



**CLAUSE 4.6 – EXCEPTIONS TO DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS**

**VARIATION TO THE MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF  
BUILDINGS STANDARD UNDER CL. 4.3 HORNSBY  
LEP 2013**

---

**Lot 11 in DP 748030 No. 29 Leighton Place, HORNSBY**

Construction of an additional eight (8) Industrial Units within approved Strata Lots under DA/829/2018 and associated car parking as part of an existing industrial complex.

**CLAUSE 4.6 VARIATION REQUEST**

ISSUE NO	AMENDMENT	DATE
A	INITIAL DRAFT REPORT	5 <sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2021
B	ISSUE TO CLIENT	5 <sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2021

**REPORT PREPARED BY:**

**Peter Fryar**

BTP (UNSW), CERT T&CP (Ord4), MPIA



**DIRECTOR,**  
**KEY URBAN PLANNING**

**WAIVER**

THIS REPORT HAS BEEN PREPARED IN ACCORDANCE WITH AND FOR THE PURPOSES OUTLINED IN THE SCOPE OF SERVICES AGREED WITH KEY URBAN PLANNING AND THE CLIENT. IT HAS BEEN PREPARED BASED ON THE INFORMATION SUPPLIED BY THE CLIENT, AS WELL AS INVESTIGATION UNDERTAKEN BY KEY URBAN PLANNING AND ANY SUB-CONSULTANTS ENGAGED BY THE CLIENT FOR THE PROJECT.

UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED IN THIS REPORT, INFORMATION AND ADVICE RECEIVED FROM EXTERNAL PARTIES DURING THE COURSE OF THIS PROJECT WAS NOT INDEPENDENTLY VERIFIED. HOWEVER, ANY SUCH INFORMATION WAS DEEMED TO BE CURRENT AND RELEVANT PRIOR TO ITS USE. WHILST ALL REASONABLE SKILL, DILIGENCE AND CARE HAVE BEEN TAKEN TO PROVIDE ACCURATE INFORMATION AND APPROPRIATE RECOMMENDATIONS, IT IS NOT WARRANTED OR GUARANTEED AND NO RESPONSIBILITY OR LIABILITY FOR ANY INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN OR FOR ANY CONSEQUENCES OF ITS USE WILL BE ACCEPTED BY KEY URBAN PLANNING.

THIS DOCUMENT IS SOLELY FOR THE USE OF THE AUTHORISED RECIPIENT. IT IS NOT TO BE USED OR COPIED (EITHER IN WHOLE OR IN PART) FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE OTHER THAN THAT FOR WHICH IT HAS BEEN PREPARED. KEY URBAN PLANNING ACCEPTS NO RESPONSIBILITY TO ANY THIRD PARTY WHO MAY USE OR RELY ON THIS DOCUMENT OR THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN.

THE CLIENT SHOULD BE AWARE THAT THIS REPORT DOES NOT GUARANTEE THE APPROVAL OF ANY APPLICATION BY ANY COUNCIL, GOVERNMENT AGENCY OR ANY OTHER REGULATORY AUTHORITY



## **VARIATION UNDER CLAUSE 4.6 OF THE HORNSBY LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN 2013 TO DEVELOPMENT STANDARD FOR MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF BUILDINGS (CLAUSE 4.3).**

Peter Fryar of Key Urban Planning has prepared this clause 4.6 request (the “**request**”) to assist in gaining development consent for *‘Construction of an additional eight (8) Industrial Units within approved Strata Lots under DA/829/2018 and associated car parking as part of an existing industrial complex.’*

The property is known as Lot 11 in DP 748030 No. 29 Leighton Place, Hornsby (the “**site**”). The site is located on the northern side of Leighton Place.

The site has an area of 5,041m<sup>2</sup> and is located on the northern side of Leighton Place. The site comprises an existing four storey industrial building with a fifth storey mezzanine level. The existing thirty-three (33) industrial units occupies a total floor area of 4,121m<sup>2</sup> and includes an on-site carparking provision for fifty-four (54) car parking spaces.

The proposed development detailed under the Statement of Environmental Effects prepared in support of the development application includes an assessment of the proposed works. In consideration of this matter, we have:

- Undertaken an inspection of the site and surrounding locality;
- Undertaken a review of the relevant provisions of the Hornsby Local Environmental Plan 2013 (the “**LEP**”);
- Undertaken a review of the relevant sections of the Hornsby Development Control Plan 2013 (the “**DCP**”); and
- Given consideration to the relevant provisions of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 (the “**Act**”) and the Environmental Planning & Assessment Regulations, 2000 (the “**Regs**”).

### **INTRODUCTION**

Key Urban Planning is providing urban planning services to the owners of the site in support of the above-described development application submitted to Hornsby Shire Council.

The purpose of this request is to seek a variation to Clause 4.3 (Height of Buildings) of the Hornsby Local Environmental Plan 2013. The proposal involves the construction of an additional eight (8) industrial units within an existing complex with associated car parking. The proposed

**CLAUSE 4.6 VARIATION REQUEST**

works will result in a portion of the new building works along the southern façade of the building to exceed the maximum height control prescribed under the LEP.

Clause 4.3 of the LEP states:


**"4.3 Height of buildings**

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

(a) to permit a height of buildings that is appropriate for the site constraints, development potential and infrastructure capacity of the locality.

(2) The height of a building on any land is not to exceed the maximum height shown for the land on the *Height of Buildings Map*."

**Figure 1-** Extract of the LEP height map.



The request seeks a variation to the fourteen and one half (14.5) metre maximum height standard prescribed under the LEP. A revised scheme has been prepared and the amended plans form the basis for this clause 4.6 variation request. **The maximum proposed height on the revised scheme is 24.25m.** The breach of the maximum height control is along elements of the southern elevation of the proposed building at portions where the building projects above the existing rooftop concrete slab.

## CLAUSE 4.6 FRAMEWORK

Clause 4.6 (*Exceptions to Development Standards*) provides a mechanism for a Consent Authority to grant flexibility in Development Standards when it considers this would result in improved planning outcomes for and from a development.

Clause 4.6(3)(a) and (b) requires that a consent authority must not grant a variation to a development standard unless it is satisfied:

*“(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;”*

Additionally, there is Case Law precedence that must be considered prior to determining any variation request under the Clause. The Land and Environment Court Case law has set questions to be addressed in requests for variations facilitated by Clause 4.6. The relevant precedence is in:

- *Wehbe v Pittwater Council (2007)*; and, more recently
- *Four2Five Pty Ltd v Ashfield Council (2015)*.

More recently, in two recent decisions (one in the Court of Appeal and one in the Land and Environment Court), Preston CJ further clarified the requirements for clause 4.6 requests and sought to unify the approaches in *Initial Action* and *Al Maha*.

### **1. *Baron Corporation Pty Limited v Council of the City of Sydney [2019] NSWLEC 61***

At first instance, Grey C refused development consent to the DA. One of the bases on which consent was refused was that the Commissioner was not satisfied that the Applicant's 4.6 variation request had adequately addressed the matters required to be demonstrated by cl 4.6(3).

On appeal to a judge of the Land and Environment Court (Preston CJ), Baron argued that the Commissioner had misdirected herself by asking whether she was '*directly and reasonably satisfied*' with the reasons given in the 4.6 request. The applicant made this submission in reliance on Preston CJ's statement in *Initial Action* (at [25]) that:

*“...the consent authority, or the Court on appeal, does not have to directly form the opinion of satisfaction regarding the matters in cl 4.6(3)(a) and (b), but only indirectly form the opinion of satisfaction that the applicant's written request has adequately addressed the matters required to be demonstrated by cl 4.6(3)(a) and (b).”*

After a detailed consideration of the issue (at [74-81]), His Honour rejected the applicant's argument. At [78], His Honour held:

*“The consent authority's consideration of the applicant's written request, required under cl 4.6(3), is to evaluate whether the request has demonstrated the achievement of the outcomes that are the matters in cl 4.6(3)(a) and (b). Only if the request does demonstrate the achievement of these outcomes will*

the request have “adequately addressed the matters required to be demonstrated” by cl 4.6(3), being the requirement in cl 4.6(4)(a)(i) about which the consent authority must be satisfied. The request cannot “adequately” address the matters required to be demonstrated by cl 4.6(3) if it does not in fact demonstrate the matters.”

## **2. RebelMH Neutral Bay Pty Limited v North Sydney Council [2019] NSWCA 130**

After the decision in *Baron Corporation*, the Court of Appeal once again considered the proper construction of clause 4.6 in *RebelMH*. Preston CJ sat in the Court of Appeal and delivered the Court’s reasons.

The development in question contravened the height development standard set out in the *North Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2013* (‘NSLEP’) and a clause 4.6 variation request was therefore required.

At first instance, Moore J dismissed the appeal as he was not satisfied that the request had adequately addressed the matters required to be demonstrated by cl 4.6(3) of the NSLEP. His Honour also found that the proposed development was not in the public interest because it was not consistent with objectives (b) and (f) of the height development standard. Objective (b) was to promote the retention and sharing of existing views and Objective (f) was to encourage an appropriate scale and density of development that was in accordance with the character of an area.

On appeal, the applicant argued that Moore J had misconstrued and misapplied cl 4.6 by finding that to ‘adequately address’ the matters required to be demonstrated in cl 4.6(3), the request had to actually demonstrate those matters, rather than merely seek to demonstrate those matters.

The Court rejected this argument. After setting out Preston CJ’s conclusions in *Baron Corp*, the Court reaffirmed (at [51]):

*“... in order for a consent authority to be satisfied that an applicant’s written request has “adequately addressed” the matters required to be demonstrated by cl 4.6(3), the consent authority needs to be satisfied that those matters have in fact been demonstrated. It is not sufficient for the request merely to seek to demonstrate the matters in subcl (3) (which is the process required by cl 4.6(3)), the request must in fact demonstrate the matters in subcl (3) (which is the outcome required by cl 4.6(3) and (4)(a)(i)).”*

This application to vary a development standard is framed to provide responses to each of the heads of consideration under Clause 4.6 and to address the precedence set by this relevant Case Law. It is set out as follows:

- Verification that a statutory Development Standard is proposed to be varied;
- Description and quantification of the proposed variation
- Justification on merit of the validity of the variation requested (with particular attention to the current case law precedence in *Four2Five vs Pty Ltd v Ashfield Council & Wehbe v Pittwater Council (2007)*). Particularly, clause 4.6(3)(a) identifies that the request must demonstrate that

compliance with the development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances.

- Assessment against the remaining relevant statutory heads of consideration in the LEP 2013 and other relevant case law.
- As required by clause 4.6(3)(b) the request will demonstrate that there are sufficient environmental grounds to justify contravening the development standard.

#### **DEVELOPMENT STANDARD PROPOSED TO BE VARIED**

The Development Standard to be varied by this application is Clause 4.3 (Height of buildings) of the Hornsby LEP 2013.

The map indicates that the maximum height for a building must not exceed 14.5 metres. The purpose of this request is to seek a variation to Clause 4.3 (Height of Buildings) of the Hornsby Local Environmental Plan 2013.

The site is zoned IN1 General Industrial Zone under the LEP.

The Dictionary to LEP 2013 defines “Height of Buildings Map” as:

*“Height of Buildings Map means the [Hornsby Local Environmental Plan 2013 Height of Buildings Map](#).”*

Building height is defined in the LEP 2013 as:

*“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.”*

Section 1.4 of the Act defines a ‘development standard’ to mean:

*“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,*

## CLAUSE 4.6 VARIATION REQUEST

- (b) the proportion or percentage of the area of a site which a building or work may occupy,*
- (c) the character, location, siting, bulk, scale, shape, size, height, density, design or external appearance of a building or work,*
- (d) the cubic content or floor space of a building,*
- (e) the intensity or density of the use of any land, building or work,*
- (f) the provision of public access, open space, landscaped space, tree planting or other treatment for the conservation, protection or enhancement of the environment,*
- (g) the provision of facilities for the standing, movement, parking, servicing, manoeuvring, loading or unloading of vehicles,*
- (h) the volume, nature and type of traffic generated by the development,*
- (i) road patterns,*
- (j) drainage,*
- (k) the carrying out of earthworks,*
- (l) the effects of development on patterns of wind, sunlight, daylight or shadows,*
- (m) the provision of services, facilities and amenities demanded by development,*
- (n) the emission of pollution and means for its prevention or control or mitigation, and*
- (o) such other matters as may be prescribed."*

The maximum building height identified on the 'Height of buildings map' is a development standard as defined under section 1.4 of the Act.

The Land and Environment Court of NSW in *Bramley v Coffs Harbour City Council* [2014] NSWLEC 1194 considered a development proposal involving a clause 4.6 submission seeking variation to the height standard. Commissioner Brown at para. 28 to 29 described the clause 4.6 assessment framework as follows:

*"28. 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))."*



29. In considering the question of consistency, I have adopted approach of the former Chief Judge, Justice Pearlman in *Schaffer Corporation v Hawkesbury City Council (1992) 77 LGRA 21* where, Her Honour expresses the following opinion at [27]:

**The guiding principle, then, is that a development will be generally consistent with the objectives, if it is not antipathetic to them. It is not necessary to show that the development promotes or is ancillary to those objectives, nor even that it is compatible.”**

NOTE: Bold and underlining by author.

Accordingly, the proposed alterations & additions to the existing industrial complex development forming part of the DA constitutes a variation to the maximum building height development standard contained within the LEP and requires the proponent to formally seek a variation under the provisions of clause 4.6 of the LEP.

## 2. EXTENT OF VARIATION SOUGHT

The purpose of this request is to seek a variation to Clause 4.3 (Height of buildings) of the Hornsby Local Environmental Plan 2013. It is proposed that elements of the upper level of the additional units will exceed the maximum height control predominantly at the southern elevation of the existing building.

The extent of the non-compliance with the maximum height standard being a maximum height at the southern elevation of 24.25 metres. Most of the building will remain unaltered. The breach of the maximum height control is along elements of the southern elevation of the existing building and in the context of the site and the existing development is negligible in the impacts.

## 3. JUSTIFICATION FOR CONTRAVENTION OF THE DEVELOPMENT STANDARD

The proposed variation is justified below firstly via a merit – based assessment on the recent case law and subsequently against the relevant heads of consideration in the LEP 2013. Case law (*Winten Property Group v North Sydney Council, 2001* & *Wehbe v Pittwater Council, 2007*) sets the basis for decision making on tests to assess variations to a Development Standard founded in whether the varied development would achieve the objectives of the relevant zoning and the Development Standard. In the decision in *Four2Five Pty Ltd v Ashfield Council, 2015*, Commissioner Pearson found that merely showing that the development achieves the objectives of the development standard would be insufficient to justify that a development is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances of the case for the purposes of a Clause 4.6 objection. This refined the test set in *Wehbe v Pittwater Council* to include an obligation to tie the test to outcomes specific to the proposed development and its site as opposed to grounds that would apply to any similar development on the site or in the vicinity. Consent authorities have since been applying this site & development specific test (“*the Four2Five Test*”) to objections under Clause 4.6. The merit - based assessment of this variation request is based on this test.

With respect to the *Four2Five* test, there are several outcomes for the development on this site that go to justification of the variation request for maximum building height.

These include:

- The shape and locality of the site and the opportunities and constraints that arise for its redevelopment (in part) as a result;
- The potential for negative town planning and urban outcomes that may arise from strict compliance with the requirement are negligible when considering the context of the site with surrounding development;
- The unique qualities of the site and the proposed alterations and additions will maintain and enhance these and the character of the locality;
- The shape and locality of the site and the opportunities and constraints that arise for its development as a result – specifically the opportunity to provide substantial public benefits in the form of a public street frontage with no discernible impacts arising from the additional height proposed on the locality.
- The extent of the non-compliance is minor in the context of the existing built form.
- There is limited opportunity to ‘step’ the design and the additional height is within an envelope already approved for development under the approved strata plan.
- In order to achieve the development potential of the site envisaged by controls such as FSR, the site constraints created when the original subdivision occurred have caused strict compliance with the height standard adopted under the current LEP unfeasible. The historic height provisions that were envisaged at the time the subdivision creating the site occurred would allow building height greater than proposed. This is evident in the heights of older industrial developments in the locality.
- Scale of the building as viewed from the adjoining roadway is negligible due to existing site topography. The proposed building in the context of the backdrop of existing buildings constructed to the rear of the site is considered reasonable.

#### **4. ASSESSMENT AGAINST THE STATUTORY HEADS OF CONSIDERATION**

The proposed variation is assessed below against the relevant sub-clauses in Clause 4.6 of the LEP.

*Compliance with the development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances of the case (Cl.4.6(3)(a))*

In his decision in *Wehbe v Pittwater Council [2007] NSW LEC 827* (relating to the now repealed State Environmental Planning Policy No.1), Chief Justice Preston expressed the view that there are 5 different ways in which a Development Standard may be shown to be unreasonable or unnecessary (and so that an objection to the development standard may be well founded). In accordance with this precedent, the proposed variation is tested below against each of these.

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

The relevant objective underpinning the building height development standard is:

*“(a) to permit a height of buildings that is appropriate for the site constraints, development potential and infrastructure capacity of the locality.”*

The relatively modest additional height proposed (above the existing building) contributes to the delivery of a high-quality development on this site. The zoning of the site and surrounding industrial lands includes land of relatively steep topography that may be considered in some respects unsuitable for industrial development. Consequently, a number of industrial complexes in the locality have been approved by Council in contravention of the current LEP height standard. The proposed building works are consistent with the height and scale of the building constructed immediately adjoining the site to the west.

The existing building has been constructed more than 25 metres in height. The minor additional breach in height at small elements of the building is considered acceptable in the circumstances and in the context of the surrounding development.

The lateral expansion of the building to achieve the councils floor space expectations for industrial development of the site will impact adversely on the endangered ecological community situated upon the site and the additional height responds to the ecological constraints on the site. The natural topography of the site will result in unreasonable impacts by way of excavation should the additional floor space be provided outside the existing building envelope.

The council in the granting of development consent for the creation of the strata lots upon which the additional industrial units are proposed has envisaged additional ‘height’ occurring as part of the development subject of this DA.

The objectives of the standard can be achieved, notwithstanding the additional height, and that a superior development outcome would result.

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

The underlying objective or purpose of the standard is relevant to this development but, as illustrated in the plans submitted with the development application, it is achieved through the height variation with a higher quality urban planning and urban design outcome. This also accounts for the natural/modified topography of the land and a desire to achieve the allowable floor space standard under the LEP (FSR proposed 0.93:1 - FSR allowed 1:1).

- *The underlying object or purpose would be defeated or thwarted if compliance was required and therefore compliance is unreasonable;*

The underlying object or purpose of the standard would not be defeated or thwarted if compliance was required. However, strict compliance with the development standard would result in a missed

opportunity specific to this site to develop a high-quality development that will present in a positive manner to Leighton Place.

- *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;*

Council has departed on the development standard in historic planning circumstances on the site and on surrounding sites.

A number of industrial buildings that have been constructed within the surrounding industrial precinct are well in excess of the current height standard and in many cases are built at heights of 25-30 metres. It is considered that compliance with the standard in the circumstances is unreasonable and unnecessary when considering historic approvals by the council in the locality.

- *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.*

The zoning of the site and surrounding industrial lands includes land of relatively steep topography that may be considered in some respects unsuitable for industrial development. Consequently, a number of industrial complexes in the locality have been approved by Council in contravention of the current LEP height standard. The proposed building is consistent with the height and scale of the building constructed immediately adjoining the site to the west.

The proposed variation is consistent with the heads of consideration set by the decision of *Wehbe v Pittwater Council [2007]* and thus that for this particular case it would be unreasonable to strictly apply the numerical height standard for the development.

***There are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening the development standard (Cl.4.6(3)(b))***

The merit - based justification above in this request provides strong evidence that the proposed height variation would have clear positive outcomes including the protection and enhancement of identified values specific to the site and provision of high-quality industrial development in the locality.

The additional height is a negligible issue within the context of the greater planning benefit, including opportunities for the protection and enhancement of local values and provision of high-quality industrial development that would result from the minor variation to the height standard.

In this regard, there are sufficient environmental planning grounds specific to this site to justify the proposed departure from the development standard.

The underlying objective of the height standard is to minimise potential adverse environmental impacts of development of the site on the surrounding area. It is noted that the height standard was applied to the site at a time historically when the subdivision of the locality had occurred that created industrial

allotments on extremely steep topography. It could be argued that the current height standard is inappropriate when accounting for changes to height controls that have occurred in recent years on surrounding lands.

Although the proposal breaches the height of buildings control, the development achieves appropriate building envelopes and separation to the adjacent industrial land. It is also worth noting that the development does comply with solar access, site coverage and other similar requirements adopted by Council.

*The proposal will be in the public interest because it is consistent with the objectives of the relevant development standard and the objectives for development within the relevant zone (Cl.4.6(4)(a)(ii))*

The analysis previously in the SEE indicates that the proposed height variation will result in a development that is consistent with the objectives of the IN1 General Industrial zone and the Height Standard clause within the LEP 2013. The development proposal will result in a gross floor area that will effectively match the resultant development volume to transport and other infrastructure for the site.

In *RebelMH Neutral Bay Pty Limited v North Sydney Council* [2019] NSWCA 130

- Case concerned a DA for a 5 storey residential flat building that did not comply with the applicable development standard for height under North Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2013.
- One of the issues raised in the appeal to the Court of Appeal was whether, in order for a consent authority to be satisfied that an applicant's request has "adequately addressed" the matters required to be demonstrated by cl 4.6(3), the consent authority needs to be satisfied that those matters have in fact been demonstrated.
- The appellant contended that clause 4.6(4)(a)(i) should be read as requiring the consent authority to be satisfied that the written request covers or deals with the required matters and that it was not necessary for the consent authority to agree with the conclusions of a request, nor the accuracy of the factual assertions contained within it. In other words, the appellant asserted that the consent authority only needed to be satisfied that the written request contained an argument about each of the matters required to be demonstrated by cl 4.6(3).
- Justice Payne said:

*"Clause 4.6(3) requires the consent authority to have "considered" the written request and identifies the necessary evaluative elements to be satisfied. To comply with subcl (3), the request must demonstrate that compliance with the development standard is "unreasonable or unnecessary" and that "there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify" the contravention. It would give no work to subcl 4.6(4) simply to require the consent authority to be satisfied that an argument addressing the matters required to be addressed under subcl (3) has been advanced."*

- Justice Preston (sitting in the Court of Appeal) said at 51:

*"...in order for a consent authority to be satisfied that an applicant's written request has "adequately addressed" the matters required to be demonstrated by cl 4.6(3), the consent authority needs to be satisfied that those matters have in fact been demonstrated. It is not sufficient for the request merely to seek to demonstrate the matters in subcl (3) (which is the process required by cl 4.6(3)), the request must in fact demonstrate the matters in subcl (3) (which is the outcome required by cl*

*4.6(3) and (4)(a)(i)."*

It is considered that the public benefit will not be undermined by varying the height development standard. The proposed development is considered to be generally consistent with the adopted planning controls for the site.

## **6. SECRETARY'S CONCURRENCE**

Under Clause 4.6(5) of the LEP, the Secretary's concurrence is required prior to any variation being granted. The proposal is assessed below against the matters to be considered by the Secretary.

*(a) whether contravention of the development standard raises any matter of significance for State or regional environmental planning, and*

The variation to the minimum lot area development standard will raise no matters that could be deemed to have State or Regional Significance. The proposed variation will have no potential for impacts outside the immediate vicinity of the site.

*(b) the public benefit of maintaining the development standard, and*

Maintaining the development standard in this case will not compromise that development form envisaged by the planning controls adopted by council.

*(c) any other matters required to be taken into consideration by the Secretary before granting concurrence.*

We know of no other specific matters that would require the Secretary's consideration prior to granting concurrence.

## **CONCLUSION**

The proposed development satisfies the test established by the Land and Environment Court of NSW in *Wehbe -v- Pittwater Council* [2007] NSW LEC 827 as being appropriate for consideration of "unreasonable or unnecessary" circumstances in the application of Clause 4.6 variation request because:

- the objectives of the standard are achieved notwithstanding non-compliance with the standard;
- the underlying objective or purpose of the standard is not relevant to the development therefore compliance is unnecessary in the context of the facts of this case;
- the underlying objective or purpose would be defeated or thwarted if compliance was required and therefore compliance is unreasonable - it would not result in the orderly and economic development of the land;

In the circumstances set out above there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to vary the numerical standard in this matter. Requiring strict compliance with the standard would hinder attainment of the relevant objects of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.

**Peter Fryar**

BTP(UNSW), CERT T&CP(Ord4), MPIA

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Peter Fryar', with a large, stylized loop at the end.

Director,

KEY URBAN PLANNING