	Cumberland City Council Variations Register For April 2020 - June 2020														
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
DA2018/77/1	А	419270		67	Clyde Street	GUILDFORD	2161	Residential - New multi unit	Holroyd LEP 2013	R4 High Density Residential - Holroyd	Clause 4.3 - Height of Buildings	The proposal results in the building height exceedance of 810mm for the lift over run, where a 15m building height limit applies on the site. The proposal is supportable given that the objectives of the clause to minimise visual impact of the development, sufficient solar access and privacy of the neighbouring properties, consistency with the landform and provision of appropriate scales and intensities of the development through height controls have been demonstrated.	5.4%	Council under assumed concurrence	20/05/2020
DA2019/141/1	5	35287		11	Joyner Street	WESTMEAD	2145	DA Other (Not specifically categorised)	Holroyd Local Environmental Plan 2013	R4 High Density Residential - Holroyd	Height	The proposal involves a non-compliance with the Height of Buildings standard. The proposal has a height of 17.67m where the maximum height permitted is 15m. This represents a 17.8% departure from the standard. The objectives of the building height standard are to enable appropriate development density to be achieved and to ensure that the height of the building is compatible with the character of the locality as outlined above. The proposal is compliant (subject to conditions) with the maximum FSR of 1.64 inclusive of the bonus provision under the ARH SEPP. The departure sought is considered to be modest and does not unreasonably impact on adjoining properties. The additional height does not result in the appearance of bulk when viewed from the existing streetscape and would not impinge on the changing streetscape that is anticipated for the immediate area. Given that the proposed development responds to the site and does so without compromising relationships with adjoining development is acceptable and does not unduly compromise other relevant controls. The proposal is considered to be consistent with the objectives of height requirements and development within the R4 zone. It is also important to note that the height variation is largely to address the overland flow that the subject size is affected from	17.8	DG of Dept of Planning	27/05/2020