Attachment 6 - Holroyd Development Control Plan 2013 compliance table

No.	Clause	Comment	Yes	No	N/A			
	A – GENERAL CONTROLS							
1	Subdivision							
	Subdivision not proposed.				\square			
2	Roads and Access							
2.4	Access: Vehicular Crossings, Splay Corners, Kerb & Guttering							
	VC to be reconstructed if in poor condition, damaged or design doesn't comply.	New VC proposed along Beaufort Street. Design does not comply with Council's requirements – Refer to Traffic Comments.		\boxtimes				
	Avoid services/facilities in road reserve, existing trees, pedestrian crossing, pram ramps etc.	New VC location does not encroach any existing services or utilities.	\boxtimes					
	Corner sites VC to be min. 6m from the tangent point.	VC is located greater than 6m from tangent point.						
	Corner sites require 3m x 3m (residential) and 4m x 4m (commercial) splay corner to be dedicated.	The proposal provides for a 3m x 3m splay.	\boxtimes					
2.7	Road Widening							
	The subject site is affected by 1.5m wide Beaufort Street and Berwick Street – Ro street frontages on plans in accordance	ad widening is shown to both	\boxtimes					
3	Car Parking							
3.1	Minimum Parking Spaces							
	 Car Parking – Child Care Centre Minimum spaces required: 1 per 4 children Required = 76 children / 4 = 19 spaces 	19 parking spaces for the child care centre are provided on Basement Level 1 (including 1 accessible space)						
	Car Parking - Residential Minimum spaces required: 1 bedroom = 0.8 1 bedroom = 1 2 bedroom = 1.2 3 + bedroom = 1.5 Visitor/dwelling = 0.2	Refer to ARH SEPP compliance table.			\boxtimes			
2.2	 Bicycle Parking - Residential Minimum residential spaces required: Studio / 1 bed. unit = 0.5 2 bed unit = 0.5 3+ bed unit = 0.5 Visitor = 0.1 per unit. 	Residential = $18 \times 0.5 = 9$ Visitor = $18 \times 0.1 = 1.8$ Total required = 10.8 (rounded up to 11) Provided = 7 bicycle spaces						
3.3	Car Parking, Dimensions & Gradient Council's Traffic Engineer reviewed the	application and advised that the						
	proposal is not supported, and traffic and of the reasons of refusal within the draft	d parking matters raised form part		\square				

Driveways shall be setback a minimum of 1.5m from the side boundary. Driveway is setback 1.255m from eastern boundary. 3.6 Parking for the Disabled 2 spaces per 100 spaces up to 400, and 1 per 100 thereafter, or part thereot. 1 accessible residential car space and 1 accessible vision 4 Tree and Landscape Works Image: control of the proposal and advised that the proposal is acceptable subject to conditions, should conserve the granted. 5 Biodiversity Imagement The subject site is not identified on the Environmentally Sensitive Land Map and is not within an E2 - Environmental Conservation zone. Imagement 6.1 Retaining Walls Retaining Walls Imagement Retaining Walls proposed vary from 0.3m-0.55m in height. Full details of any retaining walls greater than 1m in height are to be provided prior to the issue of a construction certificate, should consent granted. Imagement 6.3 Soil Management Imagement Imagement 7 Stormwater Management Imagement 7 Stormwater Management Imagement Imagement 6.3 Retaining walls proposed vary from 0.3m-0.55m in height. Retaining walls proposed development cannot be supported. Engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal within the Draft Notice of Determination. Imagement 7 Stormwater Management Imageme	3.5	Access, Maneuvering and Layout				
of 1.5m from the side boundary. eastern boundary. eastern boundary. Image: Construction of the construction of			Driveway is setback 1.255m from			
3.6 Parking for the Disabled 2 spaces per 100 spaces up to 400, and 1 per 100 thereafter, or part thereot. 1 accessible residential car space and 1 accessible vision 4 Tree and Landscape Works Image: Control Car parking space for child care center provided. 4 Tree and Landscape Works Image: Control Care parking space for child care center provided. 5 Biodiversity Image: Control Care parking space for child care center provided. 6 Soil Management. Image: Control Care parking space for child care center provided. 6.1 Retaining Walls proposed vary from 0.3m-0.55m in height. Full details of any retaining walls greater than 1m in height are to be provided prior to the issue of a construction certificate, should consent granted. 6.3 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan The subjicant has submitted an erosion and sediment control plan which is satisfactory. 7 Stormwater Management Council's Development Engineer has reviewed the proposal and outlined that proposed development Engineer for refusal within the Drait Notice of Determination. 8 Flood Prone Land 7 Stormwater Management Engineer if marpinering matters raised for level (FEL) shal be equal to grant than the WHe levels as identified in Council's mapping system – The variation of levels baing in the extent of approximately 6.0m. In addition, the proposal is not supported and engineering matters raised form part of t					\square	
2 spaces per 100 spaces up to 400, and 1 per 100 thereafter, or part thereof. 1 accessible residential car space and 1 accessible visitor car parking space for child care 4 Tree and Landscape Works centre provided. Council's Tree Management Officer has assessed the proposal and advised that the proposal is acceptable subject to conditions, should consent be granted. Image: Condition of the proposal and advised that the proposal is acceptable subject to conditions, should 5 Biod/wersity The subject site is not identified on the Environmentally Sensitive Land Map and is not within an E2 - Environmental Conservation zone. Image: Condition of the text of the						
2 spaces per 100 spaces up to 400, and 1 per 100 thereafter, or part thereof. 1 accessible residential car space and 1 accessible visitor car parking space for child care 4 Tree and Landscape Works centre provided. Council's Tree Management Officer has assessed the proposal and advised that the proposal is acceptable subject to conditions, should consent be granted. Image: Condition of the proposal and advised that the proposal is acceptable subject to conditions, should 5 Biod/wersity The subject site is not identified on the Environmentally Sensitive Land Map and is not within an E2 - Environmental Conservation zone. Image: Condition of the text of the						
1 per 100 thereafter, or part thereof. space and 1 accessible visitor Required: 2 accessible spaces centre provided. 4 Tree and Landscape Works Councils Tree Management Officer has assessed the proposal and advised that the proposal is acceptable subject to conditions, should consert be granted. Image: Councils Councis Councils Co	3.6					1
car parking space for child care carre provided. 4 Tree and Landscape Works centre provided. 6 Council's Tree Management Officer has assessed the proposal and advised that the proposal is acceptable subject to conditions, should consent be granted. centre provided. 5 Biodiversity						
A control is Tree Management Officer has assessed the proposal and advised that the proposal is acceptable subject to conditions, should consent be granted. 5 Biodiversity The subject site is not identified on the Environmentally Sensitive Land Map and is not within an E2 - Environmental Conservation zone. 6 Soil Management 6.1 Retaining Walls Retaining walls proposed vary from 0.3m-0.55m in height. Full details of any retaining walls greater than 1m in height are to be provided prior to the issue of a construction certificate, should consent granted. 6.3 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan The applicant has submitted an erosion and sediment control plan which is satisfactory. 7 Stormwater Management Council's Development Engineer has reviewed the proposal and outlined that proposed development cannot be supported. Engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal within the Draft Notice of Determination. 8 Flood Prone Land The submitted Survey Plan does not correspond with levels as identified in Council's Development Engineer for comment who has outlined that the submitted Survey Plan does not correspond with levels as identified in Council's Development trengend within the PMF level in accordance with the Flood Prone Land or greater than the PMF level in accordance with the Flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. In this regard, the finshed Care centre which is identified with proposal and there is inadequate information to support the development. In this regard, the proposal fails to provide the required levels for the proposal and there is inadequate		1 per 100 thereafter, or part thereof.	space and 1 accessible visitor	\square		
4 Tree and Landscape Works Council's Tree Management Officer has assessed the proposal and advised that the proposal is acceptable subject to conditions, should one and is not identified on the Environmentally Sensitive Land Map and is not within an E2 - Environmental Conservation zone. 5 Biodiversity The subject site is not identified on the Environmentally Sensitive Land Map and is not within an E2 - Environmental Conservation zone. 6. Soil Management 6.1 Retaining walls proposed vary from 0.3m-0.55m in height. Full details of any retaining walls greater than 1m in height are to be provided prior to the issue of a construction certificate, should consent granted. 6.3 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan The applicant has submitted an erosion and sediment control plan which is satisfactory. □ 7 Stormwater Management □ Council's Development Engineer has reviewed the proposal and outlined that proposal development cannot be supported. Engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal within the Draft Notice of Determination. 8 Flood Prone Land 8 Flood Prone Land 9 Applicant has reported or greater than the PME level in accordance with the Flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. Given the submitted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal reported and engineer for comment who has outlined that the submitted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal fails to provide the requirel levels for the proposal			car parking space for child care			
4 Tree and Landscape Works Council's Tree Management Officer has assessed the proposal and advised that the proposal is acceptable subject to conditions, should one and is not identified on the Environmentally Sensitive Land Map and is not within an E2 - Environmental Conservation zone. 5 Biodiversity The subject site is not identified on the Environmentally Sensitive Land Map and is not within an E2 - Environmental Conservation zone. 6. Soil Management 6.1 Retaining walls proposed vary from 0.3m-0.55m in height. Full details of any retaining walls greater than 1m in height are to be provided prior to the issue of a construction certificate, should consent granted. 6.3 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan The applicant has submitted an erosion and sediment control plan which is satisfactory. □ 7 Stormwater Management □ Council's Development Engineer has reviewed the proposal and outlined that proposal development cannot be supported. Engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal within the Draft Notice of Determination. 8 Flood Prone Land 8 Flood Prone Land 9 Applicant has reported or greater than the PME level in accordance with the Flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. Given the submitted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal reported and engineer for comment who has outlined that the submitted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal fails to provide the requirel levels for the proposal		Required: 2 accessible spaces	centre provided.			
Councils Tree Management Officer has assessed the proposal and advised that the proposal is acceptable subject to conditions, should one sented. Image: Council Counci Council Council Counci Council Council Council Council Council Co	4					
advised that the proposal is acceptable subject to conditions, should □ 5 Biodiversity The subject site is not identified on the Environmentally Sensitive Land Map and is not within an E2 - Environmental Conservation zone. □ 6 Soil Management □ □ 6.1 Retaining Walls proposed vary from 0.3m-0.55m in height. Full details of any retaining walls greater than 1m in height are to be provided prior to the issue of a construction certificate, should consent granted. □ □ 6.3 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan □ □ □ The applicant has submitted an erosion and sediment control plan which is satisfactory. □ □ □ 7 Stormwater Management □ □ □ □ Council's Development Engineer has reviewed the proposal and outlined that proposed development connot be supported. Engineering matter raised form part of the reasons for refusal within the Draft Notice of □ □ □ 8 Flood Prone Land □ □ □ □ 8 Flood Prone Land □ □ □ □ □ 8 Flood Prone Land □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ <th></th> <th></th> <th>has assessed the proposal and</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>			has assessed the proposal and			
consert be granted.				\square		
5 Biodiversity The subject site is not identified on the Environmentally Sensitive Land Map and is not within an E2 - Environmental Conservation zone. Imagement 6.1 Retaining Walls proposed vary from 0.3m-0.55m in height. Full details of any retaining walls greater than 1m in height are to be provided prior to the issue of a construction certificate, should consent granted. Imagement 6.3 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Imagement 7 Stormwater Management Imagement Council's Development Engineer has reviewed the proposal and outlined that proposed development cannot be supported. Engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal within the Draft Notice of Determination. Imagement 8 Flood Prone Land Imagement the submitted Survey Plan does not correspond with levels as identified in Council's mapping system – The variation of levels being in the extent of approximately 6.0m. In addition, the proposal comprises of a child care centre which is identified within the sensitive land use category in Table 7 – Land Use Categories for Development upon Flood Prone Land – Section 8 – Flood Prone Land or 4 of HOCP 2013. In this regard, the finished floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to or greater than the PMF level in accordance with the Flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. In this regard, the insched din engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. 9 Managing External Road Noise Imagement form the stres of the proposal and there is inadequate information to support the d						
The subject site is not identified on the Environmentally Sensitive Land Map and is not within an E2 - Environmental Conservation zone. Imagement 6.1 Retaining Walls proposed vary from 0.3m-0.55m in height. Full details of any retaining walls greater than 1 m in height are to be provided prior to the issue of a construction certificate, should consent granted. Imagement 6.3 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Imagement The applicant has submitted an erosion and sediment control plan which is satisfactory. Imagement 7 Stormwater Management Imagement Council's Development Engineer has reviewed the proposal and outlined that proposed development cannot be supported. Engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal within the Draft Notice of Determination. Imagement 8 Flood Prone Land Imagement Engineer for comment who has outlined that the submitted Survey Plan does not correspond with levels as identified in Council's mapping system – The variation of levels being in the extent of approximately 6.0m. In addition, the proposal comprises of a child care centre which is identified within the sensitive land use category in Table 7 – Land Use Categories for Development upon Flood Prone Land – Section 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDCP 2013. In this regard, the finished floor level (FLLs) shall be equal to or greater than the PMF level in accordance with the Flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. In this regard, the finished engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. 9 Managing	5					
and is not within an E2 - Environmental Conservation zone. Imagement 6 Soil Management 6.1 Retaining Walls Retaining Walls proposed vary from 0.3m-0.55m in height. Full details of any retaining walls greater than 1m in height are to be provided prior to the issue of a construction certificate, should consent granted. 6.3 Ercsion and Sediment Control Plan The applicant has submitted an erosion and sediment control plan which is satisfactory. Image: Control Plan 7 Stormwater Management Image: Control Plan Council's Development Engineer has reviewed the proposal and outlined that proposed development cannot be supported. Engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal within the Draft Notice of Determination. Image: Council's Development Engineer for comment who has outlined that the submitted Survey Plan does not correspond with levels as identified in Council's mapping system – The variation of levels being in the extent of approximately 6.0m. In addition, the proposal comprises of a child care centre which is identified within the sensitive land use category in Table 7 – Land Use Categories for Development upon Flood Prone Land – Section and Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal fails to provide the required levels for the proposal and there is inadequate information to support the development. In this regard, the finished floor level (FLs) shall be equal to or greater than the PMF level in accordance with the Flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. Chis regard, the finished diaft notice of determination. 9 Management R	5		Environmentally Consitive Land Man			
and is not within an E2 - Environmental Conservation Zone. Imagement 6.1 Retaining Walls Retaining walls proposed vary from 0.3m-0.55m in height. Full details of any retaining walls greater than 1m in height are to be provided prior to the issue of a construction certificate, should consent granted. Imagement 6.3 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Imagement Imagement 7 Stormwater Management Imagement Imagement Council's Development Engineer has reviewed the proposal and outlined that proposed development cannot be supported. Engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal within the Draft Notice of Determination. Imagement Imagement 8 Flood Prone Land Imagement for comment who has outlined that the submitted Survey Plan does not correspond with levels as identified in Council's mapping system – The variation of levels being in the extent of approximately 6.0m. In addition, the proposal comprises of a child care centre which is identified within the sensitive land use category in Table 7 – Land Use Categories for Development Longineer for Comment who has outlined floor level (FFLS) shall be equal to or greater than the PMF level in accordance with the Flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. In this regard, the finished floor level (FFLS) shall be equal to or greater than the PMF level in accordance with the Flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. Given the submitted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal fails to provide the regime matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>\square</th>						\square
6.1 Retaining Walls Retaining walls proposed vary from 0.3m-0.55m in height. Full details of any retaining walls greater than 1m in height are to be provided prior to the issue of a construction certificate, should consent granted. 6.3 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan The applicant has submitted an erosion and sediment control plan which is satisfactory. □ 7 Stormwater Management Council's Development Engineer has reviewed the proposal and outlined that proposed development cannot be supported. Engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal within the Draft Notice of Determination. 8 Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in Council's mapping. The proposal was referred to Council's Development Engineer for comment who has outlined that the submitted Survey Plan does not correspond with levels as identified in Council's mapping system – The variation of levels being in the extent of approximately 6.0m. In addition, the proposal comprises of a child care centre which is identified within the sensitive land use category in Table 7 – Land Use Categories for Development upon Flood Prone Land – Section 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDCP 2013. In this regard, the finished □ Given the submitted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal is not supported and engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. 9 Managing External Road Noise The site is not affected by road or rail noise. □ □ □	_		li Conservation zone.			
Retaining walls proposed vary from 0.3m-0.55m in height. Full details of any retaining walls greater than 1m in height are to be provided prior to the issue of a construction certificate, should consent granted. 6.3 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan The applicant has submitted an erosion and sediment control plan which is satisfactory. Image: Control Plan with the applicant has submitted an erosion and sediment control plan which is satisfactory. 7 Stormwater Management Council's Development Engineer has reviewed the proposal and outlined that proposed development cannot be supported. Engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal within the Draft Notice of Determination. 8 Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in Council's mapping. The proposal was referred to Council's Development Engineer for comment who has outlined that the submitted Survey Plan does not correspond with levels as identified in Council's mapping system — The variation of levels being in the extent of approximately 6.0m. In addition, the proposal comprises of a child care centre which is identified within the sensitive land use category in Table 7 – Land Use Categories for Development upon Flood Prone Land = Section 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDCP 2013. In this regard, the finished Image: Steps with the flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. Given the submitted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal is not supported and engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. 9 Managing External Road Noise The site is and affe		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
Full details of any retaining walls greater than 1m in height are to be provided prior to the issue of a construction certificate, should consent granted. Image: Construction certificate, should consent granted. 6.3 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Image: Construction certificate, should consent granted. 7 Stormwater Management Image: Construction cannot be supported. Engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal within the Draft Notice of Determination. Image: Construction cannot be supported. Engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal within the Draft Notice of Determination. 8 Flood Prone Land Image: Construction correspond with levels as identified in Council's mapping. The proposal was referred to Council's Development Engineer for comment who has outlined that the submitted Survey Plan does not correspond with levels as identified in Council's mapping system – The variation of levels being in the extent of approximately 6.0m. In addition, the proposal comprises of a child care centre which is identified within the sensitive land use category in Table 7 – Land Use Categories for Development upon Flood Prone Land – Section 8 – Flood Prone Land on Part A of HDCP 2013. In this regard, the finished floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to or greater than the PMF level in accordance with the Flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. Given the submitted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal fails to provide the required levels for the proposal and there is inadequate information to support the development. In this regard, the proposal is not supported and engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. Image: Contadd Categories for the	6.1					
provided prior to the issue of a construction certificate, should consent granted. Image: Construction Construction Certificate, Should consent granted. 6.3 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan The applicant has submitted an erosion and sediment control plan which is satisfactory. Image: Construction Control Plan which is satisfactory. 7 Stormwater Management Image: Council's Development Engineer has reviewed the proposal and outlined that proposed development cannot be supported. Engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal within the Draft Notice of Determination. 8 Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in Council's mapping. The proposal was referred to Council's Development Engineer for comment who has outlined that the submitted Survey Plan does not correspond with levels as identified in Council's mapping system – The variation of levels being in the extent of approximately 6.0m. In addition, the proposal comprises of a child care centre which is identified within the sensitive land use category in Table 7 – Land Use Categories for Development Lop Prone Land - Section 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDCP 2013. In this regard, the finished floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to or greater than the PMF level in accordance with the Flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. Given the submitted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal is not supported and engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. 9 Managing External Road Noise The site is not affected by road or rail noise. Image: Centre and residential apartments ar						
granted. Gaste Construction Central etablic Consent 6.3 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan The applicant has submitted an erosion and sediment control plan which is satisfactory. Image: Consent Control Plan which is satisfactory. 7 Stormwater Management Image: Consent Control Plan Which is satisfactory. 7 Stormwater Management Image: Consent Control Plan Which is satisfactory. 8 Flood Prone Land Image: Consent Control Plan Control Plan Which is solution to be supported. Engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal within the Draft Notice of Determination. 8 Flood Prone Land Image: Control Control Plan Contrel Control Plan Contret is identified within the sensitive land u		Full details of any retaining walls group	eater than 1m in height are to be	\square		
Granted. Grained. 6.3 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan The applicant has submitted an erosion and sediment control plan which is satisfactory. Image: Concol's Development Engineer has reviewed the proposal and outlined that proposed development cannot be supported. Engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal within the Draft Notice of Determination. 8 Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in Council's mapping. The proposal was referred to Council's Development Engineer for comment who has outlined that the submitted Survey Plan does not correspond with levels as identified in Council's mapping system – The variation of levels being in the extent of approximately 6.0m. In addition, the proposal comprises of a child care centre which is identified within the sensitive land use category in Table 7 – Land Use Categories for Development upon Flood Prone Land – Section 8 – Flood Prone Land or greater than the PMF level in accordance with the Flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. In this regard, the finished Importanted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal is not supported and engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. 9 Managing External Road Noise 10 Safety and Security 10 Safety and Security 11 Design new development to reduce the audit apartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses.		provided prior to the issue of a cons	struction certificate, should consent			
6.3 Érosion and Sediment Control Plan The applicant has submitted an erosion and sediment control plan which is satisfactory. 7 Stormwater Management Council's Development Engineer has reviewed the proposal and outlined that proposed development cannot be supported. Engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal within the Draft Notice of Determination. 8 Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in Council's mapping. The proposal was referred to Council's Development Engineer for comment who has outlined that the submitted Survey Plan does not correspond with levels as identified in Council's mapping system – The variation of levels being in the extent of approximately 6.0m. In addition, the proposal comprises of a child care centre which is identified within the sensitive land use category in Table 7 – Land Use Categories for Development upon Flood Prone Land – Section 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDCP 2013. In this regard, the finished floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to or greater than the PMF level in accordance with the Flood Risk Precints (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. Given the submitted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal is not supported and engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. 9 Managing External Road Noise 10 Safety and Security 10 Safety and Security 11 Categories for crime by minimising, removing or concealing apartments are not easily identifiable for the streat and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealment a			,			
The applicant has submitted an erosion and sediment control plan which is satisfactory. Image: Satisfactory. 7 Stormwater Management Council's Development Engineer has reviewed the proposal and outlined that proposed development cannot be supported. Engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal within the Draft Notice of Determination. Image: Satisfactory. 8 Flood Prone Land Image: Satisfactory. The site is identified as flood prone in Council's mapping. The proposal was referred to Council's Development Engineer for comment who has outlined that the submitted Survey Plan does not correspond with levels as identified in Council's mapping system – The variation of levels being in the extent of approximately 6.0m. In addition, the proposal comprises of a child care centre which is identified within the sensitive land use category in Table 7 – Land Use Categories for Development upon Flood Prone Land – Section 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDCP 2013. In this regard, the finished floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to or greater than the PMF level in accordance with the Flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. Given the submitted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal fails to provide the required levels for the proposal and there is inadequate information to support the development. In this regard, the proposal is not supported and engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. 9 Managing External Road Noise The site is not affected by road or rail noise. Image: Concealing apartments are not easily identifiable for the child care centre and residential apartments are not easily iden	6.3	•				
satisfactory. Image: Satisfactory. 7 Stormwater Management Council's Development Engineer has reviewed the proposal and outlined that proposed development cannot be supported. Engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal within the Draft Notice of Determination. 8 Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in Council's mapping. The proposal was referred to Council's Development Engineer for comment who has outlined that the submitted Survey Plan does not correspond with levels as identified in Council's mapping system – The variation of levels being in the extent of approximately 6.0m. In addition, the proposal comprises of a child care centre which is identified within the sensitive land use category in Table 7 – Land Use Categories for Development upon Flood Prone Land – Section 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDCP 2013. In this regard, the flished floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to or greater than the PMF level in accordance with the Flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. Given the submitted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal fails to provide the required levels for the proposal and there is inadequate information to support the development. In this regard, the proposal is not supported and engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. 9 Managing External Road Noise 10 Safety and Security 10 Safety and Security 11 Care centre and residential apartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealiment also due			and sediment control plan which is	\square		
7 Stormwater Management Council's Development Engineer has reviewed the proposal and outlined that proposed development cannot be supported. Engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal within the Draft Notice of Determination. 8 Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in Council's mapping. The proposal was referred to Council's Development Engineer for comment who has outlined that the submitted Survey Plan does not correspond with levels as identified in Council's mapping system – The variation of levels being in the extent of approximately 6.0m. In addition, the proposal comprises of a child care centre which is identified within the sensitive land use category in Table 7 – Land Use Categories for Development upon Flood Prone Land – Section 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDCP 2013. In this regard, the finished floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to or greater than the PMF level in accordance with the Flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. Given the submitted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal fails to provide the required levels for the proposal and there is inadequate information to support the development. In this regard, the proposal is not supported and engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. 9 Managing External Road Noise The site is not affected by road or rail noise. Imaging apartments are not easily identifial gartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealiment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses.			rand sediment control plan which is			
Council's Development Engineer has reviewed the proposal and outlined that proposed development cannot be supported. Engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal within the Draft Notice of Determination. Image: Council's Council's mapping matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal within the Draft Notice of Determination. 8 Flood Prone Land Image: Council's mapping. The proposal was referred to Council's Development Engineer for comment who has outlined that the submitted Survey Plan does not correspond with levels as identified in Council's mapping system – The variation of levels being in the extent of approximately 6.0m. In addition, the proposal comprises of a child care centre which is identified within the sensitive land use category in Table 7 – Land Use Categories for Development upon Flood Prone Land – Section 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDCP 2013. In this regard, the finished floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to or greater than the PMF level in accordance with the Flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. Given the submitted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal fails to provide the required levels for the proposal and there is inadequate information to support the development. In this regard, the proposal is not supported and engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. 9 Managing External Road Noise The site is not affected by road or rail noise. Image: Counce and residential apartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses.	7					
that proposed development cannot be supported. Engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal within the Draft Notice of Determination. Image: Context and Cont	1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	reviewed the proposal and eviliand			
raised form part of the reasons for refusal within the Draft Notice of Determination. Image: Construct Structure 8 Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in Council's mapping. The proposal was referred to Council's Development Engineer for comment who has outlined that the submitted Survey Plan does not correspond with levels as identified in Council's mapping system – The variation of levels being in the extent of approximately 6.0m. In addition, the proposal comprises of a child care centre which is identified within the sensitive land use category in Table 7 – Land Use Categories for Development upon Flood Prone Land – Section 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDCP 2013. In this regard, the finished floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to or greater than the PMF level in accordance with the Flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. Given the submitted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal fails to provide the required levels for the proposal and there is inadequate information to support the development. In this regard, the proposal is not supported and engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. 9 Managing External Road Noise 10 Safety and Security minimising, removing or concealing apartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealement also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses. Incorporate and/or enhance Design does not provide for passive						
Betermination. Betermination. 8 Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in Council's mapping. The proposal was referred to Council's Development Engineer for comment who has outlined that the submitted Survey Plan does not correspond with levels as identified in Council's mapping system – The variation of levels being in the extent of approximately 6.0m. In addition, the proposal comprises of a child care centre which is identified within the sensitive land use category in Table 7 – Land Use Categories for Development upon Flood Prone Land – Section 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDCP 2013. In this regard, the finished floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to or greater than the PMF level in accordance with the Flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. Given the submitted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal is not supported and engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. 9 Managing External Road Noise The site is not affected by road or rail noise. Imaging entries for the child care centre and residential apartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses.					\square	
8 Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in Council's mapping. The proposal was referred to Council's Development Engineer for comment who has outlined that the submitted Survey Plan does not correspond with levels as identified in Council's mapping system – The variation of levels being in the extent of approximately 6.0m. In addition, the proposal comprises of a child care centre which is identified within the sensitive land use category in Table 7 Land Use Categories for Development upon Flood Prone Land – Section 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDCP 2013. In this regard, the finished floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to or greater than the PMF level in accordance with the Flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. Given the submitted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal fails to provide the required levels for the proposal and there is inadequate information to support the development. In this regard, the proposal is not supported and engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. 9 Managing External Road Noise The site is not affected by road or rail noise. Imaging external Road Noise 10 Safety and Security The building entries for the child care centre and residential apartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses.		raised form part of the reasons for				
The site is identified as flood prone in Council's mapping. The proposal was referred to Council's Development Engineer for comment who has outlined that the submitted Survey Plan does not correspond with levels as identified in Council's mapping system – The variation of levels being in the extent of approximately 6.0m. In addition, the proposal comprises of a child care centre which is identified within the sensitive land use category in Table 7 – Land Use Categories for Development upon Flood Prone Land – Section 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDCP 2013. In this regard, the finished floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to or greater than the PMF level in accordance with the Flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. Given the submitted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal fails to provide the required levels for the proposal and there is inadequate information to support the development. In this regard, the proposal is not supported and engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. 9 Managing External Road Noise 10 Safety and Security 10 Safety and Security 11 Design new development to reduce the attractiveness of crime by minimising, removing or concealing crime opportunities. The building entries for the child care centre and residential apartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealiment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses.			refusal within the Drait Notice of			
referred to Council's Development Engineer for comment who has outlined that the submitted Survey Plan does not correspond with levels as identified in Council's mapping system – The variation of levels being in the extent of approximately 6.0m. In addition, the proposal comprises of a child care centre which is identified within the sensitive land use category in Table 7 – Land Use Categories for Development upon Flood Prone Land – Section 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDCP 2013. In this regard, the finished floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to or greater than the PMF level in accordance with the Flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. Given the submitted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal fails to provide the required levels for the proposal and there is inadequate information to support the development. In this regard, the proposal is not supported and engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. 9 Managing External Road Noise 10 Safety and Security 10 Safety and Security 11 Design new development to reduce the attractiveness of crime by minimising, removing or concealing crime opportunities. The building entries for the child apartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses.		Determination.	refusal within the Draft Notice of			
that the submitted Survey Plan does not correspond with levels as identified in Council's mapping system – The variation of levels being in the extent of approximately 6.0m. In addition, the proposal comprises of a child care centre which is identified within the sensitive land use category in Table 7 – Land Use Categories for Development upon Flood Prone Land – Section 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDCP 2013. In this regard, the finished floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to or greater than the PMF level in accordance with the Flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. Given the submitted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal fails to provide the required levels for the proposal and there is inadequate information to support the development. In this regard, the proposal is not supported and engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. 9 Managing External Road Noise The site is not affected by road or rail noise. 10 Safety and Security minimising, removing or concealing The building entries for the child crime opportunities. The building entries for the and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for Imaging identifiable from the street and hidden b	8	Determination. Flood Prone Land				
in Council's mapping system – The variation of levels being in the extent of approximately 6.0m. In addition, the proposal comprises of a child care centre which is identified within the sensitive land use category in Table 7 Land Use Categories for Development upon Flood Prone Land – Section 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDCP 2013. In this regard, the finished floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to or greater than the PMF level in accordance with the Flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. Given the submitted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal fails to provide the required levels for the proposal and there is inadequate information to support the development. In this regard, the proposal is not supported and engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. Managing External Road Noise The site is not affected by road or rail noise. Safety and Security Design new development to reduce the attractiveness of crime by minimising, removing or concealing crime opportunities. The building entries for the child care centre and residential apartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealement also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses. 	8	Determination. Flood Prone Land				
in Council's mapping system – The variation of levels being in the extent of approximately 6.0m. In addition, the proposal comprises of a child care centre which is identified within the sensitive land use category in Table 7 Land Use Categories for Development upon Flood Prone Land – Section 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDCP 2013. In this regard, the finished floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to or greater than the PMF level in accordance with the Flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. Given the submitted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal fails to provide the required levels for the proposal and there is inadequate information to support the development. In this regard, the proposal is not supported and engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. Managing External Road Noise The site is not affected by road or rail noise. Safety and Security Design new development to reduce the attractiveness of crime by minimising, removing or concealing crime opportunities. The building entries for the child care centre and residential apartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealement also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses. 	8	Determination. Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in C	council's mapping. The proposal was			
approximately 6.0m. In addition, the proposal comprises of a child care centre which is identified within the sensitive land use category in Table 7 - Land Use Categories for Development upon Flood Prone Land – Section 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDCP 2013. In this regard, the finished floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to or greater than the PMF level in accordance with the Flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. Given the submitted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal fails to provide the required levels for the proposal and there is inadequate information to support the development. In this regard, the proposal is not supported and engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. 9 Managing External Road Noise The site is not affected by road or rail noise. 10 Safety and Security Design new development to reduce the attractiveness of crime by minimising, removing or concealing crime opportunities. The building entries for the child care centre and residential apartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses. Incorporate and/or enhance Design does not provide for passive Imaging Imaging Imaging Comparison of the proportion of the proportion of the pedestrian accesses.	8	Determination. Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in C referred to Council's Development Eng	council's mapping. The proposal was ineer for comment who has outlined			
centre which is identified within the sensitive land use category in Table 7 - Land Use Categories for Development upon Flood Prone Land – Section 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDCP 2013. In this regard, the finished floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to or greater than the PMF level in accordance with the Flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. Given the submitted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal fails to provide the required levels for the proposal and there is inadequate information to support the development. In this regard, the proposal is not supported and engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. 9 Managing External Road Noise The site is not affected by road or rail noise. Imaging External Road Noise 10 Safety and Security Design new development to reduce the attractiveness of crime by minimising, removing or concealing crime opportunities. The building entries for the child care centre and residential apartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealiment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses. Incorporate and/or enhance Design does not provide for passive Imaging Imaging Imaging Care center opportunities for concealing apartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealing apartments are not easily identifiable from the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses.	8	Determination. Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in C referred to Council's Development Eng that the submitted Survey Plan does no	council's mapping. The proposal was ineer for comment who has outlined t correspond with levels as identified			
 Land Use Categories for Development upon Flood Prone Land – Section 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDCP 2013. In this regard, the finished floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to or greater than the PMF level in accordance with the Flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. Given the submitted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal fails to provide the required levels for the proposal and there is inadequate information to support the development. In this regard, the proposal is not supported and engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. Managing External Road Noise The site is not affected by road or rail noise. Safety and Security Design new development to reduce the attractiveness of crime by minimising, removing or concealing crime opportunities. The building entries for the child care centre and residential apartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses. Incorporate and/or enhance 	8	Determination. Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in C referred to Council's Development Eng that the submitted Survey Plan does no in Council's mapping system – The var	council's mapping. The proposal was ineer for comment who has outlined t correspond with levels as identified iation of levels being in the extent of			
8 - Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDCP 2013. In this regard, the finished floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to or greater than the PMF level in accordance with the Flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. Given the submitted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal fails to provide the required levels for the proposal and there is inadequate information to support the development. In this regard, the proposal is not supported and engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. Image: Content of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. 9 Managing External Road Noise The site is not affected by road or rail noise. Image: Content of the attractiveness of crime by minimising, removing or concealing crime opportunities. The building entries for the child hiden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses. Image: Concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses.	8	Determination. Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in C referred to Council's Development Eng that the submitted Survey Plan does no in Council's mapping system – The var approximately 6.0m. In addition, the	council's mapping. The proposal was ineer for comment who has outlined t correspond with levels as identified iation of levels being in the extent of proposal comprises of a child care			
floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to or greater than the PMF level in accordance with the Flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. Given the submitted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal fails to provide the required levels for the proposal and there is inadequate information to support the development. In this regard, the proposal is not supported and engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. Imaging External Road Noise 9 Managing External Road Noise Imaging external Road Noise 10 Safety and Security Imaging extrements of crime by minimising, removing or concealing crime opportunities. The building entries for the child hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses. Imaging Imaging External Road Noise	8	Determination. Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in C referred to Council's Development Eng that the submitted Survey Plan does no in Council's mapping system – The var approximately 6.0m. In addition, the centre which is identified within the set	council's mapping. The proposal was ineer for comment who has outlined t correspond with levels as identified iation of levels being in the extent of proposal comprises of a child care nsitive land use category in Table 7			
accordance with the Flood Risk Precincts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. Given the submitted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal fails to provide the required levels for the proposal and there is inadequate information to support the development. In this regard, the proposal is not supported and engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. Imaging External Road Noise 9 Managing External Road Noise Imaging External Road Noise 10 Safety and Security Imaging extreme concealing the attractiveness of crime by minimising, removing or concealing crime opportunities. The building entries for the child care centre and residential apartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses. Imaging Imaging Imaging Imaging Concession Incorporate and/or enhance Design does not provide for passive Imaging Imaging Concession	8	Determination. Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in C referred to Council's Development Eng that the submitted Survey Plan does no in Council's mapping system – The var approximately 6.0m. In addition, the centre which is identified within the se – Land Use Categories for Development	council's mapping. The proposal was ineer for comment who has outlined t correspond with levels as identified iation of levels being in the extent of proposal comprises of a child care nsitive land use category in Table 7 nt upon Flood Prone Land – Section			
Given the submitted Survey Plan is incorrect, the proposal fails to provide the required levels for the proposal and there is inadequate information to support the development. In this regard, the proposal is not supported and engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. 9 Managing External Road Noise The site is not affected by road or rail noise. Imaging External Road Noise 10 Safety and Security Design new development to reduce the attractiveness of crime by minimising, removing or concealing crime opportunities. The building entries for the child apartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses. Incorporate and/or enhance Design does not provide for passive	8	Determination. Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in C referred to Council's Development Eng that the submitted Survey Plan does no in Council's mapping system – The var approximately 6.0m. In addition, the centre which is identified within the se – Land Use Categories for Development 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDC	council's mapping. The proposal was ineer for comment who has outlined t correspond with levels as identified iation of levels being in the extent of proposal comprises of a child care nsitive land use category in Table 7 nt upon Flood Prone Land – Section CP 2013. In this regard, the finished			
the required levels for the proposal and there is inadequate information to support the development. In this regard, the proposal is not supported and engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. 9 Managing External Road Noise The site is not affected by road or rail noise. Imaging External Road Noise 10 Safety and Security Design new development to reduce the attractiveness of crime by minimising, removing or concealing crime opportunities. The building entries for the child apartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses. Incorporate and/or enhance Design does not provide for passive	8	Determination. Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in C referred to Council's Development Eng that the submitted Survey Plan does no in Council's mapping system – The var approximately 6.0m. In addition, the centre which is identified within the se – Land Use Categories for Development 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDC floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to	council's mapping. The proposal was ineer for comment who has outlined t correspond with levels as identified iation of levels being in the extent of proposal comprises of a child care nsitive land use category in Table 7 nt upon Flood Prone Land – Section CP 2013. In this regard, the finished or greater than the PMF level in			
support the development. In this regard, the proposal is not supported and engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. Imaging External Road Noise 9 Managing External Road Noise Imaging External Road Noise 10 Safety and Security Imaging in ew development to reduce the attractiveness of crime by minimising, removing or concealing crime opportunities. The building entries for the child apartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses. Imaging Ima	8	Determination. Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in C referred to Council's Development Eng that the submitted Survey Plan does no in Council's mapping system – The var approximately 6.0m. In addition, the centre which is identified within the set – Land Use Categories for Development 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDC floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to accordance with the Flood Risk Precision	council's mapping. The proposal was ineer for comment who has outlined t correspond with levels as identified iation of levels being in the extent of proposal comprises of a child care nsitive land use category in Table 7 nt upon Flood Prone Land – Section CP 2013. In this regard, the finished or greater than the PMF level in cts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013.			
engineering matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination. 9 Managing External Road Noise 9 Managing External Road Noise Imaging External Road Noise Imaging External Road Noise 10 Safety and Security Imaging External Road Noise Imaging External Road Noise 10 Safety and Security Imaging External Road Noise Imaging External Road Noise Imaging External Road Noise Imaging External Road Noise Imaging External Road Noise Imaging External Road Noise 10 Safety and Security Imaging External Road or rail noise. Imaging Im	8	Determination. Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in C referred to Council's Development Eng that the submitted Survey Plan does no in Council's mapping system – The var approximately 6.0m. In addition, the centre which is identified within the se – Land Use Categories for Development 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDC floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to accordance with the Flood Risk Precision Given the submitted Survey Plan is independent.	council's mapping. The proposal was ineer for comment who has outlined t correspond with levels as identified iation of levels being in the extent of proposal comprises of a child care nsitive land use category in Table 7 nt upon Flood Prone Land – Section CP 2013. In this regard, the finished or greater than the PMF level in cts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. correct, the proposal fails to provide			
within the draft notice of determination. 9 Managing External Road Noise The site is not affected by road or rail noise. Image: Comparison of the child care centre and residential apartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses. Incorporate and/or enhance Design does not provide for passive	8	Determination. Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in C referred to Council's Development Eng that the submitted Survey Plan does no in Council's mapping system – The var approximately 6.0m. In addition, the centre which is identified within the se – Land Use Categories for Development 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDC floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to accordance with the Flood Risk Precision Given the submitted Survey Plan is independent to the required levels for the proposal and	council's mapping. The proposal was ineer for comment who has outlined t correspond with levels as identified iation of levels being in the extent of proposal comprises of a child care nsitive land use category in Table 7 nt upon Flood Prone Land – Section CP 2013. In this regard, the finished or greater than the PMF level in cts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. correct, the proposal fails to provide d there is inadequate information to			
9 Managing External Road Noise The site is not affected by road or rail noise. Image: Constraint of the street and the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses. 10 Safety and Security 10 Safety and Security 10 Design new development to reduce the attractiveness of crime by minimising, removing or concealing crime opportunities. The building entries for the child care centre and residential apartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses. Image: Construct of the street and construction o	8	Determination. Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in C referred to Council's Development Eng that the submitted Survey Plan does no in Council's mapping system – The var approximately 6.0m. In addition, the centre which is identified within the set – Land Use Categories for Development 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDC floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to accordance with the Flood Risk Precision Given the submitted Survey Plan is ind the required levels for the proposal an support the development. In this regard	council's mapping. The proposal was ineer for comment who has outlined t correspond with levels as identified iation of levels being in the extent of proposal comprises of a child care nsitive land use category in Table 7 nt upon Flood Prone Land – Section CP 2013. In this regard, the finished or greater than the PMF level in cts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. correct, the proposal fails to provide d there is inadequate information to d, the proposal is not supported and			
The site is not affected by road or rail noise. Image: Constraint of the site is not affected by road or rail noise. Safety and Security Design new development to reduce the attractiveness of crime by minimising, removing or concealing crime opportunities. The building entries for the child care centre and residential apartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses. Image: Concent of the child care centre and residential apartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses. Incorporate and/or enhance Design does not provide for passive Image: Concent of the child care centre and cent of the child care cent of the care cent of the child care cent of the care cent of the child care cent of the care cen	8	Determination. Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in C referred to Council's Development Eng that the submitted Survey Plan does no in Council's mapping system – The var approximately 6.0m. In addition, the centre which is identified within the set – Land Use Categories for Development 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDC floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to accordance with the Flood Risk Precision Given the submitted Survey Plan is ind the required levels for the proposal an support the development. In this regard engineering matters raised form part of	council's mapping. The proposal was ineer for comment who has outlined t correspond with levels as identified iation of levels being in the extent of proposal comprises of a child care nsitive land use category in Table 7 nt upon Flood Prone Land – Section CP 2013. In this regard, the finished or greater than the PMF level in cts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. correct, the proposal fails to provide d there is inadequate information to d, the proposal is not supported and of the reasons for refusal contained			
10 Safety and Security Design new development to reduce the attractiveness of crime by minimising, removing or concealing crime opportunities. The building entries for the child care centre and residential apartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses. Incorporate and/or enhance Design does not provide for passive		Determination. Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in C referred to Council's Development Eng that the submitted Survey Plan does no in Council's mapping system – The var approximately 6.0m. In addition, the centre which is identified within the se – Land Use Categories for Development 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDC floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to accordance with the Flood Risk Precision Given the submitted Survey Plan is ind the required levels for the proposal an support the development. In this regard engineering matters raised form part of within the draft notice of determination.	council's mapping. The proposal was ineer for comment who has outlined t correspond with levels as identified iation of levels being in the extent of proposal comprises of a child care nsitive land use category in Table 7 nt upon Flood Prone Land – Section CP 2013. In this regard, the finished or greater than the PMF level in cts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. correct, the proposal fails to provide d there is inadequate information to d, the proposal is not supported and of the reasons for refusal contained			
10 Safety and Security Design new development to reduce the attractiveness of crime by minimising, removing or concealing crime opportunities. The building entries for the child care centre and residential apartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses. Incorporate and/or enhance Design does not provide for passive Image: Conceal conceal concent conceal concent conceal concent c		Determination. Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in C referred to Council's Development Eng that the submitted Survey Plan does no in Council's mapping system – The var approximately 6.0m. In addition, the centre which is identified within the set – Land Use Categories for Development 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDC floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to accordance with the Flood Risk Precision Given the submitted Survey Plan is ind the required levels for the proposal an support the development. In this regard engineering matters raised form part of within the draft notice of determination. Managing External Road Noise	council's mapping. The proposal was ineer for comment who has outlined t correspond with levels as identified iation of levels being in the extent of proposal comprises of a child care nsitive land use category in Table 7 nt upon Flood Prone Land – Section CP 2013. In this regard, the finished or greater than the PMF level in cts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. correct, the proposal fails to provide d there is inadequate information to d, the proposal is not supported and of the reasons for refusal contained			
Design new development to reduce the attractiveness of crime by minimising, removing or concealing crime opportunities. The building entries for the child care centre and residential apartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses. Incorporate and/or enhance		Determination. Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in C referred to Council's Development Eng that the submitted Survey Plan does no in Council's mapping system – The var approximately 6.0m. In addition, the centre which is identified within the set – Land Use Categories for Development 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDC floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to accordance with the Flood Risk Precision Given the submitted Survey Plan is ind the required levels for the proposal an support the development. In this regard engineering matters raised form part of within the draft notice of determination. Managing External Road Noise	council's mapping. The proposal was ineer for comment who has outlined t correspond with levels as identified iation of levels being in the extent of proposal comprises of a child care nsitive land use category in Table 7 nt upon Flood Prone Land – Section CP 2013. In this regard, the finished or greater than the PMF level in cts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. correct, the proposal fails to provide d there is inadequate information to d, the proposal is not supported and of the reasons for refusal contained			
the attractiveness of crime by minimising, removing or concealing crime opportunities. care centre and residential apartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses. Incorporate and/or enhance Design does not provide for passive	9	Determination. Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in C referred to Council's Development Eng that the submitted Survey Plan does no in Council's mapping system – The var approximately 6.0m. In addition, the centre which is identified within the se – Land Use Categories for Development 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDO floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to accordance with the Flood Risk Precision Given the submitted Survey Plan is ind the required levels for the proposal an support the development. In this regard engineering matters raised form part of within the draft notice of determination. Managing External Road Noise The site is not affected by road or rail r	council's mapping. The proposal was ineer for comment who has outlined t correspond with levels as identified iation of levels being in the extent of proposal comprises of a child care nsitive land use category in Table 7 nt upon Flood Prone Land – Section CP 2013. In this regard, the finished or greater than the PMF level in cts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. correct, the proposal fails to provide d there is inadequate information to d, the proposal is not supported and of the reasons for refusal contained			
minimising, removing or concealing crime opportunities. apartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses. Image: Concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses. Incorporate and/or enhance Design does not provide for passive Image: Concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses.	9	Determination. Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in C referred to Council's Development Eng that the submitted Survey Plan does no in Council's mapping system – The var approximately 6.0m. In addition, the centre which is identified within the se – Land Use Categories for Development 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDO floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to accordance with the Flood Risk Precision Given the submitted Survey Plan is ind the required levels for the proposal an support the development. In this regard engineering matters raised form part of within the draft notice of determination. Managing External Road Noise The site is not affected by road or rail r	council's mapping. The proposal was ineer for comment who has outlined t correspond with levels as identified iation of levels being in the extent of proposal comprises of a child care nsitive land use category in Table 7 nt upon Flood Prone Land – Section CP 2013. In this regard, the finished or greater than the PMF level in cts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. correct, the proposal fails to provide d there is inadequate information to d, the proposal is not supported and of the reasons for refusal contained			
crime opportunities. identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses. Image: Concern and	9	Determination. Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in C referred to Council's Development Eng that the submitted Survey Plan does no in Council's mapping system – The var approximately 6.0m. In addition, the centre which is identified within the set – Land Use Categories for Development 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDO floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to accordance with the Flood Risk Precision Given the submitted Survey Plan is ind the required levels for the proposal an support the development. In this regard engineering matters raised form part of within the draft notice of determination. Managing External Road Noise The site is not affected by road or rail r Safety and Security Design new development to reduce	Souncil's mapping. The proposal was ineer for comment who has outlined t correspond with levels as identified iation of levels being in the extent of proposal comprises of a child care nsitive land use category in Table 7 nt upon Flood Prone Land – Section CP 2013. In this regard, the finished or greater than the PMF level in cts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. correct, the proposal fails to provide d there is inadequate information to d, the proposal is not supported and of the reasons for refusal contained			
hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses. Image: Concealment also due to the narrow of the narrow o	9	Determination. Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in C referred to Council's Development Eng that the submitted Survey Plan does no in Council's mapping system – The var approximately 6.0m. In addition, the centre which is identified within the set – Land Use Categories for Development 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDO floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to accordance with the Flood Risk Precision Given the submitted Survey Plan is ind the required levels for the proposal an support the development. In this regard engineering matters raised form part of within the draft notice of determination. Managing External Road Noise The site is not affected by road or rail r Safety and Security Design new development to reduce the attractiveness of crime by	Souncil's mapping. The proposal was ineer for comment who has outlined t correspond with levels as identified iation of levels being in the extent of proposal comprises of a child care nsitive land use category in Table 7 nt upon Flood Prone Land – Section CP 2013. In this regard, the finished or greater than the PMF level in cts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. correct, the proposal fails to provide d there is inadequate information to d, the proposal is not supported and of the reasons for refusal contained moise.			
spaces and create opportunities for concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses.	9	Determination. Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in C referred to Council's Development Eng that the submitted Survey Plan does no in Council's mapping system – The var approximately 6.0m. In addition, the centre which is identified within the set – Land Use Categories for Development 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDC floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to accordance with the Flood Risk Precision Given the submitted Survey Plan is ind the required levels for the proposal an support the development. In this regard engineering matters raised form part of within the draft notice of determination. Managing External Road Noise The site is not affected by road or rail r Safety and Security Design new development to reduce the attractiveness of crime by minimising, removing or concealing	Souncil's mapping. The proposal was ineer for comment who has outlined t correspond with levels as identified iation of levels being in the extent of proposal comprises of a child care nsitive land use category in Table 7 nt upon Flood Prone Land – Section CP 2013. In this regard, the finished or greater than the PMF level in cts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. correct, the proposal fails to provide d there is inadequate information to d, the proposal is not supported and of the reasons for refusal contained moise.			
concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses. Incorporate and/or enhance Design does not provide for passive	9	Determination. Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in C referred to Council's Development Eng that the submitted Survey Plan does no in Council's mapping system – The var approximately 6.0m. In addition, the centre which is identified within the set – Land Use Categories for Development 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDC floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to accordance with the Flood Risk Precision Given the submitted Survey Plan is ind the required levels for the proposal an support the development. In this regard engineering matters raised form part of within the draft notice of determination. Managing External Road Noise The site is not affected by road or rail r Safety and Security Design new development to reduce the attractiveness of crime by minimising, removing or concealing	Souncil's mapping. The proposal was ineer for comment who has outlined it correspond with levels as identified iation of levels being in the extent of proposal comprises of a child care nsitive land use category in Table 7 nt upon Flood Prone Land – Section CP 2013. In this regard, the finished or greater than the PMF level in cts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. correct, the proposal fails to provide d there is inadequate information to d, the proposal is not supported and of the reasons for refusal contained moise.			
width of the pedestrian accesses. width of the pedestrian accesses. Incorporate and/or enhance Design does not provide for passive Image: Constraint of the pedestrian accesses.	9	Determination. Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in C referred to Council's Development Eng that the submitted Survey Plan does no in Council's mapping system – The var approximately 6.0m. In addition, the centre which is identified within the set – Land Use Categories for Development 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDC floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to accordance with the Flood Risk Precision Given the submitted Survey Plan is ind the required levels for the proposal an support the development. In this regard engineering matters raised form part of within the draft notice of determination. Managing External Road Noise The site is not affected by road or rail r Safety and Security Design new development to reduce the attractiveness of crime by minimising, removing or concealing	Souncil's mapping. The proposal was ineer for comment who has outlined t correspond with levels as identified iation of levels being in the extent of proposal comprises of a child care nsitive land use category in Table 7 nt upon Flood Prone Land – Section CP 2013. In this regard, the finished or greater than the PMF level in cts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. correct, the proposal fails to provide d there is inadequate information to d, the proposal is not supported and of the reasons for refusal contained moise. The building entries for the child care centre and residential apartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play			
Incorporate and/or enhance Design does not provide for passive	9	Determination. Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in C referred to Council's Development Eng that the submitted Survey Plan does no in Council's mapping system – The var approximately 6.0m. In addition, the centre which is identified within the set – Land Use Categories for Development 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDC floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to accordance with the Flood Risk Precision Given the submitted Survey Plan is ind the required levels for the proposal an support the development. In this regard engineering matters raised form part of within the draft notice of determination. Managing External Road Noise The site is not affected by road or rail r Safety and Security Design new development to reduce the attractiveness of crime by minimising, removing or concealing	Souncil's mapping. The proposal was ineer for comment who has outlined t correspond with levels as identified iation of levels being in the extent of proposal comprises of a child care nsitive land use category in Table 7 nt upon Flood Prone Land – Section CP 2013. In this regard, the finished or greater than the PMF level in cts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. correct, the proposal fails to provide d there is inadequate information to d, the proposal is not supported and of the reasons for refusal contained moise.			
	9	Determination. Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in C referred to Council's Development Eng that the submitted Survey Plan does no in Council's mapping system – The var approximately 6.0m. In addition, the centre which is identified within the set – Land Use Categories for Development 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDC floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to accordance with the Flood Risk Precision Given the submitted Survey Plan is ind the required levels for the proposal an support the development. In this regard engineering matters raised form part of within the draft notice of determination. Managing External Road Noise The site is not affected by road or rail r Safety and Security Design new development to reduce the attractiveness of crime by minimising, removing or concealing	Souncil's mapping. The proposal was ineer for comment who has outlined it correspond with levels as identified iation of levels being in the extent of proposal comprises of a child care nsitive land use category in Table 7 nt upon Flood Prone Land – Section CP 2013. In this regard, the finished or greater than the PMF level in cts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. correct, the proposal fails to provide d there is inadequate information to d, the proposal is not supported and of the reasons for refusal contained moise.			
opportunities for effective natural surveillance with clear sightlines	9	Determination. Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in C referred to Council's Development Eng that the submitted Survey Plan does no in Council's mapping system – The var approximately 6.0m. In addition, the provimately 6.0m. In the second accordance with the Flood Risk Precision accordance with the Flood Risk Precision for the required levels for the proposal an support the development. In this regard engineering matters raised form part of within the draft notice of determination. Managing External Road Noise The site is not affected by road or rail r Safety and Security Design new development to reduce the attractiveness of crime by minimising, removing or concealing crime opportunities.	Souncil's mapping. The proposal was ineer for comment who has outlined t correspond with levels as identified iation of levels being in the extent of proposal comprises of a child care nsitive land use category in Table 7 nt upon Flood Prone Land – Section CP 2013. In this regard, the finished or greater than the PMF level in cts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. correct, the proposal fails to provide d there is inadequate information to d, the proposal is not supported and of the reasons for refusal contained moise.			
	9	Determination. Flood Prone Land The site is identified as flood prone in C referred to Council's Development Eng that the submitted Survey Plan does no in Council's mapping system – The var approximately 6.0m. In addition, the proposition of the submitted Survey Plan does - Land Use Categories for Development 8 – Flood Prone Land in Part A of HDC floor level (FFLs) shall be equal to accordance with the Flood Risk Precision Given the submitted Survey Plan is ind the required levels for the proposal an support the development. In this regard engineering matters raised form part of within the draft notice of determination. Managing External Road Noise The site is not affected by road or rail r Safety and Security Design new development to reduce the attractiveness of crime by minimising, removing or concealing crime opportunities. Incorporate and/or end/or enhance	Souncil's mapping. The proposal was ineer for comment who has outlined t correspond with levels as identified iation of levels being in the extent of proposal comprises of a child care nsitive land use category in Table 7 nt upon Flood Prone Land – Section CP 2013. In this regard, the finished or greater than the PMF level in cts (FRPS) in Part A of HDCP 2013. correct, the proposal fails to provide d there is inadequate information to d, the proposal is not supported and of the reasons for refusal contained moise. The building entries for the child care centre and residential apartments are not easily identifiable from the street and hidden between the outdoor play spaces and create opportunities for concealment also due to the narrow width of the pedestrian accesses. Design does not provide for passive			

	surveillance by providing clear sight lines between public and private places, installation of effective lighting, and the appropriate landscaping of public areas.	between public domain and building entrances as a result of the outdoor spaces within the front setback areas.				
	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 destinations, identify where people can and cannot go and restrict access to high crime risk areas such as car parks.	Suitable access control is proposed.				
	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 defined by fencing.	\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 is not considered to provide adequate crime prevention measures through design which are sympathetic to the quality of the streetscape.		\boxtimes		
11	Waste Management					
	Council's Waste Management Office advised that the waste arrangements not supportable with regards to waste the reasons for refusal contained with	are unsatisfactory. The proposal is management and this forms part of		\boxtimes		
12	Services					
	Appropriate conditions would be inclu- consultation with relevant service prov		\boxtimes			
	B – RESIDENTIAL CONTROLS					
1	GENERAL RESIDENTIAL CONTROL	_S				
1.1	Building Materials					
	Acceptable materials and finishes pro	posed.	\bowtie			
1.2	Fences					
	Front fencing is proposed in the form of outdoor play spaces along both street and 2m from Beaufort St and Berwick		\square			
	The proposed fencing is solid in construction with landscaping forward of the fencing. The front fencing proposed exceeds the maximum 1.5m height permitted for fencing of solid construction.					
1.3	Views	the proposed douglages at				
4.4	No significant views will be affected by	r me proposed development.	\bowtie			
1.4	Visual Privacy	d appropriate animate for an identification of the	[[
	To provide a high level of visual and neighbours in dwellings and private op			\boxtimes		
	<u>Comment:</u> Apartments (Levels 1-3)					

	Building separation is not considered acceptable with respect to the AL				
	Communal Open Space / Rooftop Terrac	Δ			
	Planter boxes are provided along all elevations of the roof top terrace to				
	minimise overlooking. The rooftop terrace being located on the 5 th storey				
	requires a greater setback of 9m from the eastern and southern boundary.				
	The rooftop terrace is setback 6m to the e				
	privacy concerns.				
	Ground Level / Child Care Centre				
	Min. 1.5m-2m high fencing along Beaufor	t St and Berwick St and			
	landscaping restricts overlooking of outdo				
	Boundary fencing with landscape buffer a				
	privacy between the child care centre and	l adjoining properties.			
1.5	Landscaped Area				
1.5	25% of site area to be provided as landsc	aped area (2m min, width)			
	Refer to ARH SEPP compliance table.				
1.8	Sunlight Access				
	1 main living area of existing adjacent	The proposal has not provided			
	dwellings to receive 3 hours direct sunlight between 9am and 4pm, 22 June.	a detailed assessment for overshadowing impact. No			
	Sumight between sam and 4pm, 22 sume.	elevational shadow diagrams			
		have been submitted to		\bowtie	
		demonstrate the proposal will			
		not adversely overshadow the			
		adjoining 3 storey residential			
	Min. 50% of required POS of existing	flat building to the south at 62- 66 Berwick St between 9am-			
	adjacent dwellings to receive 3 hours	3pm, mid-winter.			
	direct sunlight between 9am and 4pm, 22	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
	June.	Plan form shadow diagrams are			
		provided for 9am, 12pm, 1pm			
		and 3pm and identify the north		\boxtimes	
		facing private open space and living areas of 6 out of 17 units,			
		of the adjoining RFB at 62-66			
		Berwick St as not receiving the			
		minimum 3 hours sunlight, mid-			
		winter, as required.			
1.9	Cut and Fill Cut is permitted to a maximum of 1 metre	Excavation for 2 levels of			I
	Cut is permitted to a maximum of 1 metre	Excavation for 2 levels of basement proposed.	\boxtimes		
	Cut is to be limited to 450mm where it is	Minimal cut proposed outside			
	within 900 mm of rear or side boundaries	building envelope	\square		
1.1	Demolition				
0	Approval for demolition is required from	Demolition of existing			
	Council.	structures sought as part of this	\square		
		application.			
	Photographic record capturing the	Submitted with application.			
	external configuration of the building		\square		
	proposed to be demolished is required.				
1.1	Vehicular Access and Driveways				
-	VCs to be a minimum width of 3 m and	New VC 6m width proposed			
	maximum width of 5m at the boundary			\boxtimes	

	All new driveways should be located at least 1.5m from side property boundaries	New driveway is setback 1.255m from eastern boundary.		\boxtimes	
	Council favours the use of a central under-building access with arrangement for cars to exit the property in a forward direction.	One vehicular access is provided to the basement car parking.	\boxtimes		
	Maximum gradient to be 20%	Driveway gradients less than 20%.	\square		
	Basement parking is mandatory for all residential flat buildings and multi- dwelling developments within the R4 zone.	All parking is located in the basement.	\boxtimes		
1.1 2	Universal Housing and Accessibility				
	15% of units shall be adaptable units Class B. Required : 15% x 18 = 2.7 (3) units	3 adaptable units proposed (16.7%) Typical Unit 01.04 on each level = 3 units	\boxtimes		
6.0	Residential Flat Buildings				
6.1	Lot Size and Frontage				
	Minimum lot frontage for residential flat buildings is 24m or 28m	Berwick St = 40.235m Beaufort St = 33.53m	\square		
	Residential flat buildings are not permitted on battleaxe lots	Site is not a battle-axe lot.			\square
6.2	Site Coverage	470 4			
	Maximum site coverage of any residential flat development shall not exceed 30% (Max. 370.85m ²)	472.4m² (38%)		\boxtimes	
6.3	Setbacks			6	
	Front setback from principal street minimum 6m	6m provided to Berwick St to external walls			
		Outdoor play spaces encroach within front setback area.		\square	
		Balconies of apartments on Levels 1-3 encroach within the front setback area.			
	Front setback from secondary street minimum 4m	4m provided to Beaufort St to external walls.			
		Outdoor play spaces encroach within front setback area.			
		Balconies of apartments on Levels 1-3 encroach within the front setback area.			
	Minimum rear setback required: Up to four storeys – 20% (Min. 6.4m) Five storeys or more – 30%	See ADG building separation.		\boxtimes	
	Side setback minimum 3m	See ADG building separation.		\boxtimes	
6.4	Building Height	1			ı
	Maximum building height in storeys shall be provided in accordance with the table below:	Max. permitted = 15m (4 storeys)	\square		

	Bormittad Usia	abt (storous)	The proposal is 4 storey with			
	Permitted Heig		roof top terrace, which is compliant with respect to the			
	Height	Storeys	maximum number of storeys.			
	9m	1				
	11m	2 3	The proposal exceeds the			
	12.5m 15m	3 4	maximum 15m LEP height			
		5	standard – Refer to HLEP			
	18m 21m	6	compliance table for further			
	21111 24 m	7	discussion.			
			The proposed colling beights			
	be:	o ceiling heights shall	The proposed ceiling heights are as follows:			
		for habitable rooms.	 Ground floor 2.7m 			
		for non habitable	Level 1 2.7m			
	rooms.	Ior non nabitable	• Level 2 2.7m	\bowtie		
		for the second storey	• Level 3 2.7m			
		wo storey units if 50%				
		the apartment has a 2.7				
		num ceiling height.				
6.5	Building Depth					
		al depth of a RFB shall	Max. internal depth = 19.4m		\bowtie	
	be 18m					
6.6	Open Space	0	D. (1	·		
	Communal Oper		Rooftop terrace $COS = 323.2m^2$			
	Min. 30% (370.8	511-)	(26.14%)		\square	
			Refer to ADG compliance table.			
	Private Open Sp	ace	All balconies are >10m ²			
		be a min. area of 10m ² ,	Min. 2m dimensions provided to			
		nensions for studios and	2+bedroom units.		\square	
	1 bedroom u	nits, and min. 2.4m				
	dimensions for 2		Refer to ADG compliance table.			
6.7	Building appear					
		e composed with an	Design response is generally			
	appropriate scale	e, rhythm and proportion	appropriate in the context of the site. The location of outdoor			
			play spaces of the child care		\square	
			centre within the front setback			
			area is not supported.			
6.8	Building entry a	nd pedestrian access				
		shall be visible from the	The building entry to			
	street, sheltered		apartments from Berwick St is			
			not clearly defined or easily			
			identifiable. The residential			
			pedestrian access is narrow		\bowtie	
			and hidden between two			
			outdoor play spaces of the child			
			care centre and as such can be			
			easily mistaken as the entry for the child care centre.			
	Main building ent	try is to be separate from	Separate pedestrian path			
	car park entry		provided from the street.	\square		
	Only basement	car parking is permitted	All parking spaces are in the	\boxtimes		
	for residential fla		basement.			
		e, vehicular parking	Vehicular access is via the			
		located off secondary	secondary street.	\boxtimes		
	streets.					

	Part E – Public Participation				
	Notification Requirements	The application was publicly notified to adjoining and opposite owners, a notice was placed in the local press and a notice placed on the site for 21 days from 20 February 2019 to 13 March 2019. In response, 3 submissions were received. The grounds of objections raised in the submissions have been addressed in the body of this Report.			
	T I – CHILDCARE CENTRES				
	, DENSITY AND LOCATION				
No.		Comment	Yes	No	N/A
1	SIZE AND DENSITY Any proposed Child Care Centres in R2 zones should be limited in size to accommodate not more than forty-five (45) children. Capacities of child care centres located in other zones will be assessed on the merits of each application.	The subject site is zoned R4 High Density Residential. 76 children placement proposed.			
	Development in residential zones shall have an appropriate size, scale, bulk, etc sympathetic to the surrounding residential development.	The location of outdoor play spaces within the front setback area is not supported.		\boxtimes	
	The general design requirements for Child Care Centres located within R2 and R3 zones, should comply with the standards outlined in Part B of this DCP relating to one and two storey residential development.	N/A – The subject site is zoned R4.			
	Note: If the proposed child care centre has a common boundary with an existing child care centre, the applicant must demonstrate that the new centre is not an addition to the existing centre by way of illustrating that the centre cannot be combined at a later stage.	There are no child care centres located on the adjoining lots.			
	If the proposed child care centre is to be located in a building consisting of more than one level, the child care centre component must be located on the ground floor of the buildings with office and storage space permitted on the upper level.	The child care centre is located on the entire ground floor of the proposed building. Office, kitchen and staff facilities are all located on the ground level adjacent to the building entry.			
	The minimum site frontage for a child care centre is 20 metres.	The site has a frontage of >20m to both street frontages. The property complies with the site and location			

		considerations contained within the			
		Child Care Planning Guideline.			
	LOCATION		I	I	•
	The site must not be 300m from hazardous industries, LP gas sites, mobile telephone base stations and towers, and safe from any other environmental health hazards, such as high lead levels, chemical spraying in rural areas, or proximity to cooling tower drift in high rise building areas.	The subject site is surrounded by a mix of low to high density residential developments within a 300m radius. An environmental site and locality analysis has not been undertaken, however, all development within the 300mm radius is residential, and in this regard, it is considered that there are no hazardous land uses within this locality.			
	Child care centres should not be located having frontage to any road, which in the opinion of Council, is unsuitable for the establishment of a child care centre having regard to:- (a) prevailing traffic conditions; (b) pedestrian and traffic safety; and (c) the likely impact of development on the flow of traffic on the surrounding street system.	The proposed development has been assessed by Council's Traffic Section, and is considered to be satisfactory from a locational perspective. The site does not have frontage to an arterial or sub-arterial road. The site / road is not listed within Appendix 1 or 2 of Part I of the HDCP 2013.	\boxtimes		
	In this regard child care centres should not be located having frontage to an arterial or sub-arterial road (see Appendix 1 to Part I of HDCP 2013). As a general guide the roads identified in Appendix 2 are also considered by Council to be generally unsuitable for the establishment of child care centres, without special consideration firstly being given to the prevailing traffic conditions. All applications are to be supported by a Traffic and Parking Report prepared by a suitably qualified person addressing the above issues to Council's satisfaction.	The proposed development was accompanied by a traffic and parking study which has been reviewed by Council's Traffic Engineering department. The proposal is not supported and parking and traffic matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination.			
2	VEHICULAR ACCESS AND PARKI ACCESS	NG			
	Separate entry and exit	Separate entry/exit driveways are			
	driveways shall be provided where safe and convenient on street parking is not otherwise available, to Council's satisfaction, for the setting down and picking up of children. The design of such driveways shall ensure	not provided. The site does not have frontage to an arterial or sub-arterial road. Council's Traffic Engineer has reviewed the proposal and accompanying Traffic Report and		\boxtimes	

	 that inbound and outbound vehicles are separated and that vehicles enter and leave the site in a forward direction. Applications for Child Care Centres will not be favourably considered where the site has frontage to an arterial road, sub-arterial road or where the development would be contrary to the environmental capacity of the street or contrary to the traffic movement on the surrounding street system. All applications are to be supported by a Traffic and Parking Report prepared by a suitably qualified person addressing the above issues to Council's satisfaction. 	raised issues relating to functionality and non-compliance of the basement car parking with respect to the internal layout, manoeuvring, driveways and traffic measures required. In this regard, the proposal is not supported and parking and traffic matters raised form part of the reasons for refusal contained within the draft notice of determination.		
	PARKING	In accordance with Dort A of LIDCD	[
	All staff parking shall be provided on-site in any event. To eliminate the possibility of frontages and access ways containing expanses of plain cement, decorative pavement treatment shall be provided to all driveways and parking areas. That is, the use of decorative paving materials such as exposed aggregate or pattern stamped and coloured concrete and paving bricks. Plain cement or coloured cement will not be accepted for driveways and parking areas for aesthetic and amenity purposes.	In accordance with Part A of HDCP 2013, staff parking is not required for child care centre as the site is zoned R4. Should consent be granted a condition can be imposed requiring a contrast of driveway finishes.		
3	ACOUSTIC AND VISUAL PRIVACY An acoustic assessment	With respect to acoustic impacts, the		
	An acoustic assessment must be completed by a suitably qualified person. A Noise Management Plan shall accompany the development application. This should, as a minimum, provide details of child to staff ratios, noise control measures of children while in outdoor play areas and seasonal play times Noise abatement measures are to be undertaken to ensure that inside noise levels do not exceed 40dB(A) (Leq 24). Assessments should take background noise levels into account	with respect to acoustic impacts, the submitted acoustic report provides no consideration for the use/impacts of noise from the child care facility. The report also did not have consideration of the use/impacts from the proposed 76 place child care centre on the tenants on the site as well as adjoining neighbours. As such, projected noise levels have not been identified for the child care centre, and no acoustic fencing has been recommended or incorporated within the design of the centre. Visual privacy of the adjoining properties has been maintained to an acceptable level through the use of hi-light windows, boundary		

4	A landscape buffer with suitable screening plants and a minimum width of 1 metre shall be provided along the side and rear boundaries of the development to help minimise overlooking.	fencing and appropriate side and rear setbacks. A landscape buffer has been provided adjacent to outdoor spaces along the eastern and southern boundaries, with the exception of the eastern boundary adjacent to the race track.		
5	Where achievable, windows of indoor play areas are to be located with a northern orientation and should receive at least three hours of sunlight between the hours of 9am and 3pm on June 21. For locations where a northern orientation for indoor play areas is not achievable, they should be located where they will receive a minimum of 3 hours of sunlight, where possible OUTDOOR SPACES	It has not been adequately demonstrated that indoor spaces receive a minimum 3 hours of sunlight between 9am and 3pm, mid- winter as required by Section 4 – Indoor Spaces – Part I – Child Care Centres of HDCP 2013. In this regard, the design does not ensure that solar access to indoor spaces is optimised.		
	 a) Located away from the main entrance of the child care centre, car parking areas or vehicle circulation areas; b) Integrated with indoor space and provide direct and easy access between those two areas; c) Of a design and layout to enable clear lines of sight to all areas of the outdoor space to allow direct staff supervision from other areas of the child care centre; d) Located away from existing and potential noise and environmental health sources; e) If the child care centre is located in a predominantly residential area, outdoor spaces are to be located away from the living/bedroom windows of surrounding dwellings; f) Inaccessible from public areas outside of the child care centre, except in the case of an emergency evacuation or centre deliveries such as sand replacement; g)Located away from areas where objects can be projected down onto play areas; and h) Adequately fenced on all sides 	 a) The outdoor play areas are located away from the main entrance to the childcare centre. Outdoor spaces are proposed adjacent to the basement car parking entry and within the front setback areas which is not supported, b) The indoor spaces lead onto the outdoor play area which provides a transitional space between the two areas. c) The levels proposed between the indoor areas and outdoor areas will enable sightlines to be maintained to allow direct staff supervision. d) The outdoor area is located away from existing and potential noise sources as it is located at the rear of the site. e) The outdoor areas are located away from the bedrooms/living area of surrounding dwellings, however acoustic measures are not proposed to mitigate any potential noise impacts, f) The proposed outdoor areas are inaccessible from public areas outside of the child care centre. g) Apartments are located above the centre and there is potential for objects to fall onto the outdoor play spaces. h) The facility is considered to be adequately fenced. 		

6	 a) A transitional area between the building and the play area supporting space for both indoor and outdoor activities is to be provided. It is space additionally required for the building and the playground and may only be included as either the outdoor or indoor space requirement, not both. It may comprise of a verandah; b) The roof area of the transitional area must be a minimum of 4 meters in width to ensure sufficient activity zones with access space around them; c) The transitional area must be designed in a manner that offers protection from unfavourable weather conditions, including strong winds and rainfall; d) The transitional area must be designed in a manner that utilises natural temperature controlling measures, including cross ventilation. 	 a) A transitional area in the form of outdoor decks and undercroft area below apartments has been provided, b) The transitional areas are covered by the level above. c) Achievable d) Achievable 		
	A detailed landscape plan prepared by a suitably qualified landscape professional should be submitted with all development applications for child care centres and should demonstrate the following: a) Separation of outdoor space into active quiet areas; b) Proposed planting, with a variety of trees and plants to be used which create visual interest for children, and can provide shading where appropriate; c) Locations of play equipment; d) Separation of outdoor space according to age ranges, including the locations of lower fencing or other structures which divide the outdoor spaces; and e) Outdoor spaces such as grass, soft porous paving and the like	A landscape plan was submitted in support of the DA and is considered satisfactory. Separation of outdoor space according to age range is included on the architectural plans. The landscape plan includes details of all equipment proposed. The landscape plan shows a variety of ground surfaces.		
7	FENCING Outdoor space is required to be fenced on all sides with a height of at least 1.8m. Acoustic fences should not be higher than 2m. If a fence higher than 2m is unavoidable it must be contained within the development	Side and rear fencing is proposed. Acoustic fencing has not been considered and is proposed to minimise noise impacts.		

8	site with a 1.8m traditional lapped and capped boundary fence and the remaining height to be of thick, transparent perspex to ensure any views are maintained. FIRE SAFETY AND EMERGENCIES			
	An evacuation plan complying with AS3745-2002 Emergency Control Organisation and Procedures for Buildings, Structures and Workplaces shall be submitted as part of the Development Application	Not satisfactory. The evacuation plan indicates that there is only one emergency exit via the entry of the centre. This appears to be impractical having regard to the number of children proposed for the centre. An additional point of exit is not provided to assist with evacuation in the event of an emergency also noting that there are apartments above.	\boxtimes	
9	ACCESSIBILITY			I
	All new child care centres, building conversions and additions to existing premises shall comply with the minimum access requirements outlined in Part D3 of the Building Code of Australia and AS 1428.1 Design for Access and Mobility – General Requirements for Access – New Building Work. Details are to be included on plans to be submitted with the application for development consent.	An accessibility report was not submitted in support of the application. Should consent be granted, it is recommended that a standard condition of consent be imposed that requires compliance with the BCA, Disability Discrimination Act and Disability (Access to Premises – Buildings) Standards 2010.		