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
	42, 43, 44 & 45 Section 1	728		261	Sackville Street	Canley Vale	2166	4	Fairfield Local Environmen tal Plan 2013		Clause 4.1 – Minimum lot size 450m ²	The minimum lot size under Fairfield The application proposes the Torrens Title subdivision of 4 existing narrow allotments in order to create 2 realigned allotments. The proposed subdivision provides for 2 realigned allotments with an area as follows: Proposed Lot 1 = 450.1m2 Proposed Lot 2 = 216m2 The proposed subdivision represents a variation of 52% for proposed lot 2, to the development standard. Justification It would be unnecessary to impose the 450m² development as the existing 4 narrow lots are currently and have been below the 450m² development standard. The current allotment sizes of 62.4m², 159.5m², 223.5m², 224.8m². Proposed lot 2 can accommodate a suitable dwelling as demonstrated on the Architectural Plans prepared by NJS Design & Drafting which is generally compliant with the narrow lot provisions under Part 5C of FCWDCP 2013 and satisfy relevant flood impact criteria as addressed by Indesco in the Flood Impact Assessment report submitted in support of the proposal.		Council	16/04/2018

35.12018 30 & 51 1855 156 Boyd Street Colorancia West 2166 14 Colorancia West 2166 14 Colorancia West 2166 14 Colorancia West 2166 14 Colorancia West 2166 15 Colorancia West		T	1	T	1	<u> </u>	T	1	T	<u> </u>	1	1	The subdivision to anothe only two	1		
Sale													The subdivision to create only two			
Social 1553 104 Rays Sweet Cubramate West 2100 14 Earlield Local L													•			
23 104 Soyd Street 104 Soyd Street 104 Soyd Street 105 104 Soyd Street 105																
25.1/2018 Section 5 Section 5 Section 6 Sect																
Section 0 1 723642 1 723642 1 723642 1 1 723642 1 1 723642 1 1 723642 1 1 723642 1 1 723642 1 1 723642 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1													· ·			
Section 5 1 723642 1 723	33.1/2018	30 & 31	1553		104	Boyd Street	Cabramatta West	2166	14	I	R2			26.70%	Council	16/04/2018
1 723642 In a la Plan 2013 A 500m² 450m² 450m² 50m² 450m² 450m² 50m² 450m² 450m² 50m² 450m²												1				
1 723642 1 723642 2 7236		Section 5														
Development Application No. 351,2018 proposed a Torrens Tife subclivisor of a returnation family with the minimum subclivision of automation family with the minimum subclivision of automation family with the minimum subclivision of automation of automation of a deform as significant of clause 4.1 minimum subclivision of automation of a deform as significant of clause 4.1 minimum subclivision of automation of a deform as significant of a development in clause 4.1 minimum subclivision of automation of a deform as significant of a development in a subclivision of a development in a minimum subclivision of a development in a development in a minimum subclivision of a development in a development in a minimum subclivision of a development in a development in a minimum subclivision of a development in a development in a minimum subclivision of a development in a development in a minimum subclivision of a development in a development in a minimum subclivision of a development in a minimum subclivision of a development in a development in a minimum subclivision of a development in a development in a development in a minimum subclivision of a development in a devel												450m²	450m².	1		
S3.1/2016, proposed a Torrees Title subdivision of a redundant lineway and 2 existing narrow lots to rede2 7 new larger altohumsts. The proposed bids will not comply with the minimum subdivision to size requirement of 450m² as atpulated in Cause 4.1 minimum subdivision to size to the Fairfield LEP 2013. The proposed subdivision of the fairfield LEP 2013 and the development standard. Essentially, the proposed provises for subdivision of the development standard does not contain the fairfield LEP 2013 and the fairfield			700040	_						2013				4		
subdivision of a redundant intervery and 2 existing narrow lots to create 2 new larger allotments. The proposed follower of 1 decided the 1 decided of 1 decided]1	723642													
2 existing narrow lots to create 2 new lurger attributions. The proposed loss will not comply with the maintainment of 32 recognition of 450m² as stipulated in Clause 4.1 minimum authorision to size of the Fairfield LEP 2013. This proposed suctivision represents a variation of 26.7% for each proposed suctivision represents arounded. Essentially, the proposed provides for each of the existing two narrow allotment, to the development standard. Essentially, the proposed provides for each of the existing two narrow allotments to be amalgamated with a portion of the reduction traversy that it abouts to create two larger lots and therefore existing the narrow of the existing two narrow allotments to be amalgamated with a portion of the reduction traversy that it abouts to create two larger lots and therefore existing in a more orderly development. It is considered that the non-compliance with the development standard does not rate are surgitallized minutes with respect to Strate or Responsit Pharming authorities of the Patifield LEP 2013 is the respect to Strate or Responsit Pharming controls. 198-1/2018 22 & 33																
Image: Comparison of the com																
The proposed lots will not comply with the minimum lot size requirement of 450m² as tipulated in Cause 4.1 minimum subdivision lot size of the Farifield EP 2013. The proposed of 25.7% for each proposed allowent, to the development standard. Essentially, the proposed provides for each of the existing two narrow allothernets to be amalgamed with a portion of the redundant laneway that it abuts to create two larger lots and therefore resulting in a more orderly development. It is considered that the non-compliance with the development standard does not raise any significant matters with respect to Statio or Regional Planning and no public benefit is obtained by adhering to the relevant planning and no public benefit is obtained by adhering to the relevant planning controls. The visitation pursuant of the proposed planning and no public benefit is obtained by adhering to the relevant planning controls. The visitation pursuant of the proposed planning and no public benefit is obtained by adhering to the relevant planning controls. The visitation pursuant of the proposed planning and no public benefit is obtained by adhering to the relevant planning controls. The visitation pursuant of the proposed planning and no public benefit is obtained by adhering to the relevant planning controls. The visitation pursuant of the proposed planning and no public benefit is obtained by adhering to the relevant planning controls. The visitation pursuant of the proposed planning and no public benefit is obtained by adhering to the relevant planning controls. The visitation pursuant of the planning controls are planning and no public benefit is obtained by adhering to the relevant planning controls. The visitation pursuant of the planning controls are planning controls. The visitation pursuant of the planning controls are planning controls. The visitation pursuant of the pursuant of the planning control pursuant of the planning control planning controls are planning controls. The visitation pursuant of the planning control planning																
the minimum lot size requirement of 450m² as stignidate in Clause 4.1 minimum subdivision in clause 4.2 minimum subdivision in clause 4.3 mini													larger anothrents.	-		
the minimum lot size requirement of 450m² as stignidate in Clause 4.1 minimum subdivision in clause 4.2 minimum subdivision in clause 4.3 mini													The proposed lots will not comply with	1		
450m ² as situalised in Clause 4.1 minimum subdivision for late of the Fairfield LEP 2013. The proposed subdivision represents a variation of 26.7% for each proposed allowing to the development standard. Essentially, the proposal provides for each of the existing two narrow a province of the existing two narrow and province of the existing two narrow and province of the relational timeway that if abouts to create two larger fols and therefore resulting in a more orderly development. It is considered that the non-compliance with the development standard does not raise any significant matures with respect to State of Regional Planning and therefore resulting in a more orderly development. It is considered that the non-compliance with the development standard does not raise any significant matures with respect to State of Regional Planning and the development standard does not raise any significant matures with respect to State of Regional Planning and the relevant planning controls. The variation pursuant to Clause 4 of the Fairfield LEP 2013 is therefore considered acceptable in the circumstances. 196.1/2018 32 & 33																
minimum subdivision to size of the Fairfield LEP 2013. The proposed subdivision represents a variation of 26.7% for reach proposed slichment, to the development standard. Essentially, the proposal provides for each of the existing two harrow a ploriments to be amalgamented with a portion of the redundant laneway that it abuts to create two larger lots and therefore resulting in a more orderly development. It is considered that the non-compliance with the development standard does not raise any significant matters with respect to State or Regional Planning and no public benefits obtained by adhering to the relevant planning controls. The variation pursuant to Clause 4.6 of the Fairfield LEP 2013 is therefore resulted in the circumstances. 196.1/2018 32 & 33 1152 36 Foxlow Street Canley Heights 2166 14 Fairfield Local Environment tall Plan 2013 With reference to Clause 4.1 Minimum subdivision to taxes, subclause (3) still will be size of any lot resulting from a subdivision of land to which this clause applies is not to be less than the minimum size shown on the Lot Size Map, which is 450m².													· ·			
Fairfield LEP 2013. The proposed subdivision preparents a variation of 26.7% for each proposed allotment, to the development standard. Essentially, the proposal provides for each of the existing two narrow allotments to be amalgamated with a portion of the redundant laneway that it abuts to create two larger losts and therefore resulting in a more orderly development. It is considered that the non-compliance with the development standard does not raise are significant matters with respect to State or Regional Planning and no public benefit is obtained by adhering to the redivant planning control. The variation provision of the redivant planning control and planning control. The variation provision of the redivant planning control and planning control. The variation provision of the redivant planning control and planning control. The variation provision of the redivant planning control and planning c																
subdivision represents a variation of 26.7% for each proposed allotiment, to the development standard. Essentially, the proposal provides for each of the existing two nearow allotments to be amalgamated with a portion of the redundant laneway that it abuts to create two larger fots and therefore resulting in a more orderly development. It is considered that the non-compliance with the development standard does not raise any significant matters with respect to State or Regional Planning and no public benefit is obtained by adhering to the relevant planning controls. The variation pursuant to Clause 4.6 of the Fairfield Local Minimum subdivision for size, Subclause (3) Section K 196.1/2018 32 & 33 1152 36 Foxlow Street Canley Heights 2166 14 Fairfield Local Minimum subdivision for size, Subclause (3) stiputes that the size of any lot receivant planning to some subdivision of land to which this clause applies is not to be less than the minimum size shown on the Lot Size Map, which is 450m².																
26.7% for each proposed allotment, to the development standard. Essentially, the proposal provides for each of the existing two narrow allotments to be amalgameted with a portion of the redundant laneway that it abuts to create two larger lots and therefore resulting in a more orderly development. It is considered that the non-compliance with the development standard does not raise any significant matters with respect to State or Regional Planning and no public benefit is obtained by adhering to the relevant planning controls. The variation public benefit is obtained by adhering to the relevant planning controls. The variation pustuant to Grant the control of the province of the public planting controls. The variation public benefit is obtained by adhering to the relevant planning controls. The variation public benefit is obtained by adhering to the relevant planning controls. The variation public benefit is obtained by adhering the public benefit is obta																
the development standard. Essentially, the proposal provides for each of the existing two narrow allotments to be amalgamated with a portion of the redundant laneway that it abuts to create two larger lots and therefore resulting in a more orderly development. It is considered that the non-compliance with the development standard does not raise any significant matters with respect to State or Regional Planning and no public benefit is obtained by adhering to the relevant planning controls. The variation pursuant to Clause 4.6 of the Fairfield LEP 2013 is therefore considered acceptable in the circumstances. 196.1/2018 32 & 33 1152 36 Foxlow Street Canley Heights 2166 14 Fairfield R 2 Clause 4.1 - With reference to Clause 4.1 Minimum subdivision to large the subdivision to large the subdivision of large to with this clause applies is not to be less than the minimum size shown on the Lot Size Map, which is 450m².																
asach of the existing two narrow allotments to be amalgameted with a portion of the redundant laneway that it abuts to create two larger lots and therefore resulting in a more orderly development. It is considered that the non-compliance with the development standard does not raise any significant matters with respect to State or Regional Planning and no public benefit is obtained by adhering to the relevant planning controls. The variation pursuant Clause 4.6 of the Fairfield Let 2013 is therefore considered acceptable in the circumstances. 196.1/2018 32 & 33 1152 36 Foxlow Street Canley Heights 2166 14 Fairfield Local Environmen Environmen Ital Plan 2013 2 240082													the development standard.			
asach of the existing two narrow allotments to be amalgameted with a portion of the redundant laneway that it abuts to create two larger lots and therefore resulting in a more orderly development. It is considered that the non-compliance with the development standard does not raise any significant matters with respect to State or Regional Planning and no public benefit is obtained by adhering to the relevant planning controls. The variation pursuant Clause 4.6 of the Fairfield Let 2013 is therefore considered acceptable in the circumstances. 196.1/2018 32 & 33 1152 36 Foxlow Street Canley Heights 2166 14 Fairfield Local Environmen Environmen Ital Plan 2013 2 240082														1		
allotments to be amalgamated with a portion of the redundant laneway that it abuts to create two larger lots and therefore resulting in a more orderly development. It is considered that the non-compliance with the development standard does not raise any significant matters with respect to State or Regional Planning and no public benefit is obtained by adhering to the relevant planning controls. The variation pursuant to Clause 4.6 of the Fairfield LEP 2013 is therefore considered acceptable in the circumstances. 196.1/2018 32 & 33 1152 36 Foxlow Street Canley Heights 2168 14 Fairfield R2 Clause 4.1 With reference to Clause 4.1 Minimum subdivision of 124 R2 Minimum subdivision of 125 R2 Minimum subdivision of 124 R2 Minimum subdivision of 125 R2 Minimum subdivision of 124 R2 Minimum subdivision of 124 R2 Minimum subdivision of 125 R2 Minimum subdivision of 124 R2 Minimum subdivision of 125 R2														1		
portion of the redundant laneway that it abuts to create two larger lots and therefore resulting in a more orderly development. It is considered that the non-compliance with the development standard does not raise any significant matters with respect to State or Regional Planning and no public benefit is obtained by adhering to the relevant planning controls. The variation pursuant to Clause 4.6 of the Fairfield LEP 2013 is therefore considered acceptable in the circumstances. 196.1/2018 32 & 33																
abuts to create two larger lots and therefore resulting in a more orderly development. It is considered that the non-compliance with the development standard does not raise any significant matters with respect to State or Regional Planning and no public benefit is obtained by adhering to the relevant planning controls. The variation pursuant to Clause 4.6 of the Fairfield LEP 2013 is therefore considered acceptable in the circumstances. 196.1/2018 32 & 33																
therefore resulting in a more orderly development. It is considered that the non-compliance with the development standard does not raise any significant matters with respect to State or Regional Planning and no public benefit is obtained by adhering to the relevant planning controls. The variation pursuant to Clause 4.6 of the Fairfield LEP 2013 is therefore considered acceptable in the circumstances. 196.1/2018 32 & 33																
development.																
It is considered that the non-compliance with the development standard does not raise any significant matters with respect to State or Regional Planning and no public benefit is obtained by adhering to the relevant planning controls. The variation pursuant to Clause 4.6 of the Fairfield LEP 2013 is therefore considered acceptable in the circumstances. 196.1/2018 32 & 33																
with the development standard does not raise any significant matters with respect to State or Regional Planning and no public benefit is obtained by adhering to the relevant planning controls. The variation pursuant to Clause 4.6 of the Fairfield LEP 2013 is therefore considered acceptable in the circumstances. 196.1/2018 32 & 33													development.			
with the development standard does not raise any significant matters with respect to State or Regional Planning and no public benefit is obtained by adhering to the relevant planning controls. The variation pursuant to Clause 4.6 of the Fairfield LEP 2013 is therefore considered acceptable in the circumstances. 196.1/2018 32 & 33													It is a social and that the man according	-		
not raise any significant matters with respect to State or Regional Planning and no public benefit is obtained by adhering to the relevant planning controls. The variation pursuant to Clause 4.6 of the Fairfield LEP 2013 is therefore considered acceptable in the circumstances. 196.1/2018 32 & 33																
respect to State or Regional Planning and no public benefit is obtained by adhering to the relevant planning controls. The variation pursuant to Clause 4.6 of the Fairfield LEP 2013 is therefore considered acceptable in the circumstances. 196.1/2018 32 & 33													•			
and no public benefit is obtained by adhering to the relevant planning controls. The variation pursuant to Clause 4.6 of the Fairfield LEP 2013 is therefore considered acceptable in the circumstances. 196.1/2018 32 & 33																
adhering to the relevant planning controls. The variation pursuant to Clause 4.6 of the Fairfield LEP 2013 is therefore considered acceptable in the circumstances. 196.1/2018 32 & 33																
196.1/2018 32 & 33 1152 36 Foxlow Street Canley Heights 2166 14 Fairfield Local Environmen tal Plan 2013 2013 240082 Canus 240082 Canter Street Canley Heights 2166 14 Canter Street Canley Heights 2166 14 Canter Street Canley Heights 2166 216 2166 216 2166 216 2166 216 216																
196.1/2018 32 & 33 1152 36 Foxlow Street Canley Heights 2166 14 Fairfield Local Environmental Plan 2013 240082 Clause 4.6 of the Fairfield LEP 2013 is therefore considered acceptable in the circumstances. Clause 4.6 of the Fairfield LEP 2013 is therefore considered acceptable in the circumstances. Clause 4.1 - With reference to Clause 4.1 Minimum subdivision lot size, Subclause (3) stipulates that the size of any lot resulting from a subdivision of land to which this clause applies is not to be less than the minimum size shown on the Lot Size Map, which is 450m ² .																
therefore considered acceptable in the circumstances. 196.1/2018 32 & 33																
196.1/2018 32 & 33																
Section K Local Environmen tal Plan 2013 Section K 2013 Minimum subdivision lot size, Subclause (3) stipulates that the size of any lot resulting from a subdivision of land to which this clause applies is not to be less than the minimum size shown on the Lot Size Map, which is 450m².													circumstances.			
Section K Local Environmen tal Plan 2013 Section K 2013 Minimum subdivision lot size, Subclause (3) stipulates that the size of any lot resulting from a subdivision of land to which this clause applies is not to be less than the minimum size shown on the Lot Size Map, which is 450m².	400 4/0040	00.0.00	14450	1	00	Faula Ot 1	Camba Hallat	0400	144	Estate 1	DC	01 4 1	With reference to Observe 4.4.50	07.500/	0	07/00/0040
Section K Environmen tal Plan 2013 Environmen tal Plan 2013 Subdivision lot size subdivision lot size subdivision lot size resulting from a subdivision of land to which this clause applies is not to be less than the minimum size shown on the Lot Size Map, which is 450m².	196.1/2018	32 & 33	1152		36	Foxiow Street	Canley Heights	2166	14	I	IK2			37.56%	Council	27/06/2018
tal Plan 2013 Iot size resulting from a subdivision of land to which this clause applies is not to be less than the minimum size shown on the Lot Size Map, which is 450m². 2 240082		Section K														
2013 which this clause applies is not to be less than the minimum size shown on the Lot Size Map, which is 450m².		Section K														
less than the minimum size shown on the Lot Size Map, which is 450m ² . 2 240082			1									IOL SIZE				
the Lot Size Map, which is 450m ² . 2 240082										2013						
2 240082			1										_			
													Title Lot Size Map, Willott 15 450111.			
		2	240082	1										1		
													The proposed subdivision provides for	1		

							Proposed Lot 1 = 281 m ²		
							Proposed Lot 2 = 281 m ²		
							1 1000000 E0t 2 = 201 III		
							The proposed development therefore		
							does not comply with the required		
							minimum lot size requirement of 450m ²		
							as stipulated within Clause 4.1		
							Minimum subdivision lot size of Fairfield		
							LEP 2013.		
							Accordingly, the Applicant has		
							submitted a written application justifying		
							the minimum lot size variation of		
							37.56%, pursuant to Clause 4.6		
						1	Exceptions to development standards		
1						1	for the following reasons:		
							<u> </u>		
						1	The proposed development proposes		
							a density that will achieve the		
							objectives of the R2 Low Density		
							Residential zone that applies to the		
							site;		
							 The development achieves the 		
							objective of the development standard		
							by proposing lot sizes that are of		
							sufficient size to accommodate		
							attached dwellings or semi-detached		
							dwellings development, and will be		
							consistent with the relevant and		
							applicable planning provisions and will		
							not cause any adverse impact to		
							residential amenity;		
							·		
							The new lots created will be wider		
						1	than the existing lots at 8.38m wide, but		
							the planned subdivision will still be		
						1	consistent with the narrow lot		
						1	development pattern of the area, and at		
						1	the same time will provide opportunity		
							for higher quality housing development		
						1	that will enhance and improve the		
						1	residential character and lifestyle of the		
						1	area. Furthermore, the proposed lot		
						1	size and width will enable future		
						1	dwellings the opportunity of having		
							greater amenity.		
						1			
							The proposed lot layouts will result in		
							a better planning outcome for the site;		

	Enforcing strict compliance with the numerical component of the development standard would result in the permitted development being unachievable for the site and would be superfluous and would not be relevant to achieving the objectives and purpose of the development standard; and The development will enable the orderly and economic use and development of the land that would otherwise be compromised if strict compliance with the numerical
--	--