

Attachment 1

Clause 4.6 variation request – Height of buildings Alterations and additions to an existing shop top housing development 209 – 211 Ocean Street, Narrabeen

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, *RebelMH Neutral Bay Pty Limited v North Sydney Council* [2019] NSWCA 130 and *Merman Investments Pty Ltd v Woollahra Municipal Council* [2021] NSWLEC 1582.

2.0 Warringah Local Environmental Plan 2011 (WLEP)

2.1 Clause 4.3 - Height of buildings

Pursuant to Clause 4.3 of Warringah Local Environmental Plan 2011 (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.

From an analysis of the architectural plans and available survey information I confirm that the approved apartment to which this application also relates (DA2017/1136) has a height of 10.153m to the roof. The application proposes cladding to the approved building facade located above the 8.5 metre height standard. This represents a non-compliance of 1.653 metres or 19%.

I note that this height breach has already been approved pursuant to DA2017/1136.

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:

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 WLEP Height of Buildings Development Standard.

Clause 4.6(3) of WLEP provides:

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.

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

4.0 Request for variation

4.1 Is clause 4.3 of WLEP a development standard?

The definition of “development standard” at clause 1.4 of the EP&A Act includes a provision 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:

- (c) *the character, location, siting, bulk, scale, shape, size, height, density, design or external appearance of a building or work,*

Clause 4.3 WLEP prescribes a height provision that seeks to control the height of certain development. Accordingly, clause 4.3 WLEP is a development standard.

4.2 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,*

Comment: The proposal does not alter the overall building height or bulk and scale of the development as approved pursuant to (DA2017/1136). The building height breaching elements remain consistent with this objective.

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

Comment: The proposal does not alter the overall building height or bulk and scale of the development nor the visual impact, view sharing, privacy and solar access outcomes afforded through approval of DA2017/1136. The building height breaching elements remain consistent with this objective.

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

Comment: The non-compliant building height elements will not adversely impact on the scenic quality of Warringah's coastal and bush environments. This objective is not defeated.

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

Comment: The non-compliant building height elements will not be readily discernible as viewed from the street or any public area.

Consistent with the conclusions reached by Senior Commissioner Roseth in the matter of Project Venture Developments v Pittwater Council (2005) NSW LEC 191 we have formed the considered opinion that most observers would not find the proposed development, in particular the non-compliant building height elements, offensive, jarring or unsympathetic in a streetscape context.

Having regard to the above, the non-compliant component of the building will achieve the objectives of the standard to at least an equal degree as would be the case with a development that complied with the building height standard. Given the developments consistency with the objectives of the height of buildings standard strict compliance has been found to be both unreasonable and unnecessary under the circumstances.

4.3 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:

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.

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

In my opinion, there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify the building height variation as outlined below.

Ground 1 – No change to previously approved building height, bulk or scale

The proposal does not alter the overall building height or bulk and scale of the development as approved pursuant to (DA2017/1136) with the clause 4.6 variation request prepared in support such approved breach considered to be well founded.

The proposed elements located above the building height standard are limited to wall cladding at the upper level which does not contribute to increased height, bulk or scale. The minor nature of the breaching façade elements and absence of adverse environmental impact is an environmental planning ground in support of the building height breach.

5.0 Conclusion

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

that compliance with the development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances of the case, and

- (a) *that there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening the development standard.*

As such, I have formed the 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



Greg Boston

B Urb & Reg Plan (UNE) MPIA

Director

20.3.25