



**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 THE
MINIMUM LOT SIZE FOR CO-LIVING
HOUSING AS DETAILED IN STATE
ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICY
(HOUSING) 2021 – CLAUSE 69 1(b)(ii)**

**Demolition Works and Construction
of a Mixed-Use Development**

**29-37 Dobroyd Road, Balgowlah
Heights NSW 2093**

✉ mathew@fourtowns.com.au

☎ 0425232018

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:

Erin Isle Investments Pty Ltd

9 May 2023

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.

1. Introduction and Background

This written request is made pursuant to the provisions of Clause 4.6 of *Manly Local Environmental Plan 2013* (MLEP2013). In this regard, it is requested Council support a variation to the minimum lot size development standard for co-living housing prescribed by clause 69(1)(b)(ii) of *State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021* (SEPP Housing) which provides:

69 Standards for co-living housing

(1) Development consent must not be granted for development for the purposes of co-living housing unless the consent authority is satisfied that—

(b) the minimum lot size for the co-living housing is not less than—

(i) for development on land in Zone R2 Low Density Residential—600m², or

(ii) for development on other land—800m², and

(iii) (Repealed)

The nature and extent of the contravention is as follows:

Requirement	800sqm
Proposed	381.7sqm
Is the planning control in question a development standard?	Yes
Is the non-compliance with to the clause requirement a numerical/or performance based variation?	Numerical
If numerical enter a % variation to requirement	52.29%

Background

Development Application No. 2022/0596 (“DA”) was lodged with Northern Beaches Council on 6 May 2022. The DA seeks consent for the demolition of the existing building on the land and the erection of a co-living housing development containing 10 rooms, a business premises addressing the street and basement carparking (“Development”) at 29-37 Dobroyd Road, Balgowlah Heights (“Land”).

2. Manly Local Environmental Plan 2013 (MLEP2013) and State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021 (Housing SEPP)

Manly Local Environmental Plan 2013 (“MLEP”)

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 E1 – Local Centre (the E1 zone) and the Land Use Table in Part 2 of MLEP 2013 specifies the following objectives for the E1 zone:

- To provide a range of retail, business and community uses that serve the needs of people who live in, work in or visit the area.
- To encourage investment in local commercial development that generates employment opportunities and economic growth.
- To enable residential development that contributes to a vibrant and active local centre and is consistent with the Council’s strategic planning for residential development in the area.

- To encourage business, retail, community and other non-residential land uses on the ground floor of buildings.
- To minimise conflict between land uses in the zone and adjoining zones and ensure amenity for the people who live in the local centre in relation to noise, odour, delivery of materials and use of machinery.
- To ensure that new development provides diverse and active street frontages to attract pedestrian traffic and to contribute to vibrant, diverse and functional streets and public spaces.
- To create urban form that relates favourably in scale and in architectural and landscape treatment to neighbouring land uses and to the natural environment.

The proposed development is for the purpose of a mixed use development including co-living housing and a business premises. Co-living housing is prohibited under MLEP but is permissible under the Housing SEPP. Business premises are a permissible use in the zone.

2.2 Housing SEPP – Clause 69 Standards for co-living housing

Clause 69 Standards for co-living housing is set out below:

69 Standards for co-living housing

(1) Development consent must not be granted for development for the purposes of co-living housing unless the consent authority is satisfied that—

(b) the minimum lot size for the co-living housing is not less than—

- (i) for development on land in Zone R2 Low Density Residential—600m², or
- (ii) for development on other land—800m², and
- (iii) (Repealed)

The minimum lot size for the Land is 800sqm.

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:*

- (a) **the area, shape or frontage of any land, the dimensions of any land, buildings or works, or the distance of any land, building or work from any specified point,**

2.3 Clause 4.6 – Exceptions to Development Standards

Clause 4.6(1) of MLEP 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 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 69(1)(b) (the minimum lot size 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 minimum lot size development standard pursuant to clause 69(1) of the Housing SEPP which specifies a lot size of 800sqm, 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 Secretary 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 of satisfaction requires the consent authority to be satisfied that 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 2000*, the Secretary has given written notice dated 21 February 2018, attached to the Planning Circular PS 18-003 issued on 21 February 2018, 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 Secretary 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 Secretary before granting concurrence.*

As these proceedings are the subject of an appeal to the Land & Environment Court, the Court has the power under cl 4.6(2) to grant development consent for development that contravenes a development standard, if it is satisfied of the matters in cl 4.6(4)(a), without obtaining or assuming the concurrence of the Secretary under cl 4.6(4)(b), by reason of s 39(6) of the Court Act. Nevertheless, the Court should still consider the matters in cl 4.6(5) when exercising the power to grant development consent for development that contravenes a development standard: *Fast Buck\$ v Byron Shire Council* (1999) 103 LGERA 94 at 100; *Wehbe v Pittwater Council* at [41] (*Initial Action* at [29]).

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 69 of the Housing SEPP from the operation of clause 4.6.

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 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 69 of the Housing SEPP 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 69 and the objectives for development for in the E1 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 69 of the Housing SEPP?

4. Request for Variation

4.1 Is clause 69 of the Housing SEPP a development standard?

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

“(a) the area, shape or frontage of any land, the dimensions of any land, buildings or works, or the distance of any land, building or work from any specified point,.”

- (b) Clause 69 relates to minimum lot size to the area of the Land. Accordingly, clause 69 is a development standard.

4.2 Is compliance with clause 69 unreasonable or unnecessary?

- (a) This request relies upon the 1st, 2nd and 4th ways identified by Preston CJ in *Wehbe*.

(b) The first way in *Wehbe* is to establish that the objectives of the standard are achieved. The second way in *Wehbe* is to establish that an objective is not relevant to the development. The fourth way in *Wehbe* is to establish that the development standard has been abandoned by Council's own actions in approving development that does not comply with the standard.

(c) Each objective of the standard and reasoning why compliance is unreasonable or unnecessary is set out below. Firstly, an analysis of the objectives is provided:

At the time of lodgement of the DA the land was zoned B1 Neighbourhood Centre and clause 69(1)(b) of the Housing SEPP provided:

69 Standards for co-living housing

(1) Development consent must not be granted for development for the purposes of co-living housing unless the consent authority is satisfied that—

(b) the minimum lot size for the co-living housing is not less than—

(i) for development on land in Zone R2 Low Density Residential—the lesser of the minimum lot size requirements for manor houses under a relevant planning instrument, or 600m²,

(ii) for development on land in Zone R3 Medium Density Residential—the minimum lot size requirements for multi dwelling housing under a relevant planning instrument,

(iii) for development on other land—the minimum lot size requirements for residential flat buildings under a relevant planning instrument, and

As the Land was zoned B1 and there was no minimum lot size for shop-top housing on the Land it followed that there was no minimum lot size for co-living housing.

SEPP Housing was amended by the gazettal of *State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) Amendment 2022* (Amending SEPP). The effect of the Amending SEPP was to specify two minimum lot sizes for co-living housing being 600sqm for land in the R2 low density residential zone and 800sqm on other land. As the subject site was zoned B1 it constituted other land and therefore the minimum lot size of 800sqm applied to the Land.

The Amending SEPP did not contain any objectives or explanation for the amendments, nor was it preceded by the exhibition of a statement of intended effect. In a press release published on 1 July 2022 the Deputy Secretary of Planning Policy Brett Whitworth described the change in the following terms:

- *Simplifying the minimum lot standards for co-living housing to provide greater consistency;*

Source: [Policy changes to boost housing diversity | NSW Dept of Planning and Environment](#)

This description is consistent with the FAQ published on the DPIE website which is in the following terms:

What changes have been made to co-living housing since the Housing SEPP was made ?

Amendments were made on 1 July 2022 to simplify the minimum lot size controls for co-living housing.

The minimum lot size for co-living housing on land zoned R2 is now 600 square metres and 800 square metres on all other land.

The minimum bicycle and motorcycle parking requirements for co-living housing have also been removed from the Housing SEPP. Applicants will now need to demonstrate that they are providing adequate bicycle and motorcycle parking on site.

Source: [Co-living housing | Planning \(nsw.gov.au\)](#)

Regrettably the Amending SEPP and the published description of the changes does not disclose the underlying purpose of the new minimum lot size of 800sqm. The previous development standard set the minimum lot size by reference to the types of higher density development permitted in a zone. In particular by reference to manor houses on land in the R2 zone, multi dwelling housing on land in the R3 zone and residential flat buildings on land in other zones. The “simplification” removes the reference to other types of housing and now simply specifies either 600sqm for the R2 zone and 800sqm for land in other zones.

In the absence of stated objectives for the new minimum lot size it is necessary to identify the underlying objective of the standard. It is relevant to note that neither MLEP or MDCP specify a minimum lot size other than for manor housing in the R2 zone (clause 4.1A) however that clause contains no objectives. In the circumstances it is appropriate to discern the underlying objectives for clause 69(1)(b) from the general principles contained in clause 3 of the Housing SEPP.

A review of each Principle under Clause 3 is provided below:

(a) enabling the development of diverse housing types, including purpose-built rental housing,

The proposal is for a mixed-use development which includes co-living housing on the upper floors which is a permissible land use under the E1 Local Centre zone under the proviso of shop top housing been a permissible use in the zone. The centre is small comprising only 2 sites. The larger adjoining site has been development for business premises and residential apartments. The subject site will contain co-living housing which will create diversity in this small centre. The proposal cannot be subdivided and remains as one entity and therefore is only suitable for rental and is built for that purpose. The proposal increases diverse housing types in business zones which allows smaller apartments for purpose built renting opportunities. The development achieves this objective.

(b) encouraging the development of housing that will meet the needs of more vulnerable members of the community, including very low to moderate income households, seniors and people with a disability,

The proposal to allow for co-living housing encourages development which will meet the needs of vulnerable members of the community. The site is located in an accessible location to public transport and has been designed to meet the required accessibility provisions including two rooms designed to such standards. As such, notwithstanding it is not specifically targeted to seniors or people with a disability, it is well versed to accommodate them as vulnerable members of the community. The proposal by its nature will provide affordable housing for low to moderate income households which allows them to be located in accessible areas and locations close to work. This includes but is not limited to key workers such as teachers, nurses, police etc. The development achieves this objective.

(c) ensuring new housing development provides residents with a reasonable level of amenity,

The proposal has been designed to ensure that the development provides residents with a reasonable level of amenity. This includes the private rooms complying with the minimum and maximum floor area requirements, kitchen and laundry facilities within the individual units and the inclusion of two separate communal open space areas and a communal living area. The location of the site also provides amenity and easy access to services and infrastructure such as a café, open space and the natural environment.

The proposal also complies with the other relevant standards of the SEPP therefore confirming the amenity is achieved for the site. The development achieves this objective

(d) promoting the planning and delivery of housing in locations where it will make good use of existing and planned infrastructure and services,

The site's location is within a business zone with adequate access to infrastructure and services, noting access to public transport, sports fields, open space, tennis courts and the adjoining shop-top housing development which includes a café (refer to map below for analysis). The development achieves this objective.

Map of Area



1 – Subject site and adjoining shop top housing development at 31 Dobroyd Rd which includes ground floor commercial premises such as a café

2 – Bareena Park Tennis Courts and Bareena Park

3 – Public Bus Stops

4 – Balgowlah Bowling Club – recreation and food and drinks premises

5 – Tania Park – open space, recreation and playground

(e) minimising adverse climate and environmental impacts of new housing development,

There will be no adverse climate or environmental impacts from the proposed development. The application is supported by a BASIX Certificate. The development achieves this objective.

(f) reinforcing the importance of designing housing in a way that reflects and enhances its locality,

The proposal represents the form of a shop-top housing development but includes diverse and affordable housing through the provision of co-living housing.

The importance of designing housing comes down to the character, bulk and scale and streetscape of the area. Bulk and scale is a function of height and mass. The building height complies with the requirements of Clause 4.3 of MLEP2013 and the proposed development for the majority of the proposal is substantially below that which is permitted. The proposed bulk and scale is commensurate with the suite of controls applying to the land. The building has been architecturally designed to complement the streetscape with revised plans provided to assist in allowing a similar approach and building materials and colours approved at 31 Dobroyd Road. The desired future character is not defined in the planning controls, but the proposal is consistent with the existing streetscape and with recent approvals such as a compliant building height and FSR. This objective is achieved.

(g) supporting short-term rental accommodation as a home-sharing activity and contributor to local economies, while managing the social and environmental impacts from this use,

This objective is not relevant to the proposed development as the development does not provide short term-rental accommodation.

(h) mitigating the loss of existing affordable rental housing.

This objective is not relevant to the proposed development as the proposal does not result in the removal of existing affordable rental housing.

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. These include:

- The objectives of the development standard are achieved, notwithstanding the non-compliance with the standard in the circumstances described in this variation report and summarised as follows:
 - The proposal meets the other relevant development standards within the Housing SEPP for co-living housing. The site accommodates a good design and compliant areas for common open space and communal living areas which proves the site is of sufficient size to meet the standards of the Housing SEPP.
 - The use as co-living housing is determined by the land use shop-top housing being a permissible land use within the zone. Therefore, the variation to the development standard for minimum lot size does not impact the bulk and scale of the development, noting no minimum lot size requirements to the land use for a shop-top housing development and compliance with the building height and FSR standards which dictate bulk and scale.
 - The proposal enables a diverse and affordable housing option in a strategic planning location within a business zone.
 - The land use for co-living housing been affordable housing cannot be further subdivided and is retained as one lot, as existing.
 - The site is an isolated lot with no amalgamation options. The site meets the parameters for the bulk and scale of the streetscape noting the adjoining development at 31 Dobroyd Road, Balgowlah Heights.
 - The standard is inconsistent between the Housing SEPP and MLEP2013. It is noted that business zones within MLEP2013 do not have minimum lot sizes.
 - The proposal promotes affordable rental housing and meets the intention of the Northern Beaches Affordable Housing Needs Analysis (December 2016).

- 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*
 - (d) to promote the delivery and maintenance of affordable housing*
 - (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 highly appropriate location, in a manner that is desired by the planning controls because it will facilitate urban renewal for affordable rental housing and employment generating floor space. 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 of run-down sites.

2. In response to (d), the proposal will advance the delivery of increased affordable rental housing provision in a highly accessible location where tenants would have the option of utilising other transport modes and avoid the costs associated with purchasing, running, and maintaining their own private motor vehicle. Furthermore, such housing allows for the provision of affordable rents in highly desired locations providing diversity and accessibility.

3. In response to (g) the proposal has been designed to promote good design and amenity of the built environment, noting compliance with the maximum building height and FSR controls of MLEP2013.

The above environmental planning grounds are not general propositions, they are unique circumstances to the proposed development. These are not simply benefits of the development as a whole, but are benefits emanating from the breach of the minimum lot size.

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 minimum lot size non-compliance in this instance.

4.4 Is the proposed development in the public interest because it is consistent with the objectives of clause 69 and the objectives of the E1 Local Centre zone?

Section 4.2 of this written request demonstrates that the proposed development achieves each of the underlying objectives of clause 69(1)(b). As the proposed development achieves the objectives it follows that the proposed development is also consistent with those objectives.

(b) The objectives of the E1 zone and the reasons why the proposed development is consistent with the objectives are set out below:

The proposed mixed-use development is permissible through the Housing SEPP, therefore the proposed development is permissible with Council's consent. The proposal is consistent with the objectives of the zone, as supported below:

- The proposal provides a new form of housing which will utilise the existing commercial premises with the area in the form of affordable housing.
- The proposal provides commercial premises to the front of the site that will serve the needs of people who live or work in the surrounding neighbourhood.
- The proposal includes a new functional commercial tenancy which has an activated frontage to Dobroyd Road.
- The proposal encourages the revitalisation and rehabilitation of the existing site which is run down and in need of new facilities to bring it in line with the needs of the business zone.
- The proposal enables a form of residential development which contributes to the vibrant and active local centre and aligns with the strategic direction including the intent of the Northern Beaches Affordable Housing Needs Analysis.
- The proposal has been revised and building elements updated to create an urban form that relates favourably to the scale and treatment (both architecturally and landscape) to the neighbouring land uses and the natural environment.

4.5 Has Council obtained the concurrence of the Director-General?

The Secretary can be assumed to have concurred to the variation under Department of Planning Circular PS 18-003 'Variations to development standards', dated 21 February 2018. This circular is a notice under 64(1) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000*.

The Secretary can be assumed to have given concurrence as the matter will be determined by the Northern Beaches Local Planning Panel in accordance with the Planning Circular or by the Land & Environment Court of NSW on appeal.

The matters for consideration under clause 4.6(5) are considered below.

4.6 Has the Court considered the matters in clause 4.6(5) of MLEP2013?

(a) The proposed non-compliance does not raise any matter of significance for State or regional environmental planning as it is peculiar to the particular site and this design and lot is not readily transferrable to any other site in the immediate locality, wider region of the State and the scale or nature of the proposed development does not trigger requirements for a higher level of assessment. It has been demonstrated that the proposed variation is appropriate based on the specific circumstances of the case and would be unlikely to result in an unacceptable precedent for the assessment of other development proposals.

(b) As the proposed development is in the public interest because it complies with the objectives of the development standard and the objectives of the zone there is no significant public benefit in maintaining the development standard.

(c) there are no other matters required to be taken into account by the secretary before granting concurrence.

Summary

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