BBF TOWN PLANNERS

Suite 1, 9 Narabang Way Belrose NSW 2085 | Phone: (02) 9986 2535 | Fax: (02) 9986 3050 | www.bbfplanners.com.au

3 May 2022

The General Manager
Northern Beaches Council

RE: CLAUSE 4.6 REQUEST TO VARY THE HEIGHT OF BUILDINGS DEVELOPMENT STANDARD

7 CROWN ROAD, QUEENSCLIFF

1.0 Introduction

This clause 4.6 variation has been prepared having regard to the Land and Environment Court judgements in the matters of *Wehbe v Pittwater Council* [2007] NSWLEC 827 (*Wehbe)* at [42] – [48], *Four2Five Pty Ltd v Ashfield Council* [2015] NSWCA 248, *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.

2.0 Warringah Local Environmental Plan 2013 ("WLEP")

2.1 Clause 4.3 - Height of buildings

Pursuant to Clause 4.3 of Warringah Local Environmental Plan 2013 (WLEP) the height of a building on the subject land is not to exceed 8.5 metres in height. The objectives of this control 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.*

Building height is defined as follows:

> ***building height*** *(or* ***height of building****) means the vertical distance between ground level (existing) and 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*

Ground level existing is defined as follows:

ground level (existing) means the existing level of a site at any point.

The leading case authority which considers the definition of "ground level (existing)" is *Bettar v Council of the City of Sydney* [2014] NSWLEC 1070 which was followed in the recent decision of *Stamford Property Services Pty Ltd v City of Sydney & Anor* [2015] NSWLEC 1189.

In *Stamford Property Services*, the Court followed the reasoning adopted in *Bettar* and confirmed that "ground level (existing)" must relate to the levels of the site, and not to the artificially modified levels of the site as reflected by the building presently located on the land. In this regard the Court preferred the Council's method to determining the "ground floor (existing)" from which building height should be measured. Council's approach required that the proposed height be measured from the natural ground levels of the site where known, such as undisturbed levels at the boundary, and from adjacent undisturbed levels such as the level of the footpath at the front boundary of the site. These levels could then be extrapolated across the site reflecting the pre-development sloping topography of the land, consistent with the approach adopted in *Bettar*.

In these proceedings the Court was satisfied that even though there was limited survey information available for the site, there was enough information to determine the "ground level (existing)" for the site based on unmodified surveyed levels in the public domain (footpaths) which could be extrapolated across the site. In summary, the Court has confirmed that the definition of "ground level (existing)" from which building height should be measured:

- is not to be based on the artificially modified levels of the site such as the floor levels of an existing building. This includes the entrance steps of an existing building.
- is not to include the basement floor or the soil beneath the basement following construction of the building.
- is to be based on the existing undisturbed surveyed surface of the ground. For sites where access to the ground surface is restricted by an existing building, natural ground levels should be determined with regard to known boundary levels based on actual and surveyed levels on adjoining properties including within the public domain (footpaths).

The proposal has been further refined to ensure that level 00, as identified in the architectural set, does comply with the 8.5m to the best we can extrapolate from the surveyed levels. Notwithstanding, this clause 4.6 is provided out of an abundance of caution with regard to this level as there may be minor sections that do not strictly conform however is still considered to meet the objectives of the zoning and height standard and that there is sufficient environmental planning grounds to support a variation if a minor breach was identified.

The level identified as the 'level 01' in the architectural set represents a reduction in height due to the existing terrace being squared off to the north-western corner. While it represents decrease in height from existing there are still new elements above the 8.5m that trigger the need for a clause 4.6. The new planter boxes to the terrace will sit above the 8.5m and will reach an approximate height of 9.8m at it highest point along when taken from the east elevation. This represents a 15.3% variation to the height standard.

2.2 Clause 4.6 – Exceptions to Development Standards

Clause 4.6(1) of WLEP provides:

(1) The objectives of this clause are:

(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 WLEP 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.

This clause applies to the clause 4.3 Height of Buildings Development Standard.

Clause 4.6(3) of WLEP 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 height of buildings provision at 4.3 of WLEP which specifies a maximum building height 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 WLEP 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 Director-General 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 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 WLEP provides:

(5) In deciding whether to grant concurrence, the Director-General 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 Director-General 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 4.3 of WLEP from the operation of clause 4.6.

3.0 Relevant Case Law

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.*

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

1. Is clause 4.3 of WLEP 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 4.3 and the objectives for development for in the 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 4.3 of WLEP

4.0 Request for variation

4.1 Clause 4.6(3)(a) – Whether compliance with the development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary

The common approach for an applicant to demonstrate that compliance with a development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary are set out in Wehbe v Pittwater Council [2007] NSWLEC 827.

The first option, which has been adopted in this case, is to establish that compliance with the development standard is unreasonable and unnecessary because the objectives of the development standard are achieved notwithstanding non-compliance with the standard.

Consistency with objectives of the height of buildings standard

An assessment as to the consistency of the proposal when assessed against the objectives of the standard is as follows:

> *(a) to ensure that buildings are compatible with the height and scale of surrounding and nearby development,*

Response: The height and built form proposed are consistent with that established by the adjoining dwelling houses and the prevailing height of residential development generally within the site's visual catchment.

The works will not significantly alter the existing scale of development on the site and will refine the existing floorplates. The dwelling will still present as a multi storey that is reflective of the topography of the area. Development along this escarpment is characterised by multi storey dwellings which step down the steep topography. Increase in landscaping on and surrounding the development will provide further softening and screening while integrating with the escarpment.

Consistent with the conclusions reached by Senior Commissioner Roseth in the matter of Project Venture Developments v Pittwater Council (2005) NSW LEC 191 I have formed the considered opinion that most observers would not find the proposed development by virtue of its roof form and building height offensive, jarring or unsympathetic in a streetscape context nor having regard to the built form characteristics of development within the sites visual catchment.

The proposal is consistent with this objective.

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

Response: The building form and height has been appropriately distributed across the site to minimise disruption of views to nearby residential development from surrounding public spaces. View analysis has been undertaken which demonstrates that existing water and land interface views enjoyed by neighbouring properties will be largely unaffected.

Having regard to the view sharing principles established by the Land and Environment Court of NSW in the matter of Tenacity Consulting v Warringah [2004] NSWLEC 140 as they relate to an assessment of view impacts and that the proposed additions will not give rise to any unacceptable

public or private view affectation with the ocean and horizon views maintained from all properties located to the south along Crown Road. View impacts have been minimised and a view sharing outcome achieved.

The works have also been designed to not give rise to any significant adverse amenity impacts with regard to privacy and overshadowing.

The proposal is consistent with this objective.

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

Response: The dwelling will not significantly alter the built form as it sits within the context of the coastal escarpment. The new addition creating a connection between the garage and the dwelling will be obscured behind the main dwelling and not give rise to any unreasonable visual impact concerns. The existing geometry of the floor plates have been redesigned to present a more coherent built form presentation and will improve the scenic quality of the coastal setting. The enhancement of landscaping on the site will soften and screen the dwelling when viewed from the public domain.

The proposal is consistent with this objective.

> *(d) to manage the visual impact of development when viewed from public places such as parks and reserves, roads and community facilities.*

Response: As mentioned above, the works represent an improvement to the existing built form to present a more coherent floor plate geometry and cleaner lines which will reduce its visual impact. The upper level has raised its roof height and sits back towards the slope as to not be readily discernible from Freshwater Beach. The existing concrete walls beneath the pool will include new permeable screen to soften its current visual impact.

The proposal is consistent with this objective.

<u>Consistency with zone objectives</u>

The subject site is zoned R2 Low Density Residential pursuant to WLEP 2011 with dwelling houses permissible in the zone with consent. The stated objectives of the zone are as follows:

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

Response: The works relate to alterations and additions to an existing dwelling.

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

Response: N/A

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

Response: The works do not impact on the heritage value of the cliffs. A landscape plan has been providing detailing the enhancement of landscaping on the site and to the façade of the dwelling to ensure that it will sit within the natural environment.

The proposed works are permissible and consistent with the stated objectives of the zone.

The non-compliant component of the development, as it relates to building height, demonstrates consistency with objectives of the R2 Low Density Residential zone and the height of building standard objectives. Adopting the first option in *Wehbe* strict compliance with the height of buildings standard has been demonstrated to be is unreasonable and unnecessary.

4.2 Clause 4.6(4)(b) – 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].

Sufficient environmental planning grounds exist to justify the height of buildings variation namely the topography of the land which limits the ability to distribute a compliant quantum of floor space across the site in a contextually appropriate manner whist complying with the height of buildings standard.

The design has made concerted effort to be ensure new elements at level 01 are respectful of the 8.5m height limit with the main offending elements relating the 'level 01' which reflects a technical non-compliance due to the overall height being reduced however new works are proposed above the 8.5m. In this regard, the proposal does reduce the overall max height by refining the terrace

and squaring off the north western corner. This reduction will facilitate improved view corridors across the site while providing cleaner lines to the dwelling to reduce visual impact. There are no amenity impacts associated with the technical non-compliance at this level.

I consider the proposal to be of a skilful design which responds appropriately and effectively to the above constraints by appropriately distributing floor space, building mass and building height across the site in a manner which provides for appropriate streetscape and residential amenity outcomes including a view sharing scenario. Such outcome is achieved whilst realising the reasonable development potential of the land.

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

- The proposal promotes the orderly and economic use and development of land (1.3(c)).
- The development represents good design (1.3(g)).
- The building as designed facilitates its proper construction and will ensure the protection of the health and safety of its future occupants (1.3(h)).

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.

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

4.3 Clause 4.6(a)(iii) – Is the proposed development in the public interest because it is consistent with the objectives of clause 4.3A and the objectives of the R2 Low Density Residential zone

The consent authority needs to be satisfied that the proposed development will be in the public interest if the standard is varied because it is consistent with the objectives of the standard and the objectives of the zone.

Preston CJ in Initial Action (Para 27) described the relevant test for this as follows:

> *"The matter in cl 4.6(4)(a)(ii), with which the consent authority or the Court on appeal must be satisfied, is not merely that the proposed development will be in the public interest but that it 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. It is the proposed development's consistency with the objectives of the development standard and the objectives of the zone that make the proposed development in the public interest. If the proposed development is inconsistent with either the objectives of the development standard or the objectives of the zone or both, the consent authority, or the Court on appeal, cannot be satisfied that the development will be in the public interest for the purposes of cl 4.6(4)(a)(ii)."*

As demonstrated in this request, the proposed development 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.

Accordingly, the consent authority can be satisfied that the proposed development will be in the public interest if the standard is varied because it is consistent with the objectives of the standard and the objectives of the zone.

4.4 Secretary's concurrence

By Planning Circular dated 21st February 2018, the Secretary of the Department of Planning & Environment advised that consent authorities can assume the concurrence to clause 4.6 request except in the circumstances set out below:

- Lot size standards for rural dwellings;
- Variations exceeding 10%; and
- Variations to non-numerical development standards.

The circular also provides that concurrence can be assumed when an LPP is the consent authority where a variation exceeds 10% or is to a non-numerical standard, because of the greater scrutiny that the LPP process and determination s are subject to, compared with decisions made under delegation by Council staff.

Concurrence of the Secretary can therefore be assumed in this case.

5.0 Conclusion

Having regard to the clause 4.6 variation provisions we have formed the considered opinion:

(a) that the contextually responsive development is consistent with the zone objectives, and

(b) that the contextually responsive development is consistent with the objectives of the height of buildings standard, and

(c) that there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening the development standard, and

(d) that having regard to (a), (b) and (c) above that compliance with the building height development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances of the case, and

(e) that given the developments ability to comply with the zone and height of buildings standard objectives that approval would not be antipathetic to the public interest, and

(f) that contravention of the development standard does not raise any matter of significance for State or regional environmental planning; and

(g) Concurrence of the Secretary can be assumed in this case.

Pursuant to clause 4.6(4)(a), the consent authority is satisfied that the applicant's written request has adequately addressed the matters required to be demonstrated by subclause (3) being:

(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.

As such, I have formed the highly considered opinion that there is no statutory or environmental planning impediment to the granting of a height of buildings variation in this instance.

Boston Blyth Fleming Pty Limited

William Fleming

BS, MPLAN

Planner