



Willoughby Public School

Request for 4.6 Variation

Prepared by:

RPS AUSTRALIA EAST PTY LTD

Level 13, 255 Pitt Street,
Sydney, New South Wales 2000

T: 02 9248 9800
E: sydney@rpsgroup.com.au

Prepared by: James Gilchrist
Reviewed: Claire Muir
Approved: Louise Bochner
Project No.: PR130743-4
Version: 2
Date: July 2017

Prepared for:

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION C/O CONRAD
GARGETT ANCHER MORTLOCK WOOLEY**

35 Bridge Street
Sydney NSW 2000

T: 02 8218 9100
E: mail@conradgargett.com.au
W:

IMPORTANT NOTE

Apart from fair dealing for the purposes of private study, research, criticism, or review as permitted under the Copyright Act, no part of this report, its attachments or appendices may be reproduced by any process without the written consent of RPS Australia East Pty Ltd. All enquiries should be directed to RPS Australia East Pty Ltd.

We have prepared this report for the sole purposes of Department of Education C/O Conrad Gargett Ancher Mortlock Wooley ("**Client**") for the specific purpose of only for which it is supplied ("**Purpose**"). This report is strictly limited to the purpose and the facts and matters stated in it and does not apply directly or indirectly and will not be used for any other application, purpose, use or matter.

In preparing this report we have made certain assumptions. We have assumed that all information and documents provided to us by the Client or as a result of a specific request or enquiry were complete, accurate and up-to-date. Where we have obtained information from a government register or database, we have assumed that the information is accurate. Where an assumption has been made, we have not made any independent investigations with respect to the matters the subject of that assumption. We are not aware of any reason why any of the assumptions are incorrect.

This report is presented without the assumption of a duty of care to any other person (other than the Client) ("**Third Party**"). The report may not contain sufficient information for the purposes of a Third Party or for other uses. Without the prior written consent of RPS Australia East Pty Ltd:

- (a) this report may not be relied on by a Third Party; and
- (b) RPS Australia East Pty Ltd will not be liable to a Third Party for any loss, damage, liability or claim arising out of or incidental to a Third Party publishing, using or relying on the facts, content, opinions or subject matter contained in this report.

If a Third Party uses or relies on the facts, content, opinions or subject matter contained in this report with or without the consent of RPS Australia East Pty Ltd, RPS Australia East Pty Ltd disclaims all risk and the Third Party assumes all risk and releases and indemnifies and agrees to keep indemnified RPS Australia East Pty Ltd from any loss, damage, claim or liability arising directly or indirectly from the use of or reliance on this report.

In this note, a reference to loss and damage includes past and prospective economic loss, loss of profits, damage to property, injury to any person (including death) costs and expenses incurred in taking measures to prevent, mitigate or rectify any harm, loss of opportunity, legal costs, compensation, interest and any other direct, indirect, consequential or financial or other loss.

DOCUMENT STATUS

Version	Purpose of Document	Orig	Review	Review Date
1	Draft to Client	JG	CM	06/07/2017
2	Final to Client	CM	CM	07/07/2017

APPROVAL FOR ISSUE

Name	Signature	Date
Louise Bochner		07/07/2017

Contents

1.1

Introduction.....

1

1.2

Development Standard

1

1.3

Willoughby Local Environmental Plan 2012

1

1.4

Clause 4.6 Assessment.....

2

1.5

Compliance is unreasonable or unnecessary

3

1.6

Adequate grounds for contravening the development standard

5

1.7

Significance for State or regional planning

5

1.8

The public interest.....

5

1.9

Conclusion

6

1.1 Introduction

This statement applies for a clause 4.6 variation to the proposed building height pursuant to the provisions of *Willoughby Local Environmental Plan 2012* (WLEP). This statement considers the following LEP provisions which include:

- Clause 4.6 (Exceptions to development standards);
- The objectives of Clause 4.3 (Height of Buildings);
- “Varying Development Standards: A Guide” published by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure (August, 2011); and
- Relevant case law specifically the considerations for assessing development standards including *Wehbe v. Pittwater Council* [2007] NSWLEC 827, *Four2Five Pty Ltd v Ashfield Council* [2015] NSW LEC and *Moskovich v Waverley Council* [2016].

This request for variation of development standards provides an overview of the development standards and the extent to which the proposed works vary those standards. The variation is assessed in accordance with Clause 4.6 of WLEP and the relevant principles of the court ruling as outlined above.

The variation to the strict application of Clause 4.3 is considered appropriate for the proposed development as:

- The proposal is compliant with the objectives for Height of Buildings and as outlined in WLEP.
- The proposal is compliant with the objectives of the R2 Low Density Residential zone.
- Sufficient environmental planning grounds exist to support the proposed variations.
- The public benefit of maintaining the development standard is not eroded by the proposal.

1.2 Development Standard

Clause 4.3 Height of Building specifies the following;

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.

Height of building map is defined as:

Height of Buildings Map means the *Willoughby Local Environmental Plan 2012* Height of Buildings Map.

The relevant Height of Buildings Map shows the site as being zoned:

- (I2): 8.5m

1.3 Willoughby Local Environmental Plan 2012

Clause 4.6 provides flexibility to vary the development standards specified within the LEP where it can be demonstrated that the development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances of the case and where there are sufficient environmental grounds to justify the departure. Clause 4.6 states the following:

(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.

(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 Secretary has been obtained.

(5) In deciding whether to grant concurrence, the Secretary 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 Secretary before granting concurrence.

Accordingly, justification is set out below for departure from the maximum height of buildings controls applicable under WLEP. The purpose of the information provided is to demonstrate that strict compliance with height of building standards under WLEP is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances of this proposal.

1.4 Clause 4.6 Assessment

This section assesses the proposed variation to consider whether compliance with the height of building control can be considered unreasonable and unnecessary in the circumstances of this particular case, and whether there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening the development standard.

The assessment is structured in accordance with the three matters for consideration identified in the Wehbe Land and Environment Court judgment:

- The applicant must satisfy the consent authority that “the objection is well founded,” and compliance with the development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances of the case;
- The consent authority must be of the opinion that granting consent to the development application would be consistent with the policy's aim of providing flexibility in the application of planning controls where strict compliance with those controls would, in any particular case, be unreasonable or unnecessary or tend to hinder the attainment of the objects specified in s 5(a)(i) and (ii) of the *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979*;

- It is also important to consider;
- Whether non-compliance with the development standard raises any matter of significance for State or regional planning; and
- The public benefit of maintain the planning controls adopted by the environmental planning instrument.

Consideration has also been given to the findings of the matter of Four2Five Pty Ltd v Ashfield Council [2015] NSW LEC, initially heard by Commissioner Pearson and upheld on appeal by Justice Pain. In this ruling 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:

- Compliance with the particular requirements of clause 4.6, with particular regard to the provisions of subclauses (3) and (4) of the LEP;
- 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); and
- 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 which applies to the site.

An assessment of the proposed maximum height of buildings against the provisions of Clause 4.6 and the relevant case law is provided in the following sections.

1.5 Compliance is unreasonable or unnecessary

In the Wehbe judgement, Preston CJ set out five ways in which a variation to a development standard can be supported as follows:

- 1. The objectives of the standard are achieved notwithstanding non-compliance with the standard;*
- 2. The underlying objective or purpose of the standard is not relevant to the development and therefore compliance is unnecessary;*
- 3. The underlying object or purpose would be defeated or thwarted if compliance was required and therefore compliance is unreasonable;*
- 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;*
- 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.*

Consideration (1) is relevant in this case. It requires a demonstration that the objectives of the maximum height of buildings can be achieved, notwithstanding non-compliance with the standards. Compliance with the objectives of the maximum height of buildings standards contained within Clause 4.3 of the LEP are demonstrated below. Clause 4.3 Height of Buildings

Objectives of Clause 4.3 Height of buildings are as follows:

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

- (a) to ensure that new development is in harmony with the bulk and scale of surrounding buildings and the streetscape,*
- (b) to minimise the impacts of new development on adjoining or nearby properties from disruption of views, loss of privacy, overshadowing or visual intrusion,*
- (c) to ensure a high visual quality of the development when viewed from adjoining properties, the street, waterways, public reserves or foreshores,*
- (d) to minimise disruption to existing views or to achieve reasonable view sharing from adjacent developments or from public open spaces with the height and bulk of the development,*
- (e) to set upper limits for the height of buildings that are consistent with the redevelopment potential of the relevant land given other development restrictions, such as floor space and landscaping,*
- (f) to use maximum height limits to assist in responding to the current and desired future character of the locality,*
- (g) to reinforce the primary character and land use of the city centre of Chatswood with the area west of the North Shore Rail Line, being the commercial office core of Chatswood, and the area east of the North Shore Rail Line, being the retail shopping core of Chatswood,*
- (h) to achieve transitions in building scale from higher intensity business and retail centres to surrounding residential areas.*

The Willoughby Height of Buildings Map shows the site as having the maximum building height zoning of I2, restricting the maximum building height to 8.5m. The proposed development is for a three storey educational building to be constructed at a height of 12.8m, 4.3m (50.5%) higher than the prescribed development standard.

The proposed development will be situated at the north-west corner of the site across from low density residential uses. The sites surrounding land uses have the following Building Height controls.

- (I2): 8.5m

Compliance with the current Height of Building development standard for the site is considered unreasonable as the proposal is consistent with the existing buildings on site and the public benefit of the public school buildings.

In the context of the site, a three storey building of 12.8m is in keeping with the current and future character of the school. If full compliance with clause 4.3 was achieved, the open and recreational area would be reduced in addition to some of the much needed school facilities. The resultant building design is of a high quality standard which is in harmony with the bulk and scale of surrounding school buildings and streetscape.

In addition the proposal is able to efficiently provide for additional school capacity whilst allowing for some open space and sports areas, both important elements to education today.

The site can accommodate the scale of the proposed alterations and additions and new buildings. The site adjoins existing buildings of a similar height and massing with no adverse effect to current streetscape or unreasonable amenity impacts for the surrounding properties. This is discussed in Section 5 & 6 of the associated SEE.

1.6 Adequate grounds for contravening the development standard

Clause 4.6 requires the Applicant to demonstrate that there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to contravene the development standard. In this instance, there are strong planning grounds in support of the maximum height of building variation.

- The proposed development fully complies with the objectives of the R2 Low Density Residential zone which are:
 - *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 accommodate development that is compatible with the scale and character of the surrounding residential development.*
 - *To retain and enhance residential amenity, including views, solar access, aural and visual privacy, and landscape quality.*
 - *To retain the heritage values of particular localities and places. To encourage self-sufficiency with respect to energy and food supply.*

The proposed development provides facilities to meet the day to day educational needs of residents.

Existing residential amenity will be retained for residential properties nearby.

Provides social infrastructure that reflects the existing and future capacity of the transport network and facilitates walking, cycling and the use of public transport.

Enhance the education experience for students and staff and provides facilities to improve the quality of life of the local community.

Achieve a high quality urban form, design excellence and reflects the character of the area.

Conserve the environmental heritage of the Willoughby City Council, by retaining the existing heritage listed buildings.

The proposed development complies with the objectives of clause 4.3. In particular, the proposed development will be in keeping with the bulk and scale of the surrounding buildings and streetscape; will not adversely impact on adjoining or nearby properties; will be of a high visual quality as a result of a high standard of design with no detrimental impact to the existing views over the subject site.

1.7 Significance for State or regional planning

The non-compliance will not raise any matter of State or regional significance.

1.8 The public interest

Clause 4.6 requires the consent authority to consider the public benefit in determining whether to support the variation.

It is considered that the proposed development is in the public interest, as it is consistent with the objectives of the height of buildings controls.

The proposal also balances existing land resources in a site with significant spatial and heritage constraints to ensure a satisfactory outcome for the existing heritage items and the end users the students. The proposal consolidates the building footprint and thereby maximising the open space for students of Willoughby Public School.

It is also noted that as proposed works relate to an existing school, the works will result in a significant public benefit as it will allow for the continued provision of the educational facilities to meet the needs of an increasing number of school children residing in the local area by providing permanent facilities.

1.9 Conclusion

In view of the development context, strict compliance with Clauses 4.3 of WLEP is considered to be unreasonable and unnecessary in this case. The proposal is justified on the following environmental planning grounds.

- The proposed variation will not negatively impact on the streetscape or neighbourhood character of Willoughby.
- The proposal will fulfil the desired R2 Low Density Residential zone.
- The proposed non-compliance will have no detrimental effects upon public benefit and legitimacy of the development standard. No matters of State or regional planning will be affected by the proposed variation.

GREENCAP

Greencap Pty Ltd

ABN: 76 006 318 010

Level 2 / 11-17 Khartoum Road

North Ryde NSW 2113

Australia

P: (02) 9889 1800

F: (02) 9889 1811

www.greencap.com.au

PRELIMINARY SITE INVESTIGATION

Conrad Gargett Anchor Mortlock
Woolley on behalf of NSW Department
of Education

Willoughby Girls High School and Willoughby
Public School

June 2017

J148851

C120920 : JH

