Attachment 3 – Holroyd Development Control Plan 2013 compliance table

No.	Clause	Comment	Yes	No	N/A
PART	A – GENERAL CONTROLS				
1	Subdivision				
	Subdivision not proposed.				\boxtimes
2	Roads and Access				
2.4	Access: Vehicular Crossings, Splay	Corners, Kerb & Guttering			
	VC to be reconstructed if in poor	New VC proposed			
	condition, damaged or design doesn't		\boxtimes		
	comply.				
	Avoid services/facilities in road	Proposal complies			
	reserve, existing trees, pedestrian				
	crossing, pram ramps etc. Corner sites VC to be min. 6m from	Not a corner site			
	the tangent point.	Not a corner site			\boxtimes
	Corner sites require 3m x 3m	Not a corner site			
	(residential) and 4m x 4m	Not a comer site			
	(commercial) splay corner to be				
	dedicated.				
2.7	Road Widening			ı	I.
	The subject site is affected by 1.5 m ro				
	be granted, a condition could be impos		\boxtimes		
	1.5 m wide strip at the Cardigan Street	frontage.			
3	Car Parking				
3.1	Minimum Parking Spaces			1	ı
	Car Parking – Residential	Defect to the second se			
	Minimum spaces required:	Refer to commentary provided			
	• 1 bed. unit = 0.8	under the SEPP (ARH) section of this report			
	• bed unit = 1	or this report			
	bed unit = 1.24+ bed unit = 1.5				
	Visitor = 0.2 per unitBicycle Parking				
	Minimum spaces required:				
	• Studio / 1 bed. unit = 0.5	Refer to commentary provided			
	 bed unit = 0.5 	under the SEPP (ARH) section			
	• 3+ bed unit = 0.5	of this report			
	Visitor = 0.1 per unit	·			
3.3	Car Parking, Dimensions & Gradient			l	<u>I</u>
	Council's Traffic Engineer reviewed t				
	proposed car park access and layout s	atisfactory.			
	The parking assessment submitted v		\boxtimes		
	that Council impose a condition for a c				
	northern side of the driveway (facing				
	exiting the site can see pedestrians wa				
3.5	If consent were to be granted, such a consent were to be granted.	condition could be imposed.			
0.0	Driveways shall be setback a	The amended plans provide for			
	minimum of 1.5m from the side	a 1.2 m setback from the			
	boundary.	driveway to the southern			
		boundary. This is considered			
		satisfactory as the site has		\boxtimes	
		limited frontage and there are no			
		opportunities for amalgamation			
		with adjacent sites. The setback			
		provided is suitably landscaped	l	I	l

		with screening trees.			
3.6	Parking for the Disabled				
	2 spaces per 100 spaces up to 400 and 1 per 100 thereafter, or pa thereof.		\boxtimes		
4	Tree and Landscape Works				
	All existing trees are to be assessed for their retention value and retained with adequate setbacks where possible.	Council's Landscaping and Tree Management Officer advised that the proposed tree removal is satisfactory.	\boxtimes		
_	Provide landscaping that enhances the streetscape and setting of development, incorporating a mix of trees, shrubs and ground covers planted appropriately and where necessary, providing essential screening or solar access roles.	The proposed landscaping is considered unsatisfactory as it does not provide appropriate screening to the northern or southern side setbacks. This is included as a reason for refusal in the draft determination.			
5	Biodiversity The subject site is not identified on Map and is not within an E2 - Enviro	the Environmentally Sensitive Land nmental Conservation zone.			\boxtimes
6	Soil Management				
6.1	Retaining Walls Full details of retaining walls to be provided by condition prior to the issue of a construction certificate.				
6.3	Erosion and Sediment Control Plan A detailed erosion and sediment control plan was not submitted with the application. This is included as a reason for refusal in the draft determination.			\boxtimes	
7	Stormwater Management				
	The application was reviewed by Council's Development Engineer and is considered satisfactory subject to conditions.		\boxtimes		
8	Flood Prone Land The site is legated above the flood planning level				
_	The site is located above the flood planning level.				
9	Managing External Road Noise The subject site is not within 60 m of a rail corridor and does not have frontage to a classified road.				\boxtimes
10	Safety and Security			ı	
	Design new development to reduce the attractiveness of crime by minimising, removing or concealing crime opportunities.	Proposed design minimises crime opportunities	\boxtimes		
	Incorporate and/or enhance opportunities for effective natural surveillance by providing clear sight lines between public and private places, installation of effective lighting, and the appropriate landscaping of public areas.	Design provides for passive surveillance with clear sightlines between public domain and proposed building entrance.	\boxtimes		
	Minimise opportunities for crime through suitable access control. Use physical or symbolic barriers to attract, channel and/or restrict the movement of people. Use landscaping and/or physical elements to direct people to	Access to the basement parking area could easily be restricted to residents.			

	destinations, identify where people can and cannot go and restrict access to high crime risk areas			
	such as car parks. Clearly define the boundaries between public and private spaces as a method of territorial reinforcement. Methods other than gates, fences and enclosures are encouraged.	Private spaces are clearly defined.	\boxtimes	
	When incorporating crime prevention measures in the design of new buildings and spaces, apply subtle design techniques to blend into facades and places, and to be sympathetic with the quality of the streetscape.	Proposal provides for adequate crime prevention measures whilst being sympathetic to the quality of the streetscape.		
11	Waste Management			
	The amended plans provide for a basement to the collection point – sat			
12	Services If consent were to be granted, condi- requiring that the applicant consult wi			
	B – RESIDENTIAL CONTROLS			
1	GENERAL RESIDENTIAL CONTROL	LS		
1.1	Building Materials			
	Acceptable materials and finishes pro	posed.	\boxtimes	
1.2	Fences			
	Duana a a a l fana sina n ia a a tiafa atam . a la ia			
	Proposed fencing is satisfactory subjection	ct to standard conditions.	\square	
1.3	Views			
	Views No significant views will be affected by			
1.3	Views No significant views will be affected by Landscape Area	y the proposed development.		
	Views No significant views will be affected by	y the proposed development. 8.7% (36.9 m²) with 2 m dimensions 19.9% (84.2 m²) if no min dimensions This is significantly less than the required minimum and is included as a reason for refusal		
	Views No significant views will be affected by Landscape Area Min. 30% for a residential flat building Required: 422.5 m ² x 30% = 126.75	y the proposed development. 8.7% (36.9 m²) with 2 m dimensions 19.9% (84.2 m²) if no min dimensions This is significantly less than the required minimum and is included as a reason for refusal in the draft determination.		
	No significant views will be affected by Landscape Area Min. 30% for a residential flat building Required: 422.5 m² x 30% = 126.75 m² Max. 50% of provided landscaped are shall be forward of the front building	y the proposed development. 8.7% (36.9 m²) with 2 m dimensions 19.9% (84.2 m²) if no min dimensions This is significantly less than the required minimum and is included as a reason for refusal in the draft determination. 10.1 m² forward of the building line. This is equal to 27% of the total		
1.5	No significant views will be affected by Landscape Area Min. 30% for a residential flat building Required: 422.5 m² x 30% = 126.75 m² Max. 50% of provided landscaped are shall be forward of the front building line.	y the proposed development. 8.7% (36.9 m²) with 2 m dimensions 19.9% (84.2 m²) if no min dimensions This is significantly less than the required minimum and is included as a reason for refusal in the draft determination. 10.1 m² forward of the building line. This is equal to 27% of the total landscaping.		

		Cardigan Street such that they receive no solar access at midwinter.			
1.9	Cut and Fill				
	Cut is permitted to a maximum of 1 metre	Minimal cut proposed.	\boxtimes		
	Fill 600 mm or greater is to be contained within the building envelope.	The proposal involves up to 1 m of fill directly adjacent to the northern side boundary and within the front setback. This is considered excessive and is included as a reason for refusal in the draft determination.			
1.10	Demolition		1		
	Approval for demolition is required from Council.	Application seeks consent for demolition.	\boxtimes		
	Photographic record capturing the external configuration of the building proposed to be demolished is required.	Satisfactory photographic record provided.			
1.11	Vehicular Access and Driveways	I Daniel Branch (com France)	1		
	VCs to be a minimum width of 3 m and maximum width of 5m at the boundary	Per conditions from Engineer	\boxtimes		
	All new driveways should be located at least 1.5 m from side property boundaries	VC is 1.2 m from the side boundary which is less than the required minimum.		\boxtimes	
	Council favours the use of a central under-building access with arrangement for cars to exit the property in a forward direction.	Proposal complies.			
	Maximum gradient to be 20%	Maximum gradient is 25%		\boxtimes	
	Basement parking is mandatory for all residential flat buildings and multi-dwelling developments within the R4 zone.	Basement parking provided	\boxtimes		
1.12	Universal Housing and Accessibility				
	15% of units shall be adaptable units Class B.	This control does not apply to boarding houses. The proposal includes 2 accessible rooms as required by the BCA.			\boxtimes
6.0	Residential Flat Buildings Whilst there are no specific DCP control residential flat buildings in Part B are desired future character of the area with to the site.	relevant to the assessment in the	hat they	establi	ish the
6.1	Lot Size and Frontage Minimum lot frontage for residential flat	Cardigan Street frontage is	<u> </u>		
	buildings is 24m or 28m	13.41 m			
	Residential flat buildings are not permitted on battleaxe lots	Subject site is not a battleaxe lot			\boxtimes
	Maximum site coverage of any residential flat development shall not exceed 30%	The proposal has a site coverage of 35% (148.4 / 422.5)		\boxtimes	
6.3	Setbacks and Separation		Т		
	Front setback from principal street minimum 6m	6 m proposed.	\boxtimes		
	Front setback from secondary street minimum 4m	N/A			
	Minimum rear setback required: Up to four storeys – 20%	Required = 6.406 m Proposed = 6 m		\boxtimes	

	Five storeys or more – 30%				
0.1	Side setback minimum 3m	3 m to residential floors.	\boxtimes		
6.4	Minimum building separation For residential up to 4 storeys • 12m between habitable rooms and balconies • 9m between habitable rooms and balconies and non-habitable rooms • 6m between non-habitable rooms For residential between 5-8 storeys • 18 m between habitable rooms and balconies • 13 m between habitable rooms and balconies and non-habitable rooms • 9 m between non-habitable rooms.	Existing 4 storey RFB at 71-75 Clyde Street has a setback to the common boundary of approximately 4 m. As such, building separation is 10 m which does not comply. This is considered satisfactory as the proposal provides for its share of building separation in this case. South Existing 4 storey RFB at 72-78 Cardigan Street has setback of approximately 4.5 m to the common boundary. The resultant building separation is 7.5 m which does not comply with the control. Given the lack of landscaping provided within the setback, and the adverse overshadowing impacts detailed above, this is considered unsupportable and is included as a reason for refusal in the draft determination. North Existing RFB at 64-68 Cardigan Street has setback of approximately 4 m to the common boundary. The resultant building separation is 7 m which does not comply with the control. Given the lack of landscaping provided within this setback and resultant visual and acoustic privacy impacts, the non-compliance is not considered supportable.			
	Side and rear boundary setbacks shall be landscaped and may include private courtyards, communal open space and clothes drying facilities	The amended plans provide for a suitably landscaped rear setback. However, there is no screen planting provided to either of the side setbacks.		\boxtimes	
	One side setback may be used for access and parking if required, provided that a landscape buffer with a minimum width of 1m is provided to the side boundary	1 m landscaped buffer provided.			
	The minimum setback for basement and semi-basement levels to side and rear boundaries of an allotment is 3 m	2.166 m setback provided between basement and rear boundary. Side setbacks range from 410 mm and 1 m.		\boxtimes	

	A minimum upper storey setback of 3m is required for all floors above 4	4 storeys proposed.			\boxtimes
	storeys.				
	Building height				
	Maximum building height in storeys shall be provided in accordance with the table below:	4 storey building proposed			
	Permitted Height (storeys) Height Storeys 9m 1 11m 2 12.5m 3 15m 4 18m 5 21m 6 24 m 7				
	Maximum 4 storeys permitted in 15m height limit area	4 storeys proposed.	\boxtimes		
	Maximum internal plan depth of 18m	7.39 m proposed	\boxtimes		
	Communal open space to be provided behind the building line in one unbroken parcel with minimum dimensions of 4m	Proposal complies with communal open space requirements under SEPP ARH			\boxtimes
	COS to have minimum area of 10m ² per dwelling or 30% of site area	Proposal complies with communal open space requirements under SEPP ARH			\boxtimes
	The minimum floor to ceiling heights shall be: • 2.7 metres for habitable rooms. • 2.4 metres for non-habitable rooms. 2.4 metres for the second storey section of two storey units if 50% or more of the apartment has a 2.7 metre minimum ceiling height.	The proposal will not achieve 2.7 m ceiling heights as the allowance between floors is only 2.95 m. This will result in inadequate internal amenity for occupants.		\boxtimes	
	Attics are permissible in RFBs	No attics proposed			\boxtimes
6.7	Building appearance				
	Facades to be composed with an appropriate scale, rhythm and proportion	The design is not in harmony with the existing residential flat buildings on adjacent sites, being significantly higher and lacking in articulation to the façade.		\boxtimes	
6.8	Roof design is to respond to the orientation of the site through using eaves and skillion roofs to respond to sun access. Building entry and pedestrian access	Parapet roof form proposed which does not provide any protection from northerly or westerly solar access.			
0.0	Building entries shall be visible from	Building entry is visible from			
	the street, sheltered and well lit	the street, sheltered and well lit.		\boxtimes	
	Main building entry is to be separate from car park entry	Separate pedestrian path provided, however there is no allowance for disabled access.		\boxtimes	
	Only basement car parking is	Basement level parking provided	\boxtimes		
	permitted for residential flat buildings Where possible, vehicular parking				\boxtimes

	entries shall be located off secondary			
	streets.			
7.0	Controls for landlocked sites			
	Developing existing land locked sites			
	Development proposals involving existing land locked and isolated sites shall be assessed on their merit. Proposals shall achieve a satisfactory level of amenity, privacy, solar access, landscaping and setbacks and shall not detract from the character of the streetscape. Note: • It is likely that development of existing isolated sites may not achieve the maximum FSR & height potential. • An existing landlocked site is a site that is limited in its development potential by either an existing higher density development or an existing, current development consent for higher density development and is unable to be consolidated with adjoining properties for residential flat development due to such development or consents.	The proposed development does not achieve a satisfactory level of solar access, privacy or amenity for either the existing adjacent dwellings or the proposed development. The proposed development does not respect the character of the streetscape. This is included as a reason for refusal in the draft determination.		