

E) Residential and other submissions

Residential submissions

1. Low Density Residential Submissions

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
D01642395	Resident Perouse Rd, Randwick	Concern raised that sections 5.4 Acoustic Privacy and 7.6 Air Conditioning Equipment of C3 Low Density Residential do not contain numerical requirements for maximum noise levels. Enquiry into whether Randwick City Council follows the numeric and procedural recommendations for maximum noise levels as published by the Australian Institute of Refrigeration, Air-conditioning and Heating and NSW State Government.	<p>Noted. In NSW, noise pollution is regulated through the Protection of the Environment Operations (POEO) Act 1997 and POEO Regulation 2008. A number of policies and guideline documents also provide guidance on how to prevent and minimise noise impacts, such as the "NSW Industrial Noise Policy", "Noise Guide for Local Government" and a brochure - "Dealing with Neighbourhood Noise". DAs may be conditioned with numerical requirement (dB(A)) for noise levels of mechanical equipment, consistent with relevant legislation or standards. For example, noise from mechanical plant is considered intrusive if it exceeds the background noise by more than 5 dB(A) as measured over a 15-minute period (LAeq (15 minute)).</p> <p>A cross reference to other legislation and guiding documents in relation to noise controls will be included in the DCP, where relevant.</p>
D01650826	Resident Nolan Ave Clovelly	Preferred orientation figure on pp 32 of Low Density Residential chapter should be changed to indicate that having a courtyard glass facing closely to adjacent neighbours is not a preferred solution. Concerns raised that neighbours can overlook bathroom of property raising privacy issues.	<p><u>Preferred Orientation</u></p> <p>Not supported. The orientation of windows to the front or rear of the allotment, or towards a side courtyard is considered to be an appropriate design solution to minimise cross viewing and overlooking into neighbouring buildings, particularly in an urbanised context.</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
			<p>The diagram provided on pp 32 (section 5.3 Visual privacy of C3- Low Density Residential) regarding the preferred orientation of main living room/dining room windows, is indicative only. Notably, the arrows indicating the windows on the side are facing the internal courtyard and not the neighbouring property.</p> <p>Privacy issues with respect to side courtyards can be addressed through the use of suitable screening materials such as obscured, frosted or opaque glazing and this can be addressed at the DA stage.</p>
D01656011	Resident Perouse Rd, Randwick	Clarification sought on whether the draft DCP definition for 'deep soil permeable surfaces' includes artificial lawn/grass areas. It is noted that artificial lawn products are gaining popularity due to low maintenance, durability etc. Recommended that the definition for 'deep soil permeable surfaces' include 'artificial lawn areas on a compacted base layer'.	<p>Not supported. The inclusion of '<i>artificial lawn areas on a compacted base layer</i>' is considered too specific for inclusion in the definition of 'deep soil permeable surfaces'.</p> <p>This issue can be addressed at the DA stage by requesting further information from the applicant (e.g. brochure) detailing the type of permeable/non permeable surfaces proposed on site.</p>
D01658321	Resident South Coogee	Support for the wall height controls in the R2 Low Density zone on the basis that it would maintain low density character, prevents unreasonable amenity impacts on neighbouring properties (e.g. overshadowing, view loss, privacy and visual amenity) and ensure future development is not excessive in bulk and scale.	Support noted.

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
D01663270	Resident Cottenham Ave, Kensington	<p><u>Lower Site Coverage Limits for Larger Residential Blocks</u> Request that the site coverage limits be reduced for larger residential blocks (ie 751-900m2 and 901m2>) on the basis that larger residential blocks contribute to the character of the area and thus should not be overdeveloped so as to damage the area's environmental values.</p> <p><u>Permeable Surfaces and Landscaping</u> Request that minimum deep soil/permeable surfaces and landscaping controls be increased for larger blocks (ie: 751-900m2 and 900m2>) for the same reasons as above.</p> <p><u>Site Coverage Definition</u> The current definition for 'site area' should be amended to include verandahs, terraces and</p>	<p><u>Lower Site Coverage for Larger Residential Blocks</u> Not supported. The DCP site coverage controls in section 2.3 Site Coverage of C3 Low Density Residential are provided on a sliding scale relating to allotment size. The allowable site coverage generally decreases as allotment size increases, so that the mass and scale of any building will not form a detracting feature compromising the streetscape character.</p> <p>The site coverage thresholds have been determined following a comprehensive analysis of development patterns and approvals in Randwick City. The proposed controls (including the 45% threshold for larger allotments of 601smq or above) are considered to be a suitable and reasonable measure allowing sufficient unbuilt upon land to accommodate private open space, deep soil planting, permeable surfaces while allowing adequate built upon area.</p> <p><u>Permeable Surfaces and Landscaping</u> Not supported. The thresholds for permeable surfaces and landscaping contained in 2.4 Landscaping and Permeable Surfaces have been determined following a comprehensive analysis of development patterns and approvals in Randwick City. The 35% threshold for allotments that are 601sqm and above is considered to be a reasonable and appropriate measure and should be retained in the final DCP.</p> <p><u>Site Coverage Definition</u> Not supported. DCP definitions are to be generally consistent with the definitions ascribed in the</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		patios that are raised above the ground level, surrounded by a perimeter wall, covered by a permanent roof or canopy, or surrounded on at least three sides by parts of the house. The reason for this is that these days large terraces, verandahs etc form an integrated part of a house and not counting such structures as part of the built form undermines the objectives of the site coverage control.	<p>Dictionary to the RLEP or the Act. While a DCP definition can supplement and provide more detailed guidance to an LEP term, it cannot override or be more restrictive.</p> <p>The RLEP definition makes it clear that <i>site area</i> does not include enclosed balconies, decks, pergolas and the like. Consistent with this, the DCP further clarifies (section 2.3-Site Coverage of C3 Low Density Residential), that the calculation of site area does not include a <i>“balcony, deck, patio, pergola, terrace or veranda attached to a dwelling that is not enclosed by a wall higher than 1.4m above floor level”</i></p> <p>The submission's suggestion to amend the definition of 'site area' to include <i>“verandas, terraces, and patios raised above the ground level etc”</i>, is therefore not supported on the basis that it would result in inconsistency with the RLEP as well as the EP&A Amending Act which clarifies that a DCP is to supplement the aims, objectives and provisions of the LEP.</p>

2. Medium Density Residential submissions

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
D01662099	Resident Gale Rd Maroubra	Compliments on draft DCP which is well structured and easy to work with. Further thanks for extensive consultations and staff assistance during open days. Only inconsistency noted is numerical controls for	<p>Support noted on the DCP structure and community consultations.</p> <p><u>Setbacks</u> - see report for further discussion.</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		side setbacks for attached dwellings (3 m) which in some cases is more restrictive than residential flat buildings and multi dwelling housing. A graded approach may be more appropriate in this instance and in between the setbacks set for residential flat buildings and low density residential.	
D01663261	Resident Randwick	<p>I am very concerned about the reduction in setback requirements in residential areas. In addition, the consideration of solar impacts is inadequate. The provisions for rooftop terraces need to be re-considered. I consider a 2 metre setback from the external walls and balustrades of 1.8 metres high with insured glass should be required. Finally, the condescending comments regarding residential flat buildings constructed in the 1950s and 1970s should be removed. Many flat buildings constructed in earlier periods have similar flaws including wooden floors between units, are dark internally and have no parking, while those constructed more recently have combined kitchen and lounge rooms, minuscule laundries, open walkway entry balconies etc.</p>	<p><u>Setbacks, terrace and balconies</u> - see report for further discussion on these issues. In response to the suggested standard provision for roof top terraces of a 2 metre setback and 1.8m balustrade, these provisions are not supported. Section C4: 4.2 Roof Design clause vii) provides provisions where terraces, decks or trafficable outdoor spaces on the roof may be considered including privacy and amenity design considerations. A 2m setback and 1.8m high balustrade would add unnecessary bulk to the building may not be feasible and does not take into consideration individual sites attributes. See report for further discussion on roof terraces.</p> <p>In relation to comments on residential flat buildings constructed in the 1950s and 1970s – this was a reference taken from Council's adopted 'Design ideas for rejuvenating flat buildings', there was no condescending connotations intended and given that it was adopted by the Council it should remain.</p>
D01660375	Resident Melody Street, Coogee	<p><i>Solar access and Overshadowing</i> Part C4:4.1 is considered to be vague. 'Living areas' should be clearly defined as modern housing can have a number of rooms considered to be living areas. There is no mention of energy efficiency as a whole e.g.</p>	<p><u>Solar access and overshadowing</u> It is noted that Section C4:5.1 on solar access and overshadowing refers to both 'living areas' and 'living rooms' which can be confusing. It is recommended that all reference to 'living rooms' be updated to 'living areas' and for further</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>where a proposed building may display good solar access, however the adjoining building has reduced solar access as a consequence, then no energy efficiency is gained overall. Energy efficiency should play a greater role in the DCP.</p> <p><i>Side setbacks- Residential Flat Buildings and Multi Dwelling Housing</i> Where the frontage is 18 metres wide, the side setback has been reduced from the current standard of 3.5 m to 3m and 2m. Merit assessment on less than 12m or irregular shaped land. This is a significant decrease in itself, but combined with a lift in height in the LEP, this is guaranteed to affect amenity for neighbours.</p> <p><i>Rear Setbacks</i> Rear setbacks have been decreased from the current 6m and will affect amenity of neighbours.</p> <p><i>Balconies</i> Current trend of large balconies is a noise generator particularly in Coogee. Smaller balconies would be better suited combined with increased communal areas with landscaping to satisfy amenity and reduce noise.</p> <p><i>58-60 Carr Street</i> Existing building has a height of 26.56m which is more than double permitted in the current zone. A zero frontage on Carr Street from Kurrawa Ave to 62 Carr St will add bulk and</p>	<p>clarification refer to 'principal living area' to remove any confusion that this would apply to only the one principal living area.</p> <p>In relation to Energy Efficiency, subsection 5.2 of the draft DCP addresses natural ventilation and energy efficiency in residential flat buildings. It promotes natural ventilation in flat buildings which in turn facilitates energy efficiency. In addition to this section, section B3 in the draft DCP provides for objectives and controls to promote energy and water efficiency in the design and operation of buildings not affected by BASIX. The draft DCP therefore provides additional measures outside the scope of what is required by BASIX to promote and facilitate energy efficiency in all buildings. .</p> <p><u>Setbacks, balconies and 58-60 Carr St</u> - see report for further discussion on these separate issues</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>scale and will create a license for 62 and 64 to expand in height. 58 and 64 Carr Street are zoned residential. Allowing cafe/restaurant contravenes residential zone objectives to protect amenity.</p> <p><i>Weight Issues</i> It should be clearly stated upfront on the role and power of the DCP. Randwick Council staff have offered differing opinions on whether the controls within the DCP should be adhered to or not.</p> <p><i>Risk of Corruption</i> There is a risk of corruption and whether it is real or perceived it cannot be ignored. There is too much discretion, insufficient application of fairness, lack of rights for third parties, influence of political donations, training of councillors, the role of staff, the pressure of limiting legal costs and the segregation of the roles between staff and manager in the separation of reports.</p> <p><i>Buildings Should be Good Neighbours</i> There is too much discretion without clear boundaries; the controls on development should be as clear and concise as possible with no 'merit assessment'. Reducing numerical standards will have a disastrous effect on Coogee e.g. overdevelopment, larger building</p>	<p><u>DCP Weight Issues</u> – at the time of drafting the report to council on the DCP, state legislation had been introduced (which later came into effect on 1 March 2013) that reinforces the provisions contained in a DCP as not statutory requirements and are for guidance purposes only and for which alternative design solutions may be provided by an applicant. The role and purpose of the DCP is also clearly stated in the introduction of the draft plan under section 1.1 as a guiding document.</p> <p><u>Risk of corruption/discretion</u> – Noted. DCPs as noted above, provides guidance on the DA assessment process, which must also address merits of proposals at their specific location. NSW legislation and Council policies set the required processes, to provide for accountability within the DA assessment and decision-making stages.</p> <p><u>Buildings should be good neighbours</u>. The new draft DCP moves away from a 'performance' based approach to a clearer and simpler structure with a combination of numerical and qualitative provisions. Where a development proposal does not meet the provisions for complying development, a merit based assessment within a</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		envelopes, bulk and scale, loss of amenity, increased bad behaviour and crime. There should be a cap on development in Coogee in the draft DCP.	clear planning framework is required for Council to consider reasonable alternative solutions that could result in more desirable planning and urban design outcomes. This is to recognise that each site has unique characteristics based on a combination of site conditions, size, aspect, location, topography etc

Other various issues

1. Performance Standard / numerical controls

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
D01642844	ARPL Town Planning (Rose Bay)	<p><u>Performance Solutions Vs Numerical Controls</u></p> <p>Concern raised about shift away from performance solutions towards numeric compliance. Current approach has spawned excellent architectural and planning design. The shift towards numeric controls will ultimately result in the community coming to expect full compliance with those provisions, and places significant cost and burden upon the applicant to demonstrate alternative solutions (even when the numeric control would achieve a less satisfactory result).</p> <p>Potential inconsistency with recent Government legislation to shift away from controls in a DCP that undermine the intention of an LEP.</p>	<p>Noted. See Council report for detailed discussion on this issue.</p> <p>The DCP is considered to be consistent with the provisions relating to DCPs under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Amending Act 2012 (Amending Act), in that it provides guidelines for development assessment and retains flexibility in its application. Consistent with the Amendment Act, in those circumstances where a proposal does not comply with the numerical controls, there is scope for Council to consider reasonable alternative solutions that could result in more desirable planning and urban design outcomes. This is to recognise that each site has unique characteristics based on a combination of site conditions, size, aspect, location, topography etc.</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
			Part A Section 2.3 - <i>Achieving the Numerical Controls</i> provides further guidance on this issue and includes a number of criteria to be used to assess proposals seeking to vary the numerical controls e.g. consistency with objectives of the RLEP and DCP, degree of variation sought, site constraints, potential impacts on the public domain etc). To this end it is considered that the numerical controls would not be an impediment to achieving good design. This section will be amended to highlight the importance of this advice on controls.

2. Heritage

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
D01660269	Resident Barker St Randwick	Objection to inclusion of the property within the heritage conservation area, given that property on the opposite side of Dine Lane is not included in the HCA allowing a 4 storey apartment block to be constructed.	To clarify, Neither the LEP nor the DCP have made changes to the boundaries of The Spot heritage conservation area. Properties on the eastern side of Dine Lane have been part of the HCA since its gazettal in 1993. The most recent review of the boundaries of the HCA (for input into the recent Comprehensive LEP 2012) did not recommend changes to the western boundary of the HCA.
D01663240	Resident Maroubra Road, Maroubra	Suggest rewording of the Statement of Significance for Malabar Headland heritage conservation area, including the sections on Aesthetic significance, Historic significance, Technical/Research significance and Existing character values and controls.	Supported. The Statement of Significance for the Malabar Headland heritage conservation area is taken from the Randwick Conservation Areas Assessment and Review prepared for Council by heritage consultants Perumal Murphy Wu in 2000. More recent and more detailed Statements of Significance are provided in the Australian Heritage Database and in the State Heritage Register database. The DCP will be amended to adopt the Statement of Significance contained in

			the State and Commonwealth heritage databases, to ensure consistency of heritage data.
--	--	--	---

3. Parking

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
D01663176	Cape Cod Glenfield	<p>Note that size of garages should be at a minimum of 3m*5.4m (ideally 3m*6m) for single, 5.7m*5.4m (ideally 6m*6m) for double in accordance with AS2890.1.</p> <p>Note also that subject to the definition in the LEP, the size of garage "should allow an additional 900mm wide access strip if internal access to the dwelling is via the attached garage but excluded if not attached".</p>	<p>Not supported. Section 6.5 - garage configuration in 'low density residential' specifies that the minimum length of a garage is 5.4m while the maximum width is 3m for single and 6m for double garage. It also refers to the AS 2890.1 for other configuration of garages.</p> <p>Maximum width controls are considered essential in ensuring minimised visual impact of garages on the streetscape. Note also that according to AS 4299, the minimum parking (e.g. garage, car port) dimensions for adaptable housing are 3.8m by 6m. The control however will be slightly amended to "the maximum <u>internal</u> width of a garage is....", in accordance with the AS 2890.1.</p> <p>Not supported. The proposed garage dimensions allow for reasonable side access. It's not considered necessary to require an additional 900mm wide access strip to facilitate access to the dwelling via the garage.</p>

D01660327	Resident, Coogee	<p>All owners were sent a survey in our area a couple of years ago asking whether residential parking permits and otherwise timed parking should be implemented in our area. I voted against it and obviously others did too as it was not implemented. I continue to be extremely against this, especially in the area around Alison Rd, Arden St etc as it is not necessary and is simply a way for Council to collect revenue.</p> <p>I do not believe we should be increasing the density of living in Coogee either. I absolutely vote against this, as I think it is really important to preserve the heritage and charm of Coogee as opposed to increasing the density of living.</p> <p>I am also very for the sustainability from transport and planning perspectives. Thank you for listening to my view.</p>	<p>Under the Comprehensive DCP, residents who do not have access to an off-street parking space and live in the area where there is time limited parking in place, are still eligible to apply for residential parking permits. However, a new control is introduced to exclude residents of new developments that are approved under the new DCP from applying for parking permits. This is to minimise increases in traffic and parking demands by new developments and to further encourage provision and use of sustainable transport in these developments.</p> <p>The draft DCP doesn't contain controls to increase permissible densities in Coogee. Density/building bulk is fundamentally controlled by LEP, through zoning and principle development standards, such as FSR, height and minimum lot size. Minor adjustments to FSR and building height were made as part of the RLEP 2012.</p> <p>The draft DCP promotes and supports sustainable transport initiatives, such as measures for greater use of public transport, walking and cycling, car share, designated parking spaces for fuel efficient cars, etc. Further, the DCP allows variations to parking rates where sustainable transport alternatives are integrated into the development. This allows for flexibility to development where it may not be physically possible to provide parking. It also offers sufficient incentives for developers to incorporate the sustainable transport measures into the development.</p>
D01661833	Resident, Coogee	1. Requests clarification on 'Resident Parking Schemes' (section B7 item 2.4) if no resident parking permits will be provided to residents of	1. As clarified in both 'Explanation' and 'Controls' of Section 2.4 in B7, no resident parking permits will be issued for new development or for

		<p>buildings approved under the DCP.</p> <p>2. Raises that 'Exceptions to vehicle parking rates' (section B7 item 3.2 & 3.3) 'should not merely be used to allow a decrease of the minimum parking rates but should also be a provision for council to review and where necessary increase the parking rates for a development in certain high density areas, especially in areas where heritage buildings predominate with-out on site parking and where there is inadequate on street parking to meet current needs.</p> <p>3. Supports Council's 'car share programmes' and other sustainable transport options (light rail, small sustainable cars) but raises the point that the car share programme should not effectively discriminate against other residents who do not choose or cannot use car share programmes. In addition, Council should look at placing the special car spaces in appropriate areas, taking into account streetscapes with parking pressure that cannot accommodate a space that is not available to all residents.</p> <p>Likewise developments that provide allowances for Car Share programmes should not be allowed to reduce the minimum parking per apartment within the developments.</p>	<p>significant alterations and additions to residential flat buildings approved under the RLEP 2012 and the comprehensive DCP.</p> <p>2. Not supported. It is not considered reasonable to require additional parking above the prescribed rates for development largely given that parking rates in the DCP (which are largely carried over from the existing Parking DCP) are generally higher than adjoining comparable councils and the recommendations of the RMS. It is considered that the draft DCP delivers a clear and transparent approach, which requires all new development, change of use and major alterations/additions to comply with the parking rates.</p> <p>3. Support noted. The draft DCP contains controls to promote sustainable transport initiatives, such as designated parking for car share vehicles provided as part of the development. These parking spaces are to be provided within the development site, rather than along the street. It therefore will not have direct impacts on the existing on-street parking situation.</p> <p>Not supported. It is considered reasonable to allow variations to parking rates for development incorporating sustainable transport measures and at locations close to public transport, given that some of the on-site parking needs can be subsidised by convenient public or sustainable transport options.</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>Suggests that incentives should be provided for new developments to provide allocated accessible spaces for car share programmes available to all suburb residents, not only owners of a specific building car programme.</p> <p>4. Notes in relation to the site specific controls for 58-64 Carr Street that the proposed 'developable area' is too large, much larger than is required for something small scale. Notes that there is adequate large restaurant representation at the southern end of the bay and that another large restaurant would add significantly to the noise, traffic and acute parking issues in the areas, with residents in the adjacent residential area being adversely affected. The submission further notes that the Council resolved to keep the area zoned residential and that the draft DCP appears to propose the assessing of DAs for commercial uses in Carr St as if the zoning was commercial and not residential. All development proposals - commercial and residential - in a residential zone should be assessed according to the residential controls.</p>	<p>Noted. For large development sites, like the university and hospital, with no restricted public access, it's possible to provide precinct wide approaches to carshare parking spaces. However, for small scale development, for example, those providing parking spaces for car share vehicles in areas only accessible by building users (e.g. in the basement of a secured building), it's not practicable to require those parking spaces available to the public.</p> <p>4. See the Council report for discussion on this issue.</p>
--	--	--	---

4. DA Process

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
D01663747	Resident Victoria Street,	Have not reviewed the draft DCP, as it is pointless if there is a lack of process in	Council administers its development assessment process strictly in accordance with the EP&A Act

	Malabar	<p>administering it. Recent examples of DAs noted where the DCP controls were exceeded. Why have a DCP if it can be ignored? Spend the money on Council processes, education and oversight so that a revision is worth the paper it is written on.</p>	<p>and relevant planning documents (e.g. LEP&DCP). The LEP stipulates principle development standards and other statutory provisions while the DCP provides guidance to facilitate aims and controls in the LEP.</p> <p>As recently clarified in the EP&A Act, DCP is to be applied in a flexible manner to allow reasonable alternative solutions that may not comply with the numerical DCP controls but achieve the DCP objectives and demonstrate more desirable planning and design outcomes to suit the site characters and conditions. This has been reflected in Sections 2.2 & 2.3 of the new Comprehensive DCP (see these sections for further clarification).</p> <p>To assist with a transparent and evidence-based assessment process, the new DCP also outlines specific criteria that any proposed variation to the numerical controls will be assessed against. This ensures that the numerical controls will be adequately considered and addressed and flexibility will only be offered where clearly justified as a preferred outcome.</p>
--	---------	--	---

5. Design

TRIM ref		Submission	Council Officers' Response
D01663245	Brian Stewart Cape Cod Glenfield	<p><u>Design</u></p> <p>The requirement for a site context and a site analysis plan to be submitted for all DAs is an unnecessary duplication given that a DA submission is required to show all that detail on the submitted drawings and to address all those amenity and design issues in the SEE resulting in additional costs to the projects.</p>	<p><u>Design</u></p> <p>Not supported. Analysis of the site and its context has always been a requirement for a DA. The draft DCP strengthens this requirement to ensure the DA demonstrates a clear link between the characteristics of a site and its context and the design proposed.</p>

6. Prince Henry Site, Little Bay

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
D01663232	RPS Australia Asia Pacific on behalf of Brookfield Residential Properties	<p>Generally support the draft DCP, however raise a specific issue relating to Lot 65 DP 270427 at the Prince Henry site at Little Bay and a general issue regarding provision of adaptable housing:</p> <p>1) The draft DCP retains existing height and FSR provisions, which are inconsistent with LEP 2012 - as shown on some DCP maps that have been sourced directly from the existing DCP (discrepancies on maps are circled in red in the submission). Request that all references to height and FSR be removed from the DCP or be updated to reflect LEP controls.</p> <p>2) The proposed minimum adaptable dwelling requirement is 20% of all dwellings, which is a significant increase from a rate of 1 per 14 apartments under the current DCP. Noted that "the basis for this increase is not clear, particularly when considering rates in adjacent LGAs (all less than 15% and mostly towards 10%)". Suggest that the requirement for adaptable dwellings be considered further.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>1) Noted. Some of the draft DCP maps for Prince Henry site need to be updated in accordance with the Randwick LEP 2012 (e.g. height and FSR maps). A notation will be added to the DCP section to clarify this. These maps will be amended before finalising the DCP document.</p> <p>2) Noted. The adaptable housing requirements in the draft DCP apply to new developments only, and represent an increase from current Council requirements to better reflect key demand drivers- particularly the City's aging population (around 29% of the population is over 50 years of age) (2011 Census). The adjustment to adaptable housing thresholds is also consistent with directions of the Randwick City Plan "Outcome 6e: housing diversity, accessibility and adaptability to support our diverse community is enhanced".</p> <p>It is worth noting that while some Councils may have lower adaptable housing thresholds they also have a lower aging population rate. For example, the City of Sydney has a 15% adaptable housing requirement for developments containing 30 or more dwellings with 22% of the population being</p>

			<p>over the age of 50. Similarly, Waverley Council DCP has a 10% adaptable housing requirement for developments containing 30 or more dwellings and 26% of the population is over the age of 50. Notably, other Councils such as Marrickville have a lower proportion of people over the age of 50 (22%), yet a comparable adaptable housing threshold (20%) while Willoughby Council (which shares similar characteristics to Randwick City) has relatively higher adaptable housing thresholds ranging from 25%-50% of medium density development (depending on scale).</p>
--	--	--	---

7. Other various issues

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
D01643800	Resident Shaw Ave Kingsford	<p>There is no evidence in the DCP that there is strong commitment to ensure low density residential is not subject to conversion to medium density residential.</p> <p>Kensington town centre (KTC) is unsuitable for development into a B2 Local Centre as it is restricted to a strip, half a block wide on either side of Anzac Parade.</p> <p>Council should acquire the ground and second floors of a well located building (eg intersection of Todman Ave and Anzac Parade) to create a</p>	<p>To clarify, density is regulated by zoning and development standards contained in the RLEP, whereas the DCP provides supplementary design guidance pertaining to permissible development. Conversion of low density land uses to medium density would generally be subject to a rezoning application (and comprehensive assessment) to change the zoning applicable to a site. The issue raised in the submission is therefore beyond the scope of the DCP.</p> <p>To clarify, the DCP does not have a role in identifying land use zones. KTC is zoned B2 – Local centre in RLEP 2012. The suitable zoning of KTC was considered during preparation and exhibition of the draft RLEP (and background studies) during 2010 - 2012.</p> <p>The block-by-block envelope controls in the draft</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>pedestrian plaza on the ground floor and to provide a library/reading room/meeting room on the second floor. If impracticable, the ground floors of at least two well spaced, corner blocks should be developed as pedestrian thoroughways with seating.</p> <p>Commercial premises should be permitted on the second storey in specific buildings only. Residential uses should be limited to third storey and above in all buildings.</p> <p>Sex service premises are to be located above ground level, with entrances at ground level and on the primary frontage. The entrance to sex service premises should always be direct from the street and never from a multi purpose foyer.</p>	<p>DCP identify locations of public open space and pedestrian links. Understanding needs of and planning for community facilities is addressed in Council's City Plan and Community Facilities Plan (2003). Opportunities to provide community facilities through the development process are considered on a case-by-case basis, and where suitable opportunities exist, can be negotiated via a voluntary planning agreement. This process is covered in the Section 94A contributions plan.</p> <p>The draft DCP provides for commercial/retail uses on ground floors with a street frontage. Commercial and retail uses are permissible on second levels where justified by an economic impact study. Residential uses are identified above the second floor. It is considered the draft DCP provides reasonable mix of commercial and residential uses in Kensington Centre, similar to other centres in Randwick City.</p> <p>Supported. These have already been included in Controls 2 i) and iii) of Section D6 – Sex Services Premises and Restricted Premises.</p>
D01644484	Resident Clovelly	<p>Recommended that DA notification by post and email be adopted as a standard practice. Rates notices should have a box indicating that rate payers wish to be notified by email.</p> <p>Recommended that all DA documentation be available on Council's website (e.g. application, site analysis, drawings etc) and notifications include the access link to such documentation.</p>	<p>Noted. The issue of including a tick box for rates notices has been forwarded to Council's Rates Department for further consideration. In relation to written notification for DAs, as clarified in 3.6.2 of A3 Public Notification, "applications which are to be notified by written notice, involve letters being sent in the form of an email or standard mail". The DCP Section Documentation relevant to each DA is</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		The Residential Low Density chapter needs a specific section on the storage of waste and recycling containers including requirements for DA plans to identify the location of storage and means to transport them to the street for collection.	<p>available on Council's website aside from floor plans due to privacy issues.</p> <p>To clarify, Part B6 <i>Recycling and Waste Management, Section 4 - Ongoing Operation</i> contains a comprehensive list of controls specific to the storage of waste and recycling containers including requirements to illustrate on DA plans the location of storage, waste collection points, layout for bins etc. This section of the DCP applies to all forms of development including Low Density Residential.</p>
D01648817	Architecture Urban Design	<p>Design excellence trigger of 15 metres is inconsistent with SEPP 65 (3 storeys). Recommended that design excellence be demonstrated for more categories of projects (at least for residential flat buildings which fit SEPP 65 criteria). Notes that Sutherland Council requires a DA be assessed by Architectural Review Panel on SEPP 65 design principles for a larger variety of developments (.e.g. villa/townhouses over 6 dwellings, new industrial buildings over 2,000 m2, seniors living developments, major extensions to commercial buildings etc).</p> <p>Recommended that 7 Qualities of Successful Places be integrated into the SEPP 65 design quality principles to avoid repetition and this could be tested on a new project.</p> <p><u>Adaptable/ Universal Housing</u> Adaptable/Universal Housing Section should acknowledge BCA requirements for Class 2 buildings (to have continuous path of travel</p>	<p>The 15m building height design excellence trigger applies to all development (including non-residential) – in addition to the design excellence requirements for development covered by SEPP 65. Note also that most commercial centre buildings are also mixed use with residential and are referred to our Design Review Panel.</p> <p>Note that large sites and 'key sites' also require a site-specific DCP, and these are generally referred to the Design Review Panel for review.</p> <p>Suggestion is noted – see also comments from Design Review Panel. It is recommended the DCP Section B1 - Design be adjusted to improve integration and avoid repetition with SEPP65 design criteria.</p> <p><u>Adaptable/ Universal Housing</u> Noted. A notation referring to the BCA requirements for Class 2 buildings</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>from boundary to main entry etc). Add the word "accessible" before "continuous path of travel".</p> <p>Make clear requirements for accessible car parking. Not all adaptable dwellings should have accessible car parking as this may be costly/impact on development potential/difficult to achieve. SEPP Seniors Living car parking requirements (e.g. 1 accessible car space per 5 senior's dwellings) could be adopted. This could be tested and advice from access consultant sought.</p>	<p>accessibility requirements has merit and is thus supported for inclusion in the final DCP. Similarly, the inclusion of the word "accessible" before "continuous path of travel" (Universal housing control 2(i)) is supported and proposed for inclusion in the relevant DCP control.</p> <p>The car parking threshold for adaptable housing is stated in <i>B6 Traffic, Parking and Access (Section 3.4- Parking Requirements for Accessible Spaces)</i>, requiring that the same car parking rates for residential flat buildings be applicable to adaptable dwellings (thus dependant on the number of bedrooms per dwelling).</p> <p>The draft DCP clarifies that car parking provided to adaptable dwellings must be consistent with the Australia Standard for Adaptable Dwellings (AS4299), which stipulates that one car parking space per adaptable dwelling must have the minimum dimensions of 6.0m x 3.8m, and should otherwise comply with the minimum requirements of AS 2890.6 (Offstreet Parking for People with Disabilities). As under the Standard, the minimum carparking dimensions for adaptable dwellings only apply to one car space per dwelling, it is unlikely to make a considerable impact on dwelling yield.</p> <p>Of further note, the draft DCP <i>B6 Traffic, Parking and Access</i> section retains sufficient flexibility, subject to a Traffic and Parking Study. This provides the scope for Council to consider variations to the car parking thresholds (e.g. in those circumstances where the proposal's location</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
			is in close proximity to frequent public transport etc).
D01648820	(additional submission to D01648817)	AS4299 Adaptable Housing Class C requires 1 accessible car space per adaptable unit, citing both a min size of 3.8 x 5.4m but also referring to AS 2890.1 which refers to AS 2890.6 which requires 3.6m (not 3.2m as in the email) x 5.4m wide spaces if adjacent to another accessible space & 4.8m x 5.4m if an isolated space. These spaces take up a lot of room on a site, particularly if in garages, & constrain unit yield, so Council needs to clearly state a min carparking rate for adaptable units (1 per unit?)	Noted. See above response.
D01656835	Resident Randwick	<p><u>Solar Access</u> Concerned about the new definition for the impact on solar access. It should include all rooms and living spaces that are to be overshadowed.</p> <p><u>Carr Street</u> Carr St: the draft DCP shows a big area for development suited to a very big cafe/restaurant. A small cafe or restaurant could fit under the building with excavation with an outside dining area in the garden area in the front. Mind you Coogee has no need for</p>	<p><u>Solar Access</u> Not supported. Including a control requiring solar access to all rooms for neighbouring properties is considered to be too onerous, particular for those built up areas with a fine grain subdivision pattern.</p> <p>The draft DCP reference to 'part of a window' has been included in broad terms as it is difficult to specify a numerical figure in relation to the proportion of a window suitable to receive solar access. The determination of solar access suitability is generally undertaken on a case by case basis as part of a merit assessment.</p> <p><u>Carr Street</u> See Council report for detailed discussion on this issue.</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		any more cafes or restaurants and where will patrons and staff park. Coogee's streets are full.	
D01652603	Resident	<p><u>Childcare Centres</u> 3.2 setbacks - Suggested that this control be deleted. Not allowing outdoor play areas to be located within the front setback will render most sites unsuitable. The front setback is ideal as it is away from neighbours and minimise amenity impacts.</p> <p>4.2 Safety and security - Suggested that the passage of people next to outdoor areas be adequately separated e.g. fenced from outdoor areas and outdoor play area gates do not open straight to footpath or road. There is nothing wrong with having an entry to a childcare centre being located next to outdoor space provided safety of children from strangers and roads are addressed.</p> <p>4.3 Play Areas -There is nothing wrong with play areas being located near the main entrance. Recommended that separation from main entrance be facilitated by barrier, fence etc.</p> <p>5 Traffic, Parking, Pedestrian Safety - There are many suitable sites where on site drop off is not necessary. On such sites only staff may park on site and there maybe instances where exiting the site other than a forward direction</p>	<p><u>Setback</u> Supported. The front setback may be suitable as an outdoor play area in certain circumstances (e.g. due to site configuration, access to sunlight, where rear access is provided, relationships with neighbouring properties etc). Accordingly it is recommended that Section 3.2 - Setbacks (iii) be amended to clarify that outdoor play areas in the front setback will only be considered where the applicant can demonstrate its suitability.</p> <p><u>Safety/security and play areas</u> Supported. It is recommended that section 4.3 Play Areas in D3 Child Care Centres, be amended to require that front entrances be suitably separated from outdoor play areas, unless suitable screening/fencing is provided. It is also recommended that a new control be included in this section to ensure that play areas do not have doors/gates that open onto a footpath or road.</p> <p><u>Traffic, parking and pedestrian safety</u> Supported. It is recommended that 5.2 Vehicle, Circulation and Carparking Design in D3 Child Care Centres, be amended to clarify that vehicles entering and exiting in a</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		would be safe subject to a Traffic Study. Recommended that the control be "preferred" unless an alternative arrangement can be demonstrated by a Traffic Study.	forward direction is preferred, unless an alternative arrangement can be demonstrated in the Parking and Access Report.
D01660297	Resident South Coogee	<p>1. Roof Top Terraces Draft DCP does not provide sufficient protection of neighbourhood privacy or loss of amenity as a result of rooftop terraces and balconies. Locating living areas to the top floors to maximise views infringes on neighbour's privacy. Balconies that extend from these spaces are more frequently used. Visual and acoustic privacy of neighbours should be taken into consideration and be a valid reason for refusing planning permission.</p> <p>2. Swimming Pools Concern raised about rooftop pools. DCP should prohibit roof top pools where there are visual and acoustic impacts on neighbours.</p>	<p><u>Roof top terraces</u> Noted. See report for further discussion on this issue. To clarify, the DCP includes a number of controls considered to suitably address amenity and privacy considerations with respect to rooftop terraces and balconies. These include focusing balconies to the front or rear of developments and installation of privacy screens to mitigate against the loss of privacy (see specific sections in both Low Density and Medium density Residential).</p> <p><u>Swimming pools</u> Noted. Swimming pools are classified as Complying Development under the NSW Housing Code provided certain criteria are met (e.g. setbacks, suitable acoustic measures for pool pumps etc). Including more onerous and prescriptive controls in the draft DCP than complying development for this form of ancillary development is not recommended as it may encourage proponents to go through the Codes SEPP to gain approval as Complying Development which affords less scrutiny and public input than the DA process. Further, the DCP controls for swimming pools (contained in <i>Section.5 Swimming and Spa Pools</i>) are considered to suitably address noise impacts. The DCP does not impose a prohibition on rooftop pools and these are generally assessed on a case by case basis at the</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>3. Carr St</p> <p>DCP exempts commercial use from complying with the residential zoning of 58-64 Carr St. New developments should comply with the Medium Density residential zone, particularly setbacks.</p>	<p>DA stage.</p> <p><u>58-64 Carr St</u></p> <p>See Council report for detailed discussion on this issue.</p>
D01661967	Resident (form letter)	<p><u>Air-conditioning Units</u></p> <p>Distance of air conditioners and other noisy equipment (e.g. pool equipment) from boundary should be increased to 2 metres. There should be requirements that such equipment is installed at the front or rear of building or in basement to minimise noise and nuisance. Pool pumps should have encasing to muffle noise.</p> <p><u>CCTV Cameras</u></p> <p>DCP guidelines are required on the location of CCTV to ensure such do not impact on privacy of neighbours.</p>	<p>Form letter submission</p> <p><u>Air-conditioning units</u></p> <p>Not supported. The installation of air conditioners is Exempt Development under the NSW Housing Code and thus does not need development consent, provided a number of criteria are met, including a minimum 450mm setback. Including more onerous controls in the DCP is not recommended as it would encourage proponents to use the Housing Code to facilitate development, which does not afford the same level of DA scrutiny and public input into a proposal. The controls contained in Part C3 Low Density Residential: Section 7.6 Air conditioning equipment are considered to suitably compliment the provisions in the SEPP.</p> <p><u>CCTV cameras</u></p> <p>Installation of security cameras by public authorities is exempt development under the Infrastructure SEPP. Under the RLEP 2012 – Schedule 2 Exempt Development, installation of external lighting and security systems may be carried out as exempt development provided that it meets with requirements set out in the LEP. There are currently no specific federal or state laws regulating the use of security cameras on</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>Trees and Vegetation DCP should include restrictions on the types of vegetation to be planted in coastal areas and any dwelling. Trees need constant pruning and branches break off due to strong winds. Olive trees should be permitted as they do not need pruning and branches do not break in high winds and they resemble natives. Similarly to controls for buildings and view loss, guidelines are required restricting heights on trees in coastal areas which obscure views from above.</p> <p><u>Height of New Dwellings</u> Concern raised about overall height of new dwellings permitted under the new LEP. The DCP should include some additional restrictions to minimise maximum allowable height of new dwellings.</p>	<p>private properties or requiring development consent before any surveillance cameras can be installed on residential property. Given development consent is not required, inclusion of controls in the DCP is not warranted.</p> <p><u>Trees and vegetation</u> Noted. The raised issues will be addressed by a landscape plan required for any new development or major alterations/additions and prepared in accordance with Part B4 of the DCP. A landscape plan will need to include a range of elements and design details, including the selection and location of plant species. The plan will be carefully reviewed by Council's landscape officer as part of the development assessment process.</p> <p>In relation to Olive trees, only one species, "Olea europa var. Africana – African Olive" is included in the undesirable listing. Other species of Olive trees are generally permitted, including Olea europa var. communis (European Olive), which is actually listed for planting in Council's Street Tree Masterplan.</p> <p><u>Height of new dwellings</u> To clarify, the former LEP did not establish height standards for dwelling houses, with DA assessment relying on a 'preferred' wall height of 7 m in the current DCP. The new RLEP 9.5m height control for dwelling houses is considered to suitably reflect prevailing development patterns, and importantly creates certainty with respect to the permissible heights for this form of development.</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>External Wall Height Controls (pp 25 and 26) Delete 10.5 m and replace with 10m and delete 8m and replace with 7m. The reason for proposed change is to control the bulk and scale and minimise impact on nearby properties, as per the former LEP controls.</p>	<p>It should be noted that under the EP&A Act and Regulation, the DCP is to give effect to the objectives and provisions of an LEP and cannot override or replace the provisions of an LEP.</p> <p>Of note, the DCP includes wall heights to create a clear distinction between the overall height of the dwelling house and roof of the dwelling house. These work together with a range of other controls e.g. setbacks, landscaped area etc to determine the final built envelope.</p> <p><u>External wall height</u> See Council report for further discussion on this issue.</p>
D01660358	Resident Clovelly	<p>Backpackers Accommodation Draft DCP controls on backpackers accommodation are not sufficiently worded to control alcohol consumption. There have been problems with establishments such as 171 Arden Street Coogee, where alcohol has been restricted after intervention by the Land and Environmental Court. The DCP should include a control specifically to say "alcohol at all new backpackers' accommodation is banned"</p> <p>Carr Street The Carr Street Precinct should remain residential. The DCP wording is misleading and indicates sites such as 58-60 Carr Street are exempt from residential controls and open to much larger scale development that would</p>	<p>Not supported. The draft DCP requires a Plan of management for all new and major alterations of backpackers' accommodations, requiring that clear house rules and policies be set out for suitable behaviour of guests. Given that these are not public places, Council cannot include controls in the DCP to prohibit consumption of alcohol at backpackers' accommodations.</p> <p>See Council report for further discussion on this issue.</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		impact on the surrounding area.	
D01662112	Resident Randwick	<p>Social Impact Statements Social impact statements should be required where applications for licensed premises exceed the standard hours, regardless of patron numbers. In terms of outdoor dining, sunrise to sunset is a reasonable compromise and exceptions to this would require a management plan.</p> <p>Carr St The proposal is not consistent with Council's resolution on this matter. Commercial buildings should have to comply with residential controls for the site. This could result in a precedent for other residential areas.</p> <p>Signage Signage in commercial areas need to prohibit electronic signs that are flashing more than once per minute including scrolling text and the like.</p>	<p><u>Social impact statements</u> Noted. The draft DCP Late Night Trading section does not establish standard hours of operation as this is to be assessed on a case by case merit basis, dependant on the site context, locality and prevailing amenity and environmental issues. The table of operating hours included on page 6 is to be used as a guide only. Council's <i>Social Impact Assessment Guidelines for Assessing Development Applications</i> clarifies that a social impact assessment is generally required for new licensed premises or significant expansion of existing licensed premises.</p> <p>Applying a blanket trading period of sunrise to sunset for outdoor dining is not supported as it would be difficult to enforce consistently due to daily and seasonal variations.</p> <p><u>Carr St</u> See report for detailed discussion on this issue.</p> <p><u>Signage</u> Concern noted. Section F3 of the draft DCP, provides objectives and controls for the design and siting of outdoor advertising and signage including for each land use zone. While these controls do not specifically prohibit flashing signage, section D7: Neighbourhood Centres General Controls, clause viii) provides that '<i>any signage structure or sign</i></p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>Commercial Centres - Coogee A separate section should be prepared for Coogee town centre in conjunction with the community.</p> <p>Sex services premises For those centres where sex services are permitted, the definitions need to be broadened to be sex on premises venues similar to City of Sydney, given that such a venue has existed in Kensington without incident.</p> <p>Carshare Provision of carshare is supported but not at</p>	<p><i>must have regard to the impact on residential occupants in terms of illumination and visual impact'. Despite this, the suggested recommendation is supported to apply to all business zones and for clarification the following is recommended to be included under section F3 Outdoor Advertising and Siting: 2. General Design and Siting ix) Signage must not be flashing or animated NB: Flashing or animated signs include mechanical moving signs, moving LED signs, video/television screens, projected laser advertising and other flashing, intermittently illuminated or sequenced lighting signs;</i></p> <p>Noted. A new separate DCP section for Coogee would require a detailed study and investigation process, outside the scope and timeframe for this draft DCP process and requiring input and funding in Council's annual Delivery Plan and Budget process. A previous review commenced for Coogee in 2010 was discontinued following requests from the community consultation committee established to oversee the study.</p> <p><u>Sex services premises</u> To clarify, all comprehensive LEPs must use the same definition of 'sex services premises' as provided in the NSW Standard Instrument. Note also sex services premises are not a permissible use (i.e. are prohibited) in Kensington centre.</p> <p><u>Car share</u> See response on similar issues raised in the</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		the expense of reduction in carparking. Reference to one carshare provider should be excluded as other providers exist. Council's alliance with GoGet is not relevant for inclusion in the DCP. Other alliances with carshare companies need to be developed.	submission of Coogee Precinct (D01661951).
D01661993	Resident Randwick	<p>Underground Overhead Wires Include a section on undergrounding overheard wires.</p> <p><u>Foreshore protection</u> Include a separate section on foreshore protection and include this requirement for all development types, not only just low density residential.</p>	<p><u>Underground overhead wires</u> Provisions to underground power cables are included in the draft DCP for industrial uses (section D15 Industrial Uses: 10 Public Utilities/ Infrastructure). These provisions apply to new Industrial development only and may include the bundling of cables surrounding the development also. Council has previously requested advice on extending the requirement for undergrounding of power lines. A separate report on this matter is being prepared for reporting to Council.</p> <p><u>Foreshore protection</u> See Council report for further discussion on this issue.</p>
D01662123	Resident Randwick (form letter)	<p>Air-conditioning Units Distance of air conditioners and other noisy equipment (e.g. pool equipment) from boundary should be increased to 2 metres. There should be requirements that such equipment is installed at the front or rear of building or in basement to minimise noise and nuisance. Pool pumps should have encasing to muffle noise.</p> <p>CCTV Cameras DCP guidelines are required on the location of</p>	<p>Form letter submission See response on submission D01661967 on page 23.</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>CCTV to facilitate reasonable surveillance and ensure such do not impact on privacy of neighbours.</p> <p>Trees and Vegetation DCP should include restrictions on the types of vegetation to be planted in coastal areas and any dwelling. Trees need constant pruning and branches break off due to strong winds. Olive trees should be permitted as they do not need pruning and branches do not break in high winds and they resemble natives. Similarly to controls for buildings and view loss, guidelines are required restricting heights on trees in coastal areas which obscure views from above.</p> <p>Height of New Dwellings Concern raised about overall height of new dwellings permitted under the new LEP. The DCP should include some additional restrictions to minimise maximum allowable height of new dwellings.</p> <p>External Wall Height Controls (pp 25 and 26) Delete 10.5 m and replace with 10m and delete 8m and replace with 7m. The reason for proposed change is to control the bulk and scale and minimise impact on nearby properties, as per the former LEP controls.</p>	
D01662130	Resident (form letter)	<p>Air conditioners Distance of air conditioners and other noisy equipment (e.g. pool equipment) from boundary should be increased to 2.5 metres. There should be requirements that such equipment is installed at the front or rear of</p>	<p>Form letter submission. See response on submission D01661967 on page 23.</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>building or in basement to minimise noise and nuisance in a sound proofed enclosed structure.</p> <p>CCTV DCP guidelines are required on the location of CCTV to facilitate reasonable surveillance and ensure such do not impact on privacy of neighbours. Sutherland Council is proactive on this issue.</p> <p>Trees, Vegetation and Views DCP should include restrictions on the types of vegetation to be planted in coastal areas to ensure that any dwelling has district views. Trees are growing out of control and obstructing views. Similarly to restrictions on buildings to ensure view sharing, controls should be included in the DCP for trees.</p> <p>External Wall Height and Ceiling Height (pp26) Delete 10.5m and replace with 10m and on pp27 delete 8m and replace with 7m. The reason for this change is to control bulk and scale and minimise impacts on adjoining properties, consistent with controls in previous LEP.</p> <p>Side Setbacks Re: Dwelling Houses and Attached Dual Occupancies Table (pp 16), for the first storey replace 900mm with 1200mm and 1200mm with 1500mm. For the second storey replace 900mm with 1800 and 1500mm with 3000mm. The reason for this change is to remain</p>	<p><u>Residential controls - Side and rear setbacks</u> See Council report for further discussion on this issue.</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>consistent with current DCP which has much greater setbacks than the draft DCP. Side setbacks should not be reduced as they are critical and essential controls for ensuring privacy, sunlight access and preventing overshadowing.</p> <p>Rear Setbacks pp17 - delete 5m and replace with 6m. Reason for change is to remain consistent with current DCP which has 6 metre rear setbacks. The need for setbacks in densely populated areas is important when such areas are subject to increasing development pressure. The draft DCP should focus on preserving setbacks rather than reducing them.</p> <p>Density Concern raised about increasing density in Council area. While it is understood that Councils have to accommodate an increasing population, this must be done in a considered and well planned way. If the State Government cannot commit to improving infrastructure, and transport, it cannot expect Councils to keep adding to population and density. The DCP should reflect that.</p>	<p><u>Density</u> Noted. The RLEP sets out the zones and development standards which determine density of development across the City, while the DCP provides guidance to supplement the RLEP provisions. The RLEP contains strengthened clauses to ensure that the infrastructure needs of new development is thoroughly assessed with each proposal. Council continues to work with all State and Federal and non-government providers to ensure that the community's range of infrastructure needs and desires are continually upgraded, extended and enhanced.</p> <p>While the draft DCP cannot directly influence the provision of public infrastructure such as public transport (which is under the purview of the State Government), it does contain a range of controls</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
			to facilitate sustainability, including supporting the integration of land use and transport.
D01663239	Resident Soudan St, Randwick	<u>Solar Access</u> Concern raised that the draft DCP does not contain controls to protect sunlight access to solar panels/PV panels on residential and commercial development. Solar panels should be treated the same way as trees. If shading of existing panels occurs, then the developer must be required to install equivalent solar capacity to that lost through shading the new development. In addition, financial compensation should be made to the affected parties equivalent to the lost generation/water heating capacity for the next 10 years.	<u>Solar Access</u> Not supported. The difficulty in maintaining adequate solar access to solar panels is acknowledged. The NSW Housing Code, for instance, now provides for new dwellings and alterations and additions to existing dwellings that need not address impacts on neighbouring panels. To address this issue, where development consent is required, the draft DCP includes a number of controls to protect solar access to existing solar panels and roof panes where solar panels do not exist on neighbouring properties (e.g. <i>Low Density Residential section 5.1 Solar Access and Overshadowing</i>). The controls are considered to adequately balance the rights of owners to expect a reasonable level of solar access to their roof panes and the rights of proponents to modernise their housing and achieve development capacity as provided under the RLEP controls.
D01662131	Resident	Object to the following areas of the draft DCP: 1) Overshadowing/ solar access: The proposed control - 'principal living areas of neighbouring dwellings must receive a minimum of 3 hours access to direct sunlight to a part of a window' will severely limit and reduce neighbour's sunlight. Inclusion of the words 'a part of' may result in reduction of sunlight that is currently provided to neighbouring residences. Besides, modern buildings often use glass doors and	<u>Overshadowing/Solar Access</u> The draft DCP reference to 'part of a window' has been included in broad terms as it is difficult to specify a numerical figure in relation to the proportion of a window suitable to receive solar access. The determination of solar access suitability is generally undertaken on a case by case basis as part of a merit assessment.

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>glassed areas in the living areas. Therefore, particular reference to 'a window' is anachronistic.</p> <p>2) Balconies and roof terraces: The section relating to balconies and roof terraces allows large minimum sizes which could lead to noise and disturbance issues/impact on neighbouring amenity.</p> <p>3) 58-64 Carr Street: Given its residential zoning, any uses of the site must be subject to the residential controls and any cafe planned for the site should be kept in small scale. The DCP must ensure the commercial activities accord with the controls for residential areas.</p> <p>4) Foreshore Scenic Protection: Note that consideration should be given to ensure impact of new development is minimal on the views of neighbouring properties, on the shoreline as well as views from the shoreline.</p> <p>5) Parking: It is important that the DCP restores existing commercial and non residential on site parking requirements. "There is an influx of vehicles into Coogee definitely on Friday nights and frequently on other evenings and Coogee residents are very used to parking several bus stops away from their residences".</p>	<p><u>Residential controls - Balconies and Terraces</u> See Council report for further discussion on this issue.</p> <p><u>58-64 Carr Street</u> See Council report for further discussion on this issue.</p> <p><u>Foreshore Scenic Protection Area</u> See Council report for further discussion on this issue.</p> <p><u>Parking</u> To clarify, existing parking rates in Council's Parking DCP are largely retained in the new DCP. There have been no changes to parking rates for residential uses (such as dwelling houses, multi dwelling housing and residential flat buildings) and business uses (including business/retail/office premises, restaurants/cafes and service stations). To align with the LEP (and standard Instrument definition), some new categories of land uses have been added to the table and some existing land use categories have been updated.</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
			<p>Otherwise, only minor adjustments were made to specific uses/development types, being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - business premises in residential zones, which is proposed to be amended from 1space/50m² to 1space/100m², to reflect a previous LEP amendment relating to Clause 35 of the repealed Randwick LEP 1998 (which amended the maximum floor space of business premises in residential zones from 50m² to 100m²); and - backpackers' accommodation, proposed to be changed from 1space/15 beds to 1space/10 beds, to ensure sufficient parking facilities for visitors. <p>Note that a small correction to the parking rates table will be included to change the category 'business premises in residential areas' to 'business and office premises in residential <u>zones</u>' to better respond to the LEP Clause 6.13 – Business premises, office premises, restaurants or cafes and shops in residential zones.</p>
D01663219	Residents Cairo Street, South Coogee	<p>Request that the review of the DCP should provide for stronger and more enforceable controls and greater certainty in planning and for fair and equitable outcomes.</p> <p>Support that the term 'preferred solutions' is no longer being used and request that the new DCP should not become too flexible for proposed development.</p>	<p><u>Performance Solutions vs Numerical Controls</u> See Council report for further discussion on this issue.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>Expect that controls in the DCP will achieve a sustainable, well designed and liveable city, rather than an over- crowded place which will adversely affect residents' amenity.</p> <p>In particular, the following issues were raised:</p> <p>1. Lack of details and transparency with regards to the pre and post DA lodgement procedures.</p> <p>2. Lack of protection for residential amenity. Amenity of all neighbouring properties should be protected, rather than adjoining properties only. The amenity of the proposed development and neighbouring properties should be equally considered.</p> <p>3. Overshadowing and solar access. Limiting the control to a portion of a window is archaic and unacceptable. All glassed areas of liveable spaces should be included in the control. Request controls to ensure new development does not overshadow existing solar panels and deep soil permeable surfaces of neighbouring properties.</p>	<p>Noted. See the LEP and DCP objectives.</p> <p>1. See response also on this issue in the Coogee Precinct's submission (D01661951).</p> <p>2. The draft DCP has introduced a new section on Design (B1 Design) which applies to all developments in Randwick City and now requires development applications to address a context and site analysis. This includes the consideration of a proposed development on surrounding properties and not just the adjoining development.</p> <p>3. <u>Overshadowing and solar access</u> Not supported. Determining the adequacy of solar access to window, glassed walls and the like is undertaken on a case by case basis as part of a merit assessment process. Including a control requiring solar access to all glassed areas of liveable spaces of neighbouring properties is considered onerous and would be difficult to achieve in certain circumstances due to issues such as subdivision pattern, allotment orientation and site topography. The reference to a 'portion of a window' is indicative only as it would be difficult to include a numerical figure.</p> <p>The draft DCP includes a number of controls to protect solar access to existing solar panels and roof panes where solar panels do not exist on</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>neighbouring properties (e.g. Low Density Residential section 5.1 Solar Access and Overshadowing). Including a blanket control to preclude the shading of existing solar panels is not recommended as it would unreasonably restrict development potential/redevelopment opportunities and owners rights to modernise housing.</p> <p>In terms of solar access to private open space, the draft DCP is considered reasonable requiring that for both new development and neighbouring properties, a minimum of 3 hours of direct sunlight should be received to private open space (see section 5.1- Solar Access and Overshadowing of c3 Low Density Residential). Similarly to solar panels, it is not recommended that a blanket control be included to prevent any overshadowing as this would be onerous and difficult to achieve.</p> <p>4. Foreshore scenic protection. Specific controls are only included for low density residential, which is insufficient given there is many medium density residential and commercial developments within the foreshore area of Coogee. The impact of new development should be minimised on the shoreline or views from the shoreline or existing coastal views of neighbouring properties.</p> <p>5. Deep soil planting, green walls and roof gardens. Deep soil planting must be a priority and cannot be replaced by green walls or roof gardens, which are generally not self sustainable due to access issues and not water-</p>	<p>4. <u>Foreshore scenic protection</u> See Council report for further discussion on this issue.</p> <p>5. Deep soil planting, green walls and roof gardens. Noted. Landscaping in the form of green walls or green roofs cannot be included for calculation as deep soil area. This has been clarified in both low</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>wise as they do not support deep rooted vegetation. Controls should be in place to ensure green walls and roof gardens do not negatively impact on neighbouring properties, with respect to view loss, overshadowing, solar access, water leakage, etc.</p> <p>6. Parking. "The DCP relaxes the current parking requirements which will add to further congestion for residents.</p> <p>Public transport and car share schemes must be encouraged but not at the expense of onsite</p>	<p>density and medium density residential sections. According to the definition of "Deep soil permeable surfaces" for low density residential, deep soil area can only be provided at the ground level and does not include planted areas above roofs. Similarly, deep soil area for medium density development must be located at ground level and must not be built upon impervious surfaces, such as concrete.</p> <p>There are generally no specific controls or no numerical controls (e.g. threshold requirements) for deep soil planting for other development types.</p> <p>The concerns regarding impacts of green roofs/walls on neighbouring properties are already addressed by the DCP controls, such as requirements for a detailed site analysis (for green roofs) to assess the site suitability and preparation of a maintenance plan (for both green roofs and walls). Further, applications for green roofs are also encouraged to contact Council's landscape offer prior to lodgement to consider any potential issues or impacts to neighbours.</p> <p>6. See response also on this issue in submission D01662131 on Page 33.</p> <p>Accordingly, the statement made under 3.3 Exceptions to the parking rates in B7 – Traffic, Parking and Access, being "These rates have not been altered in this DCP" will be amended for improved accuracy.</p> <p>It is noted that Randwick City's car parking rates are generally higher than adjoining comparable</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>Overall Objectives and Controls should be in place to ensure adequate on and off street vehicle parking is provided to meet both visitor and residential demand; obviously with the needs of residents who pay high rates being given priority".</p> <p>7. Balconies and roof top terraces. Concerned about the increasing size or and lack of setback controls for terraces and balconies, particularly in Coogee. Request controls to limit the size and to protect the amenity of neighbouring properties. Being used as a living space, they should be included in FSR calculations and have setback apply to them too. Note that there are many cases where balconies are right next to the bedrooms, studies and other quiet spaces of neighbouring properties. Request that roof top terraces should not be permitted in highly built up areas and controls should be in place to safeguard existing residential amenity.</p> <p>8. Setbacks. Welcome the fact that setbacks are now controls rather than preferred solutions. Object to the reduced setback controls. The current setbacks must be retained.</p> <p>9. Wall heights. There should be a restriction to the number of floors given the transfer out of wall heights from LEP to DCP and at least, wall</p>	<p>transport in these developments.</p> <p>Noted. An objective will be added to the Vehicle Parking Rates section, being "to ensure that an appropriate level of off-street vehicle parking is provided". Note also planning controls do not favour high over lower rate payers.</p> <p>7. <u>Balconies and Roof Top Terraces</u> See Council report for further discussion on this issue.</p> <p>8. <u>Setbacks.</u> See report for further discussion on this issue.</p> <p>9. <u>Wall heights.</u> See report for further discussion on this issue.</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>height controls must be rigorously applied. Controls, such as external wall height and ceiling height, should be strengthened especially given the increasing density of the Coogee area. Suggest replacing "10.5m" with "10m" on P26 (C4) and "8m" with "7m" on P27.</p> <p>10. Privacy issues. The increasing use of CCTV and privacy screens is increasingly creating privacy issues, view loss and amenity impacts for neighbouring properties. There must be controls in place so that no CCTV on private property can have visual surveillance of any part of neighbouring properties. Controls should also be introduced to ensure privacy screens don't cause any amenity impacts on neighbouring properties, e.g. views, overshadowing, solar access, and privacy.</p> <p>11. Fencing. Request strong controls to ensure fencing does not block views and sunlight, or overshadow neighbouring properties, and is consistent with the streetscape and topography.</p>	<p>10. <u>Re: Privacy issues with CCTV</u>. See response also on this issue in submission D01661967 on Page 23.</p> <p>In relation to privacy screens, there is an existing control proposed in the Comprehensive DCP, which requires long and massive blade walls and screens be avoided to protect view sharing (see control v) under 5.6 View Sharing of C3 and control V) under 5.5 View Sharing of C4).</p> <p>11. The fencing provisions for both the low density residential section C3 and medium density residential section C4 in the draft DCP are considered appropriate to provide a balance between privacy, safety and security for the building occupants and visual interaction with the public domain, without adversely affecting the amenity of the pedestrian environment. This is outlined in the objective for both sections.</p> <p>It is noted the fencing can be built as exempt or complying development under the NSW Codes SEPP and those DCP provisions must reflect greater flexibility than the Codes for merit DA</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>12. Swimming and spa pools, air conditioning and other mechanical equipment. Request that none of these equipment should be located near neighbours' bedrooms, other quiet areas or on roof tops and should be located centrally within the property so that there is no impact on neighbouring properties. Controls should be in place to ensure that such equipment is kept in acoustically suitable enclosures, sited accordingly and not exceeds the maximum decibel allowance.</p> <p>13. Late night trading venues and trial periods and periodic reviews. There are a large number of late night trading venues in Coogee, which can detrimentally impact on residential amenity. Council should take a zero tolerance stand to drunken and alcohol related incidents and behaviour.</p> <p>Suggest the cut off for low impact premise</p>	<p>assessment purposes.</p> <p><u>12. Swimming Pools</u> Not supported. Swimming pools can be constructed as Complying Development under the NSW Housing Code, provided a number of criteria are met including specific setbacks, requirements for sound proofing of pool pumps etc. The suggested DCP controls are considered too onerous and prescriptive, and are likely to encourage proponents to go through the Codes SEPP to gain approval for swimming pools as Complying Development, which affords less scrutiny and public input than the DA process.</p> <p>The draft DCP controls on swimming pools (contained in section) are considered to be reasonable and allow for swimming pool development in appropriate circumstances, while adequately addressing amenity considerations including measures to ameliorate potential noise impacts e.g. controls to locate pool pumps away from neighbouring dwellings, requiring pool pumps be situated in acoustically treated enclosures, setbacks etc.</p> <p><u>13 Late Night Trading</u> Noted. The DCP Late Night Trading Section applies to the entire Council area and not just Coogee. All new licensed premises or extensions to licensed premises are generally required to prepare a Social Impact Assessment as per Council's <i>Social Impact Assessment Guidelines for Development Applications</i>. As noted in the Guidelines, Council has the discretion to require a Social Impact</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>should be lower than "100" and be designated fewer than 40 patrons.</p> <p>Request that bars be included as a high impact premise, all late night venues complete a social impact assessment, all venue's closing hours be reduced, earlier lock-out and wind down times be introduced and a review or change of policy regarding the concentration of licensed premises including take away liquor outlets.</p> <p>Request that backpackers' accommodation, sex premises, amusement centres, late night trading venues have a management plan, trial periods and on-going reviews to ensure that venues are being operated properly.</p> <p>The management plan for these venues should include controls and policies relating to smoking, the prohibition of alcohol (as required) and illicit drugs on the premises and in the immediate vicinity.</p>	<p>Assessment for other uses, depending upon the scale and nature of the proposal.</p> <p>The City of Sydney Late Night Trading DCP (considered to be best practice) has a 120 patron capacity to delineate between low and high impact uses. The draft DCP has a lower threshold of 100 patrons in recognition of the smaller footprints of smaller scale businesses in Randwick City. It is worth noting that the 60 person threshold under the Liquor Amendment (Small Bars) Act 2013 applies to small bars only and such uses fall under the category of high impact late night trading premises under the draft DCP.</p> <p>The Late Night Trading section has been prepared to reflect the directions and objectives of the Randwick City Plan, the Safer Randwick City Plan and the Last Drinks Paper, through clear objectives and controls (matters of consideration and management plan requirements) which focus on minimising anti social behaviour and adverse impacts on residential amenity. It takes a balanced approach also recognising the rights of proponents to operate businesses which are legitimate permissible land uses in the business zones.</p> <p>It should be noted that the DCP cannot be more restrictive than the RLEP and prohibit uses that are permitted in a zone.</p> <p>"Bars" fall under the definition of 'pubs' as per the Standard LEP Instrument and thus are automatically categorised as High Impact in the DCP. It should be noted that the definitions and</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
			<p>terms in the draft DCP have to be consistent with the RLEP/Standard LEP Instrument.</p> <p>The Hours of Operation Table on pp 6 is a guide only and not to be considered an automatic right for applicants. The hours of operation are determined on a merit basis following careful consideration of the DCP controls and where good management can be demonstrated and where adverse impacts on residential amenity and public safety are capable of being minimised.</p> <p>Concerns regarding the concentration of late night trading premises are noted. The issue of cumulative impacts is a state wide issue and is currently being dealt with at the state level with the development of a tool to guide liquor licensing and compliance decisions by the Office of Liquor Gaming and Racing (OLGR). Known as the Environment and Venue Assessment Tool (EVAT) it assesses risk factors specifically related to liquor licence applications and is to be trialled in Newcastle and City of Sydney in 2013 and a further decision on its use will be made following the release of research findings.</p> <p>The OLGR has the authority to impose lock outs, reduce the sale of alcohol shots etc under the Liquor Act. Further information can be found on www.olgr.nsw.gov.au. It should be noted that the Management Plan requirements for late night trading require the applicant to detail measures to minimise harm, anti social behaviour and crime through the responsible sale of alcohol, and this may include lock out times etc.</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
			<p>Large scale hotels such as Coogee Bay Hotel have extended trading hours, based on historical consents and Council cannot automatically reduce such trading hours. To this end, it is important to note that the draft DCP is not retrospective and cannot derogate from existing consents.</p> <p>With respect to trial periods, these are regularly applied to venues to enable Council to assess the ongoing management performance of a premises and its impact on neighbourhood amenity (as noted in the guiding notes).</p> <p>The request to include measures to prevent the consumption of drugs is supported and it is therefore recommended that the Management Plan controls be amended to require that applicants outline actions to discourage drug use and manage drug related incidents. The Management Plan requirements note that the DA has to provide information on smoking areas and patron awareness_on the disposal of cigarette butts.</p> <p>The draft DCP cannot prohibit alcohol on a premises as liquor licensing is subject to a separate application process under the purview of the OLGR (see www.olgr.nsw.gov.au for more information).</p>
D01663242	Resident Beach Street, Coogee	Note that the DCP document lacks continuous pagination and is difficult to use.	Noted. The DCP document delivers a legible structure through continuous numbering between chapters/sections (e.g. Part A, B, C, etc & Section A1, A2, etc) and individual page numbering within

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>Excessive density offered by the DCP will result in further erosion of the residential amenity in both residential and commercial areas.</p> <p>Note that there is no improvement on parking requirements. In particular, there is no requirement for parking provision for the restaurant proposed at 58-60 Carr St. If the proposal goes ahead, it would obstruct access to parking spaces provided for existing development.</p> <p>Enquire if there is any formal development application for the site. Request that the whole</p>	<p>sections.</p> <p>It is noted that continuous pagination from Page 1 to end of the document was considered but was not adopted given that it may require unnecessary editing (e.g. page re-numbering) throughout the whole document when changes are made to individual sections or new sections are included in future. However, on the DCP website, a link for downloading of the whole DCP document will also be provided to suite different needs of DCP users. In addition, improved numbering has been made for all pages within each part and section of the DCP.</p> <p>To clarify, density/building bulk is fundamentally controlled by LEP, through zoning and principle development standards, such as FSR, height and minimum lot size. The DCP provides supplementary controls (e.g. setbacks, landscaped area, wall height) to further define the building envelope and guide the design and construction of developments. DCP controls generally do not intensify the mass and bulk of a development that is already regulated by the LEP.</p> <p>There have been no major changes proposed to existing parking rates. Any future changes will be guided by a separate and detailed technical review. Note also that Car parking requirements set out in both Medium Density Residential section (C4) and the general parking section (B7) apply to any proposed development at 58-60 Carr St.</p> <p>To confirm, there is currently no formal DA for the</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>section in the DCP relating to Carr St should be removed.</p> <p>Note that "the DCP would be greatly improved: 1) if all non-quantitative aims and objects are simply struck out;</p> <p>2) if all 'should's are replaced by 'shall's, and 'may's by 'must's".</p>	<p>site. Site specific controls are included in the draft DCP in line with issues raised in community consultation on the LEP 2012 (when exhibited in draft form) and with subsequent Council resolution of May 2012. The request to remove the whole section in the DCP relating to Carr St is therefore not supported.</p> <p>Not supported. Aims and objectives in the DCP, both quantitative and non-quantitative ones, are critical in clarifying the intent of controls and what the controls are seeking to achieve. In some circumstances, variations to the provided numerical controls are supported given that they can also achieve the objectives of the controls. DCP controls must be read in conjunction with relevant objectives when preparing or assessing development applications.</p> <p>Not supported. "Should", "must" and "may" have been carefully used in the DCP document to suit different circumstances. However, these will again be reviewed to ensure suitable usage.</p>
D01662876	Resident Cairo St South Coogee	<p><u>Preferred Solutions vs Numerical Controls</u></p> <p>Support that the term 'preferred solutions' has been replaced by 'controls'. Note that moving certain planning controls, such as landscaped area, wall heights from the LEP to the DCP can cause real concerns when some developments constantly push the boundaries, creating adverse effects around them.</p> <p>Support the recognition, respect and protection</p>	<p><u>Preferred Solutions vs Numerical Controls</u></p> <p>See detailed discussion in the report on this issue.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>of valued heritage in Randwick City. Support controls that encourage design to respect streetscape, provide ecologically sustainable development, preserve and enhance biodiversity and provide at least 25% permeable surfaces.</p> <p>Expect that the vision of racecourse in part E will allow its open space value to be maintained, along with a focus on both its history and the advancement of horse training and racing.</p> <p>Support controls relating to "the limits to terraces and roof-top decks" in 4.4(i) and amenity controls in 5.3 & 5.4 of C3, which clearly show Council's awareness of serious problems relating to privacy.</p> <p>Support section 5.6, which refers to the impacts on views from developments, with some focus on maintaining views from the public domain. In relation to 5.6 (V), questioned the extent to which privacy screens can be provided.</p> <p><u>Outdoor Entertainment Areas</u> Note that there is limited control for outdoor entertainment areas. Garages, pools and</p>	<p>Noted. The draft DCP acknowledges the open space value and heritage significance of the Racecourse. Note that major development on the site is now covered by SEPP (State and Regional Development), which does not take DCPs into account. However this section of the DCP will be retained to guide other relevant development on the Racecourse.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p><u>Privacy Screens</u> Support noted. To clarify, privacy screens are assessed on a case by case basis taking into account the site conditions and privacy and view considerations for neighbouring properties and the public domain. As each site is unique, it is difficult to include numerical controls to quantify the extent of privacy screens. Assessment of privacy screens should continue to be undertaken on a merit basis.</p> <p><u>Outdoor Entertainment Areas</u> To clarify, the draft DCP includes a range of controls to address design, amenity and privacy</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>unroofed decks and terraces may encroach on required rear setbacks (S 3.3.3 (III)).</p> <p>Questioned why there is no particular control on where swimming pools can be placed.</p> <p>Questioned the term 'transitional areas' used in one of the objectives in Section 4 -building design and queried how Council justify that an area is a 'transitional area'. Same term was used in the LEP but the LEP does not provide any explanation on this. "This is similar to the concept of 'Design Excellence', which allows for significant non-compliance, but itself being a</p>	<p>considerations for a variety of outdoor entertainment areas including decks, terraces, and balconies. These forms of development are also classified as Exempt Development Under the NSW Housing Code, and therefore do not require development consent (subject to meeting a number of criteria). Notably, the Housing Code does not contain rear setback restrictions with respect to these forms of development. Including more onerous controls than the Housing Code is not recommended as it may encourage proponents to go through the SEPP to facilitate decks and the like as Exempt Development.</p> <p><u>Swimming Pools</u> Swimming pools are classified as Complying Development under the NSW Housing Code provided certain criteria are met (e.g. setbacks, suitable acoustic measures for pool pumps etc). Including more onerous and prescriptive controls in the draft DCP for this form of ancillary development is not recommended as it may encourage proponents to go through the Codes SEPP to gain approval as Complying Development which affords less scrutiny and public input than the DA process.</p> <p>Noted. Further clarification will be added to B1 – Design, under 3.1 - Context analysis, to interpret relevant terms and how they relate to each other, such as “character” and “areas undergoing transition”, which are also used in the zoning objectives in the LEP.</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>very open term that allows for varied interpretation".</p> <p>Note that there was significant community dissatisfaction expressed at all community meetings held through the planning stage of Maroubra Beach, especially when "the planner explained that any articulation for the building along the beachfront had gone with Council's enforced reduction in height of the building".</p> <p>Note that if development that is deemed to be both necessary and desirable can still maintain the residential amenity, it would be a fair outcome.</p>	<p>The Maroubra Beach commercial centre DCP is a culmination of a 3 year process. The process involved the establishment of the Maroubra Beach Working Group which comprised of local residents, property owners, the Maroubra Beach Precinct Committee and the Maroubra Chamber of Commerce. The development controls contained within DCP section D8 - Maroubra Beach Centre are the final step of a process which involved extensive consultation at all stages. The masterplan and subsequent LEP/DCP controls are the result of a consensus based process which has sought to balance and integrate the views and interests of all stakeholders. Note that this section also includes articulation requirements.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
D01663213	Resident	<p>Noted that the submission was made based on Parts A and B of the DCP, given that "Parts C, D and E haven't been published?"</p> <p>Raised issues relating to solar reflection caused by reflective materials (refer to the submission for technical details).</p>	<p>The draft DCP is a comprehensive document containing six Parts (Part A to F). During the exhibition period, the entire document (all parts/sections) can be viewed at Council's admin building, three public libraries and downloaded at a tailor made consultation webpage (www.yoursayrandwick.com.au).</p> <p>Concern noted. Both sections on Low Density and Medium Density residential require a schedule detailing materials and finishes to accompany the DA documentation and specifically, finishing</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>Noted that some terminology used in the DCP are imprecise and ambiguous, can cause confusion. For example, "Ensure quality design that reflects a site's character and context (good, bad or indifferent quality? who determines this?); "A place with a high quality public realm (Place itself is not defined and would not normally be used for an individual building which the DCP covers?)".</p> <p>Noted that "A stand on the issues which planners have to deal with on a daily basis, will save time and money, and is one essential step towards 'Quality Control', time/cost reduction and accountability within the planning office". Recommend to write a clear statement of intent, with an attached 'commentary/guide notes' outlining the various standards that apply and circumstances for inclusion, modification or exclusion.</p> <p>Also commended that given the time constraints, the DCP is well structured, presented and "something that all those who contributed should be proud of".</p>	<p>materials must be non-reflective.</p> <p>Comment noted. Draft DCP has been reviewed to improve clarify, consistency and explanations of terminology. Note that B1 – Design of the DCP will be updated to clarify these issues.</p> <p>Noted. This has been addressed by the new DCP through its user-friendly structure – two key components being “objectives” and “controls” and an “Explanation” section to aid the interpretation or provide background information to the controls. Additionally, side notes and highlighted text boxes are also included to clarify and explain specific issues. It is acknowledged that Part A – Introduction could be improved for clarity and will be reviewed to consider better explanation of the application of the DCP parts and sections.</p> <p>Compliments noted.</p>
D01662878	Resident Arden St Coogee	All buildings abutting public land boundary (public open space) should be set back to provide a buffer space.	Noted. As noted in the Design section (B1), development proposals (e.g. new buildings or external alterations/additions) are required to conduct a context analysis, to identify and appropriately respond to existing prevailing built

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>The open spaces of the racecourse are viewed by thousands every day; don't use taxpayers' money for corporate and private members. The proposed hotel is over-endowed with bars, and the sign is very large and bright.</p> <p>Don't turn High Street into a tunnel beset on both sides by competing high rise buildings.</p>	<p>and natural features in the streetscape and landscape context of a site. This will include appropriate design measures that recognise and maintain the recreational, aesthetic and ecological values of any existing public open space, such as adequate set backs of building structures that may have significant overshadowing impacts on the open space.</p> <p>However, in some circumstances, development, built to the boundary of public open space, may also be permitted, provided that it could achieve specific design outcomes. For example, development in Block 2 of Kensington Commercial Centre, as per the building envelope controls, can be built to the boundary of Kokoda Park, to achieve positive relationship between the development and the park while recognising the building layout of the previous club, which was also built to boundary.</p> <p>See response on similar issues in submission D01662876 on Page 46.</p> <p>The LEP includes only minor changes to heights (to 15m) along some parts of High St. The DCP doesn't contain any controls regulating heights of buildings. It provides building envelopes within the LEP height controls. The Urban Activation Precinct program – Randwick Precinct, initiated by the State Government, is currently underway. It is investigating potential opportunities for growth for</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		<p>Suggest views to Blenheim house are "required" rather than "encouraged".</p> <p>Dismayed that "Hygena and Corana" on Belmore Road are to disappear into a modern high rise. They should be heritage listed and saved. They offer affordable boarding house accommodation.</p> <p>Carr Street: area is zoned residential; but owners have special treatment, allowing developer to have their cake and eat it too. Why are residential controls not applied? Developable area extends to side boundaries and ignores setbacks for medium density residential development. This will block the sea view of neighbouring development and present</p>	<p>Randwick Education/Health Specialised Centre, including High St, to achieve the maximum use of the new infrastructure (i.e. light rail extension to Randwick) and optimal land use outcomes (e.g. provision of housing and employment close to open space and public transport). The NSW Government's website http://www.planning.nsw.gov.au/HousingDelivery/UrbanActivation/Randwick/tabid/616/language/en-US/Default.aspx will provide more information as the program investigations proceed.</p> <p>The DCP contains controls for 15 Blenheim St (Blenheim House curtilage) under section 8.4 of C4 – Medium density Residential. These controls are provided to encourage (but cannot require) redevelopment of the privately owned subject site adjacent to Blenheim House to improve the curtilage and amenity of Blenheim House and achieve better design outcomes.</p> <p>These buildings are not earmarked for removal – rather it is the site adjacent that contains new envelope controls to facilitate redevelopment for health/medical and residential uses.</p> <p>See detailed discussion in the Council report on this issue.</p>

TRIM ref	Submitter	Submission	Council Officers' Response
		a bulky built form to the foreshore. Developing on the driveway will block access to the car park.	
D01660255	Resident	<p>Noted that the draft documents are broken into sections and finding and reading through it is difficult.</p> <p>Noted that "DCP is a legal document" and as such must use appropriate and precise language. This document is secondary to the LEP and yet there is no contextual linkage between the documents.</p>	<p>The comprehensive DCP is a large document which consolidates all existing 26 DCPs/policies and includes new sections to address a range of issues, such as ESD, water management, boarding houses, etc. Through Council's consultation website, residents or DCP users are able to view and download individual sections relevant to their purposes. However, a link which allows downloading of the whole document will also be provided. Some restructuring of the sections and improved numbering will also be included, as per feedback on the DCP, to improve the structure of the document.</p> <p>To clarify, the DCP is a guidance document to give effect to the aims of the LEP, to achieve zoning objectives and to facilitate permitted development. The contextual linkage between the LEP and DCP is clarified in Part 1 Introduction (1.1 purpose of the plan in particular) and in references where relevant in various parts of the DCP.</p>

Queries

TRIM ref		Queries	Council Officers' Response
D01642844	Resident Randwick	Enquire about the status of the site at the corner of Prince St and Frances St, Randwick, which was originally part of the old tram route.	The site is owned by the State Transit Authority NSW and currently being used as an informal car park. It has been rezoned to RE1 Public Recreation under the RLEP 2012 to recognise its potential/future use as a pocket park to provide continuation of the parkland along Frances St.