

The CEO Eurobodalla Shire Council 99 Vulcan Street Moruya NSW

CI 4.6 Exception to the development Standards – Dual Occupancy

Clause 4.6 of the Eurobodalla LEP 2012 **(ELEP 2012)** is to allow flexibility into the planning assessment process and to allow the Council to consider merit-based objections to development standards that would mean a development was not permitted except for the standard.

Development Application DA/0095/24 seeks development consent for the construction of a dual occupancy on the land at 217A beach Road Denhams Beach (Lot 2 DP 773132), the subject site.

The Land is zoned R2 – Low Density Residential under the ELEP 2012. Dual occupancies are permitted in the zone subject to consent. The objectives of the R2 – Low Density Residential zone in the ELEP 2012 are:

- To provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment.
- To enable other land uses that provide facilities or services to meet the day to day needs of residents.
- To encourage residential development that is consistent with the character of the neighbourhood.

Clause 4.3(2) of the ELEP 2012 sets a development standard that requires that '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'.

The objectives of clause 4.3 are:

(a) to ensure that buildings are compatible with the height, bulk and scale of the existing and desired future character of the locality,

(b) to minimise visual impact, disruption of views, loss of privacy and loss of solar access to existing development.

PM ANDERSON CONSULTING

17 Currawong Road, Wamberal NSW 2260

M 0407 330 884 E paul@pmandersonconsulting.com.au



The Height of Buildings Map in the ELEP 2012 identifies that the Land is subject to a maximum height standard of 8.5. The maximum height of the Proposal is 9.1140m from existing ground level to the roof line of a very small section of the roof on dwelling unit 2. Dwelling unit 1 has a height exceedance of over the 8.5m height limit of 303mm, but is less than the variation sought for dwelling unit 2. The extent of the height exceedance is shown on drawing 085 DA01 prepared by Adhami Pender Architecture:



Height plane drawings

The height exceedance includes a small section of roof that extends over a small portion of the steeper rear embankment of the site. The maximum variation sought under this request equates toa 7.2% variation to the development standard as outlined in clause 4.3 of the ELEP 2012. This height variation is shown on the elevations, drawings 201 and 203 (attached to this request).

The objectives of clause 4.6 of the ELEP 2012 are to provide an appropriate degree of flexibility in applying development standards for particular developments and to achieve better outcomes for and from development by allowing flexibility in particular circumstances. The development standard contained in Cl4.3 is not expressly excluded from the operation of Cl 4.6(8).

This written request is submitted on behalf of the applicant to seek to justify the contravention of the height development standard in clause 4.3(2) of ELEP 2012 by demonstrating:

(a) That compliance with the development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances of the case

Historically, the most commonly invoked way to establish that a

development standard was unreasonable or unnecessary was satisfaction of the first test of the five set out in Wehbe v Pittwater Council [2007] NSWLEC 827 which requires that the objectives of the standard are achieved notwithstanding the non-compliance with the standard. The applicant relies upon this 'way' in this written request.

This was re-affirmed in the matter of *Randwick City Council v Micaul Holdings Pty Ltd* [2016] NSWLEC 7 [34] the Chief Judge held that "establishing that the development would not cause environmental harm and is consistent with the objectives of the development standards is an established means of demonstrating that compliance with the development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary".

The objectives of the standard are addressed as follows.

(a) to establish maximum height limits for buildings,

The first objective of the standard is declaratory in nature, consistent with the reasoning of Preston CJ in Nessdee Pty Ltd v Orange City Council [2017] NSWLEC 158 at [18] and in Wehbe at [63]. In this case, the objective merely sets out the intention to set a height limit and does not restrict the application of clause 4.6.

(b) to permit building heights that encourage high quality urban form,

The building height of the Proposal responds to the existing development along Beach Road and the topographical features of the site. The Proposal seeks to provide a consistent transition from beach Road and to concentrate the bulk to the development to the rear of the site, away from the public domain of Beach Road and set back from the public area of the beach to the rear of the site. The topography of the site causes a minor breach of the height limit. The height limit breach will not be apparent from Beach Road or the Beach to the rear of the site. The building height will encourage a high quality urban form through its thoughtful massing on the Land and will enable the private open space and outdoor area for residents to be located.

(c) to ensure that buildings and public areas continue to receive satisfactory exposure to sky and sunlight,

The shadow diagrams prepared by APA on drawing 071,072, 073 and the elevation shadow study on drawings 074 and 075 (**attached**) demonstrate that due to the orientation of the Land, the proposal will have only minimal solar impacts on neighbouring properties private open space, living spaces or solar access to roofs for current or future PV systems. Those areas will continue to have satisfactory access to sky and sunlight. The development pattern of the area is that dwellings typically address beach Road and the allotments generally follow a Northwest to Southeast alignment. The wide streets, orientation of building on the site and the easterly aspect of the adjoining lots will assist in retaining satisfactory exposure to sky and sunlight of surrounding buildings and public areas.

(d) to nominate heights that will provide an appropriate transition in built form and land use intensity,

The objective is again, declaratory in nature. The proposal responds to the nominated heights and provides a transition of built form on the site catering to the topographical constraints of the steep cliff face to the rear of the site.

(e) to ensure that taller buildings are located appropriately in relation to view corridors and view impacts and in a manner that is complementary to the natural topography of the area,

The design of the dual occupancy and its location on. The site along with the orientation of the lot will ensure that view loss to the adjoining properties is maintained. The additional height sought as part of this request does not impact on the view sharing qualities of this site to ta adjoining or adjacent properties.

(f) to protect public open space from excessive overshadowing and to allow views to identify natural topographical features.

The shadow diagrams attached demonstrate that there will not be excessive overshadowing to public open space. The Proposal will afford views from the Land. The Proposal will sit comfortably in its context and when read from afar, it will not overwhelm any natural topographic features of the locality.

Strict compliance with the height development standard would be unreasonably or unnecessary in circumstances where the proposal achieves the objectives of the control.

(b) That there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening the development standard.

The Land & Environment Court matter of Initial Action Pty Ltd v Woollahra Council [2018] NSWLEC 2018, provides assistance in relation to the consideration of sufficient environmental planning grounds whereby Preston J observed that:

- in order for there to be 'sufficient' environmental planning grounds to justify a written request under clause 4.6, the focus must be on the aspect or element of the development that contravenes the development standard and the environmental planning grounds advanced in the written request must justify contravening the development standard, not simply promote the benefits of carrying out the development as a whole; and
- there is no basis in Clause 4.6 to establish a test that the noncompliant development should have a neutral or beneficial effect relative to a compliant development.

The Proposal seeks a slight and modest increase in height from the standards contained in Council's LEP. The design presents a contemporary and attractive design to Beach Road which will benefit the adjoining and adjacent dwwellings in. the area.

Clause 4.6(4)(a)(ii)

It is acknowledged that the consent authority must be satisfied that the written request has adequately demonstrated the matters required to be demonstrated by clause 4.6(3) and must also be satisfied that the proposed development is 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. Whilst that matter does not need to be included in the written request, it is included to assist.

The Proposal is consistent with the objectives of the height standard and the objectives for development within the R2 – Low Density Residential zone

The Proposal is consistent with the objectives of the height standard. The written request demonstrates why the Proposal **achieves** the objectives of the height standard, notwithstanding non compliance with the standard. The test required by clause 4.6(4(a)(ii) is slightly lower as it calls for 'consistency' instead of achievement. When considering the term consistency it is relevant to note the meaning applied to the term by Pearlman CJ in Schaffer Corporation v Hawkesbury City Council (1992) 77 LGRA 21 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.

For the reasons set out in the written request, the Proposal achieves and is consistent with the objectives of the development standard.

The proposal is consistent with the objectives of the R2 zone. Those objectives are addressed as follows.

• To provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment.

The proposed dual occupancy development provides for alternative and diverse housing choice for residents in a low-density environment. The development is residential in nature and satisfies the provisions of Council LEP and DCP.

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

The proposed development is the creation of residential dwelling units. This objective is satisfied by virtue of the use being residentical in nature.

• To encourage residential development that is consistent with the character of the neighbourhood.

The neighbourhood of this area of Denhams Beach is residential. The properties on either side of the proposed development are dual occupancy developments of varying ages and designs. The development on the opposite side of Beach Road is also residential with a variety of styles and ages of residential dwellings and units. The proposal is consistent with the character of the locality in which it is proposed.

Clause 4.6(4) Planning Secretary Concurrence

The contravention of the standard does not raise any matters of significance for state or regional environmental planning. The development does not impact upon or have any implications for any state policies in the locality or impacts which would be considered to be of state or regional significance.

The clause 4.6 request has demonstrated that there are significant environmental planning benefits associated with the contravention of the standard. There is no material impact or benefit associated with strict adherence to the development standard and there is no compelling reason or public benefit derived from maintenance of the standard in the particular circumstances of the case.

Conclusion

Strict compliance with the maximum height of buildings development standard contained within clause 4.3 of the ELEP 2012 is unreasonable and unnecessary in the particular circumstances of the case. In addition, there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify the variation. Finally, the proposed development and height variation are in the public interest because it facilitates a development which is consistent with the objectives of the standard and the zone which will deliver the public benefit of contributing to the vitality of the Denhams Beach and the broader Batemans Bay area which encourages a mixture of residential and residentially aligned uses and will assist in the promotion and economic development of the region as a whole.

Yours faithfully

Paul Anderson Director PM.Anderson Consulting Pty Ltd

15th June 2024.









site shadows - Proposed - June 22 0900 1:500

site shadows - Proposed - June 22 1000 1:500

the purpose of defining shadows casted by proposed design and that mass to the extent of the maximum permissible envelope on 219A. ch Rd, shadows have been casted on a plain projected over a vacant and over the diff past the top of barns at the level of ground entry from street. This also allows for differentiation between the impact of dows of building elements from shadows casted by the natural steep graphy of the land and the cliff.

Aximum permissible building envelope shown in the diagram is a mass rojection following councils setback of 900mm higher than 4.5m up to a max eight limit of 8.5m from ENGL; Front setback is assumed to be 5.5m for eight limit of 8.5m from ENGL; Front setback is assumed to be 5.5m for

ased on site observations, google 3D mapping and some realestate angery, we believe neighboring property includes a private open space alcony on the upper level that extends from the main open plan living real est towards the view and is partially roofed. The proposed design asts shadows over the neighbouring southern facade but does not versihadow their POS, their ord or solar panels as marked in these





site shadows - Max Permissible Envelope - June 22 0900 1:500

site shadows - Max Permissible Envelope - June 22 1000

	NOTES Very all dimensions on site All works are to comply with the Building Code of Australia and wetweenced Australian Ibandanis, including and not initiated to: Pror to completen of works, complete to: All 1170.3: Ence Loading Code	adhami pender architecture		CLIENT	DESCRIPTION SHADOW PLANS 01	SCALE at A3 1:500	12/02/2024	
	Le proviet 5 excited au torre serve. A 1318: Gaso In building, action and installation 1. Centrication of reforming, Libroucher 2. Weit Serving 3. Weit Serving 4. Status Central Serving 4. Status Central Serving 4. Status Central Serving 5. Termine Provide 6. Samp Central Serving 5. Termine Provide 6. Samp Central Serving 6. Samp Cen	wetchne@safaunipencerarchitecture.com Tel: (02) 63477242 Shog 21, 84 Almanoch St Mainson ACT 2607	\checkmark	PROJECT DENHAMS BEACH DUPLEX		DESIGNED APA	JOB NO J000167	
				LOT 2 DP 773132	PROJECT STATUS	DRAWN MG	DRAWING NO 071	
DAD1 10.08.2023 Authorities Approval 2 12.02.24 Response to council's RFI SK01 24.05.23 PRE DA REVIEW 1 07.08.23 revised post Civil coordination ISS DATE ISSUE DESCRIPTION REV DATE REV DESCRIPTION	7. Decision Final AUSTRALIA: PART 3.2 MARCHRY					CHECKED NA	ISSUE DA01	





site shadows - Max Permissible Envelope - June 22 1100 $_{1\,:\,500}$

21 Bash Rd Hardware Revectores Bullone Stretcres 20 Base Rd Portegers 20 Base Rd Portegers 20 Base Rd

site shadows - Max Permissible Envelope - June 22 1200 $_{1\,:\,500}$



site shadows - Max Permissible Envelope - June 22 1300







site shadows - Proposed - June 22 1400 1 - 500



site shadows - Max Permissible Envelope - June 22 1400 1 : 500

site shadows - Proposed - June 22 1500



site shadows - Max Permissible Envelope - June 22 1500 1 : 500





Elevation shadow study - Proposed - June 22 0900



Elevation shadow study - Proposed - June 22 1100



Elevation shadow study - Proposed - June 221000

Elevation shadow study - Proposed - June 22 1200



Elev shadow study - Max Permissible Envelope - June 22 900 Elev shadow study - Max Permissible Envelope - June 22 1000 Openings to balconey / openings to balcon

As per the ESC DCP, at solar access to adjacent occupancy has an east living room windows to b are cu

balcony. There are no r ty has a north facing wind ing spaces. Balcon facing like op





Elevation shadow study - Proposed - June 22 1300



Elev shadow study - Max Permissible Envelope - June 22 1100 Elev shadow study - Max Permissible Envelope - June 22 1200 Elev shadow study - Max Permissible Envelope - June 22 1300







Elev shadow study - Max Permissible Envelope - June 22 1400 Elev shadow study - Max Permissible Envelope - June 22 1500

