.

3. The underlying object or purpose would be defeated or thwarted if compliance was required and therefore compliance is unreasonable (Third Way).

This exception to development standards request does not rely on this reason.

4. The development standard has been virtually abandoned or destroyed by the Council's own actions in granting consents departing from the standard and hence compliance with the standard is unnecessary and unreasonable (Fourth Way).

This exception to development standards request does not rely on this reason.

5. The zoning of the particular land is unreasonable or inappropriate so that a development standard appropriate for that zoning is also unreasonable and unnecessary as it applies to the land and compliance with the standard would be unreasonable or unnecessary. That is, the particular parcel of land should not have been included in the particular zone (Fifth Way).

This exception to development standards request does not rely on this reason.

This clause 4.6 variation request establishes that compliance with the development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances of the proposed development because the objectives of the standard are achieved and accordingly justifies the variation to the FSR control pursuant to the First Way outlined in Wehbe.

Thus, it is considered that compliance with Clause 4.6(3)(a) is satisfied.

3.2 Clause 4.6(3)(B) – Are there sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening the development standard?

There are sufficient grounds to permit the variation of the development standard. In particular:

- The variation is for a very small area of the dwelling
- There are no shadowing or bulk issues resultant
- The site is constrained by the slope and the existing siting
- The overall result is an architecturally pleasing development and increases the amenity for the residents which could not be achieved with full compliance.

3.3 Clause 4.6(4)(A)(ii) – Will the proposed development be in the public interest because it is consistent with the objectives of the particular standard and objectives for development within the zone which the development is proposed to be carried out.

The proposed development is consistent with the objectives of the standard (see Cl 4.6(3)(A)). An assessment of consistency with the objectives of the Zone is provided below:

Zone – R1 General Residential

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

Consistent. The proposal is for a residential dwelling.

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

Consistent. The proposed alterations and additions resulting in significant improvement to the dwelling's contribution to the character of the area. The existing street view will be enhanced by more articulation and a complementary design element.

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

Not relevant. The proposal is for a residential dwelling.

The proposed development is not contrary to the public interest, because it is consistent with the objectives of the standard (see Cl 4.6(3)(A)) and objectives for development within the zone.

Clause 4.6(5)(a) whether contravention of the development standard raises any matter of significance for State or regional environmental planning,

The non-compliance will not raise any matter of State or Regional Significance.

Clause 4.6(5)(b) the public benefit of maintaining the development standard,

The proposed development is not contrary to the public interest, accordingly there can be no quantifiable or perceived public benefit in maintaining the standard.

Clause 4.6(5)(c) any other matters required to be taken into consideration by the Secretary before granting concurrence

How would strict compliance hinder the attainment of the objects specified in Section 1.3 of the Act.

Strict compliance with the standard would hinder the attainment of the objects specified in section 1.3 of the Act

- (a) to promote the social and economic welfare of the community and a better environment by the proper management, development and conservation of the State's natural and other resources,*
- (b) to facilitate ecologically sustainable development by integrating relevant economic, environmental and social considerations in decision-making about environmental planning and assessment,*
- (c) to promote the orderly and economic use and development of land,*
- (d) to promote the delivery and maintenance of affordable housing,*
- (e) to protect the environment, including the conservation of threatened and other species of native animals and plants, ecological communities and their habitats,*
- (f) to promote the sustainable management of built and cultural heritage (including Aboriginal cultural heritage),*
- (g) to promote good design and amenity of the built environment,*
- (h) to promote the proper construction and maintenance of buildings, including the protection of the health and safety of their occupants,*
- (i) to promote the sharing of the responsibility for environmental planning and assessment between the different levels of government in the State,*
- (j) to provide increased opportunity for community participation in environmental planning and assessment.*

Strict compliance with the 0.45:1 FSR development standard would hinder the development for the purpose of *to promote good design and amenity of the built environment.*

The proposed development is for additions to residential dwelling, on land zoned R1 – General Residential.

The proposed alterations and additions are located within the footprint of the existing dwelling and are nestled into the roof level. The FSR non-compliance is minor in nature and allows for a development within the scope of what is reasonable in the locality.

From no perspective will the dwelling present with excessive bulk. The use of varied materials, architectural elements of interest, window locations all result in facades which are positive vistas for neighbouring dwellings. The proposed dwelling will not result in unreasonable overshadowing or privacy impacts to surrounding properties