

ATTACHMENT 2 – Summary of draft CoP DCP and response to Discussion Paper Recommendations

Council prepared the Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper (Discussion Paper) as the first stage of the harmonisation review process. The Discussion Paper identified the differences between the existing LEPs and DCPs that currently apply in the City and suggested options for how local planning controls could be consolidated (or 'harmonised').

Council endorsed the Discussion Paper on 26 November 2018 and a copy can be viewed here:

[Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper](#)

Contents

Table 1 – General	3
Table 2 – Hazard and Pollution Management	5
Table 3 – Protection of the Natural Environment.....	12
Table 4 – Environmental Performance	18
Table 5 – Heritage and Archaeology	22
Table 6 – General Design Controls	27
Table 7 – Controls Specific to Residential Development	31
Table 8 – Traffic and Parking	38
Table 9 – Controls Specific to Other Development.....	45

Abbreviations used in this Attachment

ARHSEPP	State Environmental Planning Policy (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009
ADG	Apartment Design Guide
AS	Australian Standard
BCA	Building Code of Australia
Codes SEPP	State Environmental Planning Policy (Exempt and Complying Codes) 2008
CoP	City of Parramatta
DCP	Development Control Plan
Education and Child Care SEPP	State Environmental Planning Policy (Educational Establishments and Child Care Facilities) 2017
EP&A Act	Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979
EV	Electric Vehicle
HCA	Heritage Conservation Area
LEP	Local Environmental Plan
LGA	Local Government Area
LSPS	Local Strategic Planning Statement
SEPP	State Environmental Planning Policy
SEPP 19	State Environmental Planning Policy No 19 – Bushland in Urban Areas
SEPP 55	State Environmental Planning Policy No 55 – Remediation of Land
SEPP 64	State Environmental Planning Policy No 64 – Advertising and Signage
SOPA	Sydney Olympic Park Authority
Biodiversity and Conservation SEPP	State Environmental Planning Policy (Biodiversity and Conservation) 2021
Housing SEPP	State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021
Resilience and Hazards SEPP	State Environmental Planning Policy (Resilience and Hazards) 2021
Planning Systems SEPP	State Environmental Planning Policy (Planning Systems) 2021
Sustainable Buildings SEPP	State Environmental Planning Policy (Sustainable Buildings) 2022
Transport and Infrastructure SEPP	State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021
Vegetation SEPP	State Environmental Planning Policy (Vegetation in Non-Rural Areas) 2017

Key

✓	DCP includes provisions on this issue
*	DCP does not contain any provisions in this issue

Table 1 – General

Topics: Introductory sections and definitions, Notification procedures, Submission requirements

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
Introductory sections and definitions	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	All of the DCPs have an introduction chapter that sets out legislative information, definitions, previous amendments, aims and objectives and other administrative information.	A consolidated introduction chapter will be adopted in the DCP.	<p>Consistent with the recommendations of the Discussion Paper.</p> <p>Part 1 contains a consolidated introduction with administrative updates to reflect the new boundary with a land application map. This includes a statement to explain that this DCP will repeal the five DCPs that were inherited from Auburn, Holroyd, Hornsby The Hills, and Parramatta.</p> <p>Savings and transitional provisions are also included to ensure that development applications lodged under the previous DCP are not disadvantaged.</p> <p>Refer to Part 1 – Introduction of the draft CoP DCP.</p>
Notification procedures	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Notification requirements vary across the DCPs, particularly in regards to minimum exhibition times and notification requirements (e.g. adjoining vs adjacent land owners).	Under recent amendments to the <i>EP&A Act</i> , Councils are required to prepare a Community Participation Plan, which sets out when and how Council will engage with the community, including notification of development proposals. DCP notification requirements will be reviewed as part of work to prepare a Community Participation Plan.	<p>Consistent with the recommendations of the Discussion Paper.</p> <p>In December 2020, Council consolidated the various sets of development application (DA) notification requirements from the Development Control Plans, into a single and consistent set of requirements. The Consolidated Development Application Notification Requirements have formed an appendix to the Community Engagement Strategy.</p> <p>The DCP has been updated to make reference to the updated list of requirements which supersedes former requirements, including Appendix 5 Notification requirements from Parramatta DCP 2011.</p> <p>Refer to Part 1 – Introduction, Section 1.9 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>
Submission requirements	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	Auburn DCP includes a section outlining the documents and information required to be submitted with a development application. Other DCPs do not, but provide the information instead through Council's website.	It is proposed to keep a list of submission requirements on Council's website as this allows them to most easily be kept up to date. A separate section in the DCP is not considered necessary. Submission requirements will be reviewed as necessary as part of the	Part 1 contains a link to Council's website outlining information on submitting a development application. However, in some instances, development application submission requirements for specific development types within the DCP have been retained with minor updates to reflect recommendations from the Discussion Paper

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
							development of the consolidated DCP to reflect the policies and controls that will be included.	<p>relating to that development. This applies to some requirements in Part 4 Non-Residential Uses, Part 5 Environmental Management. For example, Part 4 submission details for Places of Public Worship include the requirement to lodge a Noise Impact Assessment and Operational Plan of Management as this is current practice.</p> <p>Refer to Part 1– Introduction, Section 1.9 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>

Table 2 – Hazard and Pollution Management

Topics: Flooding, Stormwater management, Protection of groundwater, Soil management (sedimentation, acid sulfate soils and salinity), Sloping sites, Land contamination, Air quality, Bush fire prone land

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
Flooding	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>Parramatta, Auburn, Holroyd and The Hills DCPs take a similar approach, applying detailed development controls to development based on land use type and a site's level of flood risk.</p> <p>General principles and controls are broadly consistent across these DCPs, however there is some variation in the language used and in some of the detailed requirements, such as those for car parking areas and emergency evacuation.</p> <p>The DCPs generally limit the most sensitive and critical uses to locations with lowest flood risk, however there are some differences. Parramatta DCP considers sensitive land uses such as child care centres, hospitals, schools and seniors housing as unsuitable anywhere within the extent of the largest flood that could ever occur (the 'Probable Maximum Flood'). Other DCPs allow these uses in medium and/or low risk areas.</p> <p>Within the highest flood risk areas, most DCPs tend to only support open space uses and 'concessional development', being one-off small scale extensions to existing development (generally of no more than 10% in floor area). Holroyd DCP also specifies that larger scale redevelopment may be supported in high flood risk areas where there is an economic imperative.</p> <p>By contrast to the other DCPs, Hornsby DCP provides a very limited set of controls.</p>	<p>Detailed DCP controls will be reviewed to ensure a clear and consistent set of requirements are applied to development on flood prone land, consistent with the NSW <i>Floodplain Development Manual</i>. The controls will guide a merit based assessment of development to ensure that appropriate measures are taken to reduce or eliminate the risks from flooding to owners and occupiers of flood prone property and the wider community.</p> <p>It is proposed to use a matrix style approach, backed with clear and unambiguous controls, to clearly identify the specific design and siting controls that apply to development, based on the type of land use and degree of flood risk.</p> <p>Sensitive uses, such as child care centres, schools, seniors housing and hospitals are not considered suitable on flood prone land. This matter is also discussed in Section 7.3 of the Discussion Paper.</p> <p>Less sensitive uses, such as residential and commercial development, may be located within the flood planning area (the area covered by water in a 1 in 100-year flood plus freeboard of 500mm), but not in floodways, high hazard flowpaths or significant flood storage areas.</p> <p>Development within high flood risk areas will be limited to low intensity open space uses and 'concessional development', being one-off minor additions or alterations to existing properties of up to 10% of existing habitable floor area.</p> <p>Consistent with the current approach taken by DCPs, development will need to demonstrate that it will not expose people to unacceptable risk, or significantly increase flood affectation elsewhere, such as by altering flood flows, velocities or levels.</p>	<p>The recommendations from the Discussion Paper have largely been adopted with some changes to support existing policy.</p> <p>The existing Parramatta DCP 2011 controls have been updated to reflect recent State and Federal policy amendments such as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Best Practice Guidance Australian Institute of Disaster Resilience (AIDR) Handbook 7 Considering <i>Flooding in Land Use Planning (2021)</i> Local Environmental Plan (LEP) clauses which introduces flood related development controls <p>The existing Parramatta DCP 2011 controls have also been further supplemented with suitable controls carried across from other DCPs currently applying to the City of Parramatta.</p> <p>Controls carried across from other DCPs applying to the City of Parramatta were workshopped with City of Parramatta Council engineers to ensure only suitable controls have been carried across to apply to the new City. Where suitable, this included some of the contemporary best practice controls contained within the exhibited Parramatta City Centre DCP. An overview of the key controls and policy direction within the draft CoP DCP are included below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> General flooding controls are proposed in addition to the flood matrix, in line with the Discussion paper recommendation. Objectives and controls in line with a risk-based approach to floodplain development and mitigation of potential harm based on a merit assessment consistent with the current Floodplain Development Manual have been added. This includes additional controls outlining flood study and modelling

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
							<p>It is proposed to adopt controls relating to the design of car parking consistent with those within the Parramatta DCP. These strongly discourage basement car parks within the floodplain. Where basement car parks are necessary they are required to be protected from all flooding and provide an adequate emergency response and evacuation plan.</p> <p>Over the longer term Council is undertaking new flood studies covering the new LGA, which will inform the preparation of a new floodplain risk management study and plan. Further review of DCP controls may be required once this work is completed.</p>	<p>requirements, which requires greater consideration for surrounding sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Basement car parking continues to be discouraged in the floodplain. However, in instances where Council may consider basement car parking due to other site planning considerations, the draft CoP DCP contains additional controls to clarify requirements for basement car parking within the floodplain to minimise risk Sensitive uses continue to be prohibited in the floodplain. However, the draft CoP DCP includes controls to outline requirements for centre based childcare facilities and aged care facilities which must be demonstrated for such development to be considered in the floodplain by Council. Controls have been added to outline Council's expectations for flood hazard modelling. Land use categories have been updated in line with State Government flood planning guidelines. Where provisions such as 'shelter in place' are already permitted under the current PDCP 2011, controls outlining further requirements have been added. Controls have been added to clarify Council's expectation for development adjoining floodways and foreshore areas. Requirements for flood warning and emergency response plans have been added to ensure practical plans are applied. In line with the current approach, it is outlined that warning and response plans cannot be considered to reduce the hydraulic hazard. Additional controls relating to flooding have been added for development adjoining water ways. New objectives have been included to encourage the naturalisation and semi-naturalisation of concrete floodway channels and creeks where feasible. New controls have been added that require development to

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
								incorporate protection and conservation of riparian zones, as well as facilitating human access, amenity and public safety as appropriate. Refer to Part 5– Environmental Management, Section 5.1 of the draft CoP DCP.
Stormwater management	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>All DCPs include controls aimed at managing the impacts of stormwater runoff from development sites which are broadly similar in intent, however there are some differences in detailed requirements. Auburn DCP has less of a focus on Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) than the others.</p> <p>Generally, DCPs require development to not increase run-off from a site. In addition, certain development is required to incorporate treatment measures. One difference between DCPs is the development thresholds for when stormwater treatments controls are to be applied. For example, Parramatta DCP requires a WSUD Strategy for residential development as small as 5 dwellings on sites of 1,500sqm or more, whereas other DCPs set a larger site-area based threshold (Holroyd DCP: 2,500sqm+ and Hornsby DCP: 2,000sqm+).</p> <p>Holroyd, Hornsby, and Parramatta DCPs (and The Hills DCP, in part) prescribe minimum stormwater quality targets that development requiring a WSUD Strategy needs to meet. There is some variation in these targets across DCPs.</p> <p>Some DCPs also include technical requirements for the design of drainage systems.</p> <p>There is opportunity to review the controls so that they better align with Council's vision of bringing back swimming to the Parramatta River by 2025. The Harmonisation process also presents an opportunity to update controls so that they are clearer, more effectively implemented and reflect latest best practice.</p>	<p>It is proposed to include objectives and design principles consistent with those in Parramatta DCP as these are considered to be reasonably comprehensive. Stormwater management controls will be updated to ensure they reflect best practice.</p> <p>It is proposed to adopt thresholds for requiring stormwater treatment measures consistent with Parramatta DCP. Much of the development in Parramatta is on smaller sites, therefore adopting the larger site thresholds of other DCPs would result in very few developments being required to implement WSUD and achieve stormwater quality targets.</p> <p>For development that meets the thresholds, it is proposed to apply the stormwater treatment targets set out in Parramatta DCP as these are consistent with targets set by other Sydney councils and Sydney Olympic Park Authority (SOPA). However, it is recommended that the targets for hydrocarbons, oil and grease be updated to require a 90% reduction in the post development mean annual load, consistent with those set by SOPA.</p> <p>It is also proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> That development should use landscape based approaches to meet stormwater quality controls as these provide benefits beyond stormwater quality treatment, in line with the broader intentions of water sensitive urban design. Where stormwater treatment measures are required, to require developers to provide evidence that they have put in place a minimum three-year contract for the 	<p>The recommendations from the Discussion Paper have largely been implemented in the draft CoP DCP.</p> <p>Examples of these include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improving reduced stormwater treatment targets by increasing the reduction targets. Specifying WSUD requirements for smaller developments and larger developments. Specifying landscape based measures and methods to achieve WSUD. Technical specifications for the design of drainage will be retained within Council <i>Development Engineering Design Guidelines</i>. <p>To reflect best practice and distil between stormwater management, WSUD and on-site detention management requirements, additional changes have been made and these include:</p> <p>New provisions derived from the review and consolidation of Council's Stormwater Disposal Policy into the DCP.</p> <p>Elevating key references from Council's <i>Development Engineering Design Guidelines</i> to strengthen controls and provide better guidance.</p> <p>Refer to Part 5– Environmental Management, Section 5.1.3 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
							<p>maintenance of on-site water treatment technology.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where stormwater treatment measures are required, to include a requirement for development to reduce storm-water runoff from a site (compared to current requirements for no net increase). This will assist with reducing pollutant loads of waterways and to encourage water collection and reuse. A reduction target of approximately 10% is proposed. It is also proposed to adopt the Holroyd LEP clause for stormwater management in the consolidated LEP (refer to Appendix A of the Discussion Paper). <p>Technical specifications for the design of drainage can be covered by a companion document and do not need to be included in the DCP.</p>	
Protection of groundwater	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>Parramatta DCP is the only document with a standalone section on groundwater protection. Holroyd DCP makes reference to groundwater, but these provisions are insubstantial and relate back to WSUD and salinity.</p>	<p>As detailed controls for groundwater protection are only found in Parramatta DCP, it is proposed to retain these provisions in the consolidated DCP.</p>	<p>The recommendations from the Discussion Paper have been implemented in the draft CoP DCP.</p> <p>To improve the management and discharge of groundwater additional controls have been added to the draft CoP DCP. These have also been prepared in response to the limitations of the current controls that have arisen during the development assessment process.</p> <p>The key changes are outlined below and have been guided by Council's Engineers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New provisions with clear requirements for the different phases of a development including: during construction phase only (including temporary aquifer interference) in the long term with tanked construction and minimal aquifer interference in the long term with non-tanked (waterproofed) construction and aquifer interference. Preparation of Groundwater Guidelines by Council's technical specialists to be published on Council website to assist applicants with the use of the controls.

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
								Refer to Part 5– Environmental Management, Section 5.1.5 of the draft CoP DCP.
Soil management (sedimentation, acid sulfate soils and salinity)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>All DCPs include controls for erosion and sedimentation. These controls are generally consistent and reference the guidelines in <i>Managing Urban Stormwater: Soils and Construction</i> (the 'Blue Book') published by Landcom. Hornsby DCP is generally clearer and more prescriptive than the other DCPs and sets out different submission requirements depending on the size of a development site.</p> <p>Controls for acid sulfate soils are only included in Parramatta and Hornsby DCPs. Both DCPs are generally consistent.</p> <p>Salinity is addressed in Parramatta and Holroyd DCPs only. While Holroyd DCP is more detailed on this issue, both DCPs are consistent in that they adopt the <i>Western Sydney Salinity Code of Practice</i> as the basis for identifying when and what investigations and measures are needed to address potential salinity risk.</p> <p>The Holroyd DCP controls are applied in conjunction with the Salinity Map in Holroyd LEP to identify potential salinity risk. Parramatta DCP instead refers to the Salinity Study Map for Western Sydney. Both maps are based on the same source data.</p>	<p>Where a site is disturbed, it is proposed to require development to provide appropriate erosion sedimentation control measures to control runoff, mitigate soil erosion and trap pollutants before they can reach downslope lands and receiving watercourses. Such measures are to be designed in accordance with the 'Blue Book', as per the current approach across most of the DCPs. Application requirements will be in accordance with the level of sensitivity and amount of disturbed area on the site.</p> <p>It is proposed to retain the controls in Parramatta DCP for acid sulfate soils and apply these across the LGA, as these provisions reflect established procedures and are consistent with Hornsby DCP.</p> <p>It is proposed to retain the Parramatta DCP controls for salinity and apply these across the LGA. As the <i>Western Sydney Salinity Code of Practice</i> provides detailed guidance on salinity management additional DCP controls are not considered necessary to manage this issue in the LGA. Given the extension of the Parramatta DCP salinity controls to the former Holroyd area, it is proposed to remove the Holroyd LEP salinity clause from the consolidated LEP.</p> <p>It is noted that the BCA outlines technical requirements for the management of salinity and acid sulfate soils.</p>	<p>The recommendations from the Discussion Paper have been implemented in the draft CoP DCP.</p> <p>The draft CoP DCP retains the Acid Sulfate Soils and Salinity provisions from the Parramatta DCP 2011. In line with the structural changes proposed as part of the draft CoP DCP, the development principles were converted into an objective or control.</p> <p>Administrative or 'housekeeping' changes made to ensure contemporary policy references. For example, reference to the <i>Salinity Study Map for Western Sydney 2006</i> was removed and updated with the new <i>Map of Salinity Potential in Western Sydney 2022</i>.</p> <p>Refer to Part 5 – Environmental Management, Section 5.2 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>
Sloping sites	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>All DCPs have controls for sloping sites and cut and fill, which have a consistent aim to minimise disturbance to the natural topography of a site.</p> <p>Holroyd, Hornsby and The Hills DCPs prescribe maximums for how much cut and fill can occur.</p>	<p>There is a need for clear and strong controls in the LGA. For sloping sites, it is proposed to retain the provisions in Parramatta DCP, with the addition of the Hornsby DCP requirement for a geotechnical report for development applications on sites with a gradient of 20% or greater.</p>	<p>The recommendations from the Discussion Paper have been implemented in the draft CoP DCP.</p> <p>As per the Discussion Paper the Parramatta DCP 2011 controls have been transferred into the draft CoP DCP and supplemented with maximum cut and fill provisions from the Hornsby, Holroyd and the Hills DCPs; along with the Hornsby DCP</p>

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
						<p>Parramatta and Auburn DCPs do not, applying more general provisions.</p> <p>Hornsby and The Hills DCPs mandate when a geotechnical report is required, which the other DCPs do not.</p>	<p>It is proposed to prescribe maximum cut and fill provisions, drawing on the controls in Holroyd, Hornsby and The Hills DCPs. Consideration will be given to the most appropriate controls to adopt. It is anticipated that the strongest controls will be retained.</p>	<p>requirement for a geotechnical report for development applications on sites with a gradient of 20% or greater.</p> <p>Refer to Part 5 – Environmental Management, Section 5.2.4 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>
Land contamination	*	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>Most DCPs have controls which aim to reduce potential land contamination and any associated risk to public health and the environment.</p> <p>The controls generally focus on when a contamination assessment is required or when a DA is needed for remediation work. Parramatta and Hornsby DCPs rely on the provisions of <i>SEPP 55</i> for investigating and managing land contamination.</p> <p>Parramatta and Holroyd DCPs have a supporting asbestos / contaminated land policy, which provide information for the local community and wider public about land contamination and Council's responsibilities.</p> <p>The Hills DCP only has controls for the Wright's Road precinct in Kellyville, which do not apply in the City of Parramatta LGA.</p>	<p>It is proposed to adopt the provisions in Parramatta DCP, as these controls are considered to be the strongest. The list of 'activities that may cause contamination' (Table 2.4.4.1 of Parramatta DCP) will be expanded to include works that may disturb asbestos on known James Hardie Legacy Contamination sites, which were once used for the disposal of asbestos products.</p> <p>Contaminated land will also be managed under the <i>Contaminated Land Management Act 1997</i>, the <i>EP&A Act</i> and <i>SEPP 55</i>, which supersede the provisions of the DCP where there is an inconsistency.</p> <p>The State Government has indicated it intends to replace <i>SEPP 55</i> with a new <i>Remediation of Land SEPP</i>. A further review of the DCP may be required once the new SEPP comes into effect.</p>	<p>The recommendations from the Discussion Paper have been implemented in the draft CoP DCP.</p> <p>As recommended in the Discussion Paper, proposed Land Contamination controls have retained and adopted those in the Parramatta DCP.</p> <p>In the table 'Activities that May Cause Contamination', any works on James Hardy Legacy sites although specifically mentioning earthworks, has been expanded to include any works that may cause potential disturbances to land.</p> <p>Legislation references have been updated to include the current legislative framework, which as flagged by the Discussion Paper, supersedes the provisions of the DCP. This includes all references to <i>SEPP 55</i> being replaced with <i>SEPP (Resilience and Hazards) 2021</i>.</p> <p>Refer to Part 5 – Environmental Management, Section 5.2.5 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>
Air quality	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>All of the DCPs have controls for managing air quality. The intent is broadly consistent - to protect air quality and reduce pollution and odour emissions – but the matters for consideration differ, such as what reports are required to support a DA.</p> <p>Air quality controls in Auburn, Holroyd and The Hills DCPs apply to industrial development only, whereas Parramatta and Hornsby DCPs apply more generally. Hornsby DCP also has special considerations for sensitive land uses (e.g. child care centres) near major roads and requires an Air Quality Assessment in these cases. Holroyd DCP requires an assessment of air quality for</p>	<p>It is proposed to adopt the approach in Parramatta DCP, which is to apply air quality controls to all development that may cause atmospheric pollution or odour.</p> <p>A new requirement will be inserted from Hornsby DCP that requires an Air Quality Assessment for air quality sensitive uses (e.g. child care centres) that are proposed within 100m of a major road.</p> <p>Updates will be made to reference current legislative requirements, including the need to for all development to be undertaken in accordance with the <i>Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997</i>, the</p>	<p>The recommendations from the Discussion Paper have been implemented in the draft CoP DCP.</p> <p>As per the Discussion Paper the Parramatta DCP 2011 controls have been transferred into the draft CoP DCP and supplemented with the Air Quality Assessment for air quality sensitive uses control from the Hornsby DCP.</p> <p>Legislation references have been updated to include the current legislative framework, which as flagged elsewhere in the Discussion Paper, supersedes the provisions of the DCP.</p>

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
						industrial developments to be submitted with a DA.	<i>Protection of the Environment Operations (Clear Air) Regulation 2010</i> , the <i>Infrastructure SEPP</i> , relevant Australian Standards and any other requirements of the NSW Environmental Protection Authority, such as <i>Approved Methods of Modelling and Assessment of Air Pollutants in New South Wales</i> and the <i>Technical Framework - Assessment and Management of Odour from Stationary Sources in NSW</i> .	Refer to Part 5 – Environmental Management, Section 5.2.6 of the draft CoP DCP.
Bush fire prone land	x	x	✓	x	✓	<p>The City of Parramatta has inherited bush fire prone land from The Hills and Hornsby LGAs. Council is currently working with the NSW Rural Fire Services (RFS) to review and update the mapping of bush fire prone land in the LGA.</p> <p>Both The Hills and Hornsby DCPs have controls for bush fire management, which generally require compliance with the RFS publication <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006</i>. Hornsby DCP has a small number of additional matters for consideration relating to asset protection zones and minimising the need for bush fire hazard reduction.</p>	It is proposed to adopt the provisions from Hornsby DCP. The <i>EP&A Act</i> requires all development on bush fire prone land to be undertaken in accordance with <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006</i> , which identifies best practice guidelines for developing in bush fire prone areas. As such, detailed additional DCP controls are not considered necessary.	<p>The recommendations from the Discussion Paper have been implemented in the draft CoP DCP.</p> <p>Bush fire prone land controls from the Hornsby DCP have been added, and references to the most current bush fire policy framework (i.e. <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2019</i>) have been included.</p> <p>Refer to Part 5 – Environmental Management, Section 5.2.7 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>

Table 3 – Protection of the Natural Environment

Topics: General landscaping controls, Biodiversity, Tree and vegetation protection, Natural waterways and riparian zones

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
General landscaping controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>All DCPs have landscaping controls for residential and non-residential development, which cover issues such as minimum dimensions, siting and planting requirements. These controls vary across DCPs, particularly minimum landscaping requirements and detailed design specifications.</p> <p>Holroyd and The Hills DCPs are generally more detailed and have a number of technical requirements not found in other DCPs, including for construction standards, maintenance, drainage and considerations during/after construction.</p> <p>All DCPs include objectives and/or controls seeking existing trees and vegetation to be considered in the design of development and retained, where possible.</p> <p>Controls for landscaping and deep soil areas are not clearly differentiated in DCPs. While 'landscaped areas' may include hard surfaces (e.g. driveways) or swimming pools, 'deep soil zones' are areas of natural ground with no impervious obstructions above or below. Deep soil is important as it promotes healthy growth of large trees, protects existing mature trees and allows water to infiltrate naturally to ground water.</p> <p>Green roofs and walls are poorly addressed across DCPs and their role should be considered further, as they can contribute to greening and cooling of our urban environments.</p>	<p>It is proposed to adopt minimum landscaping and deep soil controls for all residential and non-residential development types. Refer to Sections 2-5 of the Discussion Paper for proposed residential controls.</p> <p>The remaining landscaping and deep soil controls will be reviewed further to develop a strong and concise set of controls. Key objectives will be enhancing the appearance of development, providing privacy and amenity to occupants, supporting tree canopy cover and biodiversity. Where possible, existing vegetation and natural features should be retained.</p> <p>Further consideration will be given to green roofs and walls, as they provide many environmental and community benefits, such as improved air quality, cooling temperatures and insulating buildings. Green roofs and walls are supported by Council's <i>Environmental Sustainability Strategy 2017</i>.</p> <p>It is not considered necessary to include technical specifications for landscaping design and construction in the DCP (such as pot sizes, tree stock standards, certification of completed works and maintenance periods), as many of these overlap with Australian Standards and are addressed through special conditions of consent. These provisions will be reviewed further to ascertain what level of detail is needed in the DCP.</p> <p>All new dwellings will be required to submit a landscape plan, consistent with The Hills and Hornsby DCPs.</p>	<p>The recommendations from the Discussion Paper have been implemented in the draft CoP DCP, with some additional controls added.</p> <p>Consistent with the recommendations from the Discussion Paper, general landscaping and deep soil controls that apply to all development have been updated and reworded to remove ambiguity in their application. This includes defining deep soil to not be located above any structure (such as a basement).</p> <p>As a consequence of the varying controls across DCPs, controls have been adapted in consultation with Council's Landscaping and Tree Management Team and City Design Team to deliver suitable landscaping and vegetation controls. These include additional controls reinforcing the requirement of existing healthy trees to be incorporated into Landscape Plans during the design phase of a development. This is to ensure suitable protection of established trees and design outcomes that integrate existing healthy trees with new development and landscaping. This also creates a link to the Tree Preservation controls and reinforces the requirements of the applicant.</p> <p>In line with Council's <i>Environmental Sustainability Strategy</i> and Council Resolution of 26 April 2022 to review tree management controls, additional objectives and controls were added to provide deep soil areas for canopy trees and vegetation planting. For example, it is proposed to increase the soil depth required for a landscaping area from 1.0m to 1.2m This will help support larger tree plantings and deliver deep soil zones capable of accommodating trees to meet Councils tree canopy targets. This is also consistent with the <i>Apartment Design Guideline</i>.</p> <p>Refer to Part 2 – Open Space and Landscape, Section 2.7 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>
Biodiversity	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>All of the DCPs have general controls requiring consideration of the impact of development on</p>	<p>Consideration will be given to incorporating additional detailed controls from Hornsby DCP to</p>	<p>The recommendations from the Discussion Paper have been implemented in the draft CoP DCP.</p>

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
						<p>biodiversity and waterways. The intent of the DCPs is broadly consistent, however there is some variation in the detailed requirements.</p> <p>Most of the DCPs refer back to requirements under biodiversity legislation, however a number of these references are out of date and need to be updated.</p> <p>Of the DCPs, Hornsby DCP has the most detailed controls, which include prescriptive measures covering landscaping adjacent to bushland, roadside vegetation, land adjoining public open space and provisions for aquatic biodiversity (wetlands, salt marshes, and fish habitats). The DCP requires buffer zones (setbacks) of 10m - 20m to be maintained to significant bushland and vegetation.</p> <p>Parramatta and The Hills DCPs also include requirements for development to consider potential impacts on adjoining bushland, but do not prescribe specific setbacks. However, Parramatta DCP does require development to consider the need for buffer zones to be protect adjoining bushland.</p> <p>Parramatta, The Hills and Hornsby DCPs include a list of tree and vegetation native to the local area to assist with species selection for landscaping and tree replacement. The lists of species differ somewhat.</p>	<p>ensure the strongest provisions for biodiversity are adopted. Otherwise, it is proposed to generally retain the controls in Parramatta DCP.</p> <p>References to repealed policy will be removed/updated to ensure the controls are consistent with current legislation and State policy.</p> <p>It is proposed to require development sites to incorporate a buffer zone of at least 10m from all significant bushland and ecological sites (E2 zoned sites and sites mapped on the LEP Biodiversity Map). This will help prevent bushland being cleared under the RFS's <i>10/50 Vegetation Clearing Code</i>. It will also assist with implementing <i>SEPP 19</i> which requires Councils to take into account the impact of development on adjoining public bushland. This proposal is discussed further in Section 7.1 of the Discussion Paper.</p> <p>It is proposed to review and update the list of native vegetation communities and plant species so that it encompasses the new LGA boundary. This will be informed by current mapping published by the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage.</p> <p>It is not proposed to adopt a recommended planting list for street trees, as street tree planting should be undertaken in consultation with council staff and take into account the characteristics of each site (e.g. overhead powerlines vs underground lines).</p>	<p>Some additional controls have also been added to the DCP.</p> <p>Consistent with the recommendations from the Discussion Paper, controls are prepared in accordance with the existing controls from the Parramatta DCP 2011 and those from Hornsby DCP. These relate to development avoiding fragmentation of existing native vegetation and the retention natural features such as wetlands.</p> <p>Legislation references have been updated to include the current legislative framework, which as flagged elsewhere in the Discussion Paper, supersedes the provisions of the DCP. Additional controls to support changes to legislation also introduced. For example, requirements for when a Biodiversity Offset Scheme is triggered under the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Regulation 2017</i>.</p> <p>The list of appropriate tree species for planting has been updated to be suitable for the new City of Parramatta boundary. The supporting control has been updated to say that whilst preference for indigenous and/or endemic species reflective of the vegetation of the local area, exotic species appropriate to the landscape setting may also be considered by Council. This was considered appropriate by Council's Tree Management Team as it provides guidance on the preferred trees to be planted, but also allow some flexibility as indigenous or endemic trees may not be suitable or practical in all circumstances. An additional control to specify the minimum setback for tree plantings from buildings and drainage lines is also included to ensure sufficient space and minimise impact on development and infrastructure.</p> <p>Refer to Part 5 – Environmental Management, Section 5.3.1 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>
Tree and vegetation protection	✓	✓	✓	✓	•	All DCPs have controls for tree and vegetation protection. There are differences in the criteria for when a tree or vegetation is protected, and the exemptions that may apply. For instance, the height threshold for trees ranges from 3.6m or	It is proposed to apply tree protection controls consistent with those within Parramatta and Hornsby DCPs to the remainder of the LGA, including the list of exempt tree works. This will ensure a consistent approach to tree and	The draft CoP DCP controls build on the recommendations of the Harmonisation Discussion Paper (i.e. the Parramatta and Hornsby DCP controls), and have been amended following a detailed review carried out by Council Officers in

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
						<p>above under Holroyd DCP to 6m or above under The Hills DCP. Auburn and The Hills DCPs also include canopy spread and trunk widths as criteria for protection.</p> <p>A number of the DCPs also protect tree and mangrove vegetation on public land and trees on heritage conservation areas or heritage items, regardless of their size.</p> <p>In February 2018 Council adopted amendments to Hornsby DCP to increase the level of protection of trees to land that was formerly within the Hornsby LGA. These amendments increased protection of trees by extending controls consistent with the Parramatta DCP to this area. Hornsby DCP also includes additional protections for all bushland and vegetation on heritage listed properties.</p>	<p>vegetation protection is achieved. The DCP provisions will be updated to ensure they are consistent with current legislation and the <i>Vegetation SEPP</i>.</p> <p>The proposed threshold for protected trees and vegetation are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any tree or palm with a height equal to or exceeding 5 metres Any tree or mangrove vegetation located on public land, irrespective of size Any tree or plant, irrespective of size, that is or forms part of a heritage item, heritage conservation area, Aboriginal object or is within an Aboriginal Place of heritage significance All vegetation in bushland areas <p>The proposed threshold of 5m for trees of private properties will protect mature trees that contribute the most to amenity and tree canopy cover across the LGA. This threshold strikes a balance between protecting tree canopy cover and not placing an unreasonable burden on homeowners by requiring approval for tree works on minor vegetation that does not significantly contribute to canopy cover. This matter is also discussed in Section 7.1 of the Discussion Paper.</p>	<p>response to the Council Resolution from 26 April 2022 that stated the following:</p> <p><i>That Council review its tree preservation and management controls as part of the preparation of the Draft Harmonisation Development Control Plan (DCP) to ensure they properly provide for the protection of trees within the City of Parramatta.</i></p> <p>Key controls</p> <p>The draft CoP DCP requires written consent (via Development Application or Tree Permit Application) for works to the following trees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any tree or palm - whether indigenous, endemic, exotic or introduced species with a height equal to or exceeding five (5) metres. <p>This retains the Parramatta threshold (as recommended by the Discussion Paper) and is considered to protect trees that contribute to canopy cover.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any tree, bushland, or mangrove vegetation located on public land, irrespective of size <p>This retains the Parramatta threshold (as recommended by the Discussion Paper).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any tree that is or forms part of an Aboriginal object, or that is within an Aboriginal place of heritage significance (existing in PDCP 2011), or that is located on land mapped 'high sensitivity' on the Aboriginal sensitivity map (added as part of Harmonisation process). <p>This retains the Parramatta PDCP 2011 threshold that requires development approval for works to any tree or plant irrespective of size that is an Aboriginal place of heritage significance. The draft CoP DCP proposes the same level of protection for</p>

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
								<p>land with high Aboriginal sensitivity to increase protection to these areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any tree with a height equal to or exceeding three (3) metres or any tree capable of growing to a height of 3 metres (where the tree with a height less than 3 metres has been intentionally planted): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. that is or forms part of a heritage item, or that is within a heritage conservation area (existing in PDCP 2011) b. that is located within a Special Character Area as defined by this DCP (added as part of Harmonisation process). <p>This amends the Discussion Paper recommendation which retains the current Parramatta DCP 2011 threshold for these special areas. Replacing 'any tree or plant irrespective of size' with 'any tree with a height equal to or exceeding three (3) metres or any tree capable of growing to a height of 3 metres (where the tree with a height less than 3 metres has been intentionally planted)' will deliver additional protection within special areas (i.e. 3m vs 5m) without development approval for works to small plants and shrubs. This will allow gardens to be maintained, while protecting amenity, and importantly, canopy trees.</p> <p>The draft DCP also adds to the special areas which this control applies by adding Special Character Areas (as defined by the draft DCP).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vegetation on land identified as 'Biodiversity' on the City of Parramatta LEP 2022 Natural Resources Map. <p>This is consistent with the recommendations of the Discussion Paper and is a requirement of the</p>

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
								<p><i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 and Biodiversity and Conservation SEPP 2021.</i></p> <p>A number of other changes are proposed to the DCP to improve protection and management of trees. These are outlined below.</p> <p><u>Other changes</u></p> <p>A number of other changes are proposed to the DCP to improve protection and management of trees. These are outlined below:</p> <p>Exemptions removed to protect more trees (i.e. consent required)</p> <p>To support tree canopy cover, the following are no longer exemptions and require consent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tree works to any tree on the <i>Biosecurity Act 2015</i> (NSW). Some trees on this list offer significant contribution to canopy (e.g. Camphor Laurel) and are proposed to not be exempt in order to increase protection of canopy cover. • Tree works on a tree where the trunk of the tree at ground level is within 3 metres of legally constructed building, carport, or swimming pool. This is to offer additional protection to trees on private land and further helps protects canopy cover. However, it is noted that the CDC process allows tree removal for these trees. • Removal of some species from the exempt tree species list. This means more tree species requires work approval and will assist in canopy protection. <p>Administrative amendments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A table outlining the type of tree applications required has been introduced to remove any ambiguity and make the section clearer for those seeking to undertake works. The table was modelled off the table currently used within the Hornsby DCP, and explicitly outlines

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
								<p>Council's interpretation of major and minor tree works.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference to <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Vegetation in Non Rural Areas) 2017</i> was replaced with <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Biodiversity and Conservation) 2021</i>, and other general updates to standards and policies referenced. <p>Refer to Part 5 – Environmental Management, Section 5.3.4 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>
Natural waterways and riparian zones	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>Most DCPs include some objectives and/or controls relating to natural waterways, but Parramatta and Hornby DCPs are the only documents with a standalone section. The intent of the Parramatta and Hornsby DCP controls are similar, but Hornsby DCP controls are more detailed. Both DCPs require provision of vegetated buffers along waterways.</p> <p>Development within 40m of the bank of a waterway, with the exception of dwellings and dual occupancies and other minor works, needs to be referred to the NSW Office of Water for approval. The NSW Office of Water requires development to maintain or rehabilitate vegetated riparian corridors along waterways.</p> <p>Also see above discussion on flooding and stormwater management and in Section 7.3 of the Discussion Paper.</p>	<p>It is proposed to include controls seeking the retention and, where appropriate, the enhancement of natural watercourses and riparian vegetation to ensure our waterways are adequately protected. These will be based on the principles and controls in Hornsby and Parramatta DCPs.</p> <p>It is proposed to include a requirement that development must maintain a vegetated riparian zone along waterways, consistent with NSW Office of Water guidelines and Parramatta and Hornsby DCPs.</p> <p>For sites fronting creeks a vegetated buffer zone of at least 10m (measured from the top of the bank) will be required to maintain the environmental integrity of the riparian zone. A minimum buffer zone will allow for some development to occur (i.e. minor structures), but the rest must be vegetated. This proposal is also discussed in Section 7.2 of the discussion paper.</p> <p>The NSW Office of Water will require larger setbacks to major waterways such as the Parramatta River, as per the <i>Guidelines for Riparian Corridors on Waterfront Land</i>.</p> <p>Development will also need to comply with any applicable LEP foreshore building line and riparian land controls (refer to Appendix A of the Discussion Paper).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recommendations from the Discussion Paper have been implemented in the draft CoP DCP. Some additional controls have also been added to the DCP. <p>As per the Discussion Paper, the objectives and controls have been prepared in accordance with the existing controls from the Parramatta DCP 2011 and those from Hornsby DCP. However, additional objectives and controls from the draft Parramatta City Centre DCP have been included to encourage the naturalisation and semi-naturalisation of concrete floodway channels and creeks where feasible. New controls have been added that require a development to incorporate protection and conservation of riparian zones, as well as facilitating human access, amenity and public safety as appropriate.</p> <p>Refer to Part 5 – Environmental Management, Section 5.3.2 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>

Table 4 – Environmental Performance

Topics: Passive design measures, Energy efficiency and renewables, Water efficiency and reuse, Water management

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
Passive design measures	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	All DCPs have passive design controls which are based on established principles that promote solar design, daylight access and natural ventilation. There are some minor differences in the requirements, otherwise the provisions are broadly consistent.	As the controls are mostly consistent and based off well-established industry standards, it is proposed to retain the controls in Parramatta DCP, including a floor to ceiling height requirement of 2.7m for all residential floors (excluding attics).	<p>Consistent with the Discussion Paper recommendation, the requirement for 2.7m minimum floor to ceiling heights have been maintained for all residential dwelling types (excluding attics).</p> <p>Refer to Part 3 – Residential Development of the draft CoP DCP.</p> <p>A minimum floor to ceiling height has also been included for all commercial development.</p> <p>Refer to Part 4 – Non-Residential Development, Section 4.2 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>
Energy efficiency and renewables	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>All DCPs include objectives and controls seeking to reduce energy use in development.</p> <p>Mandatory energy efficiency targets for residential development are set by the State Government through the Building and Sustainability Index (BASIX) and are not required to be included in DCPs to have effect. Residential apartment buildings are also required to take into consideration the criteria and guidance in the <i>Apartment Design Guide</i>, published by the State Government.</p> <p>Some DCPs include performance targets for non-residential development. Parramatta and The Hills DCPs require certain non-residential development to achieve a minimum of 4-star rating under the Australian Building Greenhouse Rating Scheme, which has since been replaced by the National Australian Built Environment Rating System (NABERS). Hornsby DCP encourages non-residential development to achieve a 4-star rating under the Green Building Council of Australia's Green Star Rating tool.</p> <p>DCPs also include design principles for development that is not required to meet a specified performance target. A common requirement is for the use of solar hot water</p>	<p>All development will be required to incorporate measures to reduce energy use, consistent with well-established principles of passive solar design, natural ventilation and the use of efficient fittings and appliances.</p> <p>Energy efficiency targets for residential development will continue to be mandated through BASIX requirements.</p> <p>For large non-residential development, it is proposed to adopt updated performance targets. Large scale retail and industrial developments will also be required to install solar PV. These proposals are outlined in Section 7.4 of the Discussion Paper.</p> <p>Higher outcomes focused energy efficiency targets will encourage uptake of renewable technologies, such as solar HW, heat pump and PV.</p> <p>Non-residential development below the proposed thresholds will be required to incorporate energy efficiency measures for mechanical heating and cooling, lighting and hot water systems, consistent with those within Parramatta DCP (Section 3.2.4 design principles P3 to P5).</p>	<p>Consistent with the recommendations from the Discussion Paper, Council officers have undertaken a review of the provisions to reflect industry standard and legislation updates.</p> <p>Environmental Performance controls have been updated to reflect the exhibited draft Parramatta City Centre DCP that respond to industry benchmarks. Council officers considered the suitability of applying such controls across the whole City in line with the Discussion Paper recommendation.</p> <p>Controls have been introduced with the intent to reduce reliance on the main energy grid and reduce energy bills and the whole of life cost of energy services. Current <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Sustainable Buildings) 2022</i> requires all 'large commercial' buildings to minimise the use of on-site fossil fuels, as part of the goal of achieving net zero emissions in New South Wales by 2050. In line with the intent of the SEPP, the following is proposed;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All new commercial development and non-residential development that is State Significant development specified in <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Planning Systems) 2021</i>, Schedule 1, Section 13-15 are to use only electricity (grid provided and on-site

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
						<p>systems that have a minimum 3.5-star energy efficiency rating.</p> <p>Auburn DCP encourages the use of renewable energy to power lighting in commercial and industrial schemes.</p> <p>Some of the language and controls in DCPs are now out of date and don not reflect current industry standards and ratings systems. There is therefore an opportunity to update controls as part of the DCP harmonisation process to reflect current industry standards and assist in achieving Council's strategic objectives.</p>	<p>It is proposed to require documentation to be submitted with development applications to demonstrate how developments comply with the relevant controls including requiring architectural plans to be marked up with BASIX certificate (where required) commitments and specifications. This is consistent with current Parramatta DCP controls and will improve compliance, leading to better energy efficiency outcomes.</p>	<p>renewables) for all energy requirements associated with normal operations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where it is demonstrated that the intended use of the building requires a process or equipment that is not able to be served by electricity, fossil fuels may be provided to service that service only. Evidence shall be provided with the application of market testing and equipment supplier advice to confirm that an electricity powered alternative is not technically possible. <p>Energy and water efficiency targets proposed for non-residential development similar to those required by the City Centre DCP are proposed. A Green Star certification requirement for industrial development has been introduced, as industrial development is not covered by the NABERS rating system.</p> <p>Existing controls have been refined to ensure they are practical and allow for adequate future environmentally sustainable infrastructure within buildings.</p> <p>Proposed onsite water capture and reuse requirements that relate to Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) are proposed where BASIX is not required.</p> <p>Comprehensive requirements have been introduced to reduce new development's contribution to urban heat. The controls will require the reduction of heat created from things such as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roof surfaces Open space, Facades, Reflectivity/glare, Heating cooling systems. <p>The controls are intended to apply to high density development such as residential development that is 3 storeys or more, similar to the NSW Department of Planning and Environment <i>Apartment Design Guide</i> prompt, and higher</p>

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
								density non-residential uses outlined in the controls. Refer to Part 5 – Environmental Management, Section 5.4.1 of the draft CoP DCP.
Water efficiency and reuse	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>All DCPs include some objectives and controls relating to water efficiency or reuse, however many of these are focused on the collection and reuse of rainwater.</p> <p>Mandatory water efficiency targets for residential development are set by the State Government through the Building and Sustainability Index (BASIX) and are not required to be included in DCPs to have effect. Residential apartment buildings are also required to take into consideration the criteria and guidance in the <i>Apartment Design Guide</i>, published by the State Government.</p> <p>Parramatta and Hornsby DCPs include detailed requirements for water efficiency in non-residential development. These controls are broadly similar and include a target for 80% of non-potable water demand to come from rainwater/alternative water sources.</p> <p>The Hills DCP includes requirements for water efficient fittings and appliances for industrial development, but does not include water use targets. Auburn DCP requires commercial and industrial development to connect to recycled water systems if serviced by a dual reticulation system.</p> <p>Some of the language and controls within DCPs are out of date and do not reflect current industry standards and ratings systems. There is therefore an opportunity to update controls as part of the DCP harmonisation process to reflect current industry standards and assist in achieving Council's strategic objectives.</p>	<p>All development will be required to include water savings measures consistent with those already required by Parramatta and Hornsby DCP controls, including the use of highly efficient fixtures and appliances.</p> <p>Water efficiency targets for residential development will continue to be mandated through BASIX requirements.</p> <p>It is proposed to insert a control requiring the BASIX certificate, marked up plans and specifications are to be submitted with applications, consistent with current Parramatta DCP controls. This will improve compliance, leading to better water efficiency outcomes.</p> <p>For large non-residential development, it is proposed to adopt updated performance targets. It is also proposed to require large scale residential and commercial schemes to provide dual piping for recycled water use. These proposals are outlined in Section 7.4 of the Discussion Paper.</p> <p>Smaller non-residential development will be required to comply with water saving measures, similar to those prescribed in Parramatta DCP (Section 3.3.6.2 control C3).</p> <p>Applicants will be required to demonstrate compliance with the relevant controls by submitting a water efficiency report demonstrating how water saving measures have been incorporated into the design.</p>	<p>Consistent with the recommendations from the Discussion Paper, Council officers have undertaken a review of the provisions to reflect industry standards.</p> <p>New objectives are proposed to increase resilience and water security by requiring an alternative water supply to buildings and to reduce barriers to connect to future non-drinking water supply infrastructure.</p> <p>Controls have also been strengthened building on existing Parramatta DCP controls and controls from the City Centre DCP, changes proposed include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smart water meter controls have been included in the DCP • Reference to BASIX requirements are included in the DCP and updated requirements for residential development that is not covered under BASIX. • Large scale non-residential development to achieve updated water efficiency targets based on the NABERS rating system. • Green Star rating requirements introduced for industrial development. • Provide adequate space in development to allow future environmentally sustainable infrastructure within buildings. • Documentation demonstrating achievement of water efficiency targets included as a requirement in the DCP. • Dual water reticulation system able to support the immediate or future connection to a recycled water network required for large development. • Water efficiency targets for large development updated to reflect industry standards.

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
								Refer to Part 5 – Environmental Management, Section 5.4.2 of the draft CoP DCP.
Water management	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>All DCPs have controls for waste, but the provisions vary regarding management, storage and collection.</p> <p>In September 2017, Council secured a new seven-year contract for waste collection and resource recovery services, which applies to the entire LGA. Council also introduced new Waste Management Guidelines in Parramatta DCP to reflect the new waste contract. These provide information on waste management plans, demolition and construction, performance criteria for DAs involving demolition/construction and bin sizes, storage and collection.</p>	<p>The Waste Management Guidelines in Appendix 8 of Parramatta DCP will be retained and extended to the entire LGA. Some amendments may be necessary to fix minor errors or to improve the wording, but the adopted controls will be broadly consistent with the current provisions in Parramatta DCP.</p> <p>No changes are proposed to the current waste collection services; kerb side collection will continue to operate as per the agreed contract.</p>	<p>The recommendations from the Discussion Paper have been implemented in the draft CoP DCP. Some additional controls have also been added to the DCP.</p> <p>As per the Discussion Paper, the provisions of the Parramatta DCP were retained with minor amendments made to legislation references to ensure they are reflective of current framework.</p> <p>There were amendments made to the Waste Management Guidelines appendix. These amendments are in response to various guides prepared by the NSW Environment Protection Authority, including <i>Better Practice Guide for Resource Recovery in Residential Developments 2019</i>, <i>Waste Classification Guidelines 2014</i> and <i>Protection of the Environment Operations (Waste) Regulation 2014</i>. The amendments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • waste generation rates, to update according to Food and Garden Organics (FOGO) services throughout the LGA; • a reduction in the fortnightly capacity to residual bin sizes of 140L/fortnight; • development type specific controls for waste collection; and • performance criteria by development type. <p>Refer to Appendix 2 Waste Management Guidelines.</p> <p>Refer to Part 5 – Environmental Management, Section 5.4.9 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>

Table 5 – Heritage and Archaeology

Topics: General heritage controls (including signage controls), Archaeology, Aboriginal cultural heritage, Heritage conservation areas

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
General heritage controls (including signage controls)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>All of the DCPs have objectives and controls for development on and in the vicinity of heritage items and heritage conservation areas. The intent of the provisions is broadly consistent; however, there are some differences in language and the level of detail of controls.</p> <p>For instance, Hornsby DCP is very detailed and has separate controls for heritage items and heritage conservation areas, whereas Auburn DCP only includes brief controls for residential development within the vicinity of a heritage item.</p> <p>All DCPs, except Auburn, have objectives and controls for signs on heritage items/buildings. The intent of each DCP is broadly consistent, however the provisions vary and some DCPs are more prescriptive than others, particularly The Hills and Hornsby DCPs. A consistent approach is needed to ensure any new signage is sympathetic to heritage items.</p> <p>There is also a need for new controls to address more recent issues, such as placement of solar panels and satellite dishes and automatic gates.</p>	<p>Given the intent of controls across LEPs is broadly consistent, significant changes are not considered necessary to harmonise controls.</p> <p>It is proposed to generally retain the objectives and controls in Parramatta DCP as these provisions are considered to be relatively strong and well established in the LGA. Though some controls from other DCPs will be used where these are stronger or supplement those within the Parramatta DCP, such as those relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civic, commercial development and adaptive reuse (Holroyd and Hornsby DCPs) • Landscaping and gardens (Holroyd, The Hills and Hornsby DCPs) • Signs on heritage items (Holroyd, The Hills and Hornsby DCPs) <p>Some amendments may be necessary to ensure controls are clear and terminology is consistent with current industry language. This may result in the modification or deletion of some controls that are considered to be outdated or superfluous.</p> <p>It is also proposed to insert new controls relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide controls about visible elements of new technologies on heritage items and in conservation areas • Restrict mechanical and automated opening mechanisms on gates • Retain at least 50% of sites as garden spaces for heritage houses in residential use 	<p>The proposed provisions are consistent with the recommendations from the Discussion Paper as per the below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Controls prepared to retain the Parramatta DCP 2011, some updated controls from the Hornsby DCP • Inclusion of new additional provisions to manage new technologies such as solar energy systems are included in section 7.6 of the DCP. The provisions will be supported by further guidance contained in Appendix 3 of the draft CoP DCP. • Provisions from Hornsby DCP relating to commercial development and adaptive uses have also been supplemented by figures. <p>Upon further consideration by Council officers, additional amendments have been made and these include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of provisions from Hornsby DCP to support 'development in the vicinity of heritage'. The introduction of these controls will remove ambiguity around the expectations of development and will ensure that new work is sympathetic to heritage areas. • Inclusion of fence typologies from Hornsby DCP to deliver better design outcomes as part of heritage controls. • Inclusion of updated provisions for driveways to better protect/adaptive reuse of sandstone areas from <i>Public Domain Guidelines</i> and Hornsby DCP which addresses observations from recent development activity in Parramatta North. <p>Structural changes were also made as part of the harmonisation process to assist the practical application and enforcement of the controls. The general heritage control and the Heritage Conservation Area (HCAs) controls have been merged into one Part of the DCP to assist with the</p>

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
								usage of the DCP by both Council and the applicant. Non-policy or administrative changes were also made to the draft CoP DCP. This includes removing duplicated controls contained within the general heritage section and the HCAs; updates to legislation references; and replacing figures of poor quality or legibility. This section of the DCP has been prepared in consultation with Council's Heritage advisor. Refer to Part 7 – Heritage and Archaeology, of the draft CoP DCP.
Archaeology	*	*	*	✓	✓	<p>Specific controls for archaeology are only prescribed in Parramatta and The Hills DCPs. The DCPs generally have the same intent - to protect sites of archaeological significance - but the requirements differ. The controls in The Hills DCP only apply to sites identified as an 'archaeological site' in Schedule 5 of the LEP, requiring an Archaeological Assessment for development/disturbance of these sites. Five of these sites now fall within the City of Parramatta LGA.</p> <p>Under Parramatta DCP, all development that may affect archaeology must comply with the legal obligations set out in legislation, such as the <i>Heritage Act 1977</i> (NSW). If development is proposed on a site in the Parramatta Historical Archaeological Landscape Management Study (PHALMS), it must also comply with the relevant management recommendations set out in this Study. It is noted that PHALMS only applies to particular sites in the LGA, including Parramatta City Centre, Harris Park, North Parramatta, Westmead, Rydalmere and Camellia.</p> <p>A permit from NSW Office of Environment and Heritage may also be required for excavation work.</p>	<p>It is proposed to adopt the controls in Parramatta DCP, as these provisions are considered to be stronger and offer more protection for archaeology than those in The Hills DCP. All DAs on land that contains archaeology must comply with relevant legislation. Minor amendments may be required to ensure the terminology used is consistent with current industry language, otherwise the controls will be consistent with the provisions in Parramatta DCP.</p> <p>The archaeological sites identified in The Hills LEP that are now located within our LGA will be transferred into the consolidated LEP. The additional requirements in The Hills DCP for these sites will be given further consideration.</p>	<p>Consistent with the recommendations from the Discussion Paper, controls were prepared in accordance with the existing controls from the Parramatta DCP 2011.</p> <p>Upon further consideration by Council Officers, additional amendments have been made and these include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of a new objective that has been adapted from The Hills DCP and Hornsby DCP to minimise the likelihood of disturbance to archaeological relics. • to facilitate improved management of archaeological resources, additional provisions Hornsby DCP 2013 have also been incorporated in this section of the DCP. These are italicised below: <p>Works, including landscaping and associated elements, should be located away from sites and potential sites containing archaeological relics.</p> <p>The depth and extent of excavation should be minimised where land contains, or is likely to contain, archaeological remains or relics.</p> <p>This section of the DCP has been prepared in consultation with Council's Heritage advisor.</p>

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
								Refer to Part 7 – Heritage and Archaeology, Section 7.7 of the draft CoP DCP.
Aboriginal cultural heritage	x	x	✓	✓	x	<p>Controls for Aboriginal heritage are prescribed in Parramatta and Hornsby DCPs only. Both DCPs require appropriate consideration of the impact of development on known or potential Aboriginal archaeological sites or sites of cultural significance. However, the trigger for when an Aboriginal archaeological assessment is required vary.</p> <p>Parramatta DCP has both set criteria and a 'sensitivity map' which identifies sites more likely to have Aboriginal heritage. This map, in conjunction with the set criteria, is used to determine whether an Aboriginal Heritage Assessment is required.</p> <p>Hornsby DCP does not have a sensitivity map, relying on a list locational criteria to determine whether an Aboriginal Heritage Assessment is required.</p>	<p>It is proposed to adopt the objectives and controls in Parramatta DCP, as these provisions are considered to be the strongest.</p> <p>It is proposed to retain the 'Sensitivity Map' approach and extend this across the entire LGA. A visual representation is clearer and easier to understand than set criteria alone. Land sensitivity maps are widely used by Local Councils in NSW and are also recommended under the draft <i>Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Bill 2018</i>.</p> <p>Should this approach be taken, Council will engage a suitably qualified consultant with experience in Aboriginal archaeology to map the new areas of the LGA.</p>	<p>Consistent with the recommendations from the Discussion Paper, controls are prepared in accordance with the existing controls from the Parramatta DCP.</p> <p>An Aboriginal Sensitivity Map has been included in the draft CoP DCP that include the new City boundary (see Figure 7.8.1 in Part 7).</p> <p>Refer to Part 7 – Heritage and Archaeology, Section 7.8 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>
Heritage conservation areas	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>All land transferred to the City of Parramatta LGA contain some heritage conservation areas (HCA). Most DCPs include controls for these areas.</p> <p>Holroyd, Hornsby and Parramatta DCPs include specific controls for each HCA, as well as general controls that apply more broadly to all HCAs.</p> <p>By contrast, The Hills DCP applies the general controls in its heritage section and does not include individual controls for each HCA. Auburn DCP does not include any HCA controls.</p>	<p>Any existing HCA-specific controls applying to land in the LGA will be carried over into the consolidated DCP.</p> <p>Controls relating to Granville and South Granville HCAs will be excluded from the consolidated DCP, as these areas no longer fall within the LGA.</p> <p>Consideration of general controls applying to HCAs will be included in the review of general heritage controls discussed above.</p>	<p>The proposed provisions are consistent with the recommendations from the Discussion Paper.</p> <p>This section of the DCP has been prepared in consultation with Council's Heritage advisor. The following amendments have been made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Duplicate controls across the general heritage section and the HCAs have been removed, and both the general heritage controls and HCAs have been contained in one Part of the DCP. • Inclusion of existing controls relating to 'utilities' from Hornsby DCP. • In the absence of specific objectives and controls for various HCAs, the general heritage controls apply with the exception of Silverwater Prison Complex. However, to avoid any conflict with the provisions published on the State Heritage Inventory, Silverwater Prison Complex relies on information detailed on the NSW State Heritage Inventory

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A number of inherited HCA were not supported by information consistent with PDCP standard and therefore, where appropriate, information has been derived from the NSW State Heritage Inventory. Heritage Inventory sheets inherited from the Former Hills Shire Council for Burnside Homes Conservation Area have been carried over and provide HCA-specific controls. The headings and numbering was reformatted to be consistent with PDCP standard. All figures have been redrafted for clarity, legibility and consistency. Some figures have been consolidated with other figures to succinctly convey the relevant information. Most figures have been relocated to the General Provisions section, apart from HCA-prescriptive figures. <p>A consequential amendment to the Harris Park West HCA as a result of the City Centre planning proposal has been reflected in the DCP, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changed to the land application map's boundary to reflect its new boundary. The addition of subsection 7.10.3.6 to explain the application of Part 9 – Parramatta City Centre Controls. <p>Due to the number of HCAs across the LGA, structural changes are also proposed for this section. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Categorisation of the HCAs by ward and a supporting figure to illustrate the HCAs by ward. <p>In addition, structural changes were also made as part of the harmonisation process to assist the practical application and enforcement of the controls. The general heritage control and the Heritage Conservation Area (HCAs) controls have been merged into one Part of the DCP to assist with the usage of the DCP by both Council and the applicant.</p>

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
								Refer to Part 7 – Heritage, Section 7.10 of the draft CoP DCP.

Table 6 – General Design Controls

Topics: Views and vistas, General building form and massing controls, FSR/site coverage, Fences, Visual and acoustic amenity, Public domain, culture and public art, Disabled Access, Pedestrian Access, Safety and security

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
Views and vistas	x	✓	✓	✓	x	<p>Three DCPs have controls that require new development to be designed in a way that minimises the obstruction of significant views or vistas. The intent of the DCPs is broadly consistent - to preserve and enhance significant views - and there is a lot of overlap across the controls.</p> <p>Parramatta DCP's provisions apply generally and are not specific to any particular development type. Holroyd only prescribes controls for residential development, and Hornsby DCP has controls for view sharing which only apply to dwelling houses.</p> <p>Holroyd is the only DCP that has an objective about protecting views to and from public places, however Parramatta DCP has a development control to this effect.</p> <p>Parramatta DCP identifies protected views and vistas in an appendix (Appendix 2 – Views and Vistas). Other DCPs do not.</p>	<p>It is proposed to apply the provisions in Parramatta DCP, as these are considered to be clearer than those in other DCPs.</p> <p>It is also proposed to insert the Holroyd DCP objective about protecting public views and vistas to support the DCP controls and to make it clear these views are to be preserved where possible.</p> <p>The protected views and vistas in Appendix 2 of Parramatta DCP will also be retained as these views are considered to be important to the LGA and will assist with the implementation of the policy. Additional views may be identified through future updates to the DCP, such as part of precinct planning.</p>	<p>The Parramatta DCP 2011 controls have been retained as per the Discussion Paper, and the Holroyd DCP control to protect public views and vistas from streets and public places has been included.</p> <p>The Views and Vistas Appendix has been retained, with the new City boundary applied to the overarching Views and Vistas map (Figure A1.2.1). The views from Granville have been removed to reflect the new boundary.</p> <p>Refer to Part 2 – Design and Place, Section 2.8 and Appendix 1 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>
General building form and massing controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>All DCPs have general controls and principles to guide the built form of new buildings, with the common purpose of ensuring development is of a high quality design compatible with its context. A range of matters are addressed including façade design (e.g. articulation, materials, proportions and position of entries), roof design, balustrade design, how the design responds to context/climate and the relationship between the building and the public domain. The approach and level of detail varies across the DCPs depending on the proposed use and building typologies.</p> <p>Built form is also determined by height, floor space and permitted land uses, which are controlled by the LEP as well as other more detailed DCP design controls.</p>	<p>As these controls are general in nature they will be reviewed to ensure a set of clear and succinct provisions are included in the consolidated DCP and remove duplication with other controls.</p> <p>Generally, it is anticipated that general controls will be adopted for both residential and non-residential development in regards to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall design quality • Façade design • Building siting • Building materials • Landscaping, deep soil, parking and fencing <p>A standalone section for 'massing' or 'bulk and scale' is not considered necessary, as the size of a building will ultimately be determined by height, setback and landscaping controls.</p>	<p>Recommendations from the Discussion Paper have been adopted into the draft CoP DCP and have been reviewed to ensure there will be no duplication of themes throughout the DCP.</p> <p>The general building form and massing controls are largely consistent with the Parramatta DCP 2011. As part of the structure review work that formed the harmonisation process, this section now falls under Part 2 Design in Context. This Part was reviewed to ensure all objectives and controls contained within this section are highly specific to the context of Parramatta.</p> <p>These controls have been refined to ensure that everything contained within this Part will be generally applicable to all building types. Any information formerly included in this section that is considered to be specific to certain building types</p>

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
						In addition, many design matters are addressed by the ADG for residential apartments (including shop top housing).		only have been relocated to the relevant sections in Part 3 or 4 of the DCP. The controls relating to massing have been retained to provide further guidance on how the envelope controls are to be translated into a building design that is compatible with its surrounding context. Refer to Part 2 – Design and Place of the draft CoP DCP.
FSR/site coverage	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Some DCPs prescribe floor space ratios, gross floor area and/or site coverage controls for different land uses. For example, The Hills DCP prescribes floor space ratio controls for dual occupancy developments (0.5:1) and maximum site coverage controls for single dwellings.	It is not proposed to carry over these controls into the consolidated DCP. It is considered more appropriate to include FSR controls in the LEP where they will have maximum weight. Controls for site coverage/floor area are unnecessary as FSR, in conjunction with setbacks and deep soil controls, will ultimately determine the maximum size of developments.	Recommendations from the Discussion Paper have been adopted into the DCP. As FSR controls will be contained within the LEP, it is not necessary to repeat this in the DCP. Site coverage will be guided by setback and deep soil requirements, and therefore unnecessary to specify site coverage controls. Refer to Part 2 – Design and Place of the draft CoP DCP.
Fences	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	All DCPs have controls for fencing, but the detailed requirements vary. Controls for fencing in heritage conservation areas or special character areas will be addressed separately in the DCP.	As many forms of fencing can be carried out as exempt or complying development under the <i>Codes SEPP</i> , detailed provisions in the DCP are not considered necessary and the current design principles in Parramatta DCP will be retained.	Recommendations from the Discussion Paper have been adopted into the DCP. The controls are mostly prepared from retained Parramatta DCP 2011 controls, noting the prevalence of the <i>Codes SEPP</i> in guiding this sort of development. Refer to Part 2 – Design and Place, Section 2.6 of the draft CoP DCP.
Visual and acoustic amenity	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	The intent of DCPs is broadly consistent – to provide a high level of visual and acoustic privacy for residents - but there are differences in the detailed design requirements. All DCPs have controls for residential development, but only some have provisions for non-residential development. Some of the key differences include balcony design, noise restrictions, fence treatments and design of building elements (e.g. location of windows).	It is proposed to adopt the approach in Parramatta DCP, which is to have general controls applying to all development and then additional controls specific to each development type. The controls in Parramatta DCP will be substantially retained, as these provisions are considered quite strong. Appropriate controls for noise generating business and industrial developments will be adopted from other DCPs to ensure these developments do not have any adverse impacts	Recommendations from the Discussion Paper have been adopted into the DCP. The approach to visual and acoustic amenity has been largely adopted from the Parramatta DCP 2011. Additional controls have been drafted to strengthen Council's ability to respond to issues observed in the current development application process, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specifying the preferred location of balconies to prevent overlooking.

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
						<p>All of the DCPs have considerations for acoustic amenity, which overlap somewhat with privacy controls. Parramatta and Holroyd DCPs prescribe maximum internal noise levels for particular developments, whereas others refer back to relevant legislation. Hornsby DCP has specific requirements for construction noise, noise sensitive development and noise generation development.</p> <p>The <i>Infrastructure SEPP</i> also includes requirements for development near major roads and rail corridors, including for internal sound levels for residential development.</p>	<p>on nearby residential development. Internal noise level requirements will be amended so they are consistent with the <i>Infrastructure SEPP</i> requirements.</p> <p>The additional considerations in Hornsby DCP for noise sensitive uses and noise generating uses are considered superfluous, as these are already provided for under legislation, including the <i>Infrastructure SEPP</i> and <i>Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997</i>. Likewise, construction noise is managed through conditions of consent, which means DCP controls are not necessary.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preference for site planning to address visual and acoustic amenity issues before employing measures such as screening. Providing further guidance to achieve visual privacy using setbacks and internal layout planning instead of relying on screening methods that are often ineffective, and in turn, deliver poor visual outlook for residents from habitable rooms (i.e., the controls better balance privacy with amenity). <p>Refer to Part 3 – Residential Uses, Section 3.2 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>
Public domain, culture and public art	✓	✓	✓	✓	*	<p>Most DCPs contain provisions relating to various aspects of the public domain, including the interface of buildings with the street and the provision of street trees and other landscaping elements.</p> <p>Parramatta DCP is supported by the recently updated <i>Public Domain Guidelines</i>, which sets the protocol for all public domain improvements in the LGA.</p> <p>The provisions in other DCPs are written more as principles, not controls. Auburn DCP requires development to consider public domain plans where these have been prepared for specific precincts, such as Newington. Hornsby DCP also contains masterplans for a number of its town centres. Holroyd DCP makes reference to a Landscape Masterplan.</p> <p>Public art is addressed in most DCPs, but Parramatta DCP is generally the most prescriptive and is the only DCP that requires consideration of social and cultural elements, including buildings, archaeological features or sub-groups in the community. Auburn and Holroyd DCPs refer back to a supporting art policy to provide guidance for art installation.</p>	<p>It is proposed to include a clear set of prescriptive controls relating to the public domain in the consolidated DCP. The controls will require compliance with Council's <i>Public Domain Guidelines</i> (PDG) which are kept up to date and apply to the whole LGA.</p> <p>All development that meets the specific threshold in the PDG (as described in part 2.3.5) will be required to prepare and submit a public domain plan.</p> <p>These will include controls relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> interface between ground floor of shop top housing/mixed use development and the public domain awning design street trees <p>Duplication of controls in other sections of the DCP (such as landscaping requirements) will be removed. Precinct specific controls will be carried over into the new DCP.</p> <p>It is proposed to adopt the current Parramatta DCP provisions relating to public art in the consolidated DCP.</p>	<p>Consistent with the recommendations of the Discussion Paper, provisions from Parramatta DCP 2011 have been retained with some updates to reflect Council's Art and the Public Domain policy and parts of the <i>Public Domain Guideline</i> to provide further clarity and deliver improved design outcomes.</p> <p>Refer to Part 2 – Design and Place, Section 2.9 and 2.13 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>
Disabled Access	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	The provisions for disabled access are consistent in intent, but the level of detail of	It is proposed to adopt the approach in Parramatta DCP, which is to require compliance	Recommendations from the Discussion Paper have been adopted into the DCP.

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
						controls varies. Parramatta DCP is the least prescriptive and simply requires compliance with relevant legislation and government standards, whereas the other DCPs are more detailed and have specific provisions for particular zones/development types. All of the DCPs refer back to Australian Standards, legislation or the <i>BCA</i> .	with Australian Standards, the <i>BCA</i> and other relevant legislation. It is not necessary to include detailed controls in the DCP, as per the approach in some DCPs, as these duplicate the requirements of the aforementioned documents (which supersede the DCP controls). This includes requirements for parking for people with disabilities as rates are prescribed through the <i>BCA</i> .	Controls include reference to complying with Australian Standards (which are listed), <i>BCA</i> and relevant legislation for development for people with a disability. Refer to Part 2 – Design and Place, Section 2.11 of the draft CoP DCP.
Pedestrian Access	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	The controls for pedestrian access differ across the DCPs. Parramatta DCP focuses on pedestrian site-through links, whereas other DCPs focus on access to and within buildings.	It is proposed to retain the controls from Parramatta DCP. The additional matters for consideration in other DCPs are generally covered in Australian Standards, the <i>BCA</i> or legislation, or are addressed in other parts of the DCP (such as disabled access or building design).	Recommendations from the Discussion Paper have been adopted into the draft CoP DCP with a minor amendment to require a minimum width of 4m for pedestrian through-site links which is consistent with the draft City Centre DCP. Refer to Part 2 – Design and Place, Section 2.10 of the draft CoP DCP.
Safety and security	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>All DCPs have a consistent aim to minimise opportunities for crime and to increase community safety. The controls cover issues such as lighting, dwelling orientation, entries/access and casual surveillance. These are based on well-established principles.</p> <p>All DCPs include controls for different types of residential development, but the level of detail varies, particularly in regards to building design, fencing and landscaping. The Parramatta DCP include controls for all types of residential development with the exception of multi dwelling housing.</p> <p>A number of DCPs also have provisions for non-residential development, including industrial areas.</p> <p>Hornsby and Parramatta DCPs require a Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) report for large scale developments.</p>	<p>The safety and security controls will be reviewed further to ensure the strongest and clearest provisions are adopted. This review will take into account established principles and standards. Generally, it is anticipated that controls will be adopted for both residential and non-residential development types.</p> <p>It is proposed to mandate a CPTED assessment for large-scale or crime sensitive developments, such as new commercial buildings or brothels.</p>	<p>Recommendations from the Discussion Paper have been adopted into the draft CoP DCP, with minor updates to language of objectives and controls to provide further clarity.</p> <p>Provisions pertaining to safety and security for non-residential development (business and industrial development) are based upon controls from Auburn DCP, as these controls would minimise opportunities for crime and promote improved security.</p> <p>Refer to Part 2 – Design and Place, Section 2.14 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>

Table 7 – Controls Specific to Residential Development

Topics: Desired future character, Dwellings and dual occupancies, Secondary dwellings (granny flats), Multi dwelling housing, Manor houses, Apartments (residential flat buildings), Shop top housing, Housing diversity and choice, Attics

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
Desired future character	x	x	✓	✓	x	<p>Hornsby DCP has 'desired future character statements' for multi-dwelling housing and apartments, which outline expectations for particular residential zones, including density, design quality, bulk and scale and car parking.</p> <p>Similarly, Parramatta DCP has 'neighbourhood character areas' which identify traditional residential patterns and design features for dwelling houses, including roofs, entries, car parking, windows, doors and materials and finishes.</p>	<p>The character profiles within DCPs are quite generic and do not allow for much flexibility or reflect variations in local character across the LGA. These profiles will be reviewed further to identify whether they are the most effective way of outlining expectations about how new development should contribute to local character across the LGA. This review will consider work currently being undertaken by the Department of Planning and Environment on how local character can be embedded in land use plans, including the potential for LEP character overlays.</p> <p>Any existing controls relating to specific precincts in the LGA, such as those for town centres, heritage conservation areas and special character areas will be retained and included in the new DCP.</p>	<p>As per the recommendation of the Harmonisation Discussion Paper, local character profiles and existing controls relating to specific precincts, heritage conservation areas or other special character areas have been retained from the DCPs.</p> <p>A more wholistic character statement for the City has been drafted as an introduction to the DCP, that aims to encompass a description of Parramatta's geological setting, as included in Part 2 Design in Context.</p> <p>Refer to Part 2 – Design in Context and Part 8 – Centres and Precincts of the draft CoP DCP.</p>
Dwellings and dual occupancies	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>All DCPs have design controls for dwelling houses, which cover issues such as building height, lot size, floor to ceiling heights, frontage and setbacks, landscaping and dwelling / bedroom size.</p> <p>All DCPs except Hornsby have controls for dual occupancies. Holroyd DCP takes a slightly different approach by having specific controls for attached and detached dual occupancies, as well as special considerations for dual occupancies facing laneways, culs-de-sac, corner lots and arterial roads/transit ways.</p> <p>Key differences between controls relate to minimum setbacks, landscaping and deep soil.</p>	<p>Proposed controls relating to minimum setbacks, landscaping, deep soil and open space requirements are outlined in Sections 2.3 and 3.2 of the Discussion Paper. Controls relating to minimum lot sizes and restrictions of the form of dual occupancies are outlined in Section 3.1 of the Discussion Paper.</p> <p>Following feedback on these proposals, Council will consider the need for any additional design controls for dwellings and dual occupancies to support good design outcomes, such as those for site layout and configuration. This will include controls requiring dual occupancies in heritage conservation areas to be located behind the existing dwelling. These will be consulted on as part of the draft consolidated DCP.</p>	<p>Recommendations of the Discussion Paper have largely been followed for dwelling houses.</p> <p>Controls relating to dwelling houses have been largely prepared using retained Parramatta DCP 2011 controls. Minor updates include further design guidance on maintaining visual and acoustic privacy between dwellings, as well as articulation of side boundary walls through a maximum length of wall control.</p> <p>Following a detailed review of dual occupancy development outcomes across the City, a consolidated set of controls have been prepared in response to a number of recurring design concerns.</p> <p>Some of the controls proposed to support good design outcomes include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing side setback controls and introducing a building width control to ensure a proportional response between building bulk and lot size.

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximum length of wall control along side boundaries to reduce the impact on neighbouring properties. • Upper-level setback controls to guide bulk as perceived from the street. • Detailed guidance on the design, location and width of driveways/garages. • Increased provision for deep soil in the front setback to support large canopy tree planting. • Specifications for street interface design. <p>Additionally, new controls have been introduced to guide appropriate development outcomes on challenging sites such as sloping, cul-de-sac and corner lots.</p> <p>However, it should also be noted that Dual Occupancy development can proceed as complying development where as long as they comply with controls specified in the relevant SEPP they can proceed without obtaining consent from Council. In these cases, these controls would not apply.</p> <p>The Discussion Paper recommended controls requiring dual occupancies in heritage conservation areas to be located behind the existing dwelling. The Council endorsed Harmonisation Planning Proposal (i.e. draft consolidated Parramatta LEP) seeks to prohibit dual occupancy development on R2 Low Density land across Heritage Conservation Areas (HCAs) (with the exception of the South Parramatta HCA).</p> <p>In addition, the planning proposal requires dual occupancy development that is on a site with a heritage item (which is not within a HCA) to be detached (i.e. the two dwellings to be located behind the existing dwelling). Other than the inclusion of specific dual occupancy development controls for the South Parramatta HCA, which have been carried across from the current Parramatta DCP 2011 and is consistent with the draft consolidated Parramatta LEP, specific controls relating to dual occupancy development within HCAs have not been included within the</p>

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
								<p>draft CoP DCP. This is because the Harmonisation Planning Proposal seeks to prohibit dual occupancy across most HCAs and because there are general dual occupancy controls proposed within the draft CoP DCP that can be used where detached dual occupancy is permitted under the LEP. In addition, to heritage items this includes sites with two street frontages or corner sites.</p> <p>Refer to Part 3 – Residential Uses, Section 3.3 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>
Secondary dwellings (granny flats)	✓	✓	✗	✓	✗	<p>DCP controls are somewhat consistent, particularly in regards to setbacks, landscaping and deep soil. Auburn and Holroyd DCPs have additional considerations not addressed in Parramatta DCP, such as clothes drying areas, rainwater tanks and dwelling / bedroom size.</p> <p>Granny flats may also be lodged under the <i>ARHSEPP</i> which has a number of development standards, including lot size, floor area and parking, which take precedence over the controls in a DCP.</p>	<p>It is proposed to generally retain the provisions in Parramatta DCP, as these controls are considered to be the strongest. The additional considerations in other DCPs are considered superfluous as these are addressed in other sections of the DCP, such as energy and water efficiency or solar amenity.</p> <p>Granny flats proposed under the <i>ARHSEPP</i> will be also be assessed against the relevant standards in this instrument (Division 2 of Part 2).</p>	<p>As per the recommendation of the Harmonisation Discussion Paper, controls for secondary dwellings have been largely prepared using retained Parramatta DCP 2011 controls.</p> <p>However, it should also be noted that secondary dwelling development can proceed as complying development where as long as they comply with controls specified in the relevant SEPP they can proceed without obtaining consent from Council. In these cases, these controls would not apply.</p> <p>Refer to Part 3 – Residential Uses, Section 3.3 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>
Multi dwelling housing	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>All DCPs have design controls for multi dwelling housing, which cover issues such as height, frontage, setbacks, floor to ceiling heights, building separation, landscaping, deep soil and private open space. DCPs currently apply one set of controls to all multi dwelling housing types (e.g. townhouses, villas and terraces).</p> <p>Key differences relate to setbacks, lot size requirements and minimum landscaping.</p>	<p>Proposed controls relating to setbacks, separation between dwellings, minimum dwelling widths, landscaping and deep soil and open space are outlined in Section 4.4 (Table 3) of the Discussion Paper. Separate controls are proposed for townhouses/villas and terrace style development.</p> <p>Following feedback on these proposals, Council will consider the need for any additional design controls to support good design outcomes, such as those for site layout, building orientation and elevations and storage. These will be consulted on as part of the draft consolidated DCP.</p>	<p>The proposed DCP controls have varied several recommendations from the Discussion Paper, in response to the <i>Codes SEPP</i> requirements and further detailed design testing aimed at supporting good design outcomes for multi-dwelling housing. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing side setbacks from 900mm to 1.5m to improve separation and amenity between dwellings, as well as ensure a degree of consistency between DCP and <i>Code SEPP</i> outcomes. Increasing the minimum site frontage required for terrace housing from 18m to 21m. This is the minimum required to deliver three 5m wide terraces and is consistent with the minimum site frontage control specified in the <i>Code SEPP</i>.

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing the rear setback requirement for terraces and townhouses to 15% of the site length, to ensure a proportional response to lot size. This is consistent with the existing Parramatta DCP controls. Developed design guidance for street interface design and minimising the appearance of driveways/garages. Included supportive diagramming to illustrate the alternate configurations and site layout for townhouse development that can be supported in the context of Parramatta. Additional and specific guidance for corner lots. <p>As it is possible to develop terraces and other types of multi-dwelling housing as complying development under the <i>Codes SEPP</i>, the proposed DCP controls have been reviewed to ensure a degree of consistency but where development is pursued as complying development the controls in this DCP will not apply</p> <p>A definition of terraces and townhouses has been included in the draft CoP DCP, as well as guidance on the lot types or characteristics that may be most appropriately developed using these housing typologies.</p> <p>Refer to Part 3 – Residential Uses, Section 3.4 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>
Manor houses	x	x	x	x	x	The State Government recently introduced a new category of housing known as manor houses, which are defined as a form of small residential flat building, up to two storeys high, with only 3 or 4 dwellings. A manor house may be carried out as complying development or through a DA. From 1 July 2019 manor houses are scheduled to become permitted in the LGA in medium and high density residential zones, following recent changes to the Codes SEPP.	As none of the DCPs have controls for manor housing, it is proposed to adopt appropriate development controls to ensure a good built form outcome is achieved. Suggestions for key controls are outlined in Section 4.4 (Table 4) of the Discussion Paper.	<p>Recommendations from the Discussion Paper have been adopted into the draft CoP DCP, with minor amendments including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A definition of manor houses in the context of Parramatta and where they may be most appropriately developed. Increased minimum side setback requirement from 900mm to 1.5m to create consistency between other medium density housing types, the <i>Codes SEPP</i>. Additional and specific guidance for corner lots. Amenity requirements consistent with the <i>Apartment Design Guidelines</i>.

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
								As it is possible to develop manor housing as complying development under the <i>Codes SEPP</i> , the proposed DCP controls have been reviewed to ensure a degree of consistency but where development is pursued as complying development the controls in this DCP will not apply. Refer to Part 3 – Residential Uses, Section 3.4 of the draft CoP DCP.
Apartments (residential flat buildings)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>All DCPs have design controls for apartments, which cover issues such as height, frontage, setbacks, floor to ceiling heights, building separation, landscaping, deep soil, private open space and building length/depth.</p> <p>Hornsby DCP has separate controls for apartments depending if they are 3, 5 or 6+ storeys, whereas the other DCPs apply one set of controls to all apartment sizes.</p> <p>Apartment development in the LGA tends to be for buildings of 3 or more storeys with at least 4 dwellings, and so the provisions of <i>SEPP 65</i> and the associated <i>Apartment Design Guide</i> will apply.</p>	<p>Key proposed controls for apartments are outlined in Section 4.4 (Table 4) of the Discussion Paper.</p> <p>For issues such as visual privacy, solar and daylight access, common circulation and spaces, apartment size and layout, ceiling heights, private open space and balconies, natural ventilation and storage, the provisions of the State Government's <i>Apartment Design Guide (ADG)</i> will override DCP controls. As such it is proposed to align the DCP controls with the <i>ADG</i> for these matters.</p>	<p>Recommendations from the Discussion Paper have been largely adopted into the draft CoP DCP.</p> <p>The controls have been updated to reflect current standards of the State Government's <i>Apartment Design Guide</i> and position established in the Parramatta City Centre DCP.</p> <p>Specific DCP controls have been included to guide the design of building interfaces at the street, building proportions, deep soil and communal open space.</p> <p>This section of the DCP will contain controls relating to residential flat buildings of up to 8-storeys in height. Other apartment types will be guided by controls relating to specific precincts or other special areas.</p> <p>Refer to Part 3 – Residential Uses, Section 3.5 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>
Shop top housing	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>Shop top housing refers to a building with dwellings located above ground floor retail or business premises.</p> <p>All DCPs include controls for shop top housing. Key differences between DCPs relate to minimum frontage, setbacks, building separation, landscaping and deep soil.</p> <p>It is noted the provisions of <i>SEPP 65</i> and the State Government's <i>Apartment Design Guide</i> will also apply to the shop top housing where the</p>	<p>It is proposed to retain separate provisions for shop top housing, to take into account the commercial environments in which they are located. These controls will be generally consistent with the <i>ADG</i>. Additional controls proposed include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • floor to ceiling heights: 2.7m (4m for ground floor commercial) • site frontage: min. 6m wide (to retain fine grain) • setbacks: as per Parramatta DCP • landscaping: as per Parramatta DCP 	<p>Recommendations from the Discussion Paper have been adopted into the draft CoP DCP, with minor amendments to capture both shop top and other types of lower scale mixed-use development.</p> <p>Refer to Part 3 – Residential Uses, Section 3.5 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
						building is 3 or more storeys and contains at least 4 dwellings.	noise mitigation: as per Parramatta DCP	
Housing diversity and choice	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>All DCPs have controls seeking a mix of dwelling sizes to be provided in apartment developments. These controls are broadly consistent and generally require at least 10% of each size of dwelling (1, 2 and 3 bedrooms) to be provided. Auburn, The Hills and Hornsby DCPs also include dwelling mix and/or minimum internal dwelling size requirements for multi-dwelling housing schemes.</p> <p>All DCPs also include requirements for accessible or adaptable housing to be included in multi-dwelling housing and apartment developments. These generally require 5-15% of dwellings to be built to relevant Australian Standards for accessible or adaptable housing. Hornsby DCP also seeks 20% of dwellings in large schemes to meet Universal Design standards (silver level) under the <i>Livable Housing Guidelines</i>.</p> <p>Auburn and The Hills DCPs include additional controls and guidance focusing on accessibility, e.g. minimising physical barriers, requiring elevators and designing for mobility impaired people. By contrast, Parramatta, Holroyd and Hornsby DCPs place a stronger focus on residential mix and adaptability/flexibility.</p> <p>Adaptable and flexible design enables the community to respond to and accommodate the changing life cycle needs of residents over time and ensures accessibility for all people regardless of their age or mobility. Ensuring that development provides adaptable dwellings and employs universal design principles will also minimise retro-fitting costs that may be required at a later date.</p>	<p>Dwelling mix</p> <p>It is proposed to adopt the following dwelling mix requirements to provide for a range of household types:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium density housing: For schemes of 10+ dwellings, 20% must have 3 or more bedrooms • Apartments (10+ dwellings): 10-20% of dwellings to be 3+ bedrooms, 60%-75% of apartments to be 2 bedrooms, 10%-20% of bedrooms to be 1 bedroom/studios <p>It proposed to include a control seeking the majority of family-sized units to be located on the ground/lower levels of apartment blocks to support family-living in higher density housing. Holroyd and The Hills DCPs already include a similar requirement.</p> <p>Adaptable housing</p> <p>It is proposed to adopt the following requirements to enable inclusion and accessibility for all people in the LGA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multi dwelling housing, apartments and shop top housing with less than 10 dwellings: require at least 1 dwelling to meet <i>Livable Housing Guidelines (2012)</i> silver level design. • Multi dwelling housing, apartments and shop top housing with 10 or more dwellings: require at least 15% of dwellings to meet <i>Livable Housing Guidelines (2012)</i> silver level design. • Ground floor dwellings in buildings with no lift: must be 'visitable' by people with a disability in accordance with AS 1428 1:2001. • All dwellings in buildings with lift access: must be 'visitable' by people with a disability in accordance with AS 1428 1:2001. 	<p>Recommendations from the Discussion Paper have been adopted into the draft CoP DCP, with minor amendments to reference other relevant local strategies such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Socially Sustainable Parramatta Framework 2017 • Local Strategic Planning Statement 2036 • Local Housing Strategy 2020 <p>Further clarity has been provided on the preferred location of family-sized units, which are to be located at the ground level or podium level of a residential development.</p> <p>Refer to Part 3 – Residential Uses, Section 3.1 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
							<p>The proposed adaptable housing requirements are consistent with Council's <i>Disability Inclusion Action Plan (2017-2021)</i> and Council's commitment to ensuring social sustainability within our community through the <i>Sharing the Opportunities of Growth for All – Socially Sustainable Parramatta Framework (2017)</i>.</p> <p>The need for additional or amended controls will be considered following the completion of the <i>Local Housing Strategy</i>.</p>	
Attics	✓	✓	✓	✓	*	<p>Most DCPs include controls for attic design, which cover issues such as roof pitch, cross ventilation and design of windows. There is some overlap between the DCPs, however the level of detail and design requirements vary, particularly in regards to wall/roof heights and dormer windows.</p> <p>Attic conversions in dwelling houses can also be undertaken as complying development under the <i>Codes SEPP</i>.</p>	<p>It is proposed to include attic controls in the DCP to ensure appropriate design measures are in place to assess DA proposals received. Key controls proposed include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attics to be designed to fit within the building envelope (excluding dormer windows) and are not to increase the bulk and height of the roof • Attics to be designed to allow good light and ventilation • Attics to be no greater than 25sqm in floor area • A minimum floor to ceiling height of 2.4m will be required <p>Controls for roof pitch, dormer window specifications and wall heights will also be included.</p>	<p>Recommendations from the Discussion Paper have been adopted into the draft CoP DCP.</p> <p>The maximum floor area permitted for attic spaces has been increased from 25sqm to 30sqm to allow the potential for a master bedroom to be comfortably accommodated within the roof space. This slight increase in the floor area permitted for attics ensures that there is enough flexibility to meet the necessary amenity standards for a habitable room in this location such as minimum room dimensions, daylighting and natural ventilation. Detailed controls and supporting diagrams which ensure attic spaces are contained within the roof form, do not contribute to any additional building bulk or impact on the privacy of neighbouring dwellings have been preserved in this section. These diagrams demonstrate the additional 5sqm has an inconsequential impact on privacy.</p> <p>Refer to Part 3 – Residential Uses, Section 3.2 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>

Table 8 – Traffic and Parking

Topics: Car parking rates, Bike parking rates, Motorcycle parking, Loading bay rates, Design of parking areas, Sustainable transport, Electric Vehicles

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
Car parking rates	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>There are differences in car parking rates across the LGA, particularly for non-residential uses, with differences in both the amount of parking required, whether maximums and/or minimums are prescribed, and the basis for working out the required rate. There is no DCP that is consistently higher or lower than the others, with the relative differences between rates varying use by use.</p> <p>The common uses that all DCPs prescribe car parking rates for are residential, business and offices premises, retail, restaurants, industrial, child care centres, sex service premises, and places of public worship.</p> <p>Some DCPs also include site-specific rates for certain precincts, such as Epping Town Centre and Parramatta North in addition to generic LGA-wide rates.</p>	<p>Proposed car parking rates for common land uses are outlined in Section 6.1 of the Discussion Paper. The need to specify rates for other land uses will be considered as part of the preparation of the draft consolidated DCP.</p> <p>Where rates are not specified in the DCP, Council will use established Roads and Maritime Services guidelines to determine appropriate provisions and/or a traffic and parking assessment submitted with the application.</p> <p>Where DCPs contain precinct-specific rates, these will be carried over into the consolidated DCP.</p>	<p>Recommendations from the Discussion Paper have been adopted into the draft CoP DCP. A summary of the key policy directions are below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum car parking rates have been prepared by Council's Traffic and Transport team according to TfNSW Guide to Traffic Generating Development. • Creating a minimum rate of 1 space per single dwelling and dual occupancy, with a minimum of 2 spaces to be required for these development types with 3 or more bedrooms. • Car parking rates for residential flat buildings both inside and outside of public transport radius thresholds have been prepared through applying the rates as provided in Table 5.3 of TfNSW Guide to Traffic Generating Development. • Business premises car parking rates have been prepared based off the Discussion Paper recommendation to reduce car parking rates by 25% for sites within 800m of a train or light rail stop or 400m from a frequently served bus stop, confirmed to be appropriate rates by Council's T&T team. • Industrial car parking rates reflect those in the Auburn DCP. These were recommended by Council's T&T Team. Separating industrial uses for rates was recommended in the Discussion Paper, which is reflected in the controls. • Separating retail premises and restaurants was recommended by Council's Transport and Traffic team to provide more specific car parking rates for specific land uses. • Restaurant car parking rates from the existing PDCP 2011 have been retained and are to be used as a guide when determining suitable parking for this land use. The rates are included below, however the draft CoP DCP requires these to be verified through a traffic and transport impact assessment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. First 100sqm GFA: Minimum of 1 space per 30sqm GFA (available on-

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
								<p>street parking cannot be counted towards this requirement) PLUS</p> <p>b. Additional GFA over first 100sqm: 15 spaces per 100sqm GFA or 1 space per 3 seats, whichever is greater.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational establishments, hotels and clubs are to have their car parking rates determined through a traffic and transport impact assessment. • Boarding houses and Housing for Seniors and People with a Disability (Hostels, Residential Care Facilities and Independent Living Units) are to have their car parking rates provided as per their relevant SEPPs. • Recreational facilities and medical centres are to have their car parking rates determined according to TfNSW Guide to Traffic Generating Development. • Precinct-specific rates have been retained within the DCP. <p>Refer to Part 6 – Traffic and Transport, Section 6.2 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>
Bike parking rates	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>Bicycle parking requirements vary significantly across the DCPs in terms of when and how much parking is required.</p> <p>All DCPs require bike parking for apartment development and for business and commercial uses. Some DCPs also prescribe requirements for other land uses including multi-dwelling development, industrial development and education facilities.</p> <p>DCPs also include different requirements for end of trip facilities, such as lockers and showers.</p>	<p>Proposed bike parking rates are outlined in Section 6.3 of the Discussion Paper.</p> <p>The proposed rates will help to facilitate a shift towards sustainable transport, consistent with the objective of the Parramatta Bike Plan. All bicycling parking must also be consistent with AS 2890.3:2015 Parking Facilities- Bicycle Parking.</p>	<p>Recommendations from the Discussion Paper have been adopted into the DCP, with minor additions to be consistent with the current Parramatta Bike Plan 2017 and relevant Australian Standards. These are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirements for end-of-trip facilities in non-residential premises are to provide: • 1 shower and change facilities per 10 staff/employees, and • 1 locker per employee/staff bicycle parking spot provided. • Ensuring that bicycle parking facilities do not impede pedestrian or vehicular circulation and being located in highly visible, illuminated areas to minimise theft and vandalism. • Making bicycle parking facilities a requirement for all new and redeveloping business and industrial premises. Where bicycle parking

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
								<p>requirements are over 30 spaces, suitable end of trip facilities must also be provided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensuring all bicycle parking is to be provided in the form of Class B lockers for residents/employees and Class C rails for visitor parking, as specified in Australian Standard AS2890.3 – Bicycle Parking Facilities. Additional bicycle controls outside the scope of the Discussion Paper include storage facilities and charging outlets for e-bikes. Although e-bike chargers are to be provided by the owners themselves, e-bike controls include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10A e-bike charging outlets to 10% of provided bicycle parking spaces; No bicycle parking spaces being more than 20m away from an e-bike charging outlet. <p>Refer to Part 6 – Traffic and Transport, Section 6.3 of the draft CoP DCP</p>
Motorcycle parking	x	x	✓	✓	✓	<p>Hornsby, Parramatta and The Hills DCPs include parking requirements for motorcycles. Both The Hills and Hornsby DCPs require on-site motorcycle parking at a rate of 1 motorcycle parking space per 50 car spaces. Parramatta DCP only includes requirements for boarding houses, reflecting the <i>ARHSEPP</i>.</p>	<p>It is proposed to adopt the following motorcycle parking rates in the consolidated DCP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Boarding houses: Min. 1 space per 5 boarding rooms <p>All other developments: Min. 1 space per 50 car parking spaces or part thereof.</p>	<p>Recommendations from the Discussion Paper have been considered in the draft CoP DCP.</p> <p>Motorcycle parking rates within the DCP adopt the Discussions Paper's recommendation of providing a rate of 1 motorcycle parking space per 50 car parking spaces.</p> <p>For boarding house development, the DCP relies upon the controls provided in the <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021</i>. There is no set rate provided in this legislation, however, ensures that adequate bicycle and motorcycle parking spaces are provided.</p> <p>Refer to Part 6 – Traffic and Transport, Section 6.2 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>
Loading bay rates	✓	x	x	✓	✓	<p>Some DCPs prescribe loading bay requirements for non-residential uses. Rates vary across DCPs. Parramatta DCP prescribes the same rate for all land uses and these tend to be highest across DCPs. Auburn and The Hills DCPs apply different rates to different uses and are considerably higher than other DCPs.</p>	<p>A generic rate for all land uses is not considered appropriate given loading requirements will vary by use. Consideration will be given to different rates that could be prescribed for different uses.</p> <p>An alternative approach would be to not prescribe rates and instead determine appropriate provision on a case by case basis,</p>	<p>Recommendations from the Discussion Paper have been considered in the draft CoP DCP.</p> <p>As per the recommendation of the Discussion Paper, prescribed rates for loading bays are not provided in the DCP, rather that a case-by-case assessment is to be applied through a traffic and transport impact assessment. This assessment</p>

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
						Holroyd and Hornsby DCPs determine required provision on a case by case basis.	taking into account the demand, type and size of the commercial and/or retail developments and the frequency and type of delivery vehicle. This could be addressed through a Traffic Impact Assessment report submitted with applications.	<p>must demonstrate that the proposed development will not result in any on-street loading or unloading activities.</p> <p>Loading bays are to be provided in accordance with the TfNSW Guide to Traffic Generating Development, with spaces to include car and motorcycle spaces for couriers.</p> <p>Furthermore, if a more detailed Loading Dock Management Plan is required, it is recommended that it be prepared in accordance with the NSW Last Mile Toolkit.</p> <p>Refer to Part 6 – Traffic and Transport, Section 6.4 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>
Design of parking areas	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>All DCPs applying within the City of Parramatta LGA have a consistent aim to reduce the visual impact and dominance of car parking, however the level of detail of controls varies.</p> <p>Common requirements across the DCPs include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Garages and parking areas must be setback from the front of a building and limited to a maximum width of 6m or 50% of the building's street elevation The number of driveways and vehicle crossings should be minimised and appropriately spaced apart in multi dwelling housing <p>Landscaping should be used to minimise visual impact</p>	<p>Controls relating to the visual appearance of car parking areas will be reviewed to select those that help reinforce our aim to minimise the visual impact of garages and car parking areas and ensure they do not dominate the street, without unreasonably impacting the development. Refer to Section 6.2 of the Discussion Paper.</p> <p>Technical requirements for car parking areas, such as the minimum dimensions of car parking spaces and the design of circulation areas are largely governed by Australian Standards, which council routinely applies. The DCP will be reviewed to remove any duplication with these standards.</p>	<p>The proposed DCP controls have incorporated the recommendations of the Discussion Paper including design of car parking areas for dwelling houses/dual occupancies, multi-dwelling housing, non-residential development and general landscaping requirements. The DCP also addressed the issue of removing controls which duplicate Australian Standards.</p> <p>A summary of the key policy directions adapted from the five DCPs is below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing a maximum garage width of 6.3m to minimise the visual impact of garages and car parking areas and ensure they do not dominate the street, without unreasonably impacting the development. Setting carports and garages back a minimum of 300mm behind the building line or are to be recessed behind the second storey front wall. This control has been deemed sufficient by the City Design team, as the proposed 1m setback in the Hornsby DCP was excessive. Using landscaping to deliver better design and streetscape outcomes where parking is permitted forward of the building line Basement car parking on sloped sites are not to exceed 1m above ground level, as these constitute a

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
								<p>storey, and compliance with Australian Standard AS2890 is required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking at multi-dwelling housing is to be located at the rear of sites to ensure that parking is not visible from the street. • For multi-dwelling developments, ensuring that driveways are to be shared by two or more dwellings to minimise the impact to the street frontage and ensure sufficient street parking. • Vehicle access for industrial development will not impact on residential uses and, therefore, not be provided at the boundary to these uses. To minimise the visual impact on street frontage, at grade parking, loading areas and vehicle access points should be screened using landscaping. • A 1m landscaped area is to be provided along the boundary of driveways to minimise the visual impact on the street and integrate the driveway with the surrounding landscaping. • Underground/undercroft parking is to be provided with a security door/screen to minimise the visual impact of the building's façade and integrate the parking areas into it. <p>Refer to Part 6 – Traffic and Transport, Section 6.2 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>
Sustainable transport	x	x	✓	✓	x	<p>Only Parramatta and Hornsby DCPs include controls for car share schemes and travel plans. Outside of Epping Town Centre, car share is only encouraged and not a prescribed requirement under Hornsby DCP. By comparison, Parramatta DCP prescribes a minimum rate for large residential and business developments.</p> <p>Both DCPs require Travel Plans for large scale developments.</p>	<p>New developments should provide opportunities to support and encourage the use of sustainable transport through car share parking and developing travel plans. Car sharing discourages personal car ownership and use, while offering the benefits of a car for occasional trips. As such it is proposed to adopt the controls in Parramatta DCP for car share and travel plans, as these provisions are generally stronger than those in Hornsby DCP.</p>	<p>As per the recommendations of the Discussion Paper, the proposed sustainable transport controls support and encourage the use of sustainable transport throughout the City by providing car share thresholds and the development of travel plans.</p> <p>Carshare controls discourage the ownership of personal cars, while providing the opportunity of car use for occasional essential trips. Car share controls have been based on those in the Parramatta DCP 2011.</p> <p>The carshare controls have been informed by the Parramatta DCP 2011 however have been amended to remove the radial catchments (i.e 800m catchment of a railway station or 400m catchment of a bus stop) for where carshare</p>

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
								<p>parking rates apply. This is due to the uptake of the car spaces by rideshare providers and residents, with these spots within developments not effectively being used.</p> <p>The draft CoP DCP proposes to only require car share for developments within the Parramatta City Centre, Epping, Westmead, Granville and Harris Park town centres where maximum parking rates are applied to encourage less reliance on private vehicles within these centres. Due to the maximum parking rates, car sharing in these areas are likely to be more attractive for residents.</p> <p>The travel plan controls in the draft CoP DCP vary from the controls in the Parramatta DCP 2011 in the following way:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replacing the title of “Green Travel Plans” with “Travel Plans”, as the purpose of the travel plans is to promote sustainable transport use and is explained in the plan itself. Following consultation with Council’s Traffic and Transport team, removing the radial catchment from railway stations and bus stops which made travel plans a requirement. Instead of this, it was agreed upon that the size of a development should inform whether a travel plan is a requirement, rather than location. <p>Refer to Part 6 – Traffic and Transport, Section 6.1 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>
Electric Vehicles	x	x	x	x	x	No existing controls contained within the DCPs.	As Electric Vehicle (EV) controls were not within any of the DCPs at the time of writing the Discussion Paper, there was no recommendation within the Discussion Paper.	<p>The draft CoP DCP is introducing new EV controls as part of the harmonisation process.</p> <p>The uptake of electric vehicles has increased in recent times triggering several councils (including the City of Newcastle recently) proposing controls related to facilitating infrastructure to support electric vehicle requirements.</p> <p>The CoP City Centre DCP, as well as other precinct DCPs in the City such as Melrose Park and Telopea also contain controls relating to electric vehicles.</p>

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
								<p>The consideration of EV controls arose during the harmonisation process to help support the new City of Parramatta's transition towards more sustainable travel.</p> <p>Council officers undertook a review of electric vehicle controls that currently apply to the City Centre, and assessed their suitability to apply to the rest of the City. The following electric vehicle controls are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of electrical circuit and power point to enable an easy future EV connection in the garage connected to the main switch board for all single and dual occupancy dwellings. • All other residential accommodation to provide an EV Ready Connection to at least one car space for each dwelling/apartment to ensure equal access throughout buildings to EV charging. • Provide and locate EV Distribution Boards so that no cables of more than 50m from the parking bay are required to connect to charging to ensure easy accessibility to charging points. • The provision of a minimum Level 2 40A fast charger and Power Supply (connected to an EV Distribution Board) for all shared and visitor vehicle parking spaces. • All parking provided with commercial development is to provide 1 Shared EV connection for every 10 commercial car spaces throughout car parks, to enable charging opportunities for visitors and employees. <p>Refer to Part 6 – Traffic and Transport, Section 6.1.3 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>

Table 9 – Controls Specific to Other Development

Topics: Business development, Industrial development, Advertising and signage, Subdivision of land and site consolidation, Places of public worship, Child care centres, Educational establishments, Sex services premises, Restricted premises, Telecommunications facilities, Boarding houses, Precinct-specific controls.

Topic	DCP coverage					Summary of differences	Recommendations within Harmonisation Discussion Paper – January 2019	Proposed Harmonisation DCP Controls
	AUB	HOL	HOR	PAR	HIL			
Business development	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>All DCPs have provisions for business/commercial development, which cover issues such as height, site frontage, setbacks, separation, wind mitigation and building design (e.g. awnings). Some of these controls overlap with other DCP controls, such as those relating to shop top housing, parking and visual and acoustic amenity.</p> <p>Holroyd DCP includes additional specific controls for laneways, arcades and corner buildings, plus specific controls for malls, health consulting rooms and arcade centres.</p> <p>Key differences between DCPs relate to floor-to-ceiling height requirements, setbacks, building frontages and landscaping.</p> <p>In addition to the general controls for business development, some DCPs have specific controls for town centres and strategic precincts, including Carlingford, Epping, East Rydalmere and Newington. These cover the majority of business areas outside of the Parramatta DCP area.</p>	<p>As business zones are diverse and take many shapes and size, it is considered that overly detailed development standards are not appropriate. Rather, the individual characteristics of each centre should be considered before a development application is determined.</p> <p>Existing DCP controls specific to town centres or commercial precincts will be retained in the consolidated DCP, incorporating any updates or amendments made through ongoing precinct planning processes.</p> <p>For centres not covered by specific controls, it is proposed to apply controls consistent with those in Parramatta DCP. The following floor to ceiling heights is suggested to improve design outcomes: Floor-to-ceiling heights: For ground floor storeys, the minimum floor to ceiling height shall be 4m. For all other commercial floors, the minimum floor to ceiling height shall be 3.5m.</p>	<p>Consistent with recommendations from the Discussion Paper, provisions are prepared in accordance with existing controls from the Parramatta DCP 2011. This includes the inclusion of floor-to-ceiling heights (as described in the Discussion Paper) to improve design outcomes.</p> <p>Upon further consideration, additional changes have been made and include the following controls from the Auburn DCP 2010:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only open grille or transparent security (at least 70% visually transparent) shutters are permitted to retail frontages. Development on land zoned B6 Enterprise Corridor on Silverwater Road for a hotel and motel accommodation and office premises shall be a maximum of three (3) storeys. <p>Refer to Part 4 – Non-Residential Uses, Section 4.2 and Part 8 – Centres and Precincts of the draft CoP DCP.</p>
Industrial development	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>All DCPs have general controls for industrial development, which cover issues such as built form, setbacks, hours of operation, noise, landscaping and pollution.</p> <p>Some of these controls overlap with other DCP controls, such as those relating to energy and pollution and acoustic amenity and LEP controls, such as those relating to height and subdivision.</p> <p>DCPs also include provisions for specific industrial areas, including Newington Business Park and North Rocks Employment Precinct.</p> <p>It is noted that under the <i>Codes SEPP</i>, certain development including the construction of new</p>	<p>Existing site-specific controls will be carried over into the DCP. General industrial controls will be reviewed to ensure appropriate controls are adopted for development that requires approval, particularly in regards to landscaping and setbacks.</p> <p>Strong controls are needed to provide sufficient screening and softening of the built form or at grade car parking areas and to ensure significant trees and vegetation are retained, particularly on sites adjoining bushland.</p> <p>As such, it is suggested to include a control requiring at least 15% of the site to be landscaped in industrial areas and for landscaping to be provided along boundary</p>	<p>Consistent with recommendations from the Discussion Paper, landscaping and setback controls from Auburn DCP 2010 have been adopted into this DCP to strengthen controls for industrial development.</p> <p>This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a minimum of 15% of the site to be landscaped and a 3m landscape strip to be included within the setback zone along the property. 10m minimum setback to a classified road. <p>The following additional controls have also been included to improve building design and amenity of industrial types of development.</p>

						<p>industrial buildings and warehouses up to 20,000sqm (other than heavy industry) can be carried out as complying development. DCP controls would not apply in these cases.</p>	<p>setbacks. This is consistent with the Auburn DCP. The proposed 10m buffer zone to bushland, waterways and significant vegetation will also apply to industrial sites.</p> <p>Height and FSR will continue to be mandated through the LEP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider noise and light spill when determining hours of operation – from Auburn DCP 2010. Communal open space to be provided - from Parramatta DCP 2011. <p>Refer to Part 4 – Non-Residential Uses, Section 4.3 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>
Advertising and signage	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>All DCPs have objectives and controls for signage, which cover issues such as sign treatment, siting and maximum dimensions and size. Some DCPs are more detailed than others, including controls for specific types of signs such as real estate signs, business identification signage and temporary signage, as well as more general controls applying to different zones. Auburn DCP is the least prescriptive and relies on the provisions of <i>SEPP 64</i>.</p> <p>Key differences between DCPs generally relate to maximum dimensions/size, finishes and permitted sign types.</p> <p>It is noted that all advertising and signage must comply with <i>SEPP 64</i>, which has assessment criteria for signage proposals, as well as development standards for a number of sign types, such as wall signs, bridge signs and roof and sky advertisements.</p> <p>Some common forms of signage, such as wall signs, fascia signs, window signs and real estate signs, can be undertaken outside of conservation areas through exempt or complying development under the <i>Codes SEPP</i>. DCP controls would not apply in these cases.</p>	<p>Given the application of <i>SEPP 64</i> and <i>the Codes SEPP</i> to signage, it is not considered necessary to have additional detailed controls in the DCP. On this basis, the provisions of Parramatta DCP are generally considered sufficient, and will form the basis of controls in the consolidated DCP. However, two additional controls are proposed to address issues being experienced with signage in the LGA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requirement for a signage plan to be submitted with proposals for multi-tenancy buildings to ensure a coordinated approach is taken to signage across tenancies. For ground floor retail or commercial uses, no more than 40% of windows can be obscured by signage and advertising material in order to prevent visual clutter and maintain activation of the street. <p>Signs on heritage items and in heritage conservation areas will be addressed separately in the heritage and archaeology section of the consolidated DCP.</p>	<p>Recommendations from the Discussion Paper have been adopted into the DCP.</p> <p>Signs on Heritage Items and in Heritage Conservation Areas has been relocated to Part 7 – Heritage.</p> <p>Refer to Part 2 – Design and Place, Section 2.15 and Part 7 – Heritage, Section 7.9 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>
Subdivision of land and site consolidation	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>All of the DCPs have provisions for residential subdivision, but the requirements and level of detail varies. Holroyd DCP also includes subdivision controls for business and industrial zones.</p> <p>Key differences between controls relate to requirements for minimum lot sizes, frontage, access and lot orientation. Holroyd and Hornsby DCPs also include detailed considerations for road and lot design as well as other matters that overlap with controls elsewhere in the DCP</p>	<p>Most subdivision applications in the LGA are for small-scale residential uses and for these proposals the existing controls within Parramatta DCP, in conjunction with minimum lot size controls in the LEP and standard conditions of consent, are generally considered sufficient.</p> <p>Where comprehensive redevelopment of large brownfield precincts is being considered, such as at Camellia and Melrose Park, subdivision will be informed separately by a detailed master planning process. Consideration will be given as to whether additional controls are needed to</p>	<p>Residential subdivision provisions have been largely adapted from Parramatta DCP 2011, with improvements to ensure subdivisions are designed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Take account of topography, minimising the need for cut and fill associated with the dwelling and driveway construction, Protect natural and cultural/heritage features, Retain significant trees and vegetation communities, and Have regard to views to and from the site. <p>As previously identified in the Discussion Paper,</p>

						<p>(such as open space and landscaping) or LEP (in the case of minimum lot size controls).</p> <p>Most of the DCPs have controls which aim to reduce the creation of isolated lots (i.e. sites that will not be able to meet minimum frontage or lot size requirements and therefore would have limited development potential). These provisions are generally consistent across DCPs, requiring applicants to make a genuine attempt to purchase/amalgamate isolated lots. Where this is not possible, applicants must demonstrate that an orderly and economic use of the site can be achieved. Most DCPs apply this control to higher density residential development. Some, such as Hornsby and Holroyd DCPs, also apply the controls in business areas.</p>	<p>support subdivision applications in these precincts.</p> <p>Consideration will also be given as to whether subdivision controls for business and industrial land are needed. It is intended that this will be informed by the strategic work currently being undertaken by the Greater Sydney Commission.</p> <p>It is proposed to apply controls for development on isolated lots to multi-dwelling housing and apartments, consistent with the approach in Parramatta DCP. These controls are based on well-established planning principles.</p>	<p>business and industrial land can be diverse and take many shapes and size, it is considered that overly detailed development standards are not appropriate. Therefore, Council officers have not proposed subdivision controls for business and industrial land in the draft CoP DCP.</p> <p>Residential provisions for site consolidation and development on isolated sites retained from existing Parramatta DCP.</p> <p>Refer to Part 3 – Residential Uses, Section 3.6 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>
Places of public worship	x	✓	✓	✓	<p>The intent of controls across DCPs is broadly consistent – to ensure Places of Public Worship do not have adverse impacts on nearby development - however the level of detail varies.</p> <p>Common controls for Places of Public Worship relate to locational requirements, bulk and scale, acoustic privacy, open space, setbacks, amenity and traffic and parking.</p> <p>It is noted that The Hills DCP only has controls for places of Places of Public Worship in rural zones, which do not apply in the City of Parramatta LGA.</p>	<p>A clear and consistent set of controls will be developed for Places of Public Worship, drawing on the strongest controls from across DCPs, to ensure they are appropriately designed and located.</p> <p>Concerns with traffic, parking and noise are the most common issues raised with applications for Places of Public Worship. It is proposed to require a Noise Impact Assessment for all applications to help address potential acoustic impacts on nearby areas. An Operational Plan of Management will also be required for all DAs for places of public worship. Proposed car parking rates are outlined in Section 6.1 of the Discussion Paper.</p>	<p>The existing provisions from the Parramatta DCP 2011 have been retained, this includes a control pertaining to the requirement of an Operational Plan of Management for places of public worship. The provisions are aligned with the intent of the recommendations of the Discussion Paper.</p> <p>It is important to note that the Harmonisation Planning Proposal seeks to prohibit Places of Public Worship within the R2 Low Density Residential zone, and that this section of the draft CoP DCP only applies to land where Places of Public Worship are permissible under the current Parramatta LEP 2011 and the draft Harmonisation LEP (i.e. consolidated Parramatta Local Environmental Plan).</p> <p>Refer to Part 4 – Non-Residential Uses, Section 4.4 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>	
Child care centres	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>Provisions for child care centres are found in all of the DCPs, however many of these controls have now been superseded by State Government provisions introduced by the <i>Education and Child Care SEPP</i> and supporting <i>Child Care Planning Guidelines</i>, which take precedence over development controls in the DCP, with the exception of controls for building height, car parking rates and side and rear setbacks.</p>	<p>DCP controls will be reviewed to remove any duplication with provisions in the <i>Education and Child Care SEPP</i> and <i>Child Care Planning Guidelines</i>.</p> <p>Height controls will continue to be defined through the LEP. Consideration will be given to appropriate setback controls, given the different contexts within which child care centres can be located. Proposed parking requirements are outlined in Section 6.1 of the Discussion Paper.</p>	<p>Consistent with the recommendations from the Discussion Paper, a review of the DCP controls was undertaken to review duplication with SEPPs.</p> <p>The provisions largely retain existing approach from Parramatta DCP 2011, with updates from Auburn DCP and the Holroyd DCP to deliver improved landscape setback and parking design controls. This includes applying updated setback controls based on the relevant land use zone. In the case of R2 zones, an amendment has been made to give consideration to other building</p>	

								envelope controls for dual occupancies instead of dwelling houses. Where required, any controls have been removed where it contradicts the <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021 - Chapter 3 - Educational establishments and child care facilities</i> , (supersedes the <i>Education and Childcare SEPP</i>) and/or Child Care Planning Guideline. Refer to Part 4 – Non Residential Uses, Section 4.6 of the draft CoP DCP.
Educational establishments	x	x	✓	✓	x	Only Hornsby and Parramatta DCPs include controls for educational establishments. These cover issues such as landscaping, privacy, bulk, scale and traffic and parking. Since September 2017, certain education-related development, such as libraries, portable classrooms and kiosks, have been able to be carried out as exempt development under provisions in the <i>Education and Child Care SEPP</i> . The SEPP also prescribes design quality principles that must be considered when determining applications for development that still needs consent.	In light of the <i>Education and Child Care SEPP</i> , it is anticipated that fewer development applications for educational establishments will be lodged. In this regard, it is proposed to retain the current controls in Parramatta DCP until the implications of the <i>Education and Child Care SEPP</i> are better understood.	Consistent with the recommendations from the Discussion Paper, provisions largely retain existing approach from Parramatta DCP 2011 , with particular attention given to the <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021 - Chapter 3 - Educational establishments and child care facilities</i> , which supersedes the <i>Education and Childcare SEPP</i> . Refer to Part 4 – Non Residential Uses, Section 4.5 of the draft CoP DCP.
Sex services premises	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	All DCPs have controls for sex services premises, which aim to reduce any negative impact of these operations on the amenity, privacy and character of surrounding areas. Common requirements across the DCPs include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requiring a minimum buffer from particular sensitive land uses (e.g. schools), • Limiting the size and number of advertising signs, and • Requiring appropriate safety measures to protect staff and patrons There are some additional controls in other DCPs that Parramatta DCP does not address, such as fire safety, disabled access and waste.	It is proposed to apply controls consistent with those in Parramatta DCP, as these provisions are considered to be the strongest. Updates will be made to make controls less ambiguous, including adding some controls from other DCPs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrictions on side and rear lane access (Auburn DCP) • Limiting initial consent to a 12-month trial period (The Hills DCP) • Not permitting spruikers, public address /sound amplifications systems or preparation and serving of food and alcohol on site (The Hills DCP) • Requiring adequate amenities to be provided for staff and visitors (The Hills DCP) • Requiring a crime prevention audit with all proposals, and installation of security surveillance (Auburn and The Hills DCPs) 	Consistent with recommendations from the Discussion Paper, provisions are based on existing provisions from the Parramatta DCP 2011 with updates from Auburn DCP and the Hills DCP to remove any ambiguity and support improved controls. The following definition of ‘operator’ has been prepared in consultation with Council’s City Safe team and included in the DCP: Operator means management as well as the owner (i.e. nominee of the company as the operator) of the adult entertainment or sex industry business. Refer to Part 4 – Non Residential Uses, Section 4.7 of the draft CoP DCP.

							<p>While some of these controls may be addressed through Plans of Management and/or conditions of consent, it is considered helpful to include these items in the DCP to help the community and applicants better understand Council's requirements.</p> <p>It is proposed to introduce a definition for the "operator" of a business, as it is currently unclear who this refers to.</p> <p>The additional matters for consideration in other DCPs are adequately covered under another policy or government standard (e.g. BCA) and do not need to be included in the consolidated DCP.</p>	
Restricted premises	x	x	x	✓	x	<p>Parramatta is the only DCP that has specific objectives and controls for restricted premises. Restricted premises are buildings that restrict access to patrons under 18 years of age and include sex shops and adult book stores, but do not include sex services premises or home occupations (sex services).</p>	<p>As controls for restricted premises are only found in Parramatta DCP, it is proposed to retain these provisions in the consolidated DCP.</p>	<p>Consistent with recommendations from the Discussion Paper, provisions are based on existing provisions from the Parramatta DCP 2011 controls.</p> <p>Refer to Part 4 – Non Residential Uses, Section 4.7 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>
Telecommunications facilities	x	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>There are differences across DCPs, however Council receives very few DAs for telecommunications facilities, as in many circumstances they can be carried out without consent under provisions of the <i>Telecommunications Act 1997</i>. Any DA that is received for telecommunications facilities must consider the <i>Telecommunications Guideline 2010</i> published by the State Government.</p>	<p>As most telecommunication facilities are undertaken without the need for a DA, and those that do are assessed against the Telecommunications Guideline 2010, additional detailed DCP controls are not considered necessary. In this regard, the current provisions in Parramatta DCP are considered sufficient.</p>	<p>Consistent with recommendations from the Discussion Paper, provisions are based on existing provisions from the Parramatta DCP 2011 controls</p> <p>Refer to Part 4 – Non Residential Uses, Section 4.8 of the draft CoP DCP.</p>
Boarding houses	x	x	✓	✓	x	<p>Boarding house proposals can either be lodged under an LEP or the <i>ARHSEPP</i> (providing they meet the SEPP's criteria). The <i>ARHSEPP</i> sets out a number of development standards that take precedence over the controls in a DCP, including solar access, private open space, parking and maximum floor area.</p> <p>Detailed objectives and controls are only prescribed in Parramatta DCP, which cover issues such as access, building envelope, privacy and acoustic amenity. Hornsby DCP has one control for boarding houses, which is that</p>	<p>Boarding house proposals lodged under the LEP will be assessed against controls in the DCP. As detailed controls are only prescribed in Parramatta DCP, it is proposed to retain these provisions moving forward.</p> <p>Boarding house proposals lodged under the <i>ARHSEPP</i> will be assessed against the standards in this Instrument (Part 2, Division 3).</p>	<p>Recommendations from the Discussion Paper have been considered with the new <i>Housing SEPP</i> which supersedes the <i>ARHSEPP</i>.</p> <p>The provisions will retain the objectives and controls from Parramatta DCP 2011 with minor amendments to updated legislation.</p> <p>The appendix from Parramatta DCP referred to as A9 Guide to Plans of Management for Boarding House Developments has not been incorporated into the DCP and will instead be relocated to Council website.</p>

						they must comply with the provisions in the <i>ARHSEPP</i> .		Refer to Part 3 – Residential Uses, Section 3.7 of the draft CoP DCP.
Precinct-specific controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>A number of DCPs have controls specific to certain precincts, strategic centres, special character areas or HCAs.</p> <p>Controls for Carlingford Town Centre are split across Parramatta, The Hills and Hornsby DCPs. Similarly, controls for Epping Town Centre are split across Parramatta and Hornsby DCPs.</p> <p>The Parramatta DCP controls for the Granville Town Centre precinct are now split across two LGAs – City of Parramatta and Cumberland.</p>	<p>Existing site-specific controls for precincts located within the LGA will be retained in the consolidated DCP. Controls pertaining to sites in the former Woodville Ward will be excluded, as this area no longer falls within the CoP LGA. The current precinct controls for the Granville Town Centre will be retained. These will be reviewed as part of work to implement the Parramatta Road Urban Transformation Strategy.</p> <p>Controls for the Carlingford Precinct will be reviewed and combined into one document so that one set of clear and consistent controls apply.</p> <p>Controls for Epping Town Centre will be also be combined into a consolidated set, incorporating any amendments identified separately through the Epping Planning Review project.</p>	<p>Recommendations from the Discussion Paper have largely been adopted into the draft CoP DCP.</p> <p>The Parramatta DCP 2011 contains general objectives for town and neighbourhood centres intended to ensure new development contributes positively to the public domain and streetscape, promotes design quality, and promotes pedestrian connectivity to public transport. These controls have been retained and applied to strategic precincts, local centres and neighbourhood precincts as these were considered appropriate and broadly align with the objectives and intended outcomes relating to centres and precincts within the other four DCPs subject to the harmonisation process.</p> <p>Due to prioritisation of the Harmonisation DCP project, recommendations relating to controls for the Carlingford Precinct and Epping Precinct have not been undertaken and are proposed to form part of a future review of the DCP.</p> <p>The relevant controls that apply to the Carlingford Precinct and Epping Precinct have been retained and grouped within Section 8.2.7 Carlingford Local Centre and Section 8.1.1 Epping Strategic Centre.</p> <p>Site specific ‘sheet-maps’ contained in The Hills and Holroyd DCP which provide specific controls (i.e. setbacks and subdivision patterns) and/or provisions relating to proposed roads (including road widening) have also been incorporated into the draft CoP DCP.</p> <p>As a consequence of the inclusion of above-mentioned sheet maps, general objectives have been created to require consideration of the sheet maps as part of the development process. This includes a control that requires reference to other parts of the DCP that may apply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It should be noted the sheet map for Northmead Industrial Area which include part of 23-25 Windsor Road, Northmead have been

