

Appendix One - Clause 4.6 *Exceptions to Development Standards*

Clause 4.6 of the Warringah Local Environmental Plan 2011 (WLEP 2011) 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 Warringah LEP 2011 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 WLEP 2011, 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 4.3 - Height of buildings is not one of the standards excluded, it must therefore be assumed that the standard for height of buildings, is one of the development standards that can have an appropriate degree of flexibility applied under clause 4.6.

1. Environmental Planning Instrument Details (Warringah LEP 2011)

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

Warringah Local Environmental Plan 2011 (WLEP 2011)

1.2 What is the zoning of the land?

R2 – Low Density Residential

1.3 What are the objectives of the zone?

- *To provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment.*
- *To enable other land uses that provides 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.*

1.4 What is the development standard being varied?

Cl 4.3 of the Warringah Local Environmental Plan 2011, Height of Buildings

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

Cl 4.3 of the Warringah Local Environmental Plan 2011

1.6 What are the objectives of the development standard?

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

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

The numeric value of the height of buildings development standard applicable to the subject site is a maximum of 8.5m.

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 of 10.4m.

building height (or ***height of building***) means:

- (a) in relation to the height of a building in metres—the vertical distance from ground level (existing) to the highest point of the building, or
 - (b) in relation to the RL of a building—the vertical distance from the Australian Height Datum to the highest point of the building,
- including plant and lift overruns, but excluding communication devices, antennae, satellite dishes, masts, flagpoles, chimneys, flues and the like.

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

The percentage variation sought is 22.3%

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 WLEP 2011 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 that buildings are compatible with the height and scale of surrounding and nearby development,

The proposed development will present with a dwelling of compatible scale to neighbouring development. It is a modest and aesthetically pleasing addition to an existing dwelling and has been designed to retain and improve the character of the streetscape and dwelling. The height noncompliance results only for the upper level deck roof and will not be easily visible from the immediate streetscape view.

(b) to minimise visual impact, disruption of views, loss of privacy and loss of solar access,

The variation is minimal in only of the roof and only at the point where the land drops away significantly. As the breach is on the northern side of the dwelling, the solar access implications are minimal and appropriate.

(c) to minimise any adverse impact of development on the scenic quality of Warringah's coastal and bush environments,

The proposed alterations and additions will result in significant improvement to the dwellings contribution to the character of the area. The existing street view will be enhanced by the architectural integrity of the modern flat roof form in place of the original pitched roof. Colours and materials have been chosen to complement the scenic

coastal/ bushland location and there will be no adverse impacts as a result of the small breach in height.

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 height of buildings 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 overall roof structure will be reduced as a part of the Development Application which replaces the pitched roof with a flat structure.
- The breach is to allow for a roof over decking and protect from the weather. It is an open structure which does not result in great bul.
- The development is of similar scale to neighbouring sites where the fall of the land has resulted in the need for additional height to develop.
- The design has retained the footprint of the existing dwelling to avoid impacting upon the surrounding natural environment.
- The area of variation will not be easily visible from the street frontage as it is well setback and hidden by vegetation.
- The architectural merit of the design is high and it would be of vast benefit the site, neighbours and locality to allow for this contemporary and thoughtful design.
- There are no discernible solar access impacts with the variation located on the northern side of the lot only.
- There are no view loss impacts with the area of the height variation retaining a lower RL than the existing dwelling roof.

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 – R2 Low Density Residential

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

Consistent. The proposal is for a residential dwelling.

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

Not relevant. The proposal is for a residential dwelling.

- *To ensure that low density residential environments are characterised by landscaped settings that are in harmony with the natural environment of Warringah.*

Consistent. The proposal is for a single dwelling house with 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 improved by the design elements which have been created to complement the natural environment of Warringah and Curl Curl.

Despite the proposal seeking an exception to the building height clause, the bulk and scale of the building will have minimal effect as the variation is only a roof form and allows for an open structure of limited bulk.

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 8.5 metres height development standard would hinder the development for the purpose of *promoting the orderly and economic use and development of land, protecting the environment, including the conservation of threatened and other species of native animals and plants, ecological communities and their habitats and promoting good design and amenity of the built environment.*

The proposed development is for a single residential dwelling, on land zoned R2 – Low Density Residential.

The proposed alterations and additions are located within the footprint of the existing dwelling, to avoid impacting upon the surrounding natural environment.

There will be no impact on private views due to the siting of the dwelling, and the topography of the site which results in the area which is the matter of the variation having a lower RL than the existing roof ridge.

From no perspective will the dwelling present with excessive bulk. The alterations and additions are a positive change for the site when viewed from all perspectives.

The proposed dwelling will not result in unreasonable overshadowing or privacy impacts to surrounding properties with the variation limited to the northern side.

The proposed alterations and additions will result in significant improvement to the dwelling's contribution to the character of the area.