

Street name	Suburb/Town	Postcode	Category of development	Environmental planning instrument	Zoning of land	Development standard to be varied	Justification of variation	Extent of variation	Concurring authority	Date DA determined dd/mm/yyyy
Uhrig Road	LIDCOMBE	2141	9: Mixed	ALEP2010	B2 Local Centre	Clause 4.3 Height of buildings	<p>It is considered that the requested variations to the maximum height of building development standard can be supported given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not for the purpose of additional density; • It is agreed that a poor planning outcome is unlikely to result; • There are no adverse outcomes for the public domain; • The preconditions of Clause 4.6(4)(a), in relation to the adequacy of the applicant's written request and the public interest, are satisfied. 	<p>Required: 72m</p> <p>Proposed: 72.82m</p> <p>Variation: 0.82m (1.1%)</p>	JRPP	5/11/2020
Victoria Road	MELROSE PARK	2114	9: Mixed	ALEP2010	B4 Mixed Use	Clause 4.3 Height of buildings	<p>It is considered that the requested variations to the building development standard can be supported given:</p> <p>The proposal is consistent with the objectives of both the zone and height standard, including not resulting in any greater impact on the amenity of adjoining/nearby properties than a compliant scheme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of site-specific constraints limit the proposal's ability to comply with the height limit, including the need for significant fill, overland flow flooding, and the areas occupied by significant public roads, road widening and public open space. • The applicant has demonstrated that the proposal has a preferable urban design outcome to a compliant scheme, as supported by Council's Urban Design Team and the Design Excellence Advisory Panel. • The proposal significantly exceeds the minimum sustainability targets. 	<p>Required: 28m</p> <p>Proposed: 40.3m</p> <p>Variation: 12.3m (44%)</p>	JRPP	25/11/2020
Briens Road	NORTHMEAD	2152	11: Industrial	PLEP2011	IN1 - General Industrial	Clause 4.3 Height of buildings	<p>It is considered that the requested variations to the maximum height of building development standard can be supported given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variation is for the height of the proposed sugar silos. The variation on site is less than the already approved High Bay Warehouse • The proposal represents an efficient use of resources (land and existing infrastructure), consistent with the height, bulk and scale of other buildings on this site. • The exceedance above the maximum height of buildings requirement of PLEP2011 is supportable in that the proposed building height plane will be compatible with the size and scale of existing buildings within the 13.8ha Coca Cola Amatil (CCA) site. • The development results in a building with less visual impact than the existing two silos that are perched on top of an industrial building. The development will have no impact on the riparian zone or water quality of Toongabbie Creek. • No unacceptable environmental impacts will flow from the proposed development during both construction and future operations. The proposal will not contribute to any adverse environmental impacts in terms of solar access and overshadowing, visual and acoustic privacy, view loss or bulk and scale. 	<p>Required: 12m</p> <p>Proposed: 21.41m</p> <p>Variation: 9.41m (78.48%)</p>	IHAP	25/11/2020

Uhrig Road	LIDCOMBE	2141	9: Mixed	ALEP2010	B2 Local Centre	Clause 4.3 Height of buildings	<p>It is considered that the requested variations to the maximum height of building development standard can be supported given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not for the purpose of additional density; • It is consistent with the intended strategic direction and future intent for the precinct by demonstrating consistency with the exhibited draft 2020 master plan; • There are no adverse outcomes for the public domain; • The preconditions of Clause 4.6(4)(a), in relation to the adequacy of the applicant's written request and the public interest, are satisfied. 	<p>Required: 72m (west) & 42m (east)</p> <p>Proposed: Tower 1 – 94.25m; Tower 2 – 72.15m; Tower 3 – 61.66m; Tower 4 – 20.88m Tower 5 – 18m; Commercial building – 30.67m.</p> <p>Variation: Tower 1 - 52.25m (224%) Tower 2 – 30.15m (172%) Tower 3 – 19.66m (147%) Towers 4,5 & 6 no variation</p>	JRPP	17/12/2020
Church Street and Civic Place (known as Parramatta Square)	PARRAMATTA	2150	9: Mixed	PLEP2011	B4 Mixed Use	Clause 7.4 CBD Sun Access	<p>It is considered that the requested variations to the Solar Access development standard can be supported given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed trees and structures are not inconsistent with the objective of the clause which is to protect public open space within Parramatta Square from overshadowing. • Should the clause prevent installation of trees, shade structures and the like it would not allow appropriate measures to provide for amenity within the space to allow its use by the public. Rather the clause is intended to limit the shadow impact of buildings and structures surrounding the Square to specifically preserve access to sunlight in the 'sun box' area. It was not intended to prevent landscape treatments within the Square which are required to provide for the community use and enjoyment of the space. • The proposal is consistent with the objectives of the standard and the zone and that there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening the standard in this instance. It also demonstrates that the proposal is in the public interest and that strict application of the clause in this instance would be unreasonable and unnecessary. 	<p>Required: 12noon – 2pm</p> <p>Proposed: Some tree planting and shade structures will overshadow during this period.</p>	JRPP	22/12/2020
Pennant Hills Road	CARLINGFORD	2118	6: Residential - Other	PLEP2011	R4 High Density Residential Zone	Clause 4.3 Height of buildings	<p>It is considered that the requested variation to the maximum height of building development standard can be supported given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-compliance is minor in nature with the majority of the three buildings being compliant with the building height control. The point encroachments are internal to the site and their impact to the streetscape is negligible as it will be visually unnoticeable when viewed from the street level. • The variation is primarily as result of appropriately responding to the topography of the land and the site context. The resultant development is consistent with the 4 storey development envisioned for the precinct. • The proposal has been designed to ensure that privacy impacts are mitigated and that the proposal does not obstruct any recognised view corridors. • The applicant's written request has adequately addressed the matters required to be demonstrated and that the request to vary the height development standard prescribed by the Parramatta LEP 2011s can be supported as the proposal achieves the objectives of the height development standard and zone, there are sufficient site specific reasons for the breach, and the proposal is in the public interest. 	<p>Required: 14m</p> <p>Proposed: 14.84m</p> <p>Variation: 840mm (6%)</p>	Council	23/12/2020