

Council DA reference number	Lot number	DP number	Apartment/ Unit number	Street number	Street name	Suburb/Town	Postcode	Category of development	Environmental planning instrument	Zoning of land	Development standard to be varied
DA-2018/1068	81	81425	11	30-32	Stephen Road	Botany	2019	14: Other	Botany Local Environmental Plan 2013	R2 - Low Density Residential	cl 4.3 - Height of Building
DA-2018/1078	74	81425	20	30-32	Stephen Road	Botany	2019	14: Other	Botany Local Environmental Plan 2013	R2 - Low Density Residential	cl 4.3 - Height of Building
DA-2017/517	X	162302		1B	Park Road	Sans Souci	2219	4: Residential - New multi unit	Rockdale Local Environmental Plan 2011	R4 - High Density Residential	cl 4.3 - Height of Buildings and cl 4.4 FSR

DA-2018/1144	12 Sec F	939785		27	Hambly Street	Botany		3: Residential - New second occupancy	Botany Local Environmental Plan 2013	R2 - Low Density Residential	Maximum FSR 0.5:1
DA-2018/1044	18	859517		19	Dowling Street	Arncliffe	2205	12: Community facility	Rockdale Local Environmental Plan 2011	R2 - Low Density Residential	CI4.3 - Height of Building & CI 4.4 - FSR
DA-2018/223				29-31	Campbell Street	Ramsgate	2217	4: Residential - New multi unit	Rockdale Local Environmental Plan 2011	B4 - Mixed Use	CI 4.3 - Building Height

Justification of variation	Extent of variation	Concurring authority	Date DA determined dd/mm/yyyy
<p>The proposal is consistent with the underlying objectives of the standard identified. The proposed development has been assessed against Councils' Botany Bay Local Environmental Plan 2013 and Botany Bay Development Control Plan 2013 controls which are compliant with the majority. It has been established that the proposed development is appropriate and strict adherence to the development standard in this instance is unreasonable and unnecessary. Maintaining and enforcing the development standard in this case is viewed as unreasonable. The applicant's Clause 4.6 is well-founded and the minor departure in height of building development standard for 32 Stephen Road is in the public interest. On this basis, it is recommended that the development standard relating to the maximum height of building for the site pursuant to Clause 4.3 of the Botany Bay Local Environmental Plan 2013 should be varied in the circumstances as discussed above.</p>	1.44 metres or 16.94%	Council	9/10/2018
<p>The proposal is consistent with the underlying objectives of the standard identified. The proposed development has been assessed against Councils' Botany Bay Local Environmental Plan 2013 and Botany Bay Development Control Plan 2013 controls which are compliant with the majority.</p> <p>It has been established that the proposed development is appropriate and strict adherence to the development standard in this instance is unreasonable and unnecessary. Maintaining and enforcing the development standard in this case is viewed as unreasonable.</p> <p>The applicant's Clause 4.6 is well-founded and the minor departure in height of building development standard for 32 Stephen Road is in the public interest. On this basis, it is recommended that the development standard relating to the maximum height of building for the site pursuant to Clause 4.3 of the Botany Bay Local Environmental Plan 2013 should be varied in the circumstances as discussed above.</p>	1.44 metres or 16.94%	Council	9/10/2018
<p>The proposal remains consistent with the objectives of cl 4.4 Floor Space Ratio. The standard is unreasonable and unnecessary in this instance, and there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify varying the development standard. The proposal is in the public interest as it satisfied the objectives of the R4 - High Density Residential Zone</p>	<p>The proposal exceeds the maximum permissible building height of 14.5 metres by 2.52 metres. The maximum building height is 17.02 metres. The proposal exceeds the maximum permissible floor space ratio on the site which is 1:1. The proposed FSR is 1.08:1. The non-compliance is 73.43 square metres</p>	Council	23/10/2018

<p>The overall bulk, scale, density and building typology proposed is akin to that which could otherwise be achieved via a proposed dwelling house form, which, simply by means of definition, would be eligible for a greater FSR than that for 'semi-detached dwellings'.</p> <p>The resulting height, bulk, scale, setbacks, rhythm, mass and form of the development are entirely consistent with the future desired character of the area and typology of building forms which could otherwise be achieved within Area 3. The development will retain an appropriate visual relationship with the surrounding area, which is undergoing transformation to incorporate a greater diversity of housing forms and types. The subject site is of sufficient orientation, shape, area and allotment width so as to accommodate the proposed development. Additionally, the scale and extent of the proposed additional density is not inconsistent with previous approvals within the context of the subject site. The FSR standard for semi-detached dwelling forms within the locality has previously been varied. The proposal is consistent with the objectives of Clause 4.4 - FSR, and does not result in adverse environmental effects upon the use or enjoyment of adjoining properties. The proposal is consistent with the objectives of the R2 – Low Density Residential zone in that the development provides an increase in housing stock in order to provide for the housing needs of the community within a low density residential environment. They layout of dwellings as designed ensures that solar access and natural ventilation is maximised and that internal amenity for future occupants is optimised. The development is located in an accessible location, with access to public transport nearby, public open spaces including Garnet Jackson Reserve to the east and Pagewood Public School which is within 745m of the site. The proposal is therefore in the public interest.</p>	<p>0.66:1 367sq/m proposed GFA Surplus 89.6q/m (16%)</p>	<p>Council</p>	<p>13/11/2018</p>
<p>Height Justification: The variation is restricted to the lift and a minor portion of the building parapet. The lift is located centrally within the site and the variations have no adverse impacts. The proposal is consistent with the objectives of the control and the objectives of the zone, and therefore in the public interest. There are sufficient environmental planning grounds for the variations.</p> <p>FSR Justification: The variation is minor and a considerable amount of the variation is attributable to the underutilized area of the heritage listed villa on site and helps support retention of the item. The proposal is consistent with the objectives of the control and the objectives of the zone, and therefore in the public interest. There are sufficient environmental planning grounds for the variations</p>	<p>(a) Height : Maximum height permitted = 8.5m (b) FSR : Maximum FSR permitted = 0.5:1</p>	<p>Council</p>	<p>11/12/2018</p>
<p>The proposed development illustrates both compliance and variations to the height limit applicable. This is a direct result of the natural topography of the site and the design of the proposed development. The above represents a 5.37% 6.625% variation to the height standard, for a small portion of the development as proposed.</p>	<p>1.25%-6.63%</p>	<p>Council</p>	<p>18/12/2018</p>