

| 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 |
|-----------------------------|------------|-----------|-----------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------|----------|-------------------------|---|----------------|---|---|-----------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| 222.1/2021                  | 242 Sec 2  | 1553      |                       | 99            | Bold Street | Cabramatta West | 2166     | 13: Subdivision only    | Fairfield Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 2013 | R2             | Clause 4.1 minimum subdivision lot size | The Development Application proposes a Torrens Title subdivision of 2 existing narrow allotments and a redundant adjoining laneway at the rear to create 2 new larger allotments.   | Proposed Lot 1 = 26.7%; and | Council              | 31/08/2021                    |
|                             |            |           |                       |               |             |                 |          |                         |   |                |   |   |                             |                      |                               |
|                             | 243 Sec 2  | 1553      |                       | 99A           |             |                 |          |                         |   |                |   | Whilst the 2 proposed allotments will be larger in area, the newly created lots will not comply with the minimum lot size requirement of 450m² as stipulated in Clause 4.1 Minimum subdivision lot size within Fairfield LEP 2013. The proposed subdivision therefore results in a variation of 26.7% for each proposed allotment, to the development standard.   | Proposed Lot 2 = 26.7%      |                      |                               |
|                             | 1          | 256452    |                       | 99            |             |                 |          |                         |   |                |   |   |                             |                      |                               |
|                             |            |           |                       |               |             |                 |          |                         |   |                |   | The Applicant has submitted a written application justifying the minimum lot size variation of 26.7%, pursuant to Clause 4.6 Exceptions to development standards for the following reasons:   |                             |                      |                               |
|                             |            |           |                       |               |             |                 |          |                         |   |                |   |   |                             |                      |                               |
|                             |            |           |                       |               |             |                 |          |                         |   |                |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The existing lots have sufficient size and dimensions to accommodate narrow lot development to satisfy Council's DCP controls relating to building heights built fork, setbacks, car parking, landscaping, private open space, solar access and privacy.</li></ul>  |                             |                      |                               |
|                             |            |           |                       |               |             |                 |          |                         |   |                |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The application proposes subdivision of land to incorporate a redundant rear laneway, in essence creating larger lots to benefit future development of the site.</li></ul>  |                             |                      |                               |
|                             |            |           |                       |               |             |                 |          |                         |   |                |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The development has planning merit, meets the objectives of the zone and the development standard as follows:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The locality contains a significant number by similar-sized narrow lots in R2 zone. The proposed new allotments will meet the objectives of the zone to ensure that lot sizes provide for housing to meet the needs within a low density residential environment</li></ul></li></ul> |                             |                      |                               |
|                             |            |           |                       |               |             |                 |          |                         |   |                |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The proposal will ensure that the lot sizes are consistent with the future and existing desired subdivision pattern and character of the area</li></ul>   |                             |                      |                               |
|                             |            |           |                       |               |             |                 |          |                         |   |                |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The proposal will maintain a low density residential character and will not result in any adverse impact on the streetscape of the local area</li></ul>   |                             |                      |                               |
|                             |            |           |                       |               |             |                 |          |                         |   |                |   |   |                             |                      |                               |
|                             |            |           |                       |               |             |                 |          |                         |   |                |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A precedent exists for this type of development proposal, wherein Council has facilitated this type of amalgamation of the redundant rear lanes in many cases.</li></ul>  |                             |                      |                               |
|                             |            |           |                       |               |             |                 |          |                         |   |                |   |   |                             |                      |                               |

|            |                     |        |  |   |             |                 |      |                      |   |    |   |  |                        |         |            |
|------------|---------------------|--------|--|---|-------------|-----------------|------|----------------------|---|----|---|--|------------------------|---------|------------|
|            |                     |        |  |   |             |                 |      |                      |   |    | 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 is considered acceptable and appropriate in this circumstance. |  |                        |         |            |
| 233.1/2021 | 124, 125 & 126, Sec | 1553   |  | 8 | Lime Street | Cabramatta West | 2166 | 13: Subdivision only | Fairfield Local Environmental Plan 2013 | R2 | Clause 4.1 minimum subdivision lot size   | The Development Application proposes the Torrens Title subdivision of three (3) existing narrow allotments and a redundant adjoining laneway at the rear to create 3 new larger allotments.  | 26.7% for each new lot | Council | 31/08/2021 |
|            |                     |        |  |   |             |                 |      |                      |   |    |   |  |                        |         |            |
|            | 1                   | 193751 |  |   |             |                 |      |                      |   |    |   | Whilst the 3 proposed allotments will be larger in area, the newly created lots will not comply with the minimum lot size requirement of 450m <sup>2</sup> as stipulated in Clause 4.1 minimum subdivision lot size of Fairfield LEP 2013. The proposed subdivision therefore results in a variation of 26.7% for each proposed allotment, to the development standard.  |                        |         |            |
|            |                     |        |  |   |             |                 |      |                      |   |    |   |  |                        |         |            |
|            |                     |        |  |   |             |                 |      |                      |   |    |   | the Applicant has submitted a written application justifying the minimum lot size variation of 26.7%, pursuant to Clause 4.6 Exceptions to development standards for the following reasons:  |                        |         |            |
|            |                     |        |  |   |             |                 |      |                      |   |    |   |  |                        |         |            |
|            |                     |        |  |   |             |                 |      |                      |   |    |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The existing lots have sufficient size and dimensions to accommodate narrow lot development to satisfy Council's DCP controls relating to building heights, built form, setbacks, car parking, landscaping, private open space, solar access and privacy.</li></ul>  |                        |         |            |
|            |                     |        |  |   |             |                 |      |                      |   |    |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The application proposes subdivision of land to incorporate a redundant rear laneway, in essence creating larger lots to benefit future development of the site.</li></ul>   |                        |         |            |
|            |                     |        |  |   |             |                 |      |                      |   |    |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The development has planning merit, meets the objectives of both the zone and the development standard, as follows:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The locality contains a significant number by similar-sized narrow lots in the R2 zone. The proposed new allotments will meet the objectives of the zone to ensure that lot sizes provide for housing to meet the needs within a low density residential environment.</li></ul></li></ul> |                        |         |            |
|            |                     |        |  |   |             |                 |      |                      |   |    |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The proposal will ensure that the lot sizes are consistent with the future and existing desired subdivision pattern and character of the area.</li></ul>   |                        |         |            |
|            |                     |        |  |   |             |                 |      |                      |   |    |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The proposal will maintain a low density residential character and will not result in any adverse impact on the streetscape of the local area.</li></ul>   |                        |         |            |
|            |                     |        |  |   |             |                 |      |                      |   |    |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A precedence exists for this type of development proposal, wherein Council has facilitated this type of amalgamation of the redundant rear lanes in many cases.</li></ul>  |                        |         |            |
|            |                     |        |  |   |             |                 |      |                      |   |    |   |  |                        |         |            |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |   |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 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 is considered acceptable and appropriate in this circumstance. |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|