

HOLROYD DEVELOPMENT CONTROL PLAN 2013**Part A – General Controls****2.4 Access: Vehicular Crossings, Splay Corners, Kerb & Guttering**

Control	Provided	Complies (Yes/No)
VC to be reconstructed if in poor condition, damaged or design doesn't comply (check on site)	1 x new VC is proposed to the Birmingham Street frontage	Yes
Avoid services/facilities in road reserve, existing trees, pedestrian crossing, pram ramps etc or condition their relocation (check on site and survey plan)	Proposed VC to Birmingham Street is not considered to create an unacceptable impact	Yes
Corner sites VC to be min. 6m from the tangent point	Compliant	Yes
Corner sites require 3m x 3m (residential) and 4m x 4m (commercial) splay corner to be dedicated	Proposed splay corner is considered appropriate subject to conditions	Yes

3.3 Car Parking, Dimensions & Gradient

Controls	Complies (Yes/No)
Min. clear length 5.5m (5.4m AS2890.1-2004)	Yes
Min. clear width 2.4m for open space; 3m for between walls.	Yes
Min. clearance height 2.3m	Yes

3.5 Access, Maneuvering and Layout

Controls	Complies (Yes/No)
Minimum 1.5m setback from side property boundaries	Compliant

3.6 Parking for the Disabled

Control	Required	Provided	Complies (Yes/No)
2 spaces per 100 spaces up to 400, and 1 per 100 thereafter, or part thereof	2 accessible spaces required.	1 disable spaces provided	No, but given scale of development provision of one accessible space is considered satisfactory

6.3/6.4 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan

Comment: Council's Environmental Health Unit has assessed the submitted erosion and sediment control plan to be acceptable, subject to conditions.

7 Stormwater Management:

Comment: The plans submitted for stormwater management of the proposed development has been reviewed by Council's Development Engineer and are considered unacceptable as per the below comments:

1. *The submitted stormwater plan revealed a new suspended carpark slab and driveway with associated suspended concrete slab connecting to the buildings encroaching over Council's drainage easement that is unacceptable. No building/structure will be permitted over Council drainage easements.*
2. *The submitted stormwater plan has not clearly demonstrated how to manage the overland flow on site. Details and drawings of the works required to convey the 1% AEP stormwater overland flow through the site ensuring that the neighbouring properties do not suffer any increase in water levels or flooding following construction of the proposed structures.*

Note:

- *A plan showing the lift shaft, piers details, and their locations in accordance with the hydraulic flood modelling (HEC-RAS) shall be provided.*
- *The flood modelling (Post-Development) shall demonstrates/indicates any structures as*

obstruction within the overland flowpath accordingly.

- *Spot levels over the Council's drainage easement and Overland flowpath shall be provided and shown on the plan.*

As an amendment of the stormwater plan will be required, the following shall also be addressed:

3. *The OSD catchment plan shows the proposed building/parking north of Council's drainage easement is to be proposed drains into the OSD tank south of Council's drainage easement. However, the submitted stormwater plan has not reflected this accordingly.*

Note:

- *Council is generally not supported any stormwater line encroaching into Council's drainage easement subject to approval by Council's Manager of Engineering, Traffic.*
- *The OSD summary calculation sheet and the OSD design shall be revised accordingly after the catchment plan been revised.*
- *Downpipes with associated stormwater lines to the proposed OSD system shall be shown on the OSD plan.*

4. *The applicant's engineer shall demonstrate overflow or surcharge water from the OSD tank will not entering to the lobby, storage room, lift and direct to the neighbouring property.*

- 9 External Road Noise & Vibration:** Development ≤60m of a railway line and/or adjacent to a classified road to be supported by an acoustic report.

Comment: The proposed development is located >60m from a railway line and is not located adjacent to a classified road. Despite this Council's EHU has reviewed the acoustic arrangements and confirmed these are satisfactory.

- 11 Site Waste Minimisation and Management Plan (SWMMP)**

Comment: The plans are considered acceptable by Council's Waste Management Officer, subject to conditions of consent.

Part B – Residential

1. General Residential Controls

1.1 Building Materials

Comment: The proposed materials and finishes to be used are considered acceptable

1.2 Fences

Controls	Complies (Yes/No)
Max. 1.5m	Not applicable
Front fences solid ≤1m and be ≥50% transparent to 1.5m	Not applicable

1.3 Views

Comment: It is not considered that the proposal will take away from views of any significance for any adjoining properties. While it is acknowledged that the size of the proposal is a significant increase to the existing situation on the subject site, the zoning does allow for developments of this size with the expectation that the adjoining properties shall also redevelop as per the applicable development standards for their site.

1.4 Privacy

Control	Required	Provided	Complies (Yes/No)
C10. Developments shall utilise the site and building layout to maximise the potential for acoustic privacy by providing adequate building separation within the development and from neighbouring buildings.			No

1.8 Sunlight Access

Control	Provided	Complies (Yes/No)
1 main living area of existing adjacent dwellings to receive 3 hours direct sunlight between 9am and 4pm, 22 June.	Minimum 3 hours sunlight provided to neighbouring dwellings main living area.	Yes
Min. 50% of required POS of existing adjacent dwellings to receive 3 hours direct sunlight between 9am and 4pm, 22 June	Minimum 3 hours sunlight provided to 50% of neighbouring sites POS.	Yes

1.11 Vehicular Access and Driveways

Control	Provided	Complies (Yes/No)
6m wide at boundary.	5.7m	Yes
Council favours the use of a central under-building access driveway.	One driveway which is a central at grade driveway.	Yes

1.12 Universal Housing and Accessibility

Control	Provided	Complies (Yes/No)
15% of units shall be adaptable units.	The application requires the provision of 1 adaptable units, 1 adaptable units have been indicated on the architectural plans.	Yes

6.0 Residential Flat Buildings**6.1 Lot Size and Frontage:**

Control	Provided	Complies (Yes/No)
Min. lot frontage is: • 24m (if a highlighted lot in Appendix I); or	15.24	No
Not permitted on battleaxe lots.		N/A
The proposal shall not limit future development potential of adjoining lots i.e. landlocking	The applicant has partially satisfied the DCP requirements to allow the supporting of site isolation. They have demonstrated attempts to procure the neighbouring site. As documented the owners of this adjoining property have not responded to these offers. However no concept plans of the development potential for the adjoining site has been provided.	No

6.2 Site Coverage: Max. 30% of the site area

Comment: The proposal required a maximum 183.96m² site coverage the proposal has a **non-compliant** site coverage of 348.56m².

6.3 Setbacks

Control	Provided	Complies (Yes/No)
Principal St: 6m and correspond with existing building setback.	6m in keeping with the existing onsite setback	Yes
Secondary St: 4m.		N/A
Side: 3m.	Not applicable as Apartment Design Guide prevails	N/A
Rear: • ≤ 4 storeys – 20% of the site length or 6m, whichever is greater. Req. = 8m • ≥ 5 storeys – 30% of the site length. Req. = 12m	Not applicable as Apartment Design Guide prevails	N/A
Basement: 3m to side and rear boundaries.	Not applicable as Apartment Design Guide prevails	N/A
All floors >4 storeys to be setback 3m.	Not applicable as Apartment Design Guide prevails	N/A

6.4 Building Height

Control	Provided	Complies (Yes/No)						
Maximum building height in storeys shall be provided in accordance with the table below:	The application is permitted to 15m in height and 4 storeys of building with rooftop communal openspace.	Yes						
<table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Permitted Height (storeys)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Height</th> <th>Storeys</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Permitted Height (storeys)		Height	Storeys				
Permitted Height (storeys)								
Height	Storeys							

	9m	1		
	11m	2		
	12.5m	3		
	15m	4		
	18m	5		
	21m	6		
	24 m	7		
The minimum floor to ceiling heights shall be:				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 			All residential levels are provided with a floor to ceiling height of 2.7m	Yes

Attics

Control	Provided	Complies (Yes/No)
Attics are permissible in RFBs.	No attics proposed	N/A
Min. wall height of 1.5m with min 30° ceiling slope.	No attics proposed	N/A

6.7 Building Appearance - Facade

Control	Provided	Complies (Yes/No)
Appropriate scale, rhythm and proportion, responding to the building use and contextual character.	The design of the front façade is considered to be of an acceptable style.	Yes
Walls to street to be articulated by windows, verandahs, balconies or blade walls. Max. projection of 600mm forward of building line.		
Buildings on corner sites to address both frontages.		N/A

Building Appearance – Roof Design

Control	Provided	Complies (Yes/No)
Roofs shall relate to the built form, context and character of the street.	Flat roof design utilized for COS	Yes
Pitched roofs will not be permitted:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where it doesn't relate to the urban context. Where it increase the visual bulk of the building. Where land has been rezoned high density. 	A pitched roof is not proposed	N/A
Max. 3m height for roofs from ceiling line to ridge.	No pitched roof proposed	N/A

6.8 Building entry and pedestrian access

Control	Provided	Complies (Yes/No)
Shall be clearly identifiable, sheltered, well lit and visible from the street.	The main pedestrian entry point is at the end of a pathway however this is to the undercroft car park and not into the building and is such not considered satisfactory.	No
Main entry to be separate from carparks or car entries.	Main entry areas are separate from car park	Yes

6.9 Parking

Control	Provided	Complies (Yes/No)
Shall be maintained to a basement.	At grade undercroft car parking proposed.	No
Vehicle entries shall be setback from the main façade and security doors shall be provided to	Satisfactory design	Yes

car park entries to improve the appearance of vehicle entries		
One car wash bay shall be provided for all developments having 10 or more dwellings (not a visitor space).	6 units proposed	N/A

Vehicular access

Control	Provided	Complies (Yes/No)
Shall be located off secondary streets, where possible.		N/A
Direct access shall be provided between the car park to the lobby.	At grade car park has direct access to tower 01 and 02 staircase/lifts.	Yes
Access to resident parking areas shall be restricted via a security gate or door.	A security door has been identified	Yes

6.10 Dwelling Mix

Control	Provided	Complies (Yes/No)
A mix of residential dwelling types between studio, one, two, and three plus-bedroom dwellings shall be provided within each residential flat building particularly in larger developments.	One and two bedroom	Yes
The combined total number of studio and one-bedroom dwellings shall not exceed 20% of the total number of dwellings, within any single site.	50% of apartments are 1 bedroom, 3 of 6.	No
Where possible, a mix of one and three bedroom dwellings should be located on the ground floor where accessibility is easily achieved for families and the elderly.	No ground floor apartments proposed.	N/A

6.11 Internal circulation

Control	Provided	Complies (Yes/No)
All common facilities must be accessible.	Lift access provided to all levels of the development.	Yes
All staircases are to be internal.	All staircases are provided within the proposed built form	Yes
Sensitive noise rooms shall be located away from less sensitive noise rooms, corridors and stairwells.	Satisfactory	Yes

6.12 Facilities and amenities

Control	Provided	Complies (Yes/No)
Each unit shall be provided with a laundry within the unit.	Laundry facilities are provided to each unit	Yes
Open air clothes drying facilities shall be provided in a sunny, ventilated area, screened from the public domain.	Open air drying facilities are provided	Yes
Clothes drying areas shall be screened by 1.5m high walls.	Clothes drying area is proposed	Yes
Mailboxes shall not be at 90° to the street and shall be integrated with the overall design.	Provided along pedestrian accessway the entry portico	Yes

6.15 Waste Management – Bin Storage

Control	Provided	Complies (Yes/No)
Bin storage must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be located behind the building line and screened from the street and any public place. Be accessible and relatively close to each dwelling. 	The garbage room is located on the ground floor behind the building line and is enclosed. Its position is considered satisfactory	Yes

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not impact upon the amenity of adjoining premises or dwellings within the development, i.e. odour. 		
Allow for unobstructed access that does not exceed a grade of 1:8 for bins to be wheeled to the collection point.	Satisfactory design	Yes

7. Landlocked Sites

Control	Provided	Complies (Yes/No)
Residential R4 zoned lots should not result in the creation of landlocked sites.	Landlocking of No. 9 Birmingham Street is created by the proposal. Amalgamation not successful despite applicant attempts.	No
Where adjacent sites are developed concurrently, amalgamation or integration of public domain / open spaces shall be explored.	Not applicable	Not applicable
Proposals that create landlocked sites shall: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide two written independent valuations representing the affected sites value. Provide evidence that a reasonable offer has been made to the affected owners. Demonstrate how future development on the isolated sites will achieve a high quality streetscape. 	The proposal has provided the requisite valuation documentation, however they have not provided conceptual plans for the prospective development potential for the adjoining site at No. 9 Birmingham Street.	No

Existing Landlocked Sites

Control	Provided	Complies (Yes/No)
Existing landlocked sites shall be assessed on their merits.	Not applicable	Not applicable
Proposals shall achieve a satisfactory level of amenity, privacy, solar access, landscaping and setbacks and shall not detract from the streetscape.	Not applicable	Not applicable

PART E

1.2 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Comment: The subject application was notified between 28 June to 19 July 2017. No submissions were received during this period.

PART J – Site Specific Guidelines

1 – 8 SITE SPECIFIC GUIDELINES

Comment: Not applicable in this instance