

## **APPENDIX A**

### **OBJECTION PURSUANT TO CLAUSE 4.6 OF WARRINGAH LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN 2011**

#### **VARIATION OF A DEVELOPMENT STANDARD REGARDING THE MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT AS DETAILED IN CLAUSE 4.3 OF THE WARRINGAH LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN 2011**

**For:** Dwelling Additions/Alterations  
**At:** 10 Jamieson Parade, Collaroy  
**Owner:** SketchArc  
**Applicant:** SketchArc

### **1.0 Introduction**

This written request is made pursuant to the provisions of Clause 4.6 of Warringah Local Environmental Plan 2011. In this regard it is requested Council support a variation with respect to compliance with the maximum building height as described in Clause 4.3 of the Warringah Local Environmental Plan 2011 (WLEP 2011).

### **2.0 Background**

Clause 4.3 restricts the height of a building within this area of the locality and refers to the maximum height noted within the “*Height of Buildings Map*.”

The *Height of Building Map* identifies the site as being within the 8.5m maximum height limit.

This clause is considered to be a development standard as defined by Section 4 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act.

The proposed additions provide for a maximum height of approximately 9.349m which does not comply with the numerical standards of this clause. The proposal represents a maximum non-compliance of 849mm or a 9.9% variation.

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

The Warringah Local Environmental Plan 2011 contains its own variations clause (Clause 4.6) to allow a departure from a development standard. Clause 4.6 of the LEP 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 LEP 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 considered 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 development will achieve a better outcome in this instance as the proposal provides for the garage within the lower level limiting excavation and providing a dwelling that is compatible with the character of the locality without having any detrimental impact. It is considered that the proposal is consistent with the objectives of Clause 4.6.

#### **5.0 Onus on Applicant**

Clause 4.6(3) provides that:

*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.*

This submission has been prepared to support our contention that the development adequately responds to the provisions of 4.6(3)(a) & (b) above.

## 6.0 Justification of Proposed Variation

There is jurisdictional guidance available on how variations under Clause 4.6 of the Standard Instrument should be assessed in *Initial Action Pty Ltd vs Woollahra Municipal Council* [2018] NSWLEC 11 & *Samadi v Council of the City of Sydney* [2014] NSWLEC 1199.

Paragraph 27 of the judgement states:

*Clause 4.6 of LEP 2013 imposes four preconditions on the Court in exercising the power to grant consent to the proposed development. The first precondition (and not necessarily in the order in cl 4.6) requires the Court to be satisfied that the proposed development will be consistent with the objectives of the zone (cl 4.6(4)(a)(ii)). The second precondition requires the Court to be satisfied that the proposed development will be consistent with the objectives of the standard in question (cl 4.6(4)(a)(ii)). The third precondition requires the Court to consider a written request that demonstrates that compliance with the development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances of the case and with the Court finding that the matters required to be demonstrated have been adequately addressed (cl 4.6(3)(a) and cl 4.6(4)(a)(i)).*

*The fourth precondition requires the Court to consider a written request that demonstrates that there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening the development standard and with the Court finding that the matters required to be demonstrated have been adequately addressed (cl 4.6(3)(b) and cl 4.6(4)(a)(i)).*

### Precondition 1 - Consistency with zone objectives

The site is located in the R2 Low Density Residential Zone. The objectives of the R2 zone are noted as:

- *To provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment.*
- *To enable other land uses that provide facilities or services to meet the day to day needs of residents.*
- *To ensure that low density residential environments are characterised by landscaped settings that are in harmony with the natural environment of Warringah.*

### Comments

It is considered that notwithstanding the extent of the non-compliance with the maximum building height control the proposed additions to the existing dwelling will be consistent with the individual Objectives of the R2 Low Density Residential zone for the following reasons:

The proposal provides for the construction of a new single detached dwelling that maintains the low density residential character. The existing locality is characterised by large multi-storey dwellings comprising a variety of architectural styles.

The non-compliance with the height controls does not require the removal of any significant vegetation, and the existing landscaping within the front setback is being retained. The resultant dwelling is compatible with the bulk and scale of the surrounding development.

Accordingly, it is considered that the site may be further developed with a variation to the prescribed maximum building height control, whilst maintaining consistency with the zone objectives.

## **Precondition 2 - Consistency with the objectives of the standard**

The objectives of Clause 4.3 are articulated at Clause 4.3 (1):

- (a) to ensure that buildings are compatible with the height and scale of surrounding and nearby development,*
- (b) to minimise visual impact, disruption of views, loss of privacy and loss of solar access,*
- (c) to minimise any adverse impact of development on the scenic quality of Warringah's coastal and bush environments,*
- (d) to manage the visual impact of development when viewed from public places such as parks and reserves, roads and community facilities.*

It is considered that the objectives have been achieved for the following reasons:

- The proposal provides for a two storey dwelling and lower level parking that is compatible with the existing surrounding development which comprises a mixture of single and two storey dwellings.
- The proposal does not result in the loss of any significant views. The subject and surrounding properties do not currently enjoy any significant views.
- The proposal has been designed to ensure privacy of the adjoining properties. This has been achieved by locating all high use living areas on the ground floor and providing appropriate boundary setbacks.
- Shadow diagrams have been submitted that demonstrate that adjoining properties will receive in excess of the minimum 3 hour solar access on the winter solstice.
- The site and the proposed development are not visible from any coastal or bushland areas. Therefore, the proposal will not have any impact on the scenic quality of the coastal or bushland areas.
- The proposal results in a two storey dwelling with lower level parking that is considered an appropriate outcome in this locality and will not have a detrimental visual impact when viewed from Jamieson Parade.

**Precondition 3 - To consider a written request that demonstrates that compliance with the development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances of the case**

It is unreasonable and unnecessary to require strict compliance with the development standard as the proposal provides for a new single detached dwelling house, that achieves the objectives of the clause and aims to provide lower level parking without excessive excavation. Furthermore, the proposal does not have any detrimental impacts.

In the *Wehbe* judgment (*Wehbe v Warringah Council* [2007] NSWLEC 827), Preston CJ expressed the view that there are 5 different ways in which a SEPP 1 Objection may be well founded and that approval of the Objection may be consistent with the aims of the policy. These 5 questions may be usefully applied to the consideration of Clause 4.6 variations: -

1. *the objectives of the standard are achieved notwithstanding non-compliance with the standard;*

**Comment:** Yes. Refer to comments under 'Justification of Proposed Variation' above which discusses the achievement of the objectives of the standard.

2. *the underlying objective or purpose of the standard is not relevant to the development and therefore compliance is unnecessary;*

**Comment:** It is considered that the purpose of the standard is relevant but the purpose is satisfied.

3. *the underlying object or purpose would be defeated or thwarted if compliance was required and therefore compliance is unreasonable;*

**Comment:** Compliance does not defeat the underlying object of the standard development; however, compliance would prevent the approval of an otherwise supportable development.

Furthermore, it is noted that development standards are not intended to be applied in an absolute manner; which is evidenced by clause 4.6 (1)(a) and (b).

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;*

**Comment:** Not applicable.

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.*

**Comment:** The development standard is applicable to and appropriate to the zone.

For the above reasons it would therefore be unreasonable and unnecessary to cause strict compliance with the standard.

**Precondition 4 - To consider a written request that demonstrates that there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening the development standard and with the Court [or consent authority] finding that the matters required to be demonstrated have been adequately addressed**

Due to the site of the existing dwelling and existing floor levels, the proposed additions ridge will exceed the maximum height required by Clause 4.3.

The development is justified in this instance for the following reasons:

- The development does not result in a significant bulk when viewed from either the street or the neighbouring properties.
- The proposal does not obstruct any views from surrounding properties.

Having regard to the above, it is considered there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify a variation of the development standard for maximum building height.

In the recent 'Four2Five' judgement (*Four2Five Pty Ltd v Ashfield Council [2015] NSWLEC 90*), Pearson C outlined that a Clause 4.6 variation requires identification of grounds that are particular to the circumstances to the proposed development. That is to say that simply meeting the objectives of the development standard is insufficient justification of a Clause 4.6 variation.

It should be noted that a Judge of the Court, and later the Court of Appeal, upheld the Four2Five decision but expressly noted that the Commissioner's decision on that point (that she was not "satisfied" because something more specific to the site was required) was simply a discretionary (subjective) opinion which was a matter for her alone to decide. It does **not** mean that Clause 4.6 variations can only ever be allowed where there is some special or particular feature of the site that justifies the non-compliance. Whether there are "sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening the development standard", it is something that can be assessed on a case by case basis and is for the consent authority to determine for itself.

The recent appeal of *Randwick City Council v Micaul Holdings Pty Ltd [2016] NSWLEC 7* is to be considered. In this case the Council appealed against the original

decision, raising very technical legal arguments about whether each and every item of clause 4.6 of the LEP had been meticulously considered and complied with (both in terms of the applicant's written document itself, and in the Commissioner's assessment of it). In February of this year the Chief Judge of the Court dismissed the appeal, finding no fault in the Commissioner's approval of the large variations to the height and FSR controls.

While the judgment did not directly overturn the *Four2Five v Ashfield* decision an important issue emerged. The Chief Judge noted that one of the consent authority's obligation is to be satisfied that "the applicant's written request has adequately addressed ...that compliance with the development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances of the case ...and that there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening the development standard." He held that this means:

*"the Commissioner did not have to be satisfied directly that compliance with each development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances of the case, but only indirectly by being satisfied that the applicant's written request has adequately addressed the matter in subclause (3)(a) that compliance with each development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary".*

Accordingly, when assessed against the relevant Objects of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979, (NSW) outlined in s1.3, the following environmental planning grounds are considered to be sufficient to allow Council to be satisfied that a variation to the development standard can be supported:

- The proposal is considered to promote good design and amenity to the local built environment as appropriate amenity, solar access and privacy will be maintained for the neighbouring properties.
- The minor non-compliance with the height control, which is restricted to the ridge line does not have any detrimental impacts on the adjoining properties or when viewed from the public domain. Strict compliance with the control would not serve any benefit.

The above are the environmental planning grounds which are the circumstances which are particular to the development which merit a variation to the development standard.

## **7.0 Conclusion**

This development proposed a departure from the maximum building height development standard.

This variation occurs as a result of the siting of the existing building and sloping topography of the site.

This written request to vary the maximum building height specified in Clause 4.3 of the Warringah LEP 2013 adequately demonstrates that that the objectives of the standard will be met.

The bulk and scale of the proposed development is appropriate for the site and locality.

Strict compliance with the maximum building height control would be unreasonable and unnecessary in the circumstances of this case.

**Natalie Nolan**  
**NOLAN PLANNING CONSULTANTS**