## SEPP 1 Variations 2016/17

Council DA reference Lot number	IMO	OP Vo.	Street No.	Street name Suburb/ Tow	n Post code	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
								S	<b>EPTEMB</b>	ER 2016			
No SEPP 1 varia	ations								) FOEMDI	ED 2017			
10.2016.357.1 5	7	03416	20	Kamala Court Coopers Shoo	t 2479	Residential - Additions	s 2014 LEP	RU2 Rural Landscape / PART DM Deferred Matter	Clause 4.2D 2(c)		450m apart from each other. The extent of the variation to the 100m development standard is therefore 350%.	Council	11/10/2016
10.2016.217.1	7	08815	14	Jonson Street Byron Bay	2481	Commercial - Additions	2014 Byron LEP	B2 Local Centre	Clause 4.4: Floor space ratio	The proposed alterations and additions (20.1m2 of GFA) are an acceptable planning outcome for the site and provide sufficient justification for contravening FSR requirement within clause 4.4 of the Byron LEP 2014 for the following reasons.  • Small addition will provide a clear definition of public and private lands;  • The proposal will incorporate an awning to protect pedestrians  • The site is located at the entrance to the Byron Bay Town Centre and as such is an entrance statement to the town centre;  • The existing building is similar in terms of bulk and scale with surrounding commercial buildings and given the proposed additions will not significantly increase the bulk of the building that it is considered that the additions will complement the surrounding commercial precinct.  • The proposed alterations and additions comply with the Outcomes for the B2 Local Centre Zone.  • The additional retail space available within the Byron Bay Town Centre will encourage further use of walking and cycling.	existing floor space ratio (FSR) is 1.56:1. The proposal intends to increase the floor area by 20.1m2. This will result in a total floor area of 680.3m2 and new FSR of 1.61:1. This is a FSR increase of 0.05:1	Council	20/10/2016
10.2016.752.1 8	7	90185	34	Mafeking Road Goonengerry	2480	Dual Occupancy	2014 Byron LEP	RU2 Rural Landscape	Clause 4.2 D2(c)	The requirement of this Clause is that any dwellings are to be situated within 100 metres of each other, the proposal has its dwelling's located some 115 metres apart. This is due to the proposal involving utilising existing structures for the purpose of a detached dual occupancy. The application provides an objection and seeks variation of this clause under SEPP 1 & Clause 4.6 - Exceptions to development standards of LEP 2014. The variation is sought based on • It being a relatively minor variation to the requirement – that is a 15% variation; • The proposal seeks to formalise a use for an existing structure that cannot be readily relocated:  • The current location has less impact on existing agricultural uses than a compliant location; such a relocation would conflict with other clauses and objectives of LEP 2014;  • The character of the development would not be altered and the locality would not benefit from the development being compliant;  • The proposal is compliant with the objectives of Clause 4.2D  Given these factors it is a reasonable request to vary the requirement and based on the justification provided and the circumstances of the proposal, the variation sought is supported.  • The proposal seeks to formalise a use for an existing structure that cannot be readily relocated;  • The current location has less impact on existing agricultural uses than a compliant location; such a relocation would conflict with other clauses and objectives of LEP 2014;  • The character of the development would not be altered and the locality would not benefit from the development being compliant;  • The proposal is compliant with the objectives of Clause 4.2D. Given these factors it is a reasonable request to vary the requirement and based on the justification provided and the circumstances of the proposal, the variation sought is supported.	>10%	Council	23/12/2016

## SEPP 1 Variations 2016/17

10.2016.487.1   13	248363	361	Goremans Road	Eurkea	2480	Dual Occupancy	2014 Byron LEP	RU1 Primary Production	Clause 4.2D (2)(b)	Standard varied was Clause 4.2D (2)(b) requiring each dwelling to use the same vehicular access to the road. Justification was that the existing dwelling had its own access while the second dwelling involved a change of use from a restaurant which already had its own separate access. Requiring both dwellings to share the same access was unpractical and unreasonable in this instance.	Council	20/10/2016
10.2016.55.1 3	758207	17-23	Shirley Street	Byron Bay	2481	Residential	2014 Byron LEP	R3 Medium Density Residential Zone	Clause 4.3 Height of Building		Council	15/12/2016
									MARCH	2017		
10.2016.113.1	1214537	93	3 St Helena Roa	a(McLeods Shoo	ıt 2	subdivision	1988 Byron Local	7(d) Scenic Escarpment	Clause 11 (1) Minimun lot size of 40 has	No additional lots or dwelling entitlements will be created within the 7(d) zone: the proposal is not	Department of Planning	15/02/2017
10.2015.795.1 100	1070724	35	5 Bayside Way	Brunswick Heads	2483	staged consent for subdivision of land	1989 Byron Local Environmental Plan	7(b) Coastal Habitat	Clause 11(1) Minimum lot size o 40 ha	The proposal is not inconsistent with the objectives of the 7(b) zone; The area of 7(b) zoned land is	Department of Planning	
										this instance 9	5%	23/02/2017
									JUNE 2	2017		
10.2016.806.1	5 789988	32	2 Alcorn Street	Suffolk Park	2	A81 Alterations and Additions to Existing Dual Occupancy Dwelling	1988 Byron Local Environmental Plan	I DM Deferred Matter - 7(f 2) Urban Coastal Zone (f2) Zone under Byron LEP 1988.	Clause 40 (2) (b) ( of LEP 1988	The proposed additions and alterations to the dual occupancy are not permissible under the Byron Local Environmental Plan 1988 as they exceed an established development standard of that instrument. However, the application is lodged under the provisions of Section 106 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 – indicating that "Existing Use Rights" prevail for the proposed development. On this basis the application includes a SEPP 1 objection. The SEPP 1 is submitted as the proposal exceeds 4.5 metres above the existing ground level – this is the maximum height to topmost floor level of the building above ground level as established in Clause 40 (2) (b) (i) of LEP 1988. The dual occupancy additions and alterations have been disigned to reflect the integrate with the existing dual occupancy	by	21/06/2017
10.2016.273.1	3 1220608	21	1 Ballina Road	Bangalow	2	2479 subdivision of land and construction of multidwelling housing	d Byron Local Environmental Plan 1988 and Byron Local Environmental Plan 2014	R3 Medium Density Residential & DM (1(a) General Rural under BLEF 1988)	BLEP2014 - cl.4.3	BLEP1988 - The proposal is not inconsistent with the objectives of the 1(a) zone; The area of 1(a) zoned land is already significantly less than the minimum lot size and that area is not being further fragmented; The proposal raises no issues of state or regional planning significance; and There is considered to be no public benefit in maintaining the development standard in this instance. BLEP2014 - non-compliance arises die to topographic constraints; Height exceedance is minor - for a short length of roof line; will not result in overshadowing/ overlooking or privacy impacts as there is vacant rural land adjoining.	Department of Planning	20/04/2017
10.2016.794.1	10 622728	2 to 6	Keats Street	Byron Bay	2	2 lot subdivision	Byron Local Environmental Plan 1988 Byron Local Environmental Plan 2014	R2 Low Density Residential/PART DM Deferred Matter; 7(a) Wetlands Zone	Clause 11 LEP 1988 - 7(a) Wetlands - minimum lot size (40 hectares) for subdivision for the part of the land zoned 7(a) Wetlands.	The application is subject to a SEPP 1 Objection to Development Standards based on the proposed subdivision not according with the minimum lot size for subdivision for the part of the land zoned 7(a) Wetlands under LEP 1988. The NSW Planning and Environment has issued their concurrence for the SEPP 1 application. Concurren was granted in this instance for the following reasons: The proposal is not inconsistent with the objectives of the 7(a) zone; The proposal raises no issues of state or regional planning significance; and; There is considered to be no public benefit in maintaining the development standard in this instance.		15/06/2017