

**86-88 Centenary Road, Strathfield –
Planning Proposal and Development Application Comparison**

Planning Proposal					Development Application - DA2017/168				
Planning proposal lodged to Strathfield Council to increase maximum height and floor space ratio permitted on the site. Proposal sought to increase height from 28m to 65m and increase FSR from 1.2:1 to 1.8:1					Amended DA proposal for one (1) x nine (9) storey and one (1) x eleven (11) storey apartment building comprising 183 apartments, over two (2) levels of basement parking for 312 vehicles. Consent is also sought for associated landscaping and civil works and the construction of a café and one associated at grade parking space within the landscaped grounds.				
SLEP 2012	Control	Standard	Proposed	Uplift	Clause	Required	Proposed (1 lot)	Proposed (2 lots)	Compliance
Clause 4.3	Height of Building	28m (9 storeys)	65m (26 storeys)	132% (Approximately 17 storeys)	4.1A Minimum Site Area: Residential Flat Building	1,000m ²	7,406m ²	20,266.5m	Yes
Clause 4.4	Floor Space Ratio (FSR)*	1.2:1 (9760.8m ²) – based on site area of 86	3.4:1 (based on site area of 86 Centenary Drive only – 8134m ²)	108% (10,507.2m ²)	4.3 Height of Buildings	28m (on front site the location of the proposed apartment buildings)	<u>Building A</u> 26.2-27.9m to roof (complies) 29.5-30.1m to shelter (2.1m breach) 30.0-30.6m to lift (2.6m breach)	N/A	No. See following discussion
		1.2:1 (24,321.6m ²) – based on site area of 86 + 88	1.8:1 (based on total GFA including townhouses)	52% (12,642.4m ²)			<u>Building B</u> 33.1-34.1m to roof (6.1m breach) 35.9-36.5m to shelter (8.5m breach) 36.7m to lift (8.7m breach)		
* Clause 4.5 of SLEP 2012 does not exclude the access handle of 729m ² from the area;					4.4 Floor Space Ratio	1.2:1 (2 lots max 24,319.8m ² , 1 lot max. 8,887.2m ²)	16,134.1m ² (includes 10.1m ² of WCs on the roof which the applicant did not include in calculation) 2.178:1 (breach by 7,246.9m ² or 81.5%)	25,176.1m ² 1.24:1 (breach by 856.3m ² or 3.5%)	No. See following discussion
Council Recommendation in Report					Assessment Report Discussion				
Accordingly, a built form outcome of nine (9) storeys in accordance with the existing 28m height control under SLEP 2012 is considered to be more appropriate to the site.					<u>Building Height</u>				
Council will only support a maximum building height of 28m and					The variation to Building A results from the provision of roof top communal open space which will provide a better outcome than a compliant development in terms of a significant increase in amenity for the residents using this space and does not				

<p>maximum floor space ratio of 1.2:1 as permitted on the site under SLEP 2012.</p>	<p>result in any additional environmental impacts. For this reason the variation to Building A is supported in this instance.</p> <p>The additional floor space (equivalent to one floor) and the provision of private roof top facilities significantly add to the height breach without resulting in a better outcome than a compliant development, other than an improved level of profitability for the developed. As such, the Clause 4.6 fails to demonstrate that the degree of flexibility sought is appropriate to the particular development in relation to Building B.</p> <p>Accordingly, a condition of consent is recommended requiring the deletion of Level 9 of Building B and the private open space facilities on the roof of Building B, with the lift overrun being reduced to no more than RL57.7m.</p> <p><u>FSR</u></p> <p>The proposal seeks to breach the FSR control of 1.2:1 under clause 4.4 of the LEP by the following amounts:</p> <p>Assessment of subject site (<u>ie 1 lot</u>)</p> <p>GFA: 16,134.1m² (includes 10.1m² of WCs on the roof which the applicant did not include in calculation)</p> <p>FSR: 2.178:1</p> <p>Breach: 7,246.9m² or 81.5%</p> <p>Assessment of combined site (<u>ie 2 lot including townhouse site</u>)</p> <p>GFA: 25,176.1m² (includes 10.1m² of WCs on the roof which the applicant did not include in calculation)</p> <p>FSR: 1.24:1</p> <p>Breach: 856.3m² or 3.5%</p> <p>For the reasons previously discussed, it is not considered that variation of the FSR control to the extent sought is in the public interest or that there is a public benefit</p>
---	---

to varying the control to the extent sought.

However, if the breaching FSR (equivalent to the GFA of Level 9) was removed from the proposal, the breach over the two sites would be removed. This would result in an overall compliant FSR on the two sites.

Accordingly, a condition of consent is recommended requiring the deletion of Level 9 of Building B.