

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	Justification of variation	Extent of variation	Concurring authority	Date DA determined dd/mm/yyyy
LDA2015/0161	1	14964		125	Bowden Street	Meadowbank	2114	9: Mixed	RLEP 2014	B4 Mixed Use	Clause 4.3- Height of buildings	The bulk of the building is compliant and the increase in height derives from the provision of access to roof-top communal open space to provide a better outcome in terms of liveability for residents of the site.	2.3% - 11.6%	Council	1/09/2016
LDA2015/0433	3	527517		230	Victoria Road	Gladesville	2111	4: Residential - New multi unit	RLEP 2014	B4 Mixed Use	Clause 4.3- Height of buildings	Compliance with the development standard would be unreasonable and unnecessary as the development complies with the objectives of the standard and because of the height variation is very minor for the lift overrun. The variation is visually acceptable and the impacts arising from the non compliance is imperceptible.	4.50%	JRPP	31/08/2016
LDA2015/0472	1 A & B	625926 361777		715-717 18	Victoria Road William Street	Ryde	2112	4: Residential - New multi unit	RLEP 2014	B4 Mixed Use	Clause 4.3- Height of buildings	The breach in height is a result of providing access and amenity to the roof terrace area which will benefit the residents and the non compliances are not considered to add to the bulk and scale of the building. As detailed previously, the proposed development is considered to relate appropriately to the height and form of desired character for the area and to the surrounding streetscape.	7.80%	Council	9/09/2016
LDA2015/0557	2	503994		200A	Pittwater Road	Gladesville	2111	13: Subdivision only	RLEP 2014	R2 Low Density	Clause 4.1C - Minimum lot size for battle-axe lot	The application demonstrated satisfactorily that the development complies with the objectives of the minimum lot size standard and the objectives of the zone. The proposed development is considered to be in the public interest and that strict compliance with the minimum lot size standard would be unreasonable and unnecessary.	7.70%	Council	20/07/2016
LDA2015/0589	9 9 10	666422 666423 5558		1-5	Smith Street	Ryde	2112	4: Residential - New multi unit	RLEP 2014	B4 Mixed Use	Clause 4.3- Height of buildings	The exceedance is negligible within the streetscape and urban context generally and the lift overrun will not exacerbate overshadowing or visual impact on the streetscape. The exceedance will have negligible impact to adjoining neighbours in terms of overshadowing, overlooking or visual impact. Accordingly the proposal meets the objectives of the development standard.	8.70%	Council	7/09/2016
LDA2015/0653	1	785339		210- 2216	Victoria Road	Gladesville	2111	4: Residential - New multi unit	RLEP 2014	B4 mixed use	Clause 4.3- Height of buildings	Compliance is unreasonable and unnecessary as the development complies with the objectives of the standard and occurs to the motor rooms and range from 300mm to 1.6m. The development will be in proportion with & in keep with the intended future character of the area. The visual impact is negligible.	1.08%	Council	13/09/2016
LDA2015/0656	14	210868		22	Wood Street	Eatswood	2122	3: Residential - New second occupancy	RLEP 2014	R2 Low Density	Clause 4.1(2) - minimum lot frontage for strata subdivision Clause 4.1B(2)(a) - minimum lot size for dual occupancy	The breach of the development standards does not raise any matter of significance for the proposal and surrounding properties, nor is it contrary to the public interest or raise any matter which would be of State or Regional Significance other than as discussed above. The quantum of the breach is di minus (sic) and the objectives of the standard met.	1.7% 0.86% 1.7%	Council	31/08/2016

											Clause 4.1B(2)(b) - minimum lot frontage for dual occupancy				
LDA2016/0022	S	419576	109	Vimiera Road	Eatswood	2122	4: Residential - New multi unit	RLEP 2014	R2 Low Density	Clause 4.5A - Density Controls	The proposed development will be in the public interest because it is consistent with the objectives for development within the zone. It would be unreasonable and unnecessary to achieve compliance with the development standards in the circumstances of the case and there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening the development standard.	0.60%	Council	28/07/2016	
LDA2016/0146	36	11022	11	Farm Street	Gladesville	2111	4: Residential - New multi unit	RLEP 2014	B4 Mixed Use	Clause 4.3- Height of buildings	Compliance with the development standard would be unreasonable and unnecessary as the development complies with the objectives of the standard and because of the split height controls on the site, site topography and interface with low density residential development to the south. The proposed building is visually acceptable and that the impacts arising from the noncompliance is imperceptible.	3.96% (12m height control) and 14.37% (9.5m height control)	Council	30/09/2016	
LDA2016/0147	3 5	239205 245904	69 4	Abuklea Road Kaga Place	Marsfield	2122	13: Subdivision only	RLEP 2014	R2 Low Density	Clause 4.1 - Minimum subdivision lot size	Compliance with the development standard would be inconsistent with the aims of the RLEP 2014 and strict compliance with the development standard would render the application inconsistent with the objectives specified in section 5 (a) (i) and (ii) of the EPA Act.	13%	Council	25/07/2016	
LDA2016/0222	36	28855	16	Lambert Street	West Ryde	2114	3: Residential - New second occupancy	RLEP 2014	R2 Low Density	Clause 4.1B Minimum lot frontage for dual occupancy	The variation to the road frontage control will not result in adverse impacts on the streetscape or neighbouring properties and satisfies the objectives of the control. Compliance with the numerical control is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances.	0.15%	Council	20/09/2016	

LDA2016/ 0254	50	23290	33	Richmond Street	Denistone East	2112	3: Residential - New second occupancy	RLEP 2014	R2 Low Density	Clause 4.1B (2)(b) Minimum lot frontage for dual occupancy	The proposal responds well to the site without compromising relationships with adjoining developments, does not unduly compromise other relevant controls, and encourages ecologically sustainable development. In this regard it is considered that enforcing compliance with the aforementioned development standard would be unreasonable and unnecessary, and that there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify the contravention of the development standard.	0.9%	Council	19/08/2016
LDA2016/ 0255	87	23290	4	Salter Crescent	Denistone East	2112	3: Residential - New second occupancy	RLEP 2014	R2 Low Density	Clause 4.1B Minimum lot frontage for dual occupancy	The variation to the road frontage control will not result in adverse impacts on the streetscape or neighbouring properties and satisfies the objectives of the control. Compliance with the numerical control is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances.	2.5%	Council	5/08/2016