

## Attachment 3 – Summary of Submission and Responses Table

### Contents

Acronyms.....	1
Introduction.....	2
Key themes - community enquiries.....	4
Submission Response Table.....	5

### Acronyms

DCP	Development Control Plan
DPE	Department of Planning and Environment
LEP	Local Environmental Plan
PLEP 2023	<i>Parramatta Local Environmental Plan 2023</i>
SEPP	State Environmental Planning Policy

## Introduction

This attachment provides an overview of the community engagement phase undertaken for the draft Harmonisation Development Control Plan (draft DCP) carried out by Council between Monday 13 March 2023 and Monday 1 May 2023. The public exhibition process follows Council's requirements of a Level 4 – Key Land Use Planning project as detailed in the [Community Engagement Strategy 2022-24](#). Key engagement activities include:

- **Extended notification period** of 6 weeks from 13 March – 1 May 2023.
- **Notification letters** to 94,053 property owners within the City containing a QR code to the Participate Parramatta webpage.
- **Notification emails to key stakeholders** including: stakeholders and public authorities who made submissions during the public exhibition of the draft Harmonisation Local Environmental Plan, and individuals who requested to be consulted during previous stages of the Harmonisation project.
- **Exhibition material:**
  - o Community Summary Sheet (also available in Simplified Chinese, Korean, Hindi and Arabic) which provided an overview of key changes in the draft DCP.
  - o Planning Information Sheet explaining the different functions of a DCP and LEP.
  - o Copies of the Council Report and Resolution from the 28 November 2022 Council meeting endorsing the draft DCP for public exhibition. This included 4 attachments to the Council report:
    - Attachment 1 – Draft Parramatta DCP as attached to 28 November 2022 Council Report;
    - Attachment 2 – Summary of Draft Parramatta DCP and Response to Discussion Paper Recommendations;
    - Attachment 3 – Key Policy Matters; and
    - Attachment 4 – Table of Proposed DCP Structure, Key Features, and Changes.
  - o Standalone DCPs:
    - Homebush Bay West DCP 2004 – Volume 1
    - Homebush Bay West DCP 2003 – Volume 2 – Public Domain Manual
    - Wentworth Point DCP 2014
  - o Answers to Frequently Asked Questions.
- **Hardcopy exhibition material** located across all libraries within the City (Parramatta Library at PHIVE, Carlingford Library, Constitution Hill Branch Library, Dundas Library, Ermington Branch Library, and Wentworth Point Community Centre and Library).

## Attachment 3 – Summary of Submission and Responses Table

- **Digital media:**
  - Participate Parramatta webpage with digital copies of the exhibition material, as well as background and summary information. This webpage reached a total of **5,797 views** (source: SocialPinpoint).
  - Public notice on City of Parramatta’s corporate website and Participate Parramatta portal.
  - Paid social media campaign.
- **Pop-up Community Information Sessions** at each ward across the City:
  - Parramatta ward: 5:30 – 7pm, Thursday 30 March 2023 at Parramatta Square (**4** interactions);
  - Epping ward: 11:00 – 12:30pm, Saturday 1 April 2023 at Epping Rawson Street Carpark (**15** interactions);
  - North Rocks ward: 2:00 – 3:30pm, Saturday 1 April 2023 at The Chisholm Centre (**3** interactions);
  - Rosehill ward: 11:00 – 12:30pm, Sunday 2 April 2023 at Harris Park Shopping Centre (**3** interactions); and
  - Dundas ward: 2:00 – 3:30pm, Sunday 2 April 2023 at Oatlands Shopping Centre (**0** interactions).
- **Local newsletter notifications:**
  - Participate Parramatta newsletter reaching **13,306** community members (14 March edition).
  - Parra News weekly newsletter (article in 4 April 2023 edition and within the Lord Mayor Column in 25 April 2023 edition)
- **Phone-a-planner** sessions available to the public, with a total of **20** booked sessions.

In addition, Council Officers responded to a total of **174** customer enquiries:

- **85** emails from community via the project inbox ([planningharmonisation@cityofparramatta.nsw.gov.au](mailto:planningharmonisation@cityofparramatta.nsw.gov.au)), and
- **89** phone calls (totalling **14hrs 48min** with an average call time of 10 minutes) via:
  - Customer Service desk (**26**)
  - Call back requests (**42**)
  - Phone-a-planner sessions (**20**)

A summary of key themes raised in community enquiries is found below in **Figure 1**.

### Key themes - community enquiries




Figure 1 – Key themes from community enquiries

## Submission Response Table

This document summarises **58 submissions** received during the exhibition of the draft DCP. Submissions received were from the following groups:

- Residents and Individuals (**34** submissions). Refer to Table 1.
- Consultants (**8** submissions). Refer to Table 2.
- Organisations and Resident Action Groups (**6** submissions). Refer to Table 3.
- Public Authorities and Service Providers (**10** submissions). Refer to Table 4.

Each submission is summarised and provided with a Council Officer response.

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
1	Resident from Epping	<p>a. Submitter supports the draft DCP, to an extent.</p> <p>b. Submitter states that the minimum lot size for dual occupancy development should be 500sqm including calculation of area of any access corridor, right of carriageway etc.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Development for the purpose of dual occupancy subdivision is regulated under the <i>Parramatta Local Environment Plan 2023</i> (PLEP 2023), specifically, <i>Clause 4.1C Minimum subdivision lot size for dual occupancies and manor houses</i>, and <i>Clause 6.11 Dual occupancies prohibited on certain land</i>.</p> <p>Where dual occupancy development is permitted consistent with PLEP 2023, the requirement is for a minimum lot size of 600sqm and a minimum 15m frontage to a public road. This is to ensure sufficient site area to achieve the necessary amenity in relation to privacy, solar access, landscaping, private open space, and pedestrian and vehicular access.</p> <p>The minimum lot size for dual occupancy development is a principal development standard within the PLEP 2023. Feedback relating to Local Environmental Plan matters is out of scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project. The scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP is to consolidate the existing five DCPs into one consolidated set of controls to support the implementation of the PLEP 2023. A <a href="#">Planning Information Sheet</a> is available to understand more about the difference between an LEP and DCP and how they work together to guide development.</p> <p>The minimum lot size of 600sqm for dual occupancy includes driveways. ‘Access corridor’ and/or ‘right of carriage way’ are terms used in the context of battle-axe development and therefore not relevant to dual occupancy development. A battle-axe lot usually cannot be developed for the purpose of dual occupancy developments, as a battle-axe lot does not meet the minimum 15m street frontage facing a public road as required under <i>Clause 4.1C</i> of the PLEP 2023.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>c. Submitter states that blocks that are just over 1,200sqm (including area of any access corridor, driveway etc) should not be excluded for dual occupancy development.</p>	<p>As mentioned above in response <i>No. 1.b</i>, the PLEP 2023 specifies the following standards for dual occupancy development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• minimum lot size of 600sqm; and</li> <li>• minimum of 15m frontage to a public road.</li> </ul> <p>This means a site with a lot size of 1,200sqm, which has a 15m street frontage, could be development for dual occupancy development should the zoning permit this land use within the PLEP 2023.</p> <p>It is inferred from the submission that the submitter objects to the requirement of the PLEP 2023 that states the area of an access handle must not be calculated in the lot size for a battle-axe lot/subdivision (<i>Clause 4.13A</i>). Lot subdivision must comply with the minimum size shown on the Lot Size Map, plus account for any additional area to accommodate for an access handle. The subdivision opportunities for a 1,200sqm lot would be dependent on the lot size shown on the Lot Size Map. Furthermore, due to the 15m frontage to a public road requirement of the PLEP 2023, battle-axe lots would not be permitted for dual occupancy development; however, should the lot fronting the street from a battle-axe subdivision have 600sqm and a 15m frontage then a dual occupancy development could be permitted subject to the zoning.</p> <p>It is recommended the submitter speak to Council’s Development Advisory Team to understand their subdivision and development options under the PLEP 2023 which was finalised in March 2023.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
2	Resident from Carlingford	<p>a. Submitter generally supports the Harmonisation DCP project, but raises concern that the proposed setbacks (i.e. rear and front), storeys (no more than 2 storey for dwelling house) and site coverage controls are "one size fits all" approach failed to consider the established locality character (i.e. established street frontage and sloping sites) for dwelling house development.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>As explained within <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2022, controls relating to dwelling houses have been largely prepared using retained Parramatta DCP 2011 controls with minor updates. This is consistent with the recommendations of the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a> which was endorsed by Council on 26 November 2018 and placed on public exhibition from 21 January to 4 March 2019 for the community to comment on the proposed direction for the harmonisation process and the approach for residential accommodation (i.e. dwelling houses). The Discussion Paper provides a comparison of the controls for dwelling houses from the five DCPs and provides a recommendation. This process was designed to ensure the controls are suitable to accommodate for the context of the new City of Parramatta.</p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP includes different setback controls that are tailored for different residential development to deliver suitable amenity, privacy, solar access, landscaping, and private open space. All sections of the DCP (including for dwelling houses) contain both objectives and controls which provides some flexibility in the development assessment process (i.e. not a ‘one-size fits all’ approach). Should a dwelling house not strictly comply with a setback requirement, however, delivers on the objectives that consider local character and streetscape, there could be consideration of an adjustment. This ensures the controls accommodate for local character.</p> <p>Planning considerations such as building height and site coverage controls are managed by the <i>Parramatta</i></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p><i>LEP 2023.</i> The Maximum Height of Building Map specifies heights within the R2 zone (i.e. for dwelling houses). The Floor Space Ratio Map controls site coverage by specifying the maximum amount of gross floor area that can be delivered on a site. This is further supported by building envelope controls (such as setbacks) and deep soil requirements.</p> <p><i>See response No.3.c in relation to development on sloping sites.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>b. Submitter raises concern with the 6m frontage control <b>(C.05)</b> contained within <b>Section 3.3.1.2 – Preliminary Building Envelope</b> for dwelling houses in <b>Part 3 – Residential Development</b>, stating that the 6m front setback is different to the 10m front setback under the former Hills Shire DCP. Submitter has concerns new development will not match the existing/established dwelling setback in the area and deliver inconsistency with the existing street character.</p>	<p>As explained in response <i>No.3.a</i>, the draft Harmonisation DCP was informed by the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a>. The Discussion Paper (particularly <b>Section 2.3</b>) compares building envelope controls (such as setbacks) across the five DCPs. The proposed 6m setback is considered appropriate to accommodate for the context of the new City and is an appropriate outcome for the harmonisation process. The control has been drafted to allow for some flexibility in its application to ensure the existing street character is considered during the development assessment process. This will help deliver consistent streetscapes and support new development ‘matching’ with new development which the submitter raises concern with.</p> <p>The front setback control is required to be “<i>a minimum of 6 metres and be consistent with the prevailing setback along the street</i>”. This will ensure the surrounding context is taken into consideration during assessment. New development in streets which have an established setback greater than 6m will need to match this prevailing context.</p> <p><i>See response No.3.a in relation to how objectives and controls within the DCP work together to deliver suitable outcomes.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>c. Submitter raises concerns that the proposed controls of no more than 2 storeys for dwelling house does not consider development on sloping sites (i.e. greater than 2m) with ground level garage. Development for a second storey house on those sites will be not supported by the draft DCP.</p>	<p>As outlined in the Introduction to <b>Part 3 – Residential Development</b>, all controls (including those for residential dwelling houses) must be read in conjunction with <b>Part 2 – Design in Context</b> and <b>Part 5 - Environmental Management</b>. These parts of the draft Harmonisation DCP provide guidance around planning for development and specific site conditions, such as sloped sites. Specifically, <b>Section 5.2.4 – Earthworks and Development on Sloping Land</b> to ensure buildings (including dwelling houses) are designed to respond to natural topography, minimise cut and fill, maintain privacy for adjoining residents, and reduce bulk and scale.</p> <p>A development that exhibits an effective three-storey height at the street (two-storeys above garage) is not considered to be appropriate in R2 low-density residential zones. Although not detailed for dwelling houses, further guidance has been provided to illustrate how this type of development can be achieved for sloping sites (see Figure 5.2.4.1 - Dual Occupancy development on sloping land and Figure 5.2.4.2 - Terrace Housing on sloping land).</p> <p>This outcome has undergone design testing to ensure development capacity can still be achieved.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>d. Submitter objects to the proposed reduction of floor space ratio/site coverage to 50% of total site area, stating this will result in inconsistent development within the existing established area.</p>	<p>The reference to a reduction of floor space ratio/site coverage to 50% of total site area is incorrect - these terms have separate meanings and are not interchangeable.</p> <p>Maximum site coverage and floor area are planning considerations which are controlled through the implementation of a Floor Space Ratio (FSR) which is governed by a Local Environmental Plan. The <a href="#">Standard Instrument – Principal Local Environmental Plan 2006</a> provides the template for how LEPs are to be drafted, with <i>Clause 4.5</i> of the Standard Instrument specifying how floor space ratios and site areas are to be calculated.</p> <p>‘Floor space ratio’ (FSR) is defined in <i>Parramatta Local Environmental Plan 2023</i> in <i>Clause 4.5(2)</i> as, ‘<i>the floor space ratio of buildings on a site is the ratio of the gross floor area of all buildings within the site to the site area</i>’. In the Carlingford area where the submitter indicates the submission relates to, the typical FSR in residential areas is 0.5:1. FSR controls were introduced to areas that previously did not have FSR controls as part of the Harmonisation LEP process and are now contained in <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i> finalised on 2 March 2023.</p> <p>As the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i> includes this clause, as well as the standard definition for ‘gross floor area’ (which limits site coverage), the role of the DCP in managing site coverage is secondary compared to the role of the LEP. This is because the LEP is a ‘higher order’ planning instrument and the inclusion of these controls within the LEP ensures maximum weighting / compliance with these controls during the development assessment process. This is detailed on page 28 of <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> which provides a summary of the draft Harmonisation DCP in comparison to the recommendations of the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a>.</p> <p>Whilst the Hills Shire DCP 2013 includes site coverage controls, as explained above, the retention of these controls are not required due to the implementation of the LEP alongside the application of building envelope controls (such as setbacks) and landscaping and deep soil requirements.</p> <p>Further information about how the DCP and LEP work together to guide development can be accessed via Council’s <a href="#">Planning Information Sheet</a>.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
3	Resident from Homebush West	<p>a. Submitter opposes the regulation of window positions.</p>	<p>The primary function of a DCP is to provide building and design controls on how the density of a land use permitted under an LEP (specified via the height and Floor Space Ratio) can be delivered or distributed on a development site. Objectives and controls within the DCP are used together to ensure new development is designed with consideration to adjoining development, streetscape and character, and amenity.</p> <p>The provisions within the draft Harmonisation DCP that guide the location of windows for different land uses are located within <b>Part 3 – Residential Development</b> and <b>Part 4 – Non-Residential Development</b>. The controls have been prepared to manage solar access, acoustics, and privacy, and originated from the existing five DCPs that apply within the City. The controls were consolidated via the harmonisation process guided by the Land Use Planning Harmonisation <a href="#">Discussion Paper</a>.</p>



Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>In addition, the controls relating to window locations are supported by objectives. Should a development not strictly comply with a control due to site constraints or configuration, but the development outcome delivers the intent of the objective (for example, delivers privacy to neighbours), then a degree of variance could be considered via the assessment process. Therefore, the draft Harmonisation DCP does not operate as a regulatory tool.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>b. Submitter opposes increased landscaping.</p>	<p>Whilst the submitter does not specify the landscaping controls opposed, it is acknowledged that the draft Harmonisation DCP promotes increased landscaping and tree preservation. This is consistent with the recommendations of the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a>, and in line with Council’s <a href="#">Environmental Sustainability Strategy 2017</a> 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.</p> <p>The proposed controls for landscaping and tree management have been adapted in consultation with Council’s Landscaping and Tree Management Team and City Design Team to ensure suitable protection of established trees and design outcomes that integrate existing healthy trees with new development and landscaping.</p> <p><a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2022 provides detail on the preparation of landscaping controls in relation to different residential accommodation types and more broadly across the City.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>c. Submitter objects to the proposed maximum 10m wall length (<b>C.09</b>) within <b>Section 3.3.1.2 – Preliminary Building Envelope</b> which relates to residential dwellings.</p>	<p>As explained within <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2022, controls relating to dwelling houses have been largely prepared using retained Parramatta DCP 2011 controls with minor updates. One of these minor updates includes <b>C.09</b> that requires the articulation of side boundary walls through a maximum length of wall control.</p> <p><b>C.09</b> within <b>Section 3.3.1.2 – Preliminary Building Envelope</b> that guides a maximum 10m length of building wall is adapted from the former Holroyd DCP 2013, which also set a maximum wall length limit of 10m. This control has also formalised the intent of the former Hills DCP 2012 and Parramatta DCP 2011, which contained objectives that sought to minimise long blank walls and provide architectural relief to facades.</p> <p>It is noted that this control was tested as part of the urban design work carried out as part of the preparation of the draft Harmonisation DCP and is considered suitable in delivering a design outcome that promotes articulated walls and minimises bulk. The control is considered appropriate to achieve the desired amenity outcome for the context of the new Parramatta LGA.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>d. Submitters states that controls in the draft Harmonisation DCP are overly restricted and will impede development potential.</p>	<p>As mentioned above, the primary function of a DCP is to provide planning guidance and detailed building design controls to support land uses that permitted under an LEP (specified via the height and Floor Space Ratio) can be delivered or distributed on a development site. The key objective is to ensure the delivery of sustainable, liveable, and productive places.</p> <p>A. Flexibility in the application of DCP controls are provided in the development assessment phase as outlined in <i>subsection 4.15(3A)(b)</i> of the <a href="#">Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</a>, which allows reasonable alternative solutions that achieve the objectives of those standards when addressing specific type of development.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
4	Resident from Epping	<p>a. Submitter suggests that dual occupancy developments in R2 zones should be discouraged. Comments that larger, freestanding houses should be encouraged</p>	<p>Land use permissibility (i.e. where dual occupancy development is permitted within the LGA) is regulated under the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i> and is outside of the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project. Council consulted with the community on land use planning matters as part of the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a> in 2019, and the Harmonisation Planning Proposal (i.e. draft Harmonisation LEP) in 2020. These two consultation processes were the opportunity for the community to provide feedback on land use permissibility (i.e. zoning) including the permissibility of dual occupancy development. .</p> <p>The primary function of the draft Harmonisation DCP is to support the implementation of the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i>. The draft DCP provides design guidance for how dual occupancy will be delivered in areas which the PLEP 2023 identifies they are permitted with consent. Further information about how the DCP and LEP work together can be accessed via <a href="#">Planning Information Sheet</a>.</p> <p>Council's proposals to limit Dual Occupancy development through the Harmonisation LEP was not supported by the Department of Planning. Further detail on the dual occupancy permissibility issues can be accessed via Council's <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation webpage</a>.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
5	Resident	<p>a. Submitter supports the draft Harmonisation DCP in supporting the upcoming changes in zoning and development.</p> <p>b. Submitter notes that dual occupancy development are a positive building typology which alleviates the current housing crisis, and states that Parramatta can lead the state in this.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p><i>See response No.4.a in relation to dual occupancy permissibility and how an LEP and DCP function together to guide development.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
6	Resident from North Rocks	<p>a. Submitter opposes the minimum lot size of 700sqm for subdivision in the North Rocks area, stating that this is an onerous requirement. Notes that 600sqm or 650sqm would be a more appropriate minimum lot size.</p>	<p>The minimum lot size for subdivision is regulated under the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i>, specifically under <i>Part 4 Principal Development Standards</i> and is out of scope for the draft Harmonisation DCP. Council consulted with the community on land use planning matters (such a lot size) as part of the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a> in 2019, and the Harmonisation Planning Proposal (i.e. draft Harmonisation LEP) in 2020. These two consultation processes were the opportunity for the community to provide feedback on land use permissibility (i.e. zoning) and controls such as the minimum lot size..</p> <p>The primary function of the draft Harmonisation DCP is to support the implementation of the PLEP 2023 by providing design guidance for how low residential development (including dwelling housings and dual occupancies) will be delivered in areas which the PLEP 2023 identifies they are permitted with consent. Further information about how the DCP and LEP work together can be accessed in the <a href="#">Planning Information Sheet</a> that accompanied the draft Harmonisation DCP exhibition package.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
7	Resident from Old Toongabbie	<p>a. Submitter states that some background on why many areas were proposed to prohibit dual occupancy development would be beneficial</p>	<p>Following the council boundary changes of May 2016, Council commenced a review of the existing planning controls. In 2019, the Harmonisation team exhibited the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a>, which identifies the differences between the existing LEPs and DCPs that apply in the City of Parramatta and suggests options for how local planning controls could be consolidated, including various options for dual occupancy prohibition.</p> <p>Additionally, a LGA-wide <a href="#">Dual Occupancy Constraints Analysis</a> technical paper was undertaken to identify areas suitable for dual occupancy development. Areas that were moderately or significantly constrained due to lack of access to public transportation, poor vehicular access, and the established character of the locality (in addition to other criteria) were generally recommended for prohibition. Furthermore, areas that were already prohibited for dual occupancy development were also recommended to be retained for prohibition as part of the harmonisation process.</p> <p>In October 2019, Council reported the outcomes of the public exhibition of the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a> and findings of the Constraints Analysis to the <a href="#">Local Planning Panel</a>. Community feedback was divided on this planning matter (page 8 onwards), with the community’s preference for Option 2 of the Proposed Dual Occupancy Prohibition. The Local Planning Panel recommended that Council endorsed this for public exhibition, and it proceeded into the Harmonisation Planning Proposal.</p> <p>The Department of Planning and Environment did not support the recommendations of the Discussion Paper when the Harmonisation Planning Proposal was finalised. Only minor changes were made to the permissibility of dual occupancy development. Further information can be accessed via Council’s <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation webpage</a>.</p> <p>Permissibility of dual occupancy is not an issue relevant to the Harmonisation DCP content.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
8	Individual from Cloverdale, Western Australia	<p>a. Submitter generally supports the intent to reduce to GWP of refrigerant used.</p> <p>b. Submitter objects to <b>C.01</b> within <b>Section 5.4.6 Natural Refrigerants in Air Conditioning</b> and requests it be removed due to units that satisfy the controls’ requirements are hazardous and susceptible to leakages. Submitter queries how Council will ensure only compliant equipment will be used for installation (such as the use of a database).</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p><b>Section 5.4.6 – Natural Refrigerants in Air Conditioning</b> in the draft Harmonisation DCP requires all new air-conditioning and refrigeration equipment to use refrigerants with a GWP of less than 10 to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions associated with leakage or the improper disposal of synthetic refrigerant gases with high Global Warming Potential (GWP); and to future proof new HVAC (air conditioning) systems.</p> <p>Council acknowledges that there are concerns from industry relating to the proposed DCP controls as these are the first of their kind in the state. There will likely be some resistance and inertia due to risk, limited experience, as well as a lack of supply from the leading equipment manufacturers.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that there may be limited refrigeration products available with low GWP options in the current market. To reflect this, the draft DCP control includes a ‘market test’ to check for availability:</p> <p><b>C.01 All new air-conditioning and refrigeration equipment are to use refrigerants with a GWP of less than 10;</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• if the equipment can be supplied on similar terms to conventional systems, and</li> <li>• at a cost of not more than 10% higher than the market rate for conventional systems.</li> </ul> <p>Council expects the provision to be increasingly relevant as the market matures and more products are made available.</p> <p>The intent of the provision aims to lead the transition to low-GWP and encourage innovation in the sector. The draft Harmonisation DCP provision will become more effective as the market grows and the availability of appropriately skilled contractors.</p> <p>The provision currently applies to development within the Parramatta City Centre (via the Parramatta City Centre DCP 2011). The intention of draft Harmonisation DCP is to extend the control across the city more widely. The provision does not constitute a legal requirement in the NSW planning system, although compliance with the DCP is a matter for consideration when granting development consent. However, as explained above, the control is conditional to support the transition towards achieving a lower GWP.</p> <p>All refrigerants have unique hazard properties and when used and handled appropriately can be used safely. In considering the use of alternative refrigerants it is important that they be used in equipment that is fit for purpose (Safety considerations when using flammable refrigerants - DCCEEW).</p> <p>Safety is of utmost importance and any transition to new systems must be accompanied by rigorous standards, training, and certification processes to ensure the safe handling and operation of refrigeration equipment.</p> <p>Council intends to publish a guidance note to support the DCP controls to assist in the transition towards equipment that uses refrigerants with a GWP of less than 10.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
9	Resident from Carlingford )	<p>a. Submitter requests zoning on land on Flenning Street, Carlingford be changed to accommodate residential flat buildings (i.e. multi-level apartments). Submitter states that increased residential density is required due to proximity to Carlingford Court.</p>	<p>The zoning and permissibility of land use is regulated under <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i> and is outside of the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project. Council consulted with the community on land use planning matters as part of the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a> in 2019, and the Harmonisation Planning Proposal (i.e. draft Harmonisation LEP) in 2020. These two consultation processes were the opportunity for the community to provide feedback on land use permissibility (i.e. zoning).</p> <p>The primary function of the draft Harmonisation DCP is to support the implementation of the PLEP 2023 via design controls - not introduce zoning changes as requested by the submitter. Zoning changes are LEP matters and are out of scope. Further information about the Harmonisation LEP can be accessed via Council's <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation webpage</a>.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>b. Requests that the Light Rail stop be extended to Carlingford Court to better connect with local residents.</p>	<p>The design and delivery of the Parramatta Light Rail is led by Transport for NSW, and is separate to the Land Use Planning Harmonisation Framework project. Further information of the Parramatta Light Rail project can be accessed via <a href="#">Parramatta Light Rail   Parramatta (nsw.gov.au)</a></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
10	Resident from Epping	<p>a. Submitter requests that the Land Use Harmonisation Framework project should show development that has occurred over the past 10 years to understand development patterns.</p>	<p>The scope of the Land Use Planning Harmonisation Framework project involves the consolidation of planning controls contained within the inherited five LEPs and DCPs to deliver one consolidated set of controls for the new City of Parramatta. The scope of the project does not include a review of recent development patterns or trends. <b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>b. Submitter notes that areas in Epping which prohibited dual occupancy development should remain.</p>	<p>Following the council boundary changes of May 2016, Council commenced a review of the existing planning controls. In 2019, the Harmonisation team exhibited the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a>, which identifies the differences between the existing LEPs and DCPs that apply in the City of Parramatta and suggests options for how local planning controls could be consolidated, including various options for dual occupancy prohibition.</p> <p>An LGA-wide Dual Occupancy Constraints Analysis technical paper was undertaken to identify areas suitable for dual occupancy development. From this analysis, it was noted that most of the R2 zoned land in the former Hornsby council area, Beecroft and parts of Epping, were moderately or significantly constrained due to lack of access to public transportation, poor vehicular access, and the established character of the locality.</p> <p>Additionally, dual occupancy development were not permissible in R2 zoned land under the existing Hornsby Local Environmental Plan 2013. As such, Council recommended to continue to prohibit dual occupancies on R2 zoned land in the former Hornsby council area. The Department of Planning and Environment supported this when finalising the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i>, and therefore, areas that were prohibited for dual occupancy in Epping remain prohibited.</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>Further information including discussion of Dual Occupancy development through the Harmonisation LEP can be accessed via Council’s <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation webpage</a>.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>c. Submitter states that areas in Carlingford, Epping and Eastwood currently have a significant number of new multi-story and high-rise developments planned.</p>	<p>Noted. These land uses are permitted under the respective LEPs and were approved via the relevant development assessment pathway.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>d. Submitter comments that dual occupancy development would allow small increases in population, and requests that the supply of schools and open space is addressed.</p>	<p>The provision of infrastructure is out of scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project.</p> <p>Local infrastructure provision such as open space is guided by the <a href="#">Community Infrastructure Strategy (CIS) 2020</a> and delivered via the</p> <p>is managed by School Infrastructure NSW (SINSW) which has been consulted during the exhibition period of the draft Harmonisation DCP. As stated in SINSW’s submission, when planning school it is preferred (where appropriate) to optimise use of existing assets through solutions such as:</p> <p>When identifying the most effective and efficient asset solutions in school infrastructure planning, key considerations are generally given to (but not limited):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></li> </ul>
11	Resident from Epping	<p>a. Submitter states that Council’s community and engagement strategy to inform the residents of the draft DCP is inadequate, particularly given the exhibition document package is lengthy and complicated.</p>	<p>The community engagement plan for the draft Harmonisation DCP was prepared with the support from Council’s community engagement team and is consistent with the Council’s <a href="#">Community Engagement Strategy 2022-2024</a> (the Strategy).</p> <p>In response to the submitters concerns around the exhibition process and the projects complexity, a number of documents were prepared to summarise key information and assist the community in their review of the draft Harmonisation DCP. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The draft Harmonisation DCP (noting this has been provided in parts to assist the community in navigating the document to the particular planning themes)</li> <li>• A <a href="#">Community Summary Sheet</a> (available in Simplified Chinese, Arabic, Hindi, and Korean). This was prepared to provide landowners, residents and other stakeholders with the key information relating to the Land Use Planning Harmonisation Framework more broadly and how the draft Harmonisation DCP fits into this project; the draft Harmonisation DCP and its key features and how it was prepared; next steps and timeline.</li> <li>• A <a href="#">Planning Information Sheet</a> which explains key planning concepts (such as the difference between an Local Environmental Plan (LEP) and a Development Control Plan (DCP)).</li> </ul>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The <a href="#">Council Report and Resolution</a> that endorsed the draft Harmonisation DCP and respective attachments.</li> <li>• A <a href="#">summary of the draft Harmonisation DCP</a> and response to the <a href="#">Discussion Paper</a> recommendations that informed the policy direction for the draft Harmonisation DCP. This summary builds on the Discussion Paper and provides a direct ‘line of sight’ between the Discussion Paper recommendation and the draft Harmonisation DCP controls and approach. Particularly the summary outlines the following per theme: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ summary of key differences across the five DCPs,</li> <li>○ Discussion Paper recommendation,</li> <li>○ draft Harmonisation DCP approach.</li> </ul> <p>This document is public facing, and will help the community compare the DCPs and understand how the document was prepared.</p> </li> <li>• A summary of <a href="#">Key Policy Matters</a> and a table explaining the <a href="#">structure and key features of the DCP</a> are also available to assist the community understanding how the draft DCP was prepared.</li> </ul> <p>These documents, as well as Frequently Asked Questions and other background information, are available on the Participate Parramatta webpage for the project - <a href="https://participate.cityofparramatta.nsw.gov.au/harmonisation-dcp">https://participate.cityofparramatta.nsw.gov.au/harmonisation-dcp</a></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>b. Submitter states that, in line with Council's <a href="#">Community Engagement Strategy 2022-24</a>, Council staff should organise information sessions with interested stakeholders to present the overview of the draft DCP during exhibition period to inform the community to make a comprehensive submission.</p>	<p><i>See response No.11.a in relation to compliance with the <a href="#">Community Engagement Strategy 2022-24</a>.</i></p> <p>Council officers held five community pop up sessions across Council Wards within the City including one pop up session at Rawson Street Car Park at Epping on 1 April 2023, where fifteen (15) residents visited and spoke to the Council officers about the project. This was the opportunity for residents to come with targeted questions following their review of the exhibition material. In addition, phone-a-planner sessions were also available where a timeslot could be allocated to speak to staff. The booking process also requires the nomination of a planning matter the community member seeks further information on to assist staff in preparing for the meeting and bringing the requested information.</p> <p>The above engagement activities are considered sufficient in providing the community with opportunities to speak directly to Council staff about the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>c. Submitter requests to retain the site coverage and floor area coverage controls from the Hornsby DCP 2013 to prevent overdevelopment of residential site, specifically within the Epping area.</p>	<p><i>See response to No.2.d that explains why site coverage controls are not required within the draft Harmonisation DCP due to the application of the LEP.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>d. Submitter requests that the draft DCP include heritage contributory items for all Heritage Conservation Areas across the Paramatta LGA, particularly in Epping area.</p> <p>Submitter states these contributory items have been identified across different studies managed by State Government and City of Parramatta Council, such as the Epping Town Centre Heritage Report - Perumal Murphy Alessi (March 2013) and Epping Town Centre (East) Heritage Review Report 2017.</p>	<p>As detailed in <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> and <a href="#">Attachment 4</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2023, <b>Part 7 – Heritage and Archaeology</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP consolidates the general heritage controls and transfers across all Heritage Conservation Areas (HCAs) from the previous five DCPs. The preparation of <b>Part 7</b> was largely administrative to ensure a consistent structure was applied to all HCAs and deliver a uniformed Heritage and Archaeology section of the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p>Where a current DCP identified contributory items, such as the Parramatta DCP 2011, these have been transferred into the draft Harmonisation DCP. Council is aware not all former DCPs identified contributory items. The identification of contributory items and significant buildings within the HCA is not within the scope of the Harmonisation project.</p> <p>Council officers are currently considering options for exploring an LGA wide integrated heritage study. Council Officers are currently in a scoping phase of working out how the study might be completed given resources available. It is expected that a budget for a future study will be included in preparation of the 2024/25 budget. Further community consultation will be undertaken for any new heritage controls that are recommended in any future study.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>e. Submitter raises concerns that the draft Harmonisation DCP reduced the requirements for setback and deep soil, and will increase the permissible gross floor area for dwelling house and multi dwelling housing for the Epping area.</p> <p>Submitter requests the DCP retain the setback, landscaping and Gross Floor Area controls from the Hornsby DCP 2013 into the final Parramatta DCP, specifically for Epping area.</p>	<p><i>See response to No.2.d that explains how gross floor space is managed (i.e. via the Floor Space Ratio within the LEP) and why site coverage controls are not required within the draft Harmonisation DCP due to the application of the LEP in governing site coverage.</i></p> <p>Consistent with the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a>, the draft Harmonisation DCP retains controls from the Parramatta DCP 2011 for landscaping and deep soil area as they were the more suitable controls from the five DCPs to deliver feasible building envelopes (via setbacks) whilst reducing hardstand areas (i.e. concreted or paved areas) and deliver deep soil that accommodate canopy trees, vegetation plantings, and the infiltration of ground water.</p> <p>In the case of the Hornsby DCP 2013 which covers the Epping area referenced by the submitter, the landscaping and deep soil area controls were closely aligned with the same controls in Parramatta DCP 2011.</p> <p>One key difference that may be the cause of submitters concern is the removal of the site coverage control. Areas that once relied on a DCP site coverage control to manage the maximum built area on a site, now have an LEP Floor Space Ratio control to manage gross floor area relative to site area. The role of the DCP in managing site coverage is secondary compared to the role of the LEP. This is because the LEP is a ‘higher</p>



Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>order’ planning instrument and the inclusion of these controls within the LEP ensures maximum weighting / compliance with these controls during the development assessment process. This is detailed on page 28 of Attachment 2 which provides a summary of the draft Harmonisation DCP in comparison to the recommendations of the Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper.</p> <p>Furthermore, Section 2.3 and 3.2 of the <a href="#">Discussion Paper</a> provides detail on how setback and landscaping controls for residential typologies were reviewed as part of the harmonisation process; and <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> and <a href="#">Attachment 4</a> to the Council Report from 28 November 2023, provides detail on how the controls were formulated with consideration to the five DCPs.</p> <p><i>See response to No.2.d that explains why site coverage controls are not required within the draft Harmonisation DCP due to the application of the LEP</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>f. Submitter made the request that Council staff to prepare a comparative summary of how the five DCPs have been harmonised into the current draft DCP.</p>	<p>A comparison of the key differences between the five DCPs and how the policy direction within the draft Harmonisation DCP was formed is explained within <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to the Council Report from 28 November 2022 and further detailed in Section 2.3 and 3.2 of the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a>. This provides a clear line of sight between the existing DCPs, the recommendations of the Discussion Paper that was consulted within the community in 2019, and the recommended controls within the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p>Whilst there may be some differences between the draft Harmonisation DCP and the previous Hornsby DCP, the intention of the Land Use Planning Harmonisation Framework was to resolve differences between the different DCPs and take a balanced approach in order to prepare one set of controls that can be applied across the City to deliver consistency in both development outcomes and expectations from landowners.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
12	Resident from Ermington	<p>a. Submitter is of the view that increasing areas where dual occupancy development is permissible would contribute to housing affordability, stating that property and rent prices will increase if the delivery of this typology is limited.</p>	<p>Land use permissibility (i.e. where dual occupancy development is permitted within the LGA) is outside of the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project. Council consulted with the community on land use planning matters as part of the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a> in 2019, and the Harmonisation Planning Proposal (i.e. draft Harmonisation LEP) in 2020. These two consultation processes were the opportunity for the community to provide feedback on land use permissibility (i.e. zoning)</p> <p>The primary function of the draft harmonisation DCP is to support the implementation of the PLEP 2023 - it does not introduce amendments to the PLEP 2023. The draft DCP provides design guidance for how land uses would be delivered in areas which the PLEP 2023 identifies they are permitted with consent. Further information about how the DCP and LEP work together can be accessed via <a href="#">Planning Information Sheet</a>.</p> <p>Council sought to decrease the areas where dual occupancy would be prohibited under PLEP 2023. However, The Department of Planning did not support Council’s proposal and so the areas where dual occupancy are prohibited remain unchanged. Further information on proposed Dual Occupancy policy changes proposed in the</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>Harmonisation LEP can be accessed via Council’s <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation webpage</a>.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
13	Resident from Dundas Valley	<p>a. Submitter objects to dual occupancy prohibition due to the volatile property market. Submitter notes that the prohibition of dual occupancy will result in higher property sales and rent prices; and states that the restriction of the delivery of dual occupancy development will result in the expansion of Greater Sydney and higher cost of transport, fuel consumption and cost of facilities for new areas.</p>	<p><i>See response to No.12.a in relation to dual occupancy permissibility and how an LEP and DCP function together to guide development.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes are required to the draft Harmonisation DCP.</b></p>
14	Resident from North Rocks	<p>a. Submitter states the opening of the M2 and the Barclay Road bus interchange (soon the North Rocks transport hub) provides convenient transport services.</p> <p>However, it also poses parking issues on the nearby residential streets with cars parking on local streets. This causes obstruction of driveways, difficulties with normal garbage collection, movement of larger vehicles, parking for visitors, sweeping of gutters, and commuters littering the streets.</p> <p>b. Submitter is of the view that previous parking policy prepared by the Hills Shire Council (the then responsible Council) is a discriminatory parking policy, as it restricted parking on the southern side of Carlton Road while allowing all-day parking on the northern side.</p>	<p>Matters raised in relation to the parking issues as a result of the opening of the M2 Motorway and the Barclay Road bus interchange (i.e. the North Rocks Transport Hub) is out of scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project. The scope of the draft DCP is to introduce a consolidated set of controls based on existing policy contained within the five applicable DCPs.</p> <p><b>Part 6 – Traffic and Transport</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP contains general parking requirements and specific parking rates for various types of development. The controls relate to the delivery of parking on development sites; they do not relate to the management of on-street parking.</p> <p>Feedback in relation to on-street parking is outside of the scope of a DCP. The feedback has been forwarded to the relevant team at Council for their consideration.</p> <p><i>See response to No.31.a in relation to the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p><i>See response in No.14.a for information regarding scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP in relation to parking.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>c. Submitter requests that consideration be given to the fact that a new expanded M2 parking area has recently opened on the south side of Barclay Road, and requests that a new and equitable parking policy to be developed for both the southern and northern side of Carlton Road.</p>	<p><i>See response in No.14.a for information regarding scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP in relation to parking.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
15	Resident from Eastwood	<p>a. Submitter states that the proposed controls for Heritage Conservation Area are stringent and well defined compared to the controls for development around individual heritage items. Submitter has concerns that the draft controls for such development are loose and would enable non-sympathetic development around heritage items.</p> <p>b. Submitter suggests to merge controls C01-C04 for ‘Development in the vicinity of Heritage Conservation Area’ with the controls C05 – C07 for ‘Development in the vicinity of heritage items’ under one heading as of ‘Development in the Vicinity of Heritage Conservation Areas or Heritage Items’ in <b>Section 7.5 in Part 7 – Heritage and Archaeology</b>.</p> <p>c. Submitter suggests adding a definition for the term ‘Adequate Space’ contained in <b>C.02 in Section 7.5 in Part 7 – Heritage and Archaeology</b> to include the area around the property boundary of the heritage item, not just the building.</p>	<p><i>See response to No.11.d that explains the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP in relation to <b>Part 7 – Heritage and Archaeology</b>.</i></p> <p>As per <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to the Council Report from 28 November 2023, the proposed provisions relating to heritage retain the objectives and controls in the Parramatta DCP 2011 (with some updated controls from Hornsby DCP) as these provisions were considered to be relatively strong and well established in the LGA. The controls are considered suitable in ensuring the appropriate management of heritage in the City; and ensuring development is compatible with the significance and character of the area so that the new work does not detract from the historic buildings and their amenity to/or from the streetscape.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p><i>In addition, see response to No.11.d in relation to future heritage review.</i></p> <p>The submitter’s suggestion to merge ‘Development in the vicinity of Heritage Conservation Area’ with ‘Development in the vicinity of heritage items’ is not supported as the controls differ. Whilst the intent to preserve heritage character and values is consistent, the controls vary, and this merger is not considered suitable under the scope of the harmonisation process. The controls under ‘Development in the vicinity of heritage items’ are heritage item specific (i.e. micro-level); whereas the controls under ‘Development in the vicinity of Heritage Conservation Area’ consider a wider context (macro-level).</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p><i>See response to No.11.d and No.15.a that explains the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP in relation to <b>Part 7 – Heritage and Archaeology</b> and its drafting.</i></p> <p><b>Section 7.4 – General Provisions of Part 7 – Heritage and Archaeology</b> contains objectives and controls relating to the heritage curtilage (i.e. space around a heritage item) and siting of an item. These controls are designed to retain and reinforce the attributes that contribute to the heritage significance of items, areas, and their settings. These controls are considered adequate in ensuring ‘adequate space’ is considered when assessing new development.</p> <p>The application of the objectives and controls contained in <b>Section 7.4 – General Provisions</b> and <b>C.02</b> in</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p><b>Section 7.5 – Development in the Vicinity of Heritage</b> are cumulatively considered sufficient in managing the space around heritage items during the assessment of new works or development on a heritage item. Furthermore, development near or on a heritage item generally requires a Heritage Impact Assessment as part of the development application process to assist to ensure that new development is sympathetic to heritage significance, nearby heritage items, as well as adjoining heritage conservation area and their settings.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>d. Submitter suggests adding a definition for the term ‘landscaped features’ contained in <b>C.04 in Section 7.5 in Part 7 – Heritage and Archaeology</b> with it including significant trees, shrubs and hedges.</p>	<p>See response to No.11.d and No.15.a that explains the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP in relation to <b>Part 7 – Heritage and Archaeology</b> and its drafting.</p> <p><b>Section 7.4 – General Provisions of Part 7 – Heritage and Archaeology</b> includes the following control in relation to landscaping and gardens:</p> <p><b>C.64 Heritage listed gardens or significant landscape should retain layouts and primary features and structures, including native or indigenous species or exotic species such as mature trees, gardens shrubs, outbuildings, fences, stonework, pathways and the like.</b></p> <p>The application of the provisions contained in <b>Section 7.4 – General Provisions</b> and in <b>Section 7.5 – Development in the Vicinity of Heritage</b> are considered sufficient in convey what constitutes landscaped features. In addition, explained in response No.40.c, all parts of a DCP are to be read in conjunction with each other, with <b>Part 2 – Design in Context</b> and <b>Part 5 – Environmental Management</b> also contained controls relating to landscaping. Collectively the three parts are sufficient in defining what constitutes landscaping / landscaping features.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>e. Submitter raises an issue that a lack of clarity in above mentioned definitions has resulted in non-sympathetic development adjacent to heritage items. Noting that a two-storey dual occupancy development (supported by a Heritage Assessment Report) was built adjacent to their heritage property.</p>	<p>See response to No.11.d and No.15.a that explains the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP in relation to <b>Part 7 – Heritage and Archaeology</b> and its drafting.</p> <p>See response to No.15.c and No.15.d in relation to the need for the definitions and the collective role of the various parts of the DCP in guiding development in relation to ‘landscaping features’ and ‘adequate space’.</p> <p>See response to No.31.a in relation to the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p>The submitters feedback in relation to development approvals within their street is out of scope and relates to the development assessment process.</p> <p>Development assessment is completed under the provisions of the <a href="#">Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</a> with particular focus on <i>Section 4.15 Evaluation</i>. It is a requirement for applicants to explain how their development complies with relevant legislation and environmental planning instruments (including DCPs) through their Statement of Environmental Effects. The Act also requires adjoining landowners to be notified of proposed works and development, with this providing the opportunity for landowners to raise concerns with</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>impacts to heritage values/items.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>f. Submitter objects to the requirement for a DA to be submitted to install solar panels on a heritage item, as well as the application fee for doing so, citing the lack of insulation within older buildings, rising cost of energy, and aspirational shift towards renewable energy systems.</p>	<p>As per <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to the Council Report from 28 November 2023, <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a> recommended inserting new controls in the DCP relating to visible elements of new technologies on heritage items and in conservation areas. Consistent with this recommendation, <b>Section 7.6 – Solar Energy Systems</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP allows for the sensitive installation of solar energy systems (solar panels and equipment) on heritage items and within heritage conservation areas as long the development scheme protects heritage values and maintains the integrity, significance, and the character of the area.</p> <p>Appendix 3 of the draft Harmonisation DCP outlines the details of how to install solar panels on heritage item. Solar Energy System installation does not qualify for an exemption, heritage minor works (HMW) application or local heritage fund (LHF) application. A Development Application (supported by a Statement of Heritage Impact) needs to be lodged to ensure adequate assessment is carried out so the works are done in a way that protects heritage values and maintains the integrity of heritage significance.</p> <p>The draft controls and supporting Appendix allows for heritage items to improve energy efficiency and are considered suitable in achieving Council’s environment performance goals.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>g. Submitter advocates for clear controls within the DCP to remove heat islands within new development.</p>	<p>As outlined in <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to the Council Report from 28 November 2023, Environmental Performance controls have been updated to reflect the Parramatta City Centre DCP that responds to industry benchmarks in this field. Council officers considered the suitability of applying such controls across the whole City in line with the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a> recommendation.</p> <p><b>Section 5.4.4 – Urban Cooling</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP provides controls which aid in cooling and removing heat from the urban environment in the City. These are innovative controls based on Australian and international evidence on cites and the urban heat island effect. The controls address the reflectivity of building roofs, podiums and facades, reducing the impacts of heat rejection sources of heating and cooling systems and green roofs or walls.</p> <p><b>As controls sought by the submitter are already contained within the draft Harmonisation DCP, no changes are considered necessary from this submission.</b></p>
		<p>h. Submitter questions the effectiveness of the DCP in light of new development that have detrimentally been approved via the</p>	<p>Noted. The CDC pathway is regulated under the Codes SEPP and managed by State Government. The PLEP 2023, as well as the draft Harmonisation DCP, cannot legally override the SEPP due to the hierarchy of Environmental Planning Instruments.</p> <p>Council is aware of design concerns arising from the CDC approval pathway, particularly from the dual</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>Complying Development Certificate (CDC) pathway.</p>	<p>occupancy development. At its meeting of 22 May 2023, Council resolved to prepare a Preliminary Discussion Paper advocating and collaborating with other councils within the Greater Sydney Region to improve design outcomes for dual occupancy development, that are delivered and approved via the complying development process under the <i>Codes SEPP</i>.</p> <p>In order to manage the design outcomes of dual occupancy development resulting from the Development Application process (which Council oversees), updated design controls for dual occupancy development have been proposed as part of the draft Harmonisation DCP. These controls were informed by a detailed review of dual occupancy development outcomes across the City, with some of the controls proposed to support good design outcomes including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increasing side setback controls and introducing a building width control to ensure a proportional response between building bulk and lot size.</li> <li>• Maximum length of wall control along side boundaries to reduce the impact on neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• Upper-level setback controls to guide bulk as perceived from the street.</li> <li>• Detailed guidance on the design, location and width of driveways/garages.</li> <li>• Increased provision for deep soil in the front setback to support large canopy tree planting.</li> <li>• Specifications for street interface design.</li> </ul> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
16	Resident from Winston Hills	<p>a. Submitter expresses concern for the permissibility of high-density residential buildings (i.e. apartments) in Winston Hills and Northmead.</p>	<p>Land use permissibility (i.e. where high density residential development is permitted within the LGA) is regulated under the PLEP 2023 and is outside of the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project.</p> <p>The primary function of the draft harmonisation DCP is to support the implementation of the PLEP 2023, it does not introduce amendments to the PLEP 2023 to deliver new land uses. The draft DCP provides design guidance for how development would be delivered across the City in the zones which the PLEP 2023 identifies these land uses (i.e. residential flat buildings) are permitted with consent. Further information about how the DCP and LEP work together can be accessed via <a href="#">Planning Information Sheet</a>.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
17	Resident from unspecified location	<p>a. Submitter requests the heritage conservation requirements to be reduced to streamline future development. Comments that such provisions are</p>	<p><i>See response to No. 11.d and No. 15.a that explains the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP in relation to <b>Part 7 – Heritage and Archaeology</b> and its drafting.</i></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>unnecessary and are limiting these sites' development potential.</p> <p>b. Suggests that heritage status should only be retained or acquired for items of significance.</p> <p>c. Submitter is also in the view of that Council financially benefiting from heritage restrictions.</p>	<p>See response to No.31.a in relation to the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p>Heritage listings and the inclusions of a Heritage Conservation Area are managed via the PLEP 2023 and the requirements of the <a href="#">Heritage Act 1977</a>. Amendments to the requirements of these instruments is out of scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project.</p> <p>As per <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to the Council Report from 28 November 2023, the proposed provisions relating to heritage retain the objectives and controls in the Parramatta DCP 2011 (with some updated controls from Hornsby DCP) and these controls are considered suitable in ensuring the appropriate management of heritage in the City; and ensuring development is compatible with the significance and character of the area so that the new work does not detract from the historic buildings and their amenity to/or from the streetscape.</p> <p>Council officers are considering options for exploring a City wide integrated heritage study; this project is separate to the Harmonisation Project. Council officers are currently in a scoping phase of working out how the study might be completed given resources available. It is expected we may be able to provide more information on the timing and program for the study in the third quarter of 2023. This process could potentially explore the identification of heritage items within HCAs and amendments to DCP controls.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p>Council does not financially benefit from heritage protection requirement. Protecting and maintaining heritage listed properties and heritage conservation areas is one of the responsibilities Council need to satisfy as the Planning Authority under the <a href="#">Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</a> and associated regulations and guidelines.</p> <p>Heritage protection is an issue Council must consider when preparing a Local Environmental Plan (LEP) or an amendment to a LEP. Council performs this planning function on behalf of the community.</p> <p>Council also provides heritage grant funding to landowners to assist them retain and maintain heritage items and buildings in Heritage Conservation Areas.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
18	Resident from Epping	<p>a. Submitter requests that number of parking spaces requirement should be the maximum number rather than minimums for residential development located within 800m and/or 400m of frequent transport services, this will assist to reduce traffic and overall private car dependency.</p>	<p>As outlined in <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to the Council Report from 28 November 2023, the draft Harmonisation DCP includes minimum car parking rates that have been prepared by Council's Traffic and Transport team and is consistent with TfNSW Guide to Traffic Generating Development. The proposed car parking rates for residential flat buildings both inside and outside of public transport radius thresholds have been informed by the rates provided in Table 5.3 of TfNSW Guide to Traffic Generating Development. It is considered appropriate to introduce car parking provisions that consistent with TfNSW relevant guidelines.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>b. Submitter request to amend the definition of “accessible area” under the <a href="#">State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021</a> for developments near public transit to be areas that allow for at least 1 bus per 30min servicing frequency, rather than 1 bus per hour as per the current definition in the SEPP.</p>	<p><i>See response to No.31.a in relation to the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP.</i></p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP does not contain a definition for accessible areas. The definition defaults to the State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP), and the provisions of a SEPP prevail over a DCP. Therefore, the definitions of the Housing SEPP apply independently of the DCP and amending that definition is out of scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project.</p> <p>The scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP is to consolidate the five DCPs into one set of planning controls that apply to the new Parramatta City area, and it does not introduce any amendments to other planning documents (i.e. the Housing SEPP).</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>c. In regard to Table 6.3.1 – Minimum car parking rates, the submitter requests the following changes for accessible areas (with exceptions via transport impact assessment):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dwelling houses and dual occupancies: a maximum of 2 spaces per dwelling (no exceptions).</li> <li>• Higher density residential development in accessible areas: a maximum of 1 space per 2BR unit.</li> <li>• Business, office, and retail premises in accessible areas: a maximum of 1 space per 30sqm GFA.</li> <li>• Business and retail premises: a maximum of 1 space per 60sqm GFA.</li> <li>• Office premises: a maximum of 1 space per 70sqm GFA.</li> </ul>	<p><i>See response to No.18.a in relation to the preparation of car parking rates within the draft Harmonisation DCP.</i></p> <p>The submitters requested amendments to the car parking rates include changing the minimum rate to a maximum; and for some development types, increasing the number of required car parking spaces. No evidence is provided to support the requested rates.</p> <p>The specified car parking rates have been informed by a range of documents, including the recommendations of the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a>, TfNSW Guide to Traffic Generating Development, and existing provisions from the five former DCPs.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>d. Submitter suggests that “off-road parking on narrow roads” should be prohibited to align with the Technical Direction paper of ‘Off-road parking provisions on narrow roads’ issued by Transport Roads &amp; Maritime in 2014. Submitter states that there are inconsistent approaches undertaken across different areas of</p>	<p>The matter raised is out of scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project.</p> <p><i>See response to No.31.a in relation to the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP.</i></p> <p>“Off-road parking” in the Technical Directions Paper refers to car parking that is not on a ‘road’ but within a ‘road related area’ with this being, ‘an area that is open to or used by the public for driving, riding or parking vehicles’.</p> <p>It is also important to clarify that the Technical Direction paper of ‘Off-road parking provisions on narrow roads’ issued by Transport Roads &amp; Maritime in 2014 states that off-road parking on narrow roads may be considered, where on road parking on one or both sides of the road restrict the free movement of vehicles (especially</p>



Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>Parramatta LGA in relation to parking on nature trip and footpath.</p>	<p>emergency and service vehicles) along that road. This means off road parking on narrow road could be allowed given the consideration of site-specific conditions.</p> <p>In addition, Council's parking enforcement policy 307, specifies that Parking on Nature Strips in streets with Rollback Kerb and Gutter Under the Road Rules 2014 it is an offence for a motor vehicle to stop on a path/strip in a developed area unless there are permissible parking signs or a hard bay surface constructed for the purpose of motor vehicle parking. Whilst it is a requirement that motor vehicle drivers are to comply with the Road Rules 2014, consideration must also be given to the issue of the number of suburban streets within the City of Parramatta LGA where the road surface has been reduced in width and additional kerbing installed such as rollback kerbs.</p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP includes minimum car parking rates to guide development and it does not include parking provisions and/or restrictions relating to parking on footpaths or the Council verge in residential areas.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>e. Submitter requests clarity on the difference between ‘bicycle storage’ and ‘bicycle parking’, stating that some proposed controls refer to ‘bicycle storage facilities’ other refer to ‘bicycle parking space’.</p>	<p>The terms ‘bicycle storage facilities’ and ‘bicycle parking’ are used interchangeably within the draft Harmonisation DCP; however Council officers acknowledge this may cause confusion, and therefore it is recommended that the term ‘bicycle storage’ be replaced with ‘bicycle parking facilities’ to remove ambiguity and ensure the controls in <b>C.12 in Section 6.3 – Bicycle Parking</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP are applied correctly.</p> <p><b>As a result of the submission, amendments will be made to the relevant section of the draft Harmonisation DCP to replace the reference to bicycle storage with bicycle parking facilities.</b></p>
		<p>f. If above mentioned definitions are the same, submitter suggests that <b>C.12 Section 6.3 – Bicycle Parking</b> for Bicycle Storage facilities to provide charging outlets to 10% of provided bicycle parking spaces only applies if one of the following situations occurs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number of bicycle parking spaces is greater than 10</li> <li>• The bicycle parking spaces are within a residential premise</li> <li>• The bicycle parking spaces are for use by staff</li> </ul>	<p>Bicycle parking requirements vary significantly across the five DCPs in terms of when and how much parking is required. All five DCPs require bicycle 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>The proposed bike parking rates are adopted based on the recommendations contained under Section 6.3 of the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a>, with minor additions to be consistent with the current <i>Parramatta Bike Plan 2017</i> and <i>Australian Standards 2890.3:2015 Parking Facilities- Bicycle Parking</i>. This includes <b>C.12</b> which requires bicycle storage facilities to include 10A e-bike charging outlets to 10% of spaces with no space being more than 20 metres away from a charging outlet, and the chargers are to be provided by the owner, <i>please see response to submission No. 18.e above</i>.</p> <p>The submitter suggested controls would limit access to bike charging facilities potentially limiting bike use, this is contrary to the <i>Parramatta Bike Plan 2017</i> which aims to “<i>increase the proportion of people cycling in Parramatta...</i>”, and the draft Harmonisation DCP which aims to “<i>promote greater bicycle use in the LGA</i>”. Furthermore, bicycle parking provisions contained in <b>Section 6.3 – Bicycle Parking</b> relate to ‘on site bicycle parking’ not public land and therefore the intended users of the charging facilities would be limited to individuals</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>who have access to the property. The conditions proposed by the submitter are not consistent with the plans and standards referred to above and are not considered suitable for adoption in the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p>Further information of Section 6.3 of the Discussion Paper and approach undertaken to inform the draft controls for bicycle parking can be accessed via Council’s <a href="#">Discussion Paper</a> and <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to Council report from 28 November 2022.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
19	Resident from Carlingford	<p>g. Submitter states that non-staff bicycle parking spaces should be near e-bike charging outlets and subject to a fee.</p>	<p><i>See response contained in Submission 18.f for information regarding the provision of bicycle parking and related charging outlets.</i></p>
		<p>a. Submitter opposes the permissibility of dual occupancy development in R2 zoned land, where such developments were previously permitted (such as Tamboy Avenue, Carlingford and surrounding streets).</p>	<p><i>See response to No.7.a in relation to the Department of Planning and Environment not supporting the recommendations of the Discussion Paper when the Harmonisation Planning Proposal was finalised, and the Council endorsed position on dual occupancy prohibition.</i></p> <p>Land use permissibility (i.e. dual occupancy development is permitted within the LGA) is regulated under the PLEP 2023 and is outside of the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project. Council consulted with the community on land use planning matters as part of the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a> in 2019, and the Harmonisation Planning Proposal (i.e. draft Harmonisation LEP) in 2020. These two consultation processes were the opportunity for the community to provide feedback on land use permissibility (i.e. zoning).</p> <p>The primary function of the draft harmonisation DCP is to support the implementation of the PLEP 2023; it does not introduce amendments to the PLEP 2023 to address land uses. The draft DCP provides design guidance for how those development would be delivered in areas which the PLEP 2023 identifies they are permitted with consent. Further information about how the DCP and LEP work together can be accessed via <a href="#">Planning Information Sheet</a>.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>b. Submitter raises concern that current traffic infrastructure and local amenities are not adequate in supporting a growth in population, specifically from above mentioned dual occupancy development.</p>	<p>The provision of infrastructure is out of scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project. The provision of local infrastructure (such as local roads, open space) is guided by the <a href="#">Community Infrastructure Strategy (CIS) 2020</a> and delivered via the <a href="#">City of Parramatta (Outside CBD) Development Contributions Plan 2021</a> which came into effect on 20 September 2021 through the harmonisation planning framework. These plans considered anticipated growth under Council’s <a href="#">Local Housing Strategy 2020</a> and have been prepared to support future development. <i>See response to No.31.a in relation to the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
20	Resident from Ermington	<p>a. Submitter supports dual occupancy development, where conditions are appropriate.</p>	<p><i>See response to No.7.a in relation to the Department of Planning and Environment not supporting the recommendations of the Discussion Paper when the Harmonisation Planning Proposal was finalised, and the Council endorsed position on dual occupancy prohibition.</i></p> <p>Noted. Land use permissibility (i.e. dual occupancy development is permitted within the LGA) is regulated under the PLEP 2023 and is out of the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project.</p> <p>The primary function of the draft harmonisation DCP is to support the implementation of the PLEP 2023 by providing design guidance for how low residential development (including dwelling housings and dual occupancies) will be delivered in areas which the PLEP 2023 identifies they are permitted with consent. Further information about how the DCP and LEP work together can be accessed in the <a href="#">Planning Information Sheet</a> that accompanied the draft Harmonisation DCP exhibition package.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>b. Submitter objects to the CDC approval pathway and raises concerns with development approved via the Complying Development Certificate pathway (i.e. dual occupancy, granny flats) as these have negative impacts on local amenity including local infrastructure, lack of solar energy consideration, and overshadowing neighbour properties.</p>	<p>The CDC pathway is regulated under the Codes SEPP and managed by State Government. The PLEP 2023, as well as the draft Harmonisation DCP, cannot legally override the SEPP due to the hierarchy of Environmental Planning Instruments.</p> <p><i>See response to No.15.h in relation to dual occupancy development via the CDC pathway and next step for Council in advocating for changes to the Codes SEPP to manage development outcomes. Response also explains how Council is managing dual occupancy development lodged and assessed via the DA pathway.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>c. Submitter requests Council to mandate Council’s overshadowing requirements to those applying via the CDC pathway, noting that this is a significant issue with the Codes SEPP.</p>	
		<p>d. Submitter requests that off-street parking requirements are increased for dual occupancy developments and granny flat developments.</p>	<p><i>See response to No.18.a in relation to the preparation of car parking rates within the draft Harmonisation DCP.</i></p> <p>Table 6.3.1 – Minimum car parking rates within the draft Harmonisation DCP requires dual occupancy developments provide a minimum of 1 space per dwelling, and a minimum of 2 spaces for developments with 3 or more bedrooms. Secondary dwellings (i.e. granny flats) are not required to provide additional parking.</p> <p>The specified car parking rates have been informed by a range of documents, including the recommendations of the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a>, TfNSW Guide to Traffic Generating Development, and existing provisions from the five former DCPs.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
21	Resident from Epping	a. Submitter requests more public exercise machines and shelter from rain to be installed in Forest Park, Epping.	<p>The submitter’s request for more public facilities in parks is out of scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project. The scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project is largely to consolidate the five former DCPs to deliver one consolidated set of planning controls.</p> <p>While it is not within the scope of the harmonisation project, the request has been forwarded to the relevant team for consideration.</p> <p><i>See response to No.31.a in relation to the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
22	Resident from Winston Hills	a. Submitter raises concern with the way the DCP is implemented and applied arguing it is not effective because in the case of the Winston Hills Special Character Area, local character, streetscape, bulk and scale are not thoughtfully considered and that current criteria for assessment favours the maximisation of development potential, without consequences for non-compliance.	<p>Development assessment is completed under the provisions of the <a href="#">Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</a> (the Act) with particular focus on <i>Section 4.15 Evaluation</i>. It is a requirement for applicants to explain how their development complies with relevant legislation and environmental planning instruments (including DCPs) through their Statement of Environmental Effects.</p> <p>The primary function of a DCP is to provide building and design controls on how the density of a land use permitted under an LEP (which is specified via the height and Floor Space Ratio) can be delivered or distributed on a development site. Density (or ‘development potential’) is managed by the LEP, not a DCP. A <a href="#">Planning Information Sheet</a> is available to understand more about the difference between an LEP and DCP and how they work together to guide development.</p> <p>Objectives and controls within the DCP are used together to ensure new development is designed with consideration to adjoining development, streetscape and character, and amenity. Should a development not strictly comply with a control due to site constraints or configuration, but the development outcome delivers the intent of the objective (for example, delivers privacy to neighbours), then a degree of variance could be considered via the assessment process. However, emphasis is on achieving the desired character and amenity. This would also account for Special Character Areas and maintaining local character.</p> <p><b>Part 2 – Design in Context</b> and <b>Part 3- Residential Development</b> provide detailed guidance on managing local character, streetscape, and bulk and scale. These controls are required to be considered during the assessment of a Development Application. As outlined in <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to the Council report from 28 November 2022, the draft Harmonisation DCP has also revised and updated controls to improve residential building design outcomes. These have been prepared to manage the planning and design considerations raised by the submitter.</p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP has also maintained the existing Special Character Area from the former DCPs, including Winston Hills. The draft Harmonisation DCP also includes updated controls to protect local trees as outlined under <b>Section 5.3.4 - Tree and Vegetation Management</b>. These controls provide greater protection to Special Character Areas, including Winston Hills and more information can be found in <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> and <a href="#">Attachment 3</a> to the Council report from 28 November 2022.</p> <p>Whilst planning controls seek to maintain character there is an element of design that is subjective when it</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>comes to the use of character and integrated design. Furthermore, The Act also requires adjoining landowners to be notified of proposed works and development, with this providing the opportunity for landowners to raise concerns relating to things like local character, streetscape, bulk and scale. Submissions made during the development assessment process also need to be addressed as part of the development assessment process.</p> <p>Applicants must wholly comply with conditions of consent as per their DA approval. Regarding compliance, as per the <a href="#">Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</a>, post-consent certificates (construction and occupation certificates) are only issued subject to the fulfilment of the conditions of consent outlined in the DA determination.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>b. Submitter states that Council’s endorsement of the Draft DCP for public exhibition is pre-mature if consultation with the DA team has not occurred. This is to ensure that its application is practical and appropriate, stating that the Draft DCP serves no purpose if not stringently followed in practice.</p>	<p>Council’s Development Assessment team exercise apply the Parramatta LEP and DCP for the determination of development applications as required by the <a href="#">Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</a>.</p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP was developed in close consultation with Council’s relevant teams including the Development Assessment team and City Design team who apply the DCP during the development assessment process. Whilst the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP is to consolidate the existing controls within the DCPs, some minor, administrative/non-policy refinements were made to assist in the practical application of controls and remove potential for ambiguity. This is intended to assist the assessment process and the application of the controls.</p> <p>Furthermore, where new controls are proposed (for example, dual occupancy development – see response <i>No.15.h</i> for more detail), these controls were workshopped with Council’s Development Assessment team to ensure they are practical in their application.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>c. Submitter comments that limitations of the DCP and the level of discretion applied in the assessment of DAs (which ICAC and the Audit Office state to be a corruption risk) should be disclosed in the DCP to manage public expectation of future development.</p>	<p>The primary goal of the draft Harmonisation DCP is to consolidate the five former DCPs to create a consistent set of general land use policies and development controls for Parramatta LGA. Risk management and public interest disclosure is therefore out of the scope of the draft Harmonisation project, and more broadly outside of what a DCP contains.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>d. Submitter states that justifications for disconnection between the DCP and developed built outcomes should be provided, so that residents better</p>	<p><i>See response to No.22.a for detail around the development assessment process and consideration of a DCP in this process.</i></p> <p>The Development Assessment Report for a proposed development is carried out with consideration to <i>Section 4.15 Evaluation</i> of the <a href="#">Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</a>. This report requires assessment</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>understand Council's decisions, citing the inclusion of local character within Winston Hills as an example.</p>	<p>against the relevant LEP and DCP controls and whether any variations are sought. It is important to note that should a development not strictly comply with a DCP control due to site constraints or configuration, but the development outcome delivers the intent of the objective (for example, maintains local character), then a degree of variance could be considered via the assessment process. This is explained within the assessment reports. These reports are available to the public on the NSW Planning Portal.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>e. Submitter notes that street parking and traffic obstruction have not been appropriately accounted for in such scenarios. Suggests that provisions to address these context-specific issues be included in <b>Part 2 – Design in Context</b> of the Draft DCP.</p>	<p>As outlined in <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to the Council Report from 28 November 2023, the draft Harmonisation DCP includes minimum car parking rates that have been prepared by Council's Traffic and Transport team and is consistent with TfNSW Guide to Traffic Generating Development.</p> <p><b>Part 6 – Traffic and Transport</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP contain general parking requirements and specific parking rates for various types of development. The controls provide a minimum car parking rate per dwelling with a minimum of 2 spaces for developments with 3 or more bedrooms. These provisions in conjunction with <b>Section 3.3.2.5 – Parking Design and Vehicular Access</b> aim to reduce on-street parking and improve visual amenity.</p> <p>The controls within <b>Part 6 – Traffic and Transport</b> relate to the delivery of parking on development sites; they do not relate to the management of on-street parking. Feedback in relation to on-street parking is outside of the scope of a DCP. The feedback has been forwarded to the relevant team at Council for their consideration.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>f. Submitter comments that the introduction of <b>Section 3.1 - Housing Diversity and Choice</b> is misguided, stating that the recent delivery of dual occupancies have degraded local amenity and quality of life for local residents. Affirms that the shift away from low density detached housing pattern has resulted in increased and unplanned pressure on existing infrastructure.</p>	<p><i>See response to No.7.a in relation to the Department of Planning and Environment not supporting the recommendations of the Discussion Paper when the Harmonisation Planning Proposal was finalised, and the Council endorsed position on dual occupancy prohibition.</i></p> <p>The introductions to various parts of the draft Harmonisation DCP are intended to provide an overview of the planning considerations that section of the DCP is addressing. The introductions precede the objectives and controls, and cumulatively present the planning and design framework for that specific consideration.</p> <p><b>Section 3.1 - Housing Diversity and Choice</b> outlines the importance of delivering a mix of housing typologies to respond to the growing and diverse population of the City of Parramatta. It also provides links to critical council strategies that relates to housing diversity and delivery.</p> <p>The submitters feedback in relation to the content of the introduction of <b>Section 3.1</b> is considered opinion.</p> <p><i>See response No.15.h for detail on the improved dual occupancy design controls proposed within the draft Harmonisation DCP aimed to assist in managing amenity.</i></p> <p><i>See response No.19.b in relation to infrastructure provision.</i></p> <p><i>See response to No.22.a for detail around the development assessment process and consideration of a DCP in</i></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p><i>this process.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>g. Submitter is concerned with the role of large tree plantings, stating that they would impede on passive surveillance of the street and cause nuisance and danger to adjoining properties.</p>	<p>As explained within <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> and <a href="#">Attachment 3</a> to the Council report from 28 November 2022, the draft Harmonisation DCP includes updated controls to protect local trees. These controls have been developed in consultation with Council’s Landscaping and Tree Management Team and City Design team to deliver suitable landscaping and vegetation controls to achieve Council’s <a href="#">Environmental Sustainability Strategy 2017</a>.</p> <p>The draft controls within <b>Section 5.3.4 - Tree and Vegetation Management</b> have been developed to strike a balance between allowing new development and preserving and enhancing the tree coverage to protect the amenity, character and liveability of neighbourhoods. Increasing tree canopy is a Council policy due to the environmental and liveability benefits. The proposed controls also considered the practicality and interpretation of the controls, which will assist in managing compliance and community expectations around preservation.</p> <p><b>Section 5.3.4 - Tree and Vegetation Management</b> contains controls that allow for the pruning and removal of dead branches to address instances of nuisance and danger.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>h. Submitter requests balconies and decks not be identified as pergolas in the Development Application, because the DCP controls restricting the location of the balconies and decks will be ignored and result in illegal works.</p>	<p>The development assessment process is out of scope for the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p><i>See response to No.22.a for detail around the development assessment process and consideration of a DCP in this process.</i></p> <p><i>See response to No.31.a in relation to the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP.</i></p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP contains a glossary which identifies a balcony as:</p> <p><i>“Includes any porch, patio, covered deck or verandah, but does not include any deck area which is not provided with a roof”.</i></p> <p>This definition does not include a pergola and will be required to be identified as such if outside of this definition. Additionally, it will be assessed as a unique element.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
23	Resident from Epping	<p>a. Submitter recognises the importance of land use planning's role in reducing power loads and the urban heat island effect, especially considering the shutdown of Liddell.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p><i>See response No.15.g for detail on Section 5.4.4 - Urban Cooling of the draft Harmonisation DCP.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>b. Submitter requests that dual occupancies are restricted in more locations, such as R2 zoned land in Carlingford, Dundas, Eastwood, Epping and Rydalmere (with the exception of land fronting Marsden, Kissing Point and Victoria Roads). Notes that a minimum lot size of 600sqm and minimum subdivision lot of 550sqm is insufficient particularly as the built outcomes are generally too large for their lots and almost all trees are removed.</p>	<p><i>See response to No.7.a in relation to the Department of Planning and Environment not supporting the recommendations of the Discussion Paper when the Harmonisation Planning Proposal was finalised, and the Council endorsed position on dual occupancy prohibition.</i></p> <p>Land use permissibility (i.e. where dual occupancy development is permitted within the LGA) and minimum subdivision lot size are regulated under the PLEP 2023 and is outside of the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project. Council consulted with the community on land use planning matters as part of the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a> in 2019, and the Harmonisation Planning Proposal (i.e. draft Harmonisation LEP) in 2020. These two consultation processes were the opportunity for the community to provide feedback on land use permissibility (i.e. dual occupancy permissibility).</p> <p>The primary function of the draft harmonisation DCP is to support the implementation of the PLEP 2023 by providing design guidance for how low residential development (including dwelling housings and dual occupancies) will be delivered in areas which the PLEP 2023 identifies they are permitted with consent. Further information about how the DCP and LEP work together can be accessed in the <a href="#">Planning Information Sheet</a> that accompanied the draft Harmonisation DCP exhibition package.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>c. Suggests a mandate of 50% of the site to be landscaped, not concreted or paved.</p>	<p>The draft Harmonisation DCP contains landscaping controls per development type within <b>Part 3 - Residential Development</b> and <b>Part 4 – Non-Residential Development</b>. These controls have been prepared to ensure sufficient landscaping and deep soil are provided.</p> <p>The overall landscaping controls for residential building typologies (which includes dwelling houses, dual occupancies, townhouses, and terraces) within <b>Part 3</b> are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A minimum of 40% of the total site area needs to be landscaped, including deep soil which needs to be a minimum of 30% of the total site area. Additionally, the requirement for soil depth has been increased from 1.0m to 1.2m.</li> </ul> <p>Apartment buildings, shop-top housing and mixed-use developments share the same landscaping requirements with additional provisions to align with the Apartment Design Guide.</p> <p>As outlined within the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a>, controls relating to landscaping across the five DCPs for residential building typologies ranged between 10% to 50% of total lot size.</p> <p>Consistent with the Discussion Paper, the draft Harmonisation DCP retains controls from the Parramatta DCP 2011 for landscaping and deep soil area as they were the more suitable controls from the five DCPs to deliver feasible building envelopes whilst reducing hardstand areas (i.e. concreted or paved areas) and deliver deep soil that accommodate canopy trees, vegetation plantings, and the infiltration of ground water.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>



Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>d. Submitter generally objects to multi-dwelling housing development</p>	<p>Multi dwelling housing often in form of villas, dual occupancies, townhouses and terraces supports a proportion of households that want homes in shapes, sizes and locations that suit their lifestyles and budgets. The draft Harmonisation DCP controls aim to ensure all development types including multi dwelling housing are well designed and fit into the character of the area.</p> <p>Objection to multi-dwelling housing development and concerns in relation to site specific development is out of the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project. The scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project is largely to consolidate the five former DCPs with some policy changes to reflect changes in planning legislations (i.e. Code SEPP and Sustainability SEPP) and following up actions identified in Council resolutions. Land use permissibility (i.e. where multi-dwelling housing development is permitted within the LGA) is regulated under the PLEP 2023. <b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>e. Submitter generally objects to gas cooking (noting it is a BASIX problem).</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p><b>Section 5.4.3 – All Electric Buildings</b> in the draft Harmonisation DCP controls was drafted with alignment to the current <a href="#">State Environmental Planning Policy (Sustainable Buildings) 2022</a> that requires all ‘large commercial’ buildings to minimise the use of on-site fossil fuels (i.e. gas), as part of the goal of achieving net zero emissions in New South Wales by 2050.</p> <p>In line with the intent of the SEPP, the draft DCP proposes that all new commercial development and non-residential development that is State Significant development are to use only electricity (grid provided and on-site renewables) for all energy requirements associated with normal operations. It is noted that where an intended use requires a process or equipment that is not able to be served by electricity, fossil fuels may be provided to service that service only.</p> <p>The requirement for all residential development to be all electronic (i.e. not allowing gas cooking) was not proposed as part of the draft Harmonisation DCP as the DCP was drafted with close aligned with the above SEPP which does not require all residential developments to be all electric.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>f. Submitter objects to the use of dark-coloured material for roofs, driveways and grass pavers in construction and landscaping.</p>	<p>As outlined in <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to the Council Report from 28 November 2023, Environmental Performance controls have been updated to reflect the Parramatta City Centre DCP that responds to industry benchmarks in this field. Council officers considered the suitability of applying such controls across the whole City in line with the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a> recommendation.</p> <p><b>Section 5.4.4 – Urban Cooling</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP provides detailed controls which will aid in cooling and removing heat from the urban environment within the LGA, including controls addressing the reflectivity of building roofs, podiums and facades, reducing the impacts of heat rejection sources of heating and cooling systems and green roofs or walls. The draft Harmonisation DCP further details minimum shading technical requirements under <b>Section 5.4.4.3 – Facades</b> to mitigate urban heat and are required to addresses</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>environmental performance across the new City of Parramatta.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>g. Submitter generally objects to the erection of housing that have a similar appearance to office buildings (i.e. development on Willoughby Street, Epping).</p>	<p><b>Part 2 – Design in Context, Part 3 – Residential Development and Part 4 – Non-Residential Development</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP contain numerous general building form and design provisions addressing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall design quality</li> <li>• Facade design</li> <li>• Building siting</li> <li>• Building materials</li> <li>• Landscaping, deep soil, parking and fencing</li> </ul> <p>These controls have been updated to ensure adherence to built form controls that compliment and integrate into the existing streetscape. The controls are of a general nature to provide flexibility in development whilst maintaining the surrounding context. <b>Part 8 – Centres, Precincts, Special Character Areas and Specific Sites</b> contains further controls to maintain local character, special character areas and heritage conservation areas. Whilst planning controls seek to maintain character there is an element of design that is subjective when it comes to the use of character and integrated design.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
24	Resident from Northmead	<p>a. Submitter expresses disappointment at the lack of strategic progress within North Parramatta area, stating that public support and involvement is imperative to its success. Submitter comments that planning for future Parramatta North Urban Transformation Precinct (PNUT) should recognise the importance of its culture facility, entertainment, commercial and medical services, key recommendations to the planning controls for PNUT site including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning for PNUT needs to reduce the environmental impact of adjoining areas</li> </ul>	<p>.Noted. The scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project is to consolidate the five former DCPs and retain existing site specific controls. Comments in relation to site specific DCP controls (i.e. PNUT) is out of scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project, as those controls have been directly transferred from former DCPs to the current draft DCP with no changes proposed.</p> <p>The PNUT Site was rezoned in 2015 by the Minister for Planning and the master planning process was led by Property and Development NSW. The master planning process included detailed considerations of planning, design and heritage objectives/principles. Following the rezoning process, site specific DCP controls for PNUT (i.e. <b>Section 8.2.2</b>) were developed in 2017 to further support the proposed land uses. The DCP process involved consultation with the community and State Agencies including the NSW heritage Office. The controls were subject to a separate community consultation process and are considered to be appropriate.</p> <p>It is noted the study area for Westmead Place Strategy and North Parramatta Place Strategy, both led by the State Government, encompassed the entire PNUT site specified under the draft Harmonisation DCP. A specific review of the controls for the PNUT site are being considered as part of a proposal to potentially include a</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>and the size, design and visual impact of new developments must be compatible with the surrounding heritage sites and facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The boundary for the PNUT site should be inclusive of Parramatta Park and the North Parramatta Mental hospital site, supported by an overarching strategy. And significant high-rise development should be concentrated in limited areas away from the heritage sites (specifically North Rocks Road and the southern region of North Parramatta), and that Church Street should be 5-7 storeys high and "only one property deep".</li> <li>• Planning for Parramatta North Urban Transformation Precinct (PNUT) should learn from many worldwide examples (such as Boston, USA) where planning strategies successfully marry the cultural, historic, economic, and environmental strategies.</li> <li>• Exercise areas and dog training sites are to be limited and Council should consider the prohibition of such change to allow residents to lease these sites</li> <li>• The previous Council parking area between Harold and Fennell Street, which is currently used by the Parramatta Light Rail construction, should remain as a Council parking facility that could include other community uses, and an open park on the top level.</li> </ul>	<p>university campus in this precinct.</p> <p>As such, any change to the development controls (i.e. HOB, heritage curtilage) applying to PNUT will be subject to the outcomes of above mentioned projects: North Parramatta Place Strategy and the progress of Westmead Precinct Planning through separate planning process that are outside of the draft harmonisation DCP project. Detailed land use plans for the land subject to the study area of North Parramatta Place Strategy (i.e. including the previous Council car park between Harold and Fennell Street) will be considered as part of the planning process led by State government with support from Council. These planning processes will provide further opportunities for community consultation which will allow the community express their views and have them considered as part of those projects.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, the control is retained within the draft DCP and is considered suitable</b></p>
25	Resident from Silverwater	<p>a. Submitter objects to the proposed 1.5m side setback (<b>C.09</b>) within <b>Section 3.3.2.2 – Preliminary Building Envelope</b> relating to dual occupancy development in <b>Part 3 – Residential Development</b>. Submitter recommends retaining the minimum 0.9m</p>	<p>As explained in <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> and <a href="#">Attachment 3</a> to the Council report from 28 November 2022, updated design controls for dual occupancy development have been proposed as part of the draft Harmonisation DCP. This is to manage the design outcomes of dual occupancy development resulting from the Development Application process (which Council oversees).</p> <p>The revised controls were informed by a detailed review of dual occupancy development outcomes across the</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>side setback with no maximum building width control as this is standard across all former councils.</p>	<p>City. One of the controls proposed to assist in managing bulk and scale of dual occupancy development was increasing the side setback controls and introducing a building width control to ensure a proportional response between building bulk and lot size.</p> <p>Urban design testing demonstrated that a minimum 1.5m side setback (<b>C.09</b>) and maximum building width of 80% of the lot (<b>C.10</b>) are required to ensure sites are of sufficient width to achieve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the necessary standard of amenity in relation to privacy, solar access, landscaping and private open space,</li> <li>b) a sense of street address to both dwellings, and</li> <li>c) safe and efficient pedestrian and vehicular access.</li> </ul> <p>Whilst a side setback of 0.9m was contained within the PDCP 2011 and former DCPs, the resulting bulk and scale of dual occupancy development delivers poor built form and streetscape outcomes. Therefore, the proposed control is tested to improve development outcomes, which is critical as dual occupancy development continues to be prevalent across the City.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>b. Submitter requests a minimum site area of 500sqm for dual occupancy development.</p>	<p>The minimum lot size for dual occupancy development is 600sqm and is regulated under the PLEP 2023. The submitters request for a 500sqm lot size is outside of the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project. Council consulted with the community on land use planning matters (such lot size) as part of the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a> in 2019, and the Harmonisation Planning Proposal (i.e. draft Harmonisation LEP) in 2020. These two consultation processes were the opportunity for the community to provide feedback on principal development standards (i.e. minimum lot size and zoning).</p> <p>The primary function of the draft harmonisation DCP is to support the implementation of the PLEP 2023 – it does not propose amendments to the PLEP 2023. The draft DCP provides design guidance for how those development would be delivered in areas which the PLEP 2023 identifies they are permitted with consent. Further information about how the DCP and LEP work together is detailed in the <a href="#">Planning Information Sheet</a>.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>c. Submitter requests that the 100sqm private open space requirement (<b>C.03</b> of <b>Section 3.3.1.4 - Open Space and Landscape</b> for dwelling houses, secondary dwellings, and dual occupancies) apply to the principal lot for dual occupancies, providing 50sqm to each dwelling.</p>	<p>As explained within <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2023, 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. Whilst focus of this testing and design work was to address the building envelope, bulk and scale, and address to the streetscape for dual occupancy development (see <a href="#">Attachment 3</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2023), controls were also reviewed to guide private open space.</p> <p>The minimum of 100sqm of private open space per dwelling will promote adequate amenity, landscaping, and usability for residents. The control also mirrors the private open space provisions for dwelling houses. This assists in delivering consistency in the provision of quality usable private outdoor living areas for recreational</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>and outdoor activities for the various forms of residential accommodation permitted in low density neighbourhoods. In other words, the predominant residential land uses within the R2 zone deliver the same level of private space and amenity for residents, and deliver the objectives of the zone from the PLEP 2023:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to maintain the low density residential character of the area.</li> <li>• to protect and enhance tree canopy, existing vegetation and other natural features.</li> </ul> <p>The private open space requirements for residential uses permitted in the R3 Medium Density Residential zone (i.e. townhouses) and R4 High Density Residential zone (i.e. residential flat buildings) are not comparable to the requirements for the uses within the R2 zone due to the different contexts. Therefore, the submitter’s assertion that 50sqm for dual occupancy development provides an appropriate transition between different medium to high density residential uses is not valid as the uses are within different zones, with different objectives, and building densities/typologies.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>d. Submitter requests that <b>C.03</b> within <b>Section 3.4.1.2 – Preliminary Building Envelope</b> relating to townhouses be amended to permit 2 storeys for townhouse development that does not directly front a public street, rather than the single storey, stating that a limit of 1 storey is not practical or feasible.</p>	<p>The requirement of <b>C.03</b> within <b>Section 3.4.1.2 – Preliminary Building Envelope</b> within the draft Harmonised DCP that requires townhouses which do not directly front a public street to be a maximum of 1-storey plus attic has been carried over from the Parramatta DCP 2011. This is consistent with the scope and intention of the harmonisation process and was retained within the draft Harmonisation DCP to ensure town houses are designed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ensure development contributes to a visual cohesiveness along the streetscape and delivers uniformity in bulk, scale, setbacks, and height.</li> <li>• provide adequate separation between buildings and protect adjoining buildings from overlooking and loss of amenity.</li> </ul> <p>However, it is noted that the control also states that additional height may be considered to the rear of the site where it is demonstrated that amenity outcomes are acceptable. Council could consider approving additional height if a development scheme satisfies the objectives of the DCP and development provides satisfactory built form, amenity, and privacy.</p> <p><i>See response to No.42.f in relation to the number of storeys for townhouse development not frontage a street.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
26	Resident from Carlingford	<p>a. Submitter generally objects to the DCP and regulation of future development. Submitter is in the view of regulation systems infringe the rights of property owners and the DCP should not include</p>	<p><i>See response to No.3.d in relation to the purpose and function of a DCP in guiding development outcomes.</i></p> <p>In relation to the submitters comment about provisions for the maintenance of a property, the draft Harmonisation DCP (and DCPs more general) do not impose provisions around property maintenance.</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>provisions for the maintenance of property (i.e. restriction on tree removal).</p> <p>b. Submitter opposes the provisions of <b>Section 5.3.4 - Tree and Vegetation Preservation</b>, stating that private landowners should have freedom in the selection, maintenance, and removal of private trees.</p> <p>c. Submitter concerns that the restriction on tree removal within the draft DCP would result trees causing shading to building structures such as solar panels and washing lines, which is contrary to zero emission targets. Also, the proposed tree protection provision would be costly for landowners to maintain.</p> <p>d. Submitter comments that the adoption of this DCP should only be done after a referendum of all of its private property owners have voted in favour of the plan.</p>	<p>It is noted there are provisions relating to the management of trees contained in <b>Section 5.3.4 - Tree and Vegetation Management</b>. These controls are designed to manage and preserve canopy trees coverage across the City to maintain amenity, retain urban forest, canopy cover, reduce urban heat, and protect habitat.</p> <p>The removal of a tree requires an assessment as part of Tree Permit Application (or DA within certain special areas within the City such as Heritage Conservation Areas). This is consistent with the <a href="#">Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</a> and <i>Chapter 2</i> of the <a href="#">State Environmental Planning Policy (Biodiversity and Conservation) 2021</a>. Trees and vegetation that are categorised as protected are protected by law, irrespective whether it is located at private or public land. This is because trees are an important community asset and contribute to the urban forest and their removal or excessive pruning needs to be assessed by Council to determine their suitability and reduction in urban tree canopy.</p> <p>However, exempt works are contained within the draft Harmonisation DCP that allows for pruning and the removal of dead branches as required.</p> <p><a href="#">Attachment 2</a> and <a href="#">Attachment 3</a> to the Council report from 28 November 2022 contain more information on the approach to tree preservation and management.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p>The preparation and adoption process for a Development Control Plan is regulated under the <a href="#">Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</a>, specifically under <i>Division 3.6 Development Control Plans</i>. A referendum is not required as part of the preparation of this environmental planning instrument.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
27	Individual from unknown location	<p>a. Submitter raises issues with proposed controls for residential development, stating that these controls are unreasonably limiting the development potential of family homes.</p>	<p>The purpose of the residential development controls under <b>Part 3 – Residential Development</b> of the draft DCP is to balance the need for housing and economic growth and protect and enhance housing diversity, heritage, local character and the City’s environmental assets.</p> <p>The proposed controls under <b>Part 3</b> have been informed by the recommendations of the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Framework Discussion Paper</a> and further urban design testing (for certain residential accommodation as explained in <a href="#">Attachment 3</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2022) to deliver suitable built form outcomes, optimise site area coverage, private open space, and amenity.</p> <p>The controls provide detailed design guidance to support land uses permitted within the PLEP 2023. The PLEP 2023 via the land use zoning map determines where different uses are located across the City and caters for a variety of low to medium density housing typologies.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>b. Submitter comments that limiting excavation for sloping sites will result in more expensive developments, and that stepped levels provide tripping hazards for children and elderly people. Submitter is in the view of that these controls are not practical for the context of Parramatta.</p>	<p><i>See response No.2.c in relation to the draft Harmonisation DCP’s management of sloping sites.</i></p> <p><b>Section 5.2.4</b> of the draft DCP includes controls for earthwork and development on sloping site. The controls have been consolidated from the previous five DCPs and are required to ensure any cut and fill activities do not to create detrimental impacts on the surrounding environment and adjoining properties (i.e. impacts of overland flow, privacy, disputation to drainage patterns and sedimentation on downstream waterways and drainage systems).</p> <p>Further detail can be found in the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Framework Discussion Paper</a>.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
28	Resident from Epping	<p>a. Submitter requests that provisions of clearing traditional planting and significant trees on private land within Heritage Conservation areas to be strengthened and monitored/reinforced more closely.</p> <p>b. Submitter seeks for further information on whether there are any controls to enforce the protection of these trees, whether there are consequences for non-compliance, and if there are sufficient guidelines for replanting.</p>	<p><b>Section 5.3.4 – Tree and Vegetation Preservation</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP includes detailed controls for tree and vegetation preservation, specifically under Table 5.3.4.1 which specifies that a Development Application is required for any major work to any tree (including removal) for land within a Heritage Conservation Area. Furthermore, tree preservation controls have been updated to better protect the trees that contribute the most tree canopy and amenity; and offer additional protection to special areas (including Heritage Conservation Areas) without being onerous and impractical.</p> <p>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) is protected within Heritage Conservation Areas and requires approval for major works.</p> <p>Further detail is contained within <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> and <a href="#">Attachment 3</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2022.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p><i>See response No.47.a regarding tree preservation within the draft Harmonisation DCP.</i></p> <p><b>Section 5.3.4 – Tree and Vegetation Preservation</b> contains controls relating to an Offset Program (<b>C.03</b>). Where a tree is approved to be removed, Council will seek the replanting of a suitable canopy replacement tree or trees in a suitable location on the site. Any replacement trees will need to be grown to maturity and replaced if the planting fails to survive and thrive. This will usually be a condition of development consent via the development assessment process.</p> <p>In addition to <b>Section 5.3.4 – Tree and Vegetation Preservation, Part 7 - Heritage and Archaeology - Landscaping and Garden</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP includes controls to protect trees that contributes to the significance of heritage listed items. These controls require trees on sites listed on the New South Wales State Heritage Register to obtain approval from the Heritage Council prior to any pruning or removal. Exemptions may be granted for pruning up to 30% of the canopy of a tree on a State Heritage Register listed site within a two-year period. Penalties, including fines, may be issued to a person found guilty of contravening these controls.</p> <p>In addition to a penalty, the Court may also order the repair, remedial pruning or replacement of a damaged,</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>destroyed, poisoned or severely pruned or removed tree and impose an order to maintain such replacement to maturity.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p>c. Submitters questions what is being done to educate and inform residents of their rights/responsibilities to protect the natural environment.</p> <p>Matters raised in relation to education on tree protecting program is out of scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project.</p> <p><i>See response to No.31.a in relation to the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP.</i> Council’s website currently contains messaging on the value and importance of trees including a video on the benefit of trees. This material outlines the environmental, economic and social benefits of trees and detail the positive impact trees have on communities. The <a href="#">Environmental Sustainability Strategy 2017</a> equally emphasises the importance of trees as assets and the need to protect these into the future.</p> <p>The content and usage of community engagement and communication tools and programs for Council’s tree vision and policy (and any environmental or planning matter) is out of the project scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP. However, Council through its City Engagement Directorates regularly communicates to resident details of new tree planting, bushland rehabilitation, and plant give-away programs. Recently this work has focussed on the success of the Greening Parramatta program and promoting the 2023 Parramatta Light Rail Tree Planting Program. This information is communicated in Council’s monthly eNewsletters, publications and webpages and from time to time included in Lord Mayor’s Column within Parramatta News.</p> <p>There have been programs that invited schools to participate in tree planting programs including National Tree Day. Our Greening Parramatta program in particular attracted a number of school children who became enthusiastic Tree Champions. Where resources are available, environmental programs are shared with schools in the LGA and their participation encouraged.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p>d. Suggests that trees that have been removed should be replaced by trees greater than 4m height.</p> <p>Tree removal and replanting are assessed as part of the application process, suitable replacement trees (i.e. size and species) are required and assessed on a case by case scenario, and dependent on the local environment.</p> <p>A general control to require a mandated replanting tree size as suggested by the submitter would be inconsistent with the site specific assessment undertaken by Council officers as described above..</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
29	Resident from Winston Hills	a. Submitter comments that recent and upcoming dual occupancy developments in the Lois and Naomi Streets precinct of Winston Hills have severely affected the amenity of local residents, and requests	<p><b>Council has responded separately to the submitter about the issues raised in relation to the development application mentioned, with feedback on specific development outcomes, the development assessment process, and other matters not in scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP.</b></p>



Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>that greater emphasis on issues associated with dual occupancy developments on narrow streets must be addressed, including the assessment of these DAs and existing issues within affected areas.</p> <p>b. Submitter states that the DA Assessment Officers have incorrectly assessed DAs which have resulted in inappropriate built design outcomes which maximise the building footprint within a site and ignores planting requirements, pointing to 74 Naomi Street South as an example; with the Submitter of the view there is a gap within the Draft DCP and the holistic planning process.</p>	<p>The submitters general concerns about dual occupancy and process are the focus of this response.</p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP introduces new and updated controls in relation to dual occupancy development to improve on maintaining visual and acoustic privacy between dwellings, as well as articulation of side boundary walls through a maximum length of wall control. Some of the controls that have been proposed include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increasing side setback controls and introducing a building width control to ensure a proportional response between building bulk and lot size.</li> <li>• Increased provision for deep soil in the front setback to support large canopy tree planting.</li> </ul> <p>A DCP is used to support the implementation of the LEP and provides guidance related to more detailed development controls, however, they can be applied with more flexibility and thus enables more scope for variation throughout the development application process.</p> <p>The purpose of the residential development controls under <b>Part 3</b> of the draft DCP is to balance the need for housing and economic growth and protect and enhance housing diversity, heritage, local character and the City’s environmental assets.</p> <p>The proposed controls under <b>Part 3</b> have been informed by the recommendations of the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Framework Discussion Paper</a> and urban design testing (for certain residential accommodation as explained in <a href="#">Attachment 3</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2022) to deliver suitable built form outcomes, optimise site area coverage, private open space, and amenity. This design testing was carried out for a number of sites of varying contexts (including Winston Hills).</p> <p>Following on from this, the draft Harmonisation DCP introduces new and updated controls in relation to dual occupancy development to improve on maintaining visual and acoustic privacy between dwellings, as well as articulation of side boundary walls through a maximum length of wall control. Some of the controls that have been proposed include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increasing side setback controls and introducing a building width control to ensure a proportional response between building bulk and lot size.</li> <li>• Increased provision for deep soil in the front setback to support large canopy tree planting.</li> </ul> <p>Development assessment of specific development types are completed under the provisions of the <a href="#">Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</a> (the Act) with particular focus on <i>Section 4.15 Evaluation</i>. Furthermore, The Act also requires adjoining landowners to be notified of proposed works and development, with this providing the opportunity for landowners to raise concerns relating to things like local character, streetscape, bulk and scale. Submissions made during the development assessment process also need to be addressed as part of the development assessment process.</p> <p>As part of the Harmonisation Planning framework roll out, workshops have been held with Council’s development assessment teams to introduce the proposed controls to aid in familiarising Council staff with the</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>proposed changes. The intent of the workshops is to allow a smooth transition to the new controls ensuring the objectives of the draft Harmonisation DCP are satisfied as part of any development application assessed under the proposed harmonised controls.</p> <p>Applicants must wholly comply with conditions of consent as per their DA approval. Regarding compliance, as per the <a href="#">Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</a>, post-consent certificates (construction and occupation certificates) are only issued subject to the fulfilment of the conditions of consent outlined in the DA determination.</p> <p><i>See response to submission No.7.a in relation to the Department of Planning and Environment not supporting the recommendations of the Discussion Paper when the Harmonisation Planning Proposal was finalised, and the Council endorsed position on dual occupancy prohibition.</i></p> <p><i>See response to submission No.14.a for information regarding scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP in relation to parking.</i></p> <p><i>See response to submission No.22.a for detail around the development assessment process and consideration of a DCP in this process.</i></p> <p><i>See response contained in No.29.c for information regarding parking rate controls for off-street parking. See response No.15.h for detail on the improved dual occupancy design controls proposed within the draft Harmonisation DCP aimed to assist in managing amenity.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>c. Submitter states that these types of developments (generally being for 4+ bedroom dwellings) have delivered an unplanned congestion of the local road network and reduced the number of available street parking for residents and visitors (with a similar issue experienced with granny flat developments).</p>	<p><i>See response to No. 7a in relation to the Department of Planning and Environment not supporting the recommendations of the Discussion Paper when the Harmonisation Planning Proposal was finalised, and the Council endorsed position on dual occupancy prohibition.</i></p> <p><i>See response to No.18.a in relation to the preparation of car parking rates within the draft Harmonisation DCP.</i></p> <p>Table 6.3.1 – Minimum car parking rates within the draft Harmonisation DCP requires dual occupancy developments provide a minimum of 1 space per dwelling, and a minimum of 2 spaces for developments with 3 or more bedrooms. Secondary dwellings (i.e. granny flats) are not required to provide additional parking.</p> <p>The specified car parking rates have been informed by a range of documents, including the recommendations of the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a>, TfNSW Guide to Traffic Generating Development, and existing provisions from the five former DCPs.</p> <p>The rates contained within Table 6.3.1 are considered in scope of the intention of the harmonisation project, which is to consolidate existing policy.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>d. Submitter raises concerns that planning for EV charging infrastructure within street poles will contribute to growing parking and transport issues within these cul-de-sac precincts.</p>	<p>As explained within <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2022, EV controls the draft Harmonisation DCP is introducing new EV controls as part of the harmonisation process.</p> <p><b>Section 6.1.3 of Part 6 – Traffic and Transport</b> includes new provisions where all garages in single dwellings and dual occupancies require a Private EV connection when submitting their DA plans. For residential accommodation outside of dwelling houses, secondary dwellings and dual occupancies, car parking must provide an EV Ready Connection to at least one car space for each dwelling/apartment.</p> <p>There are no controls requiring charging stations within street poles within the draft Harmonisation DCP. All charging infrastructure is required to be provided on a development site.</p> <p>However, under changes made in February 2023 to the <a href="#">State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP) (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021</a>, widened provisions are made for EV charging stations as either exempt development or development with and or without consent (<i>Chapter 2, Part 2.3, Division 17, Subdivision 3</i>).</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
30	Resident from Epping	<p>a. Submitter generally objects to the changes contained in <b>Part 3 - Residential Development</b>, highlighting conflict between the draft Harmonisation DCP and the Hornsby DCP 2013 and its suitability for R2 zones in Epping.</p>	<p>The purpose of the residential development controls under <b>Part 3</b> of the draft DCP is to balance the need for housing and economic growth and protect and enhance housing diversity, heritage, local character and the City’s environmental assets.</p> <p>The proposed controls under <b>Part 3</b> have been informed by the recommendations of the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a> and further urban design testing (for certain residential accommodation as explained in <a href="#">Attachment 3</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2022) to deliver suitable built form outcomes, optimise site area coverage, private open space, and amenity. This design testing was carried out for a number of sites of varying contexts (including Epping).</p> <p>The scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project is to consolidate the five former DCPs and deliver one consistent set of planning controls for the whole City of Parramatta. Detail on how this process occurred, as well as information around how the controls were formulated from the five DCPs, can be found in <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> and <a href="#">Attachment 3</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2022.</p> <p>It is noted that the draft Harmonisation DCP is largely consistent with controls contained in the Hornsby DCP in relation to dwelling houses and multi-dwelling housing. However, the most notable difference between the Hornsby DCP 2013 and draft Harmonisation DCP is in relation to dual occupancy development. The Hornsby DCP 2013 does not contain controls for dual occupancy development due to the prohibition of this land use within R2 areas. This prohibition continues under the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i>. Therefore, whilst the draft Harmonisation DCP contains dual occupancy controls (which is a difference to the Hornsby DCP 2013), the controls will only be applicable in area that permit dual occupancy under the PLEP 2023 (which excludes most R2 land within the former Hornsby area).</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, the control is retained within the draft DCP and is considered suitable.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>b. Submitter objects to the minimum 10 metre setback for dwelling houses fronting a state and regional road <b>(C.07) Section 3.3.1.2 – Preliminary Building Envelope</b>, stating that this would result in a different streetscape within Epping.</p>	<p>State and regional roads carry high volumes of traffic across most times of the day. The minimum 10 metre setback for dwelling houses fronting these roads is proposed to manage noise, pollution, and overall amenity for residents. Consistent with the recommendations of Section 2.3 and 3.2 of the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a>, a 10m front setback from classified roads (i.e. state and regional roads) was adopted to ensure future development delivers suitable amenity.</p> <p>Consistent with the harmonisation process of consolidating and reconciling controls, whilst not all five DCPs contain a specific setback control for classified roads, it is noted that the Hornsby DCP contains a 9m setback and the Hills DCPs contains a 10m setback. These controls formed the basis of <b>C.07</b> within <b>Section 3.3.1.2 – Preliminary Building Envelope</b> and is considered suitable in the draft Harmonisation DCP. In addition, the 10m front setback enables canopy tree planting to occur on state and regional roads where street tree planting is not permitted to preserve vehicular sight lines.</p> <p>It is noted that in the context of Epping, the control would only apply to Beecroft Road and Carlingford Road which both have sections that have recently been redeveloped. In addition to the 10m requirement of <b>C.07</b>, future development would also need to take into consideration existing setbacks to deliver on the objective of <b>Section 3.3.1.2 – Preliminary Building Envelope</b> that aims to ensure development contributes to visual cohesiveness along the streetscape through an identifiable uniformity in bulk, scale, setbacks, and height. Future development would be assessed against the controls and objectives to ensure a suitable outcome.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, the control is retained within the draft DCP and is considered suitable.</b></p>
		<p>c. Submitter objects to the proposed maximum 10m wall length and the minimum recess (measured from the face of the external wall) of 1.5 metres (depth) by 2 metres (length) control for all storeys after 10 metres <b>(C.09)</b> within <b>Section 3.3.1.2 – Preliminary Building Envelope</b> which relates to residential dwellings, stating that most local dwellings have straight walls.</p>	<p>As explained within <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2022, controls relating to dwelling houses have been largely prepared using retained Parramatta DCP 2011 controls with minor updates. One of these minor updates includes <b>C.09</b> that requires the articulation of side boundary walls through a maximum length of wall control.</p> <p>The control that guides a maximum 10m length of building wall is adapted from the former Holroyd DCP 2013, which also set a maximum wall length limit of 10m. This control has also formalised the intent of the former Hills DCP 2012 and Parramatta DCP 2011, which contained objectives that sought to minimise long blank walls and provide architectural relief to facades.</p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP refines this control by specifying measures to prevent blank and poorly articulated walls via the minimum recess control <b>(C.09)</b> within <b>Section 3.3.1.2 – Preliminary Building Envelope</b>.</p> <p>It is noted that this control was tested as part of the urban design work carried out as part of the preparation of the draft Harmonisation DCP, and is considered suitable in delivering a design outcome that promotes articulated walls and minimises bulk. The control is considered appropriate to achieve the desired amenity outcome for the context of the new Parramatta LGA.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, the control is retained within the draft DCP and is considered suitable.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>d. Submitter objects to the proposed 30% requirement for the rear setback (<b>C.10</b>) within <b>Section 3.3.1.2 – Preliminary Building Envelope</b> which relates to residential dwellings, stating this would result in double the setback length of typical lots previously part of the Hornsby LGA.</p>	<p>The proposed rear setback controls retained the Parramatta DCP 2011 controls and are further supported by design testing undertaken for dual occupancy development and manor housing development. The 30% requirement was also applied by the Holroyd DCP 2013.</p> <p>The rear setback requirement will function similarly to former site coverage and minimum landscaped area controls contained in the Hornsby DCP 2013, providing more guidance on the siting of residential dwellings so as to be consistent across the block.</p> <p>It is considered appropriate to ensure sites have sufficient setbacks that are proportionate to the length of lot. This is necessary to achieve the standard of amenity required for privacy, solar access, deep soil landscape, canopy cover, and private open space within the broader context of the new Parramatta LGA.</p> <p>As mentioned above, one of the key objectives under <b>Section 3.3.1.2 – Preliminary Building Envelope</b> for dwelling housing, dual occupancy and secondary dwelling housing is to ensure development contributes to a visual cohesiveness along the streetscape through an identifiable uniformity in bulk, scale, setbacks, and height. The planning objective contained in the draft DCP is to support the planning controls, where assessment of development application would result in inconsistency between planning objectives and its supported controls, priorities would be given to assess the development application against the planning objectives.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, the control is retained within the draft DCP and is considered suitable.</b></p>
		<p>e. Submitter objects to the proposed deep soil and landscape requirement controls (<b>C.01</b> and <b>C.03</b>) within <b>Section 3.3.1.4 – Open Space and Landscape</b> which relates to residential dwellings, stating these controls will not align new development with the existing local character.</p>	<p>As explained within <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2022, controls relating to dwelling houses have been largely prepared using retained Parramatta DCP 2011 controls. This is consistent with the recommendations of the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a>. Table 1 of the Discussion Paper provides a comparison of the key DCP controls (including deep soil, landscaping, and private open space) for dwelling houses across the five DCPs and provides a recommendation.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged the draft Harmonisation DCP is increasing private open space, landscaping, and deep soil requirements in some areas of the City, the controls are consistent with the Discussion Paper, and were informed by urban design testing to identify the minimum standards necessary to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• achieve a good quality living environment and amenity</li> <li>• protect the character of neighbourhoods</li> <li>• maximise solar access and be well integrated with living areas</li> <li>• provides residents with quality usable private outdoor living areas for recreational and outdoor activities</li> <li>• provide sufficient deep soil for canopy tree planting and minimise runoff</li> <li>• integrate new development into the surrounding context by minimising bulk and scale through consistent articulation, materials, and setbacks.</li> </ul>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>Greater landscaping, deep soil for canopy trees, and green spaces also assist in managing urban heat across the City. Landscaping also attributes to local character and promotes amenity.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, the control is retained within the draft DCP and is considered suitable.</b></p>
		<p>f. Submitter objects to the proposed Private Open Space controls (C.03) within <b>Section 3.3.1.4 – Open Space and Landscape</b> which relates to residential dwelling houses, commenting that it is a 625% increase compared to the Private Open Space requirement in the current Hornsby DCP 2013.</p>	<p>The submitters understanding of the private open space control is not correct. As per Table 1 of <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a>, the Hornsby DCP 2013 requires 24m<sup>2</sup> paved principal private open space or 16 m<sup>2</sup> for lots less than 9m wide, with a minimum dimension of 3m x 3m. This requirement is referring to the deck, patio, terrace or paved area that is to be directly accessible from the living area of a dwelling and does not represent the full requirement for private open space. The former Hornsby DCP couples this with a minimum landscaped area control scaled to the site area, of which 50% is to be located to the rear of the property. For example, under the former Hornsby DCP, a site 600m in size would be required to provide a minimum 180sqm of landscape area, of which 90sqm would need to be located to the rear of the property. This results in a similar area requirement to the private open space control contained in the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p><b>C.03</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP requires the following:</p> <p><b>C.03</b> <i>A minimum 100m<sup>2</sup> of private open space must be provided for each dwelling. This space is to be contiguous, provided at ground level, located to the rear of each dwelling, and have a minimum dimension of 6 metres.</i></p> <p><i>See response to No.30.e regarding the preparation of open space and landscaping for residential dwelling houses in the draft Harmonisation DCP.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, the control is retained within the draft DCP and is considered suitable.</b></p>
		<p>g. Submitter objects to the proposed floor to ceiling height of 2.7m (C.01) within <b>Section 3.3.1.6 – Internal Amenity</b> which relates to residential dwelling houses, stating that no previous equivalent control existed in the legacy DCP. The submitter comments that such requirements are stricter than the Building Code Australia (BCA) and should be removed.</p>	<p>As explained within <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2022, controls relating to dwelling houses have been largely prepared using retained Parramatta DCP 2011 controls (with minor updates).</p> <p>The Parramatta DCP 2011 included a 2.7m floor to ceiling control for the ground floor and 2.4m for the first floor for dwelling housing, and therefore this is the origin of this control that has resulted from the harmonisation process.</p> <p>While the BCA takes precedence over controls contained with a DCP when assessing the development applications, it is important to recognise that the BCA sets minimum standards. The proposed 2.7m floor to ceiling height control is to ensure internal amenity is maximised, and minimise the potential for residential accommodation located within the R2 Low Density Residential area redeveloping with building envelopes greater than two storeys, which is considered to be incompatible with the desired character for these zones.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, the control is retained within the draft DCP and is considered suitable.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>h. Submitter objects to the minimum living room width of 5m (C.03) within <b>Section 3.3.1.6 – Internal Amenity</b> which relates to residential dwelling houses, stating that no previous equivalent control existed in the legacy DCP. The submitter comments that such requirements are stricter than the Building Code Australia (BCA) and should be removed.</p>	<p>As explained within <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2022, controls relating to dwelling houses have been largely prepared using retained Parramatta DCP 2011 controls (with minor updates).</p> <p>The minimum living room width of 5m was the result of the detailed urban design floorplan testing and urban design modelling carried out as part of the preparation of the revised dual occupancy development controls. Whilst focus of this testing and design work was to address amenity, streetscape, and bulk and scale for dual occupancy development (see <a href="#">Attachment 3</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2022), controls to guide internal amenity were also proposed as part of this process. This is to ensure dual occupancy developments (particularly attached dual occupancies) provide internal spaces that are functional and liveable, and provide a living space size that is commensurate to the average number of bedrooms observed in the delivery of this development type.</p> <p>This control was carried across for residential dwelling houses to ensure the same level of amenity is delivered in dwelling houses and deliver consistency in our residential accommodation controls. It is to also to formalise existing development assessment practice that considers and assesses the configuration and functionality of proposed living spaces for dwelling houses. Given dwelling houses generally have a greater internal width than a dwelling within a dual occupancy development (i.e. a dwelling house is distributed across the entire site width compared to a dual occupancy that has two dwellings distributed across the site width), and on average are sited on lots approximately 15m in width, designing a living space with a width of 5m is easily achievable in most cases.</p> <p>As per the above response, the BCA sets minimum standards for development and construction, particularly from safety perspective. A DCP can provide design guidance beyond what is contained within the BCA to ensure residential development delivers appropriate amenity, functionality, and liveability.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, the control is retained within the draft DCP and is considered suitable.</b></p>
		<p>i. Submitter objects to proposed control to discourage battle-axe lot subdivision (C.03) within <b>Section 3.6 – Residential Subdivision</b> stating that battle-axe lot subdivision is a key characteristic of the Epping area.</p>	<p>As explained within <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2022, residential subdivision provisions have been largely adapted from Parramatta DCP 2011.</p> <p>As stated within the submission, battle-axe lot subdivisions are a key characteristic in certain parts of the City of Parramatta (including Epping). This is the result of the historical subdivision pattern, and due to design concerns associated with this type of subdivision (which include the lack of street address and amenity, excessive cut and fill associated with the dwelling and driveway construction, and lack of views to and from the site, loss of privacy due to greater density of development, removal of existing trees located to the rear of suburban lots), new battle-axe lots are discouraged. The suitability of a battle-axe subdivision can be considered on a site-by-site basis and the suitability would be assessed against the Objectives of <b>Section 3.6</b> that broad seek to:</p> <p><b>0.01</b> <i>Ensure that subdivision of land for residential development has regard to site opportunities and constraints.</i></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p><b>0.02</b> Respect the predominant subdivision pattern of the locality.</p> <p><b>0.03</b> Ensure that lots of sufficient size are created to facilitate development that provides for: <b>a)</b> a suitable building platform, <b>b)</b> outdoor open space and service space, <b>c)</b> landscaped area, <b>d)</b> vehicular access that connects to a public road, and <b>e)</b> on-site parking.</p> <p><b>0.04</b> Maximise solar access potential for future dwellings through lot orientation.</p> <p>While discouraged, battle-axe lots are not prohibited and if the development application can demonstrate adherence to the Objectives, could be approved by Council.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, the control is retained within the draft DCP and is considered suitable.</b></p>
		<p>j. Submitter objects to the proposed minimum 3.5m wide access corridor (also commonly known as the driveway or battle-axe access) in Control <b>C.04</b> within <b>Section 3.6 – Residential Subdivision</b>, stating that the current Parramatta DCP 2011 specifies a 3.2m width for battle-axe access (30cm less than the proposed 3.5m).</p>	<p>As explained within <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2022, residential subdivision provisions have been largely adapted from Parramatta DCP 2011 with some variations. The minimum access corridor width varies across the five applicable DCPs that are subject to the Land Use Planning Harmonisation project as such:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Auburn DCP 2010 requires a width of 3m to 5.5m depending on number of lots it is servicing.</li> <li>• Holroyd DCP 2013 requires a 4m to 6m access corridor (subject to whether it is shared or not shared)</li> <li>• Parramatta DCP 2011 requires a width of 3.2m</li> <li>• The Hills DCP 2012 requires a width of 4m to 6m depending on number of lots it is servicing</li> <li>• Hornsby DCP 2013 requires a width of 3.5m to 6.65m depending on number of lots it is servicing.</li> </ul> <p>The proposed width of 3.5m is considered a satisfactory mid-point between the requirements of the five DCPs and is a suitable outcome from the harmonisation process.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, the control of 3.5m is retained within the draft DCP.</b></p>
31 & 32	Residents from Epping	<p>a. Submitter generally objects to the draft DCP, citing its inconsistencies with the previous Hornsby DCP.</p>	<p>The scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project is to consolidate the five former DCPs and deliver one set of planning objectives and controls for development in the new City of Parramatta. Some specific policy areas which extend beyond the project scope have been introduced or refined to meet current industry benchmarks and state-level policy changes (see <a href="#">Attachment 3</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2022 for more detail on the policy changes). These changes ensure that the Draft DCP controls are robust, sophisticated, and fit for purpose for the Parramatta LGA.</p> <p>A comparison of the key differences between the five DCPs and how the policy direction within the draft Harmonisation DCP was formed is explained within <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2022. This provides a clear line of sight between the existing DCPs, the recommendations of the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a> that was consulted within the community in 2019, and the recommended</p>



Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>controls within the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p>Whilst there may be some differences between the draft Harmonisation DCP and the previous Hornsby DCP, the intention of the Land Use Planning Harmonisation Framework was to resolve differences between the different DCPs and take a balanced approach in order to prepare one set of controls that can be applied across the City to deliver consistency in both development outcomes and expectations from landowners. It is noted that precinct and Heritage Conservation Area controls from specific areas across the City, including Epping, have been retained to ensure the unique controls for these areas are retained and respect local character.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>b. Submitter requests separate prescriptive measures to preserve the local low density residential character for Epping area.</p>	<p>Land use permissibility (i.e. where low density and high density residential uses are permitted across the City) is outside of the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project. Council consulted with the community on land use planning matters as part of the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a> in 2019, and the <a href="#">Harmonisation Planning Proposal</a> (i.e. draft Harmonisation LEP) in 2020. These two consultation processes were the opportunity for the community to provide feedback on land use permissibility (i.e. zoning). However, it is noted, that like the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP, the scope of the Harmonisation LEP process was to consolidate existing land use zones and principal development standards (such as, but not limited to, building heights, floor space ratios, minimum lot sizes, and dual occupancy permissibility) – not make significant policy changes. The <a href="#">Community Summary</a> document that accompanied the <a href="#">Harmonisation Planning Proposal</a> (i.e. draft Harmonisation LEP) exhibition process will provide further information around any land use changes within Epping.</p> <p>The primary function of the draft Harmonisation DCP is to support the implementation of the PLEP 2023 by providing design guidance for how low residential development (including dwelling housings and dual occupancies) will be delivered in areas which the PLEP 2023 identifies they are permitted with consent. Further information about how the DCP and LEP work together can be accessed in the <a href="#">Planning Information Sheet</a> that accompanied the draft Harmonisation DCP exhibition process.</p> <p>It is important to note that the draft Harmonisation DCP maintains the existing detailed controls for the Epping precinct and the Heritage Conservation Areas (HCA) in Epping (including East Epping HCA, Essex Street HCA and Rosebank Ave HCA). These protect distinctive residential heritage character and are considered prescriptive planning controls.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
33	Resident from Parramatta	<p>a. The submitter requests Council extend the notification period for an additional seven days for any type of development application to consider disadvantaged groups who do not have access to modern technology.</p>	<p>Feedback relating to notification procedures is out of scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project. As explained within <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2022, under recent amendments to the <a href="#">Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</a>, 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.</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<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 previous notification requirements across five former DCPs have been reviewed as part of this work. The Consolidated Development Application Notification Requirements formed an appendix to the <a href="#">Community Engagement Strategy 2022-24</a>.</p> <p>The proposed notification procedures are consistent with Council’s <a href="#">Community Engagement Strategy 2022-24</a>. It requires to notify development applications for a period of 14 days for minor development and 28 days for integrated and complicated development. While noting this the minimum notification period, it is subject to Council’s discretion to increase the notification period when deemed necessary. For development applications that require a 21 or 28 days notification period, a notification sign is also required to be placed on the site.</p> <p>In addition, Council’s Customer Service Team or library staff can assist community members to access notification materials related to specific DAs on Planning Portal via Council computers.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes are proposed as a result of this submission as the DCP does not include notification requirements as these are contained with the <a href="#">Community Engagement Strategy 2022-24</a>.</b> This feedback will be provided to the relevant team for their consideration as part of the next update to the <a href="#">Community Engagement Strategy 2022-24</a>.</p>
		<p>b. The submitter states that 10 written notification letters to adjoining properties are not sufficient when notifying development applications, particularly on smaller streets.</p>	<p>As mentioned in above response, the notification requirements across five former DCPs have been reviewed as part of the preparation of Community Engagement Strategy and formed an appendix to the <a href="#">Community Engagement Strategy 2022-24</a>. Written notifications are required to provide to the 10 closest surrounding properties. Where there is no impact to adjoining properties at the rear of the subject site, notification will be limited to the 5 closest surrounding properties to the side and opposite street of the subject site.</p> <p>It is considered the minimum required written notifications is sufficient and consistent with Council’s Community Engagement Strategy.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes are proposed as a result of this submission as the DCP does not include notification requirements as these are contained with the <a href="#">Community Engagement Strategy</a>.</b> This feedback will be provided to the relevant team for their consideration as part of the next update to the <a href="#">Community Engagement Strategy</a>.</p>
34	Resident from Parramatta	<p>a. The submitter objects the Land Use Planning Harmonisation project and the integration of the planning controls that applied to the former Holroyd Council area into the new <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i>. The submitter requests that the planning controls under the former Holroyd Council LGA to remain.</p>	<p>The integration of the planning controls that applied to the former Holroyd Council area into the new <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i> is a requirement of the <a href="#">Local Government (City of Parramatta and Cumberland) Proclamation 2016</a> which transferred parts of the former Holroyd Council into the new City of Parramatta. This amalgamation process requires the consolidation of the planning controls.</p> <p>The <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i> was finalised on 2 March 2023 and repealed the former <i>Holroyd LEP 2013</i>. As a result, feedback raised in relation to the consolidation of planning controls from the five former LEPs into the new <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i> (delivered via the Parramatta Harmonisation LEP project) is out of scope of the draft</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>Harmonisation DCP project.</p> <p>Council consulted with the community on the LEP harmonisation process as part of the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a> in 2019, and the <a href="#">Harmonisation Planning Proposal</a> (i.e. draft Harmonisation LEP) in 2020. These two consultation processes were the opportunity for the community to provide feedback on LEP matters.</p> <p>The scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project is to consolidate the five former DCPs and deliver one set of planning objectives and controls for development in the new City of Parramatta. Some specific policy areas which extend beyond the project scope have been introduced or refined to meet current industry benchmarks and state-level policy changes (see <a href="#">Attachment 3</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2022 for more detail on the policy changes). These changes ensure that the Draft DCP controls are robust, sophisticated, and fit for purpose for the Parramatta LGA.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
35	Air-conditioning & Refrigeration Equipment Manufacturers Association of Australia (AREMA)	<p>a. Submitter raises concerns with the requirements of <b>Section 5.4.6 – Natural Refrigerants in Air Conditioning</b> and the safety of the refrigerants available to achieve a Global Warming Potential (GWP) of 6 or less.</p>	<p>As explained within <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2023, Environmental Performance controls have been updated within the draft Harmonisation DCP to reflect Part 6 - Parramatta City Centre contained within the current Parramatta DCP 2011. The controls were adopted into the Parramatta DCP 2011 following the <a href="#">Parramatta CBD planning proposal</a> which responded to industry benchmarks. Council officers considered the suitability of applying such controls across the whole City in line with the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a> recommendation.</p> <p><b>Section 5.4.6 – Natural Refrigerants in Air Conditioning</b> in the draft Harmonisation DCP contains objectives and controls to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions associated with leakage or the improper disposal of synthetic refrigerant gases with high Global Warming Potential (GWP); and to future proof new HVAC (air conditioning) systems.</p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP proposes to require all new air-conditioning and refrigeration equipment to use refrigerants with a GWP of less than 10; not 6 or less as suggested in the submission.</p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP also states that this requirement is conditional on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• if the equipment can be supplied on similar terms to conventional systems, and</li> <li>• at a cost of not more than 10% higher than the market rate for conventional systems.</li> </ul> <p>The provision currently applies to development within the Parramatta City Centre (via the Parramatta City Centre DCP 2011). The intention of draft Harmonisation DCP is to extend the control across the city more widely (see below for more background on the strategic context for the use of natural refrigerants).</p> <p>The provision does not constitute a legal requirement in the NSW planning system, although compliance with the DCP is a matter for consideration when granting development consent. However, as explained above, the control is conditional to support the transition towards achieving a lower GWP.</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>Council intends to publish a guidance note to support the DCP controls to assist in the transition towards equipment that uses refrigerants with a GWP of less than 10.</p> <p><b>Strategic context</b></p> <p>Council has an ambitious goal to reduce community greenhouse gas emissions by 60% by 2038 (based on 2015 levels). The NSW State Government also has a target to deliver a 70% cut in emissions by 2035 and achieve net zero by 2050.</p> <p>To limit the impact of this growth and achieve these targets, Council has developed controls to design and build environmentally sustainable buildings that reduce energy use and greenhouse gas emissions given these buildings will be around for the next 50-100 years. Therefore, it is critical to ensure that they are future-ready to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and avoid costly technological retrofits.</p> <p>Council is mindful of the significant environmental impact of synthetic greenhouse gases due to the GWP and refrigerant leakage. It is anticipated that the provisions in the draft Harmonisation DCP will result in 607 times fewer emissions than using synthetic refrigerants.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>b. Submitter states that the only refrigerant available to meet this requirement are hydrocarbons, which are extremely flammable and would require specialised assessment, installation, and service.</p>	<p>Australia has a commitment to the phase-down of Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) per the Kigali amendment to the Montreal Protocol. In responses, Australia has set targets to phase down HFC consumption as part of its commitment, reducing levels by 85% by 2036. Newly installed HFC air conditioning will need conversion or replacement when the importation for HFC is fully restricted in 13 years. Action is needed now to anticipate the eventual and required transition away from HFCs.</p> <p>Council is not mandating hydrocarbons, which as stated are flammable and require specialised assessment, installation, and service. There are refrigerants that are not hydrocarbons that would achieve the requirement of a GWP of less than 10. These include R717, R744 and HFOs such as 1234yf and HFO1234ze. Therefore, Council has not mandated hydrocarbon refrigerants only.</p> <p><b>Industry concerns</b></p> <p>Council acknowledges that there are concerns from industry relating to the proposed DCP controls as these are the first of their kind in the state. There will likely be some resistance and inertia due to risk, limited experience, as well as a lack of supply from the leading equipment manufacturers.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that there may be limited refrigeration products available with low GWP options in the current market. To reflect this, the draft DCP control includes a ‘market test’ to check for availability:</p> <p><b>C.01 All new air-conditioning and refrigeration equipment are to use refrigerants with a GWP of less than 10;</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• if the equipment can be supplied on similar terms to conventional systems, and</li> <li>• at a cost of not more than 10% higher than the market rate for conventional systems.</li> </ul>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>Council expects the provision to be increasingly relevant as the market matures and more products are made available.</p> <p>The intent of the provision aims to lead the transition to low-GWP and encourage innovation in the sector. The draft Harmonisation DCP provision will become more effective as the market grows and the availability of appropriately skilled contractors.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
36	AAPT Group	<p>a. Submitter raises concerns with the requirements of <b>Section 5.4.6 – Natural Refrigerants in Air Conditioning</b> and the safety of the refrigerants available to achieve a Global Warming Potential (GWP) of 10 or less.</p> <p>b. Submitter states that the control would be mandating air-conditioning with hydrocarbons, which are extremely flammable and dangerous.</p> <p>c. Submitter is an industry representative from Queensland and states that there are no compliant air-conditioning systems certified for hydrocarbon use apart from parable standalone systems. Pioneer or Polaris systems are non-compliant and are not used in Queensland.</p> <p>d. Submitter states that the draft DCP control <b>C.01</b> within <b>Section 5.4.6</b> would result in Australian Standard compliant systems that have a GWP of 10 and higher being ‘banned’ or not permitted. <b>C.01</b> would require air-conditioning and refrigeration equipment that are non-compliant with Australian Standards to be delivered in order to achieve the control of a GWP of less than 10. These non-compliant systems pose a serious safety concern and the submitter notes examples of occurrences where air-conditioning equipment has malfunctioned resulting in grievous harm.</p>	<p>See response in No.35.a and No.35.b for more information on strategic context, industry concerns, and technical considerations.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p>See response in No.35.a for more information on strategic context, industry concerns, and technical considerations.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p>See response in No.35.b for information on market availability of air-conditioning and refrigerant equipment supply and ‘market test’ included in the two-part DCP control.</p> <p>Council does not prefer one type of supplier over another and anticipates that there will be a growing number of new products as global suppliers adhere to international protocols. The DCP will not apply in Queensland.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p>See response in No.35.b for information on market availability of air-conditioning and refrigerant equipment supply and ‘market test’ included in the two-part DCP control.</p> <p>All refrigerants have unique hazard properties and when used and handled appropriately can be used safely. In considering the use of alternative refrigerants it is important that they be used in equipment that is fit for purpose. (<a href="#">Safety considerations when using flammable refrigerants - DCCEEW</a>).</p> <p>Safety is of utmost importance and any transition to new systems must be accompanied by rigorous standards, training, and certification processes to ensure the safe handling and operation of refrigeration equipment.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>e. Submitter notes that Queensland is the only state that enforces compliance with Australian Standards, and that CoP Council should consider leading the industry in enforcing compliance.</p> <p>f. Submitter forwarded comments from the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW) regarding new rules on refrigeration and air conditioning equipment. DCCEEW note that these rules are in place to protect the environment, and do not regulate the replacement of the design refrigeration with a lower GWP refrigerant. DCCEEW direct the submitter towards codes of practice, Australian Standards, and state and territory laws that must be followed in any work on this equipment.</p> <p>g. Submitter retorts that non-compliant retrofitting from non-flammable refrigerants to hydrocarbon refrigerants is unregulated in every state except QLD. Affirms that compliance to Australian Standards is required (in line with QLD), stating shopping centre explosions within VIC and SA have occurred as a result of non-compliance.</p>	<p>Comments made by the submitter in relation to air-conditioning, refrigerant installation and work practice are out of scope. A Development Control Plan does not regulate or control work practices such as the installation of air-conditioning or refrigeration equipment. Concerns regarding work practices are managed by SafeWork Australia, the Commonwealth agency responsible for national policy relating to workplace health and safety.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p><i>See response in No.35.b for information on market availability of air-conditioning and refrigerant equipment supply and ‘market test’ included in the two-part DCP control.</i></p> <p>As per response to No.36.e, the management of equipment installation and work practice are out of scope. A Development Control Plan does not regulate or control work practices such as the installation of air-conditioning or refrigeration equipment.</p> <p>These are determined by the <i>Commonwealth Ozone Protection and Synthetic Greenhouse Gas Management Regulations 1995</i>. The proposed control does not contravene this legislation or encourage the non-compliance with Australian Standards.</p> <p>In addition, the draft DCP control (<b>Section 5.4.6 – C.01</b>) relates to “all new air-conditioning and refrigeration equipment” and is not requiring the retrofitting of existing equipment.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
37	Emerson Commercial & Residential Solutions	<p>a. Submitter states the requirements of <b>Section 5.4.6 – Natural Refrigerants in Air Conditioning</b> requiring refrigeration equipment to use refrigerants with a GWP of less than 10 would be a sizable change for the general industry.</p>	<p><i>See response in No.35.a for more information on strategic context, industry concerns, and technical considerations.</i></p> <p><i>See response in No.35.b for information on market availability of air-conditioning and refrigerant equipment supply and ‘market test’ included in the two-part DCP control.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
38		<p>a. Submitter generally supports the DCP.</p>	<p>Submitters general support is noted.</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
	Glaciem Cooling Technologies	<p>b. In relation to <b>Section 5.4.4.4 – Heating Cooling Systems - Heat Rejection</b>, the submitter believes that developers should be required to investigate opportunities for circular economy potential from the use of heat pumps. The purpose of this suggestion is to promote less heat being rejected into the atmosphere and should instead be repurposed for domestic heating of water and other heating needs for further efficiency of wasted heat.</p> <p>c. In relation to <b>Section 5.4.6 – Natural Refrigerants in Air Conditioning</b>, the submitter raises concerns with the effectiveness of the control as it is conditional – i.e. if the equipment can be supplied on similar terms to conventional systems, and at a cost of not more than 10% higher than the market rate for conventional systems – then equipment using refrigerants with a GWP greater than 10 could be delivered. The submitter has concerns that the controls emphasis on the capital cost of equipment (rather than whole of life cost analysis) means that developers will be able to find reasons to not comply with the control (e.g. use high GWP synthetic refrigerants) for a lower capital cost system which has serious greenhouse gas emissions from the inefficient use of the product over life and the effects of leaks of high GWP refrigerants. Developers will easily be able to find lower capital cost equipment that has a high GWP (including those using R404A, for instance or R410A which are currently being phased down).</p>	<p>Council is supportive of the idea to limit heat rejection and recycle energy from air-conditioning systems. This is an emerging field and further research into the application of this technology at scale is yet to be tested. As identified within the submission, the draft Harmonisation DCP provides controls related to heating cooling systems in <b>Section 5.4.4 in Part 5 – Environmental Management</b>. It is noted that the controls do not require the investigation of circular economy potential of heat pumps. Council may take a position on this issue in the future as the technologies evolve but is not currently in a position to include planning controls to guide the use of these technologies.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p><i>See response in No.35.a for more information on strategic context and rationale for the draft control in <b>Section 5.4.6 – Natural Refrigerants in Air Conditioning</b>.</i></p> <p><i>See response in No.35.b for information on market availability of air-conditioning and refrigerant equipment supply and ‘market test’ included in the two-part DCP control.</i></p> <p>The federal government anticipates that there will be a transition to low GWP and highly efficient systems as a result of the regulated phased down of HFCs - <a href="https://www.energy.gov.au/refrigeration">Refrigeration   energy.gov.au</a>. Council is taking a proactive approach in this area to anticipate the transition to low GWP refrigerants and ensure our buildings are built for the future. Council acknowledges that the market for the supply of air conditioning with GWP &lt;10 is very low at this point in time. Council has included a market test with the DCP provision that will become more effective as the low GWP market grows. It is anticipated that there will be some market and industry inertia to begin with but this will subside as HFCs are phased out and low GWP and natural refrigerants take over a greater share of the market.</p> <p>Council is unable to influence the energy efficiency of appliances as this is subject to separate controls under state regulations through the BASIX SEPP. Mandating a higher energy efficient appliance must be met with incentives. The choice of refrigerant is not covered in the energy efficiency calculations for BASIX. Through the proposed control Council can influence the type of refrigerant to work alongside the energy efficiency standards of BASIX to reduce the overall greenhouse gas emission footprint of the system.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
39	Australian Refrigeration Council	<p>a. The submitter raises concerns with the proposed 'law' included in <b>Section 5.4.6 – Natural Refrigerants in Air Conditioning</b>, which requires new air-conditioning and refrigeration equipment to have a Global Warming Potential (GWP) of less than 10.</p>	<p>See response in No.35.a for more information on strategic context and rationale for the draft control in <b>Section 5.4.6 – Natural Refrigerants in Air Conditioning</b>.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>b. Requests more information to better understand the legislative power that influenced the requirement for above mentioned equipment to have a GWP of less than 10, due to national and international implications this may have.</p>	<p>See response in No.35.b for information on enforcement of the DCP, market availability of air-conditioning and refrigerant equipment supply and 'market test' included in the two-part DCP control.</p> <p>Councils are able to create Development Control Plans (DCPs) under the NSW <a href="#">Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</a> (EP+A Act). A DCP provides detailed planning and design guidelines to support the legislated planning controls in the Local Environment Plan (LEP). The provisions within a DCP are not statutory requirements so this provides a level of flexibility in their application.</p> <p>In Australia, the <a href="#">Ozone Protection and Synthetic Greenhouse Gas Management Act 1989</a> informs the federal governments planned transition away from emissions of ozone depleting substances and synthetic greenhouse gases. International agreements that support application of the GWP of 10 or less include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Paris Agreement</li> <li>2. Montreal Protocol + the Kigali amendment</li> </ol> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>c. The submitter raises concern that the DCP controls do not abide by the national <a href="#">Ozone Protection and Synthetic Greenhouse Gas Management Act 1989</a>, which requires proposed greenhouse gases to not be emitted into the atmosphere.</p>	<p><i>Object 3(c) of the <a href="#">Ozone Protection and Synthetic Greenhouse Gas Management Act 1989</a> is to use the best endeavours to encourage Australian industry to:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>(i) replace ozone depleting substances and SGGs; and</i></li> <li><i>(ii) achieve a faster and greater reduction in the levels of production and use of ozone depleting substances and SGGs than are provided for in the Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol;</i></li> </ol> <p><i>to the extent that such replacements and achievements are reasonably possible within the limits imposed by the availability of suitable alternate substances, and appropriate technology and devices.</i></p> <p>The DCP provision is not linked to the Kigali amendment of the Montreal Protocol, but it is complimentary in objectives and aims, including to assist faster and greater reduction to the extent that such replacement and achievements are reasonably possible within the limits imposed by the availability of suitable alternative substances.</p> <p>Australia's HFC phase down has been started in 2018 by the Department of Environment and Energy in light of the Montreal Protocol on the substances that deplete the Ozone layer in 2016. The HFC phase down is</p>



Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>contributing to the Australia 2030 Greenhouse gas emission reduction target and encourage the industries to move to the alternative technologies using the lower or zero GWP and is managed through an annual import quota that will gradually reduce over the 18 years. The end point of the phase –down, 15% of the baseline level, will be reached on 1 January 2036. <a href="#">Hydrofluorocarbon (HFC) phase-down - DCCEEW</a></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonised DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>d. The submitter also raises concerns that the use of proposed equipment will increase the demand of electricity use and that other Councils may implement a similar control. The proposed use of refrigerants are not covered under the Act which encourage poor installation practice, a reduction in energy efficiency and increases energy demand.</p>	<p>Council is unable to influence high energy efficient appliances as this is subject to separate controls under state regulations through the BASIX SEPP. The choice of refrigerant is not covered in the energy efficiency calculations for BASIX. Through the proposed control Council can influence the type of refrigerant to work alongside the energy efficiency standards of BASIX to reduce the overall CO2e impact of the system.</p> <p>The federal government anticipates that there will be a transition to low GWP and highly efficient systems as a result of the regulated phased down of HFCs - <a href="https://www.energy.gov.au/business/equipment-and-technology-guides/refrigeration">https://www.energy.gov.au/business/equipment-and-technology-guides/refrigeration</a>. Natural refrigerants also generally have better thermodynamic properties, enabling more efficient heat transfer and lower energy consumption in the refrigeration cycle.</p> <p>There is a general push to transition away from gas and fossil fuels in all sectors. The electricity grid infrastructure and energy mix are rapidly changing in response to the transition to electrified appliances and buildings. Energy providers, AEMO and the Federal Government are working to ensure that this transition is secure, cost-competitive and reliable.</p> <p><i>Refer to No.36.g for similar response to installation concerns and it is out of scope for the draft Harmonisation DCP.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonised DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>e. The submitter asserts that air-conditioning and refrigeration equipment with a GWP of less than 10 must be handled by a competent and licenced person.</p>	<p><i>See response in No.35.b for response to industry concerns around safety and technical requirements.</i></p> <p><i>Refer to No.36.g for similar response in relation to management of installation and it is out of scope for the Draft Harmonisation DCP.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonised DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>f. The submitter asserts that the types of refrigerants that would need to be used to meet the GWP of 10 or less would impose a significant fire risk, causing safety concerns for future developments as the refrigerants are highly flammable.</p>	<p><i>See response in No.35.b for response to industry concerns around safety and technical requirements for refrigerants.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonised DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
40	LSJ Heritage Planning and Architecture	<p>a. The submitter generally supports the Land Use Planning Harmonisation project in relation to heritage considerations, particularly the addition of the East Epping</p>	<p>Noted. As detailed in <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> and <a href="#">Attachment 4</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2023, <b>Part 7 – Heritage and Archaeology</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP consolidates the general heritage controls and transfers across all Heritage Conservation Areas (HCAs) from the previous five DCPs. The preparation of <b>Part 7</b> was largely administration to ensure a consistent structure was applied to all HCAs and deliver a uniformed</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>Heritage Conservation Character Statement, and incorporation of Table 9.3.12(a) Additional Prescriptive Measures from the Hornsby DCP 2013.</p>	<p>Heritage and Archaeology section of the draft Harmonisation DCP. Consistent with the scope of the Harmonisation project, specific policy and controls from HCAs (for example, the prescriptive measures for East Epping HCA) were contained to protect the unique heritage values of each area.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>b. Submitter comments that provisions for <b>Section 7.10.8 - East Epping Conservation Area</b> for carports to be constructed in traditional materials has been removed. Requests that "Traditional materials such as timber should be used" to be added to <b>C.27</b> of the Draft DCP, and a similar provision to be included in all HCA-specific DCP.</p>	<p>As per response No.40.a, the HCAs from the five DCPs were consolidated into the draft Harmonisation DCP. A consistent template and structure was used to deliver a uniform document. As part of this, Table 9.3.12(a) from the Hornsby DCP were transferred into controls. As part of this process, ‘garages and carports’ which formed one controls from Table 9.3.12(a) was split into two categories: ‘garages’ and ‘carports’:</p> <p><i>Garages</i></p> <p><b>C.25</b> <i>Garages should be located behind the main building line and be separately articulated from the dwelling.</i></p> <p><b>C.26</b> <i>Traditional materials such as timber or face brick should be used.</i></p> <p><i>Carports</i></p> <p><b>C.27</b> <i>Carports should be located behind the main building line and be separately articulated from the dwelling</i></p> <p>As the submitter states, the reference to traditional materials to be used was omitted as part of this transfer process.</p> <p>However, it is noted, that the requirement for development to use traditional materials is included in the general heritage provisions across <b>Section 7.4 – General Provisions</b> (specifically <b>C.40</b> that states ancillary buildings (which includes a garage or carport) should be constructed of lightweight materials such as timber or metal). The controls in <b>Section 7.4</b> apply to all heritage items and HCAs in addition to any prescriptive measures contained within a HCA contained within <b>Section 7.10 – Heritage Conservation Areas</b>. In addition, <b>Section 7.2 – Consent Requirements</b> specifies controls for overall maintenance and integrity of heritage items that requires use of traditional materials. Therefore, adding a specific provision requiring traditional materials to be used for garages and carports within every HCA in <b>Section 7.10</b> is not consider necessary.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>c. Submitter comments that different provisions for the location of garages exist across <b>Part 3 - Residential Development, Part 6 - Traffic and Transport, and Part 7 - Heritage and Archaeology</b>. States that such variations of controls create confusion amongst applicants, and that the location and number of garages should be consistent across all Parts of the Draft DCP. Where relevant, Sections should reference</p>	<p>The draft Harmonisation DCP has taken a theme-based approach to improve functionality and group relevant policies together to assist in the navigation of controls and policies. The draft DCP includes 11 Parts that cover the matters that need to be considered when planning for development.</p> <p>All parts of a DCP are to be read in conjunction with each other to ensure the relevant themes for a site are considered when planning for development. This is common practice for all DCPs – not just the draft Harmonisation DCP. The introduction to each part of the draft Harmonisation DCP provides a direction on which part would prevail in the instance of an inconsistency.</p> <p>Council officers direct the submitter to <b>Section 1.7 - Structure of this Development Control Plan</b> of the draft Harmonised DCP which outlines the relationship and application of the different Parts of the draft Harmonisation</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>to other controls that need to be complied with when developing a building with heritage sensitivities.</p>	<p>DCP and what should be considered when planning for development.</p> <p>Specifically in relation to Heritage planning, the introduction to <b>Part 7 – Heritage and Archaeology</b> states that <i>“Part must be read in conjunction with other relevant controls of this DCP. Should there be any inconsistency between this Section and any other part of this DCP, this Section prevails to the extent of the inconsistency.”</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>d. Submitter requests clarity in provisions for garages within conservation areas to ensure a minimum setback of 1m from the building line, the retention of garden/landscaped settings, and existing development patterns within conservation areas (such as one garage per dwelling, which are never attached to the original dwelling). Submitter comments that tandem garages should only be considered if reflective of the architectural period of the heritage item/area.</p>	<p>As per response No.40.b, the general heritage provisions across <b>Section 7.4 – General Provisions</b> within the draft Harmonised DCP apply to all heritage items and HCAs. Any site located within a HCA would need to apply the general provisions in <b>Section 7.4</b> and the prescriptive measures contained within <b>Section 7.10 – Heritage Conservation Area</b>.</p> <p><b>C.36 – C.40</b> within <b>Section 7.4 – General Provisions</b> contain specific controls relating to garages, carports and other ancillary buildings to provide specific guidance on these types of developments. These specify that a setback of at least 1m from the building line (wall of the house, not the verandah) is required for garages. This control is also supported by <b>Figure 7.4.9</b> and <b>7.4.10</b>.</p> <p><b>C.63 – C.69</b> within <b>Section 7.4 – General Provisions</b> contains specific controls for landscaping and gardens which promote landscaping and retention of garden layouts. In addition, <b>Part 5 – Environmental Management – Section 5.3.4</b> has additional tree preservation controls for heritage items and HCAs to offer increased protection to special areas of the City.</p> <p><b>Section 7.4 – General Provisions</b> in its entirety promotes the retention of original subdivision and development patterns.</p> <p>The management of onsite parking is assessed against <b>Part 6 – Traffic and Transport</b> and in the case of a HCA, the provisions of <b>Part 7 – Heritage and Archaeology</b>. The delivery of garages must consider the fabric and development pattern of the site, and the suitability is assessed on a site-by-site basis to ensure a suitable outcome is achieved. Detailed design to heritage building (tandem garages) will be assessed based on relevant objectives contained within <b>Part 7</b>.</p> <p><b>This intent is captured sufficiently within Part 7, further changes are not considered necessary and would be out of scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP process.</b></p>
		<p>e. Submitter requests that contributory items be included for the <b>Section 7.10.8.1 - East Epping Conservation Area</b>, as identified in the Epping Town Centre Heritage Review (Perumal Murphy, 2013). Suggests that the statement "Contributory items are required to be retained" should be embedded as a general provision within the Heritage Part.</p>	<p>As specified in response No.40,a, the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP is to consolidate existing policy and controls from the five DCPs that currently apply to the City of Parramatta LGA. The controls within each HCA have been transferred across into the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p>Where a current DCP identified contributory items, such as the Parramatta DCP 2011, these have been transferred into the draft Harmonisation DCP. Council is aware not all former DCPs identified contributory items. The identification of contributory items and significant buildings within the HCA is not within the scope of the Harmonisation project.</p> <p>Council officers are considering options for exploring a City wide integrated heritage study, this project is</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>separate to the Harmonisation Project. Council officers are currently in a scoping phase of working out how the study might be completed given resources available. It is expected we may be able to provide more information on the timing and program for the study in the third quarter of 2023. This process could potentially explore the identification and addition of contributory items within HCAs.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>f. Submitter comments that the reference to the Contributory Building Map in <b>Section 7.11 – Glossary</b> is confusing as it refers to the Heritage Technical Manual, which is separate to the Draft DCP. Additionally states that the hierarchy of contributory buildings is unclear as to where these buildings might be located, what they are, and whether specific provisions apply to them.</p>	<p>The Draft Harmonisation DCP contains the following three items within <b>Section 7.11 – Glossary</b>:</p> <p><b>Contributory buildings – Heritage Conservation Area</b></p> <p><b>Contributory buildings map</b> also means ‘heritage map’ and it refers to a map of the heritage conservation area within the City which identifies buildings and sites as being contributory, neutral or non-contributory. Refer to the Contributory Buildings Maps of the Heritage Technical Manual.</p> <p>As part of the consolidation of the five DCPs which apply within the City of Parramatta, it was identified more definitions could be included in the draft Harmonised DCP to provide clarity on certain terms and assist in the application of <b>Part 7 – Heritage and Archaeology</b>. The terms ‘Contributory Buildings’ and ‘Contributory Building Map’ were intended to provide clarity on what is considered a ‘contributory building’.</p> <p>The current terminology used within the different Heritage Conservation DCP sections across the City have slightly different requirements as to what each area considers ‘contributory’. It is also noted that the Heritage Conservation Areas (HCAs) transferred into the draft Harmonisation DCP from the Parramatta DCP 2011 are the only HCAs that map contributory buildings. Therefore, the inclusion of the above definitions does not apply widely to all the HCAs, as only the former Parramatta HCAs map contributory buildings.</p> <p>Upon further consideration it is recognised that the inclusion of these definitions, when contributory buildings are not mapped for all HCAs can be confusing. It is recognised that these definitions must form part of a broader study outside the scope of the Land Use Planning Harmonisation Framework project. This broader work may require mapping of contributory items which are not currently identified, and it is likely this work could form part of a City wide integrated heritage study. Council Officers are currently in a scoping phase of working out how the study might be completed given resources available. It is expected Council may be able to provide more information on the timing and program for the study in the third quarter of 2023.</p> <p>The definition ‘Contributory Buildings’ and ‘Contributory Building Map’ may be incorporated following the completion of the abovementioned broader work therefore it is proposed to remove definitions mentioned above from the draft Harmonisation DCP. This will ensure the definitions within the Glossary are applicable to the current content of the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, the definitions of ‘Contributory Buildings’ and ‘Contributory Building Map’ are proposed to be removed from the draft Harmonisation DCP.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
41	Keylan Consulting Pty Ltd	<p>a. Submitter represents the landowners of the land bound by Parramatta Road, Duke Street, Victoria Street and Albert Street, Granville (the Site). A site specific DCP is currently being prepared by Council and the submitter to support the current LEP controls that apply to the site.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
		<p>b. Submitter states that controls should be more flexible in response to constrained sites such as those fronting a classified road or railway line, and with irregular site configurations.</p> <p>Submitter comments that Council have recently adopted a number of Site-Specific DCPs and the Sydney Central City Planning Panel have approved a number of Das on constrained sites with more flexible controls than those proposed under the Draft DCP. It is noted that these DAs permit above ground parking responses that are contrary to proposed controls within the Draft DCP.</p>	<p>Council is aware that a Site-Specific DCP is currently being prepared for the subject land bound by Parramatta Road, Duke Street, Victoria Street and Albert Street, Granville (the Site). This DCP will resolve specific planning and design objectives and controls specific to the context, site configuration, and site constraints for this site. This is the appropriate planning process to prepare and negotiate planning controls for this site. The intent of the Harmonisation DCP is to introduce policy for the whole LGA, and therefore needs to be suitable for the diverse context of the City.</p> <p>This comment is out of scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project. The intention of the draft DCP is to introduce a consolidated set of controls based on existing policy contained within the five applicable DCPs. A review of the controls to amend the policy direction, application, flexibility, or intent was not within the scope of the project. Furthermore, controls contained within any Site-Specific DCP have been prepared in response to the specific site constraints and planning considerations bespoke to the specific site being planned for. The general controls within a DCP that apply more broadly are unable to accommodate for every unique site context and constraint, which is why Site-Specific DCPs are prepared and used to guide development within specific areas.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>c. Submitter comments that above ground parking (as referenced in <b>Section 6.2</b> of the Draft DCP) should be considered for areas impacted by the rail corridor and classified roads, noting that it is an appropriate design response to mitigate visual and acoustic impacts for such sites. Suggests the removal of <b>C.38</b> and replacing it with the following control:</p> <p><i>The street facades of the podium fronting carparking should be considered in detail with appropriate depth, scale and materiality with the aim of providing passive surveillance and natural ventilation.</i></p>	<p>Comments are out of scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project.</p> <p><i>See response to No.41.b regarding scope of draft Harmonisation DCP.</i></p> <p>In addition, as outlined in <b>Section 6.2 – Parking and Vehicular Access</b>, the benefit of a reduction in above ground parking includes a reduction in visual impact from the public domain. Surface-level parking is most appropriate in residential and industrial areas. Above ground parking can be considered in areas which are prone to flooding and/or heritage and archaeological sites and are designed to minimise (where possible) the visual impact and deliver appropriate integration with the public domain.</p> <p>The Objectives and Controls of <b>Section 6.2</b> and <b>3.5.2.5</b> deliver on this intention; is consistent with existing policy from the former DCPs; and is appropriate within the draft Harmonisation DCP to be implemented across the City.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>d. Submitter states that, whilst not opposed to the intent of <b>O.02</b> and <b>C.06</b> of <b>Section 3.5.2.5 – Parking Design and Vehicular Access</b> relating to development for shop top housing and mixed-use development, both should specifically allow for aboveground parking for mixed use development.</p>	
		<p>e. In relation to rear setbacks for within the B4 zone of Granville Town Centre, in <b>C.09.b</b> of <b>Section 8.2.3.1 - Granville Town Centre</b>, the submitter states that development potential and feasibility on a constrained site (particularly a narrow width) is limited.</p>	<p>Comments are out of scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project.  <i>See response to No.41.b regarding scope of draft Harmonisation DCP.</i>                      As explained within <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2023, existing site-specific controls for precincts located within the City (including Granville) will be retained in the consolidated DCP. The current precinct controls for the Granville Town Centre are retained and are being reviewed as part of work to implement the Parramatta Road Urban Transformation Strategy.  <b>Amendments to the existing precinct controls are out of scope of the project and therefore no changes to the draft DCP Harmonisation are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>f. Submitter recommends that constrained sites should have a lower setback, including where adjacent sites are of a lower height and upper-level separation distances are not required. Submitter states that the Apartment Design Guideline (ADG) allows for a separation distance of 12m between habitable rooms for buildings up to 4 storeys in height.</p>	<p>Comments are out of scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project.  <i>See response to No.41.b regarding scope of draft Harmonisation DCP.</i>                      The intent of the Harmonisation DCP is to introduce policy for the whole LGA, and therefore needs to be suitable for the diverse context of the City the controls in the Harmonisation DCP are appropriate in this context.                      Whilst this comment is out of scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP Project, it is important to acknowledge that a DCP can take precedence over the ADG in certain planning considerations.  <i>Clause 6A</i> (Development control plans cannot be inconsistent with Apartment Design Guide) nominates 8 areas in Part 3 and 4 of the ADG where the ADG has precedence over any DCP. These include 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.  <i>Clause 6A</i> says that ‘if a DCP contains provisions that specify requirements, standards or controls in relation to a matter to which this clause applies, these provisions are of no effect’. Therefore, a DCP can take precedence in all areas other than the 8 nominated areas of the ADG listed above.                      This means a DCP can take precedence in areas such as <b>building separation</b>, deep soil, streetscape, and floor to floor heights.  <b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>g. In relation to front setbacks, the submitter generally supports a 3m tower setback, however they do not support 2m for internal tower setbacks within a site. States that there are no discernible benefits of internal tower setbacks for constrained sites.</p>	<p>Comments are out of scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project.  <i>See response to No.41.b regarding scope of draft Harmonisation DCP.</i>  <b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>h. In relation to deep soil setbacks within <b>C.02 of Section 3.5.2.4 – Open Space and Landscape</b> relating to deep soil requirements for shop top housing and mixed-use development adjoining residential development or a residential zone, the submitter highlights multiple Sydney Central City Planning Panel recommendations with no or limited deep soil due to their site restraints. States that the DCP should follow this precedence for restrained sites. States that <b>C.17 of Section 8.2.3.1 – Granville Town Centre</b>, is more onerous than the 7% requirement of the ADG. Recommends that this requirement be carried over into the Draft DCP.</p>	<p>Comments are out of scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project.  <i>See response to No.41.b, and No.41.e regarding scope of draft Harmonisation DCP.</i>  <i>See response to No.41.f regarding the interrelationship of the ADG and a DCP.</i>  <b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>i. The following issues related to setbacks are requested changes to align the Draft DCP with their submitted SSDCP. Submitter comments that front setbacks for podiums and towers to Parramatta Road within <b>Section 8.2.3.1 – Granville Town Centre, C.08</b> should be reflected within their SSDCP (as opposed to the current 6m setback). States that this is appropriate to increase separation, privacy and deep soil planting opportunities for residents to the north, and that the Granville and Auburn Transport Study 2022 does not identify the need for a 6m setback along Parramatta Road.</p>	<p>Comments are out of scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project.  <i>See response to No.41.b, and No.41.e regarding scope of draft Harmonisation DCP.</i>  <b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>j. Comments that proposed requirements for ceiling heights to be aligned with <i>Clause 6A</i> of SEPP 65, and to include provisions enabling the use of wintergardens on highly constrained sites such as those exposed to significant road and rail noise.</p> <p>k. Supports landscaping requirements (<b>C.20, Section 8.2.3.1 – Granville Town Centre</b>), car parking requirements (<b>Table 6.3.1 – Minimum car parking rates and 6.3.2 – Car parking rates for the Granville and Harris Park Town Centres</b>), and building lengths (<b>Section 3.5.1.3 – Streetscape and Building Address, C.05</b>), requesting that this is reflected in their SSDCP.</p>	<p>Comments are out of scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project.  <i>See response to No.41.a, No.41.b, and No.41.e regarding scope of draft Harmonisation DCP.</i>  <i>See response to No.41.f regarding the interrelationship of the ADG and a DCP.</i> In addition, <i>Clause 30</i> states that Council must not use unit area, carparking or ceiling height to refuse an application if it meets ADG minimums for these. These are the ‘non-discretionary standards’; therefore, irrespective of what is contained within the DCP in relation to floor to ceiling heights, the ADG will be used for this component of the assessment process.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p>Comments are out of scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project.  <i>See response to No.41.a, No.41.b, and No.41.e regarding scope of draft Harmonisation DCP.</i></p> <p>The preparation of the Site-Specific DCP will resolve specific planning and design objectives and controls specific to the context, site configuration, and site constraints for the land bound by Parramatta Road, Duke Street, Victoria Street and Albert Street, Granville. This is the appropriate planning process to prepare and negotiate planning controls for this site.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
42	<b>Think Planners</b>	<p>a. Submitter comments that an expanded index would be beneficial for navigating the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p>b. Submitter requests that the 100sqm private open space requirement (<b>C.03 of Section 3.3.1.4 - Open Space and Landscape</b> for dwelling houses, secondary dwellings, and dual occupancies) apply to the principal lot for dual occupancies, providing 50sqm to each dwelling.</p> <p>c. Submitter asserts that 50sqm presents as a logical transition for private open space across the different residential accommodation permitted under the DCP (i.e. ground floor of a residential flat building is 15sqm; town house development is 40sqm; dwelling in dual occupancy development is 50sqm; and dwelling house</p>	<p>The submitter’s request for an index within the draft Harmonisation DCP is acknowledged and will be investigated as part of a future review of the finalised DCP.</p> <p><i>See response to No.25.c in relation to the suitability of 100sqm per dwelling within a dual occupancy development.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>



Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		100sqm).	
		d. Submitter states that the planning controls for townhouses in <b>Section 3.4 – Multi-Dwelling Housing</b> of the draft DCP do not deliver a high yield for applicants which is why many R3 sites across the City have not been redeveloped for this land use.	Land use permissibility, density and built form (i.e. zoning, height and floorspace ratio) is managed under the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i> and is outside of the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project. Council consulted with the community on land use planning matters as part of the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a> in 2019, and the <a href="#">Harmonisation Planning Proposal</a> (i.e. draft Harmonisation LEP) in 2020. These two consultation processes were the opportunity for the community to provide feedback on land use and built form controls permissibility.
		e. Submitter generally supports the 11m HOB and 0.6:1 FSR controls for R3 zoned land across the City, but notes that these limit the development potential for townhouses.	It is noted that the Department of Planning and Environment during the finalisation of the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i> (which came into effect on 2 March 2023) did not support the standardisation of FSR and height controls for R3 zoned land (which Council proposed to introduce as 0.6:1 and 11m respectively under the Harmonisation Planning Proposal). More information can be found on the Land Use <a href="#">Planning Harmonisation Framework webpage</a> .  <b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b>
		f. Submitter requests that <b>C.03</b> within <b>Section 3.4.1.2 – Preliminary Building Envelope</b> relating to townhouses be amended to permit 2 storeys for townhouse development that does not directly front a public street, rather than the single storey plus attic that is currently permitted via the draft DCP. The submitter states that the attic form restricts amenity.	<i>See response to No.25.d in relation to the number of storeys for townhouse development not frontage a street.</i>  <b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b>
		g. Submitter requests the removal of the 9m building separation requirement contained in <b>C.01</b> within <b>Section 3.4.1.3 – Building Separation</b> relating to townhouses, stating that this should be merit-based.	The requirement of C.01 within 3.4.1.3 Building Separation within the draft DCP that requires a 9m building separation has been carried over from the Parramatta DCP 2011 and further refined following additional detailed design testing aimed at supporting good design outcomes (such as those for site layout, building orientation and elevations and storage) for multi-dwelling housing as directed by the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a> and as explained in <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to the Council Report from 28 November 2023.  The 9m building separation on site between dwellings where habitable rooms face habitable rooms is consistent with the scope and intention of the harmonisation process and is considered to deliver adequate privacy, access to light, air and outlook for the occupants of the proposed development, neighbouring properties and future buildings. In addition, a 9m separation helps ensure development does not prejudice the redevelopment of adjoining sites in the future.  <b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>h. Submitter requests <b>C.03</b> within <b>Section 3.4.1.5 – Open Space and Landscape</b> relating to townhouses to be amended to only require 30sqm of private open space (with minimum dimensions of 4m) instead of 40sqm (with minimum dimensions of 5m).</p> <p>i. Submitter provides comment in relation to <b>Section 4.6 – Centre-based Child Care Facilities</b>, requesting the reduction of parking spaces for childcare centres within 800m of a station or light rail stop to 1 space per 10 visitors and 1 per 2 staff, consistent with the NSW Childcare Planning Guidelines (CCPG) for sites within proximity of railway stations, stating that Cumberland City Council have taken this approach.</p>	<p><i>See response to No.42.g regarding further additional design testing carried out to support good design outcomes.</i></p> <p>The current control requires a minimum of 40sqm of private open space with minimum dimensions of 5m for each dwelling within a town house development. The further detail design testing indicated that this amount and configuration of open space will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ensure private open space provides residents with quality usable private outdoor living areas for recreational and outdoor activities.</li> <li>• ensure private open space is designed to maximise solar access and be well integrated with living areas.</li> <li>• Maintain privacy to the occupants of adjacent dwellings and within the proposed development.</li> <li>• Provide quality private open space in terms of its outlook, orientation, relationship to the dwelling, size and shape and its enclosure and landscape treatment.</li> </ul> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p>The design of centre based childcare facilities is guided by multiple Environmental Planning Instruments (EPIs) including <a href="#">State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021</a> - Chapter 3 - Educational establishments and childcare facilities (Transport and Infrastructure SEPP) and a Development Control Plan. The interrelationship between these EPIs (and what controls take precedence) is specified within the Transport and Infrastructure SEPP. The design and planning provisions within the Transport and Infrastructure SEPP take precedence over those contained within a DCP “<i>other than those concerning building height, side and rear setbacks or car parking rates</i>”.</p> <p>In other words, the building height, side and rear setbacks, and car parking rates within a DCP take precedence during development assessment to any controls relating to these planning considerations within the Transport and Infrastructure SEPP (which applies, and gives weighting to, the NSW Childcare Planning Guidelines (CCPG)).</p> <p>As explained in <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2023, the provisions for childcare centres facilities within the draft Harmonisation DCP largely retain the existing approach from the Parramatta DCP 2011 with updates from Auburn DCP and the Holroyd DCP to deliver improved landscape setback and parking design controls.</p> <p>Whilst the CCPG contains provisions regarding carparking, due to the SEPP enabling a DCP to take precedence in relation to carparking, consistency with the CCPG is not required. The car parking provisions contained within the draft Harmonisation DCP have been selected to ensure that safe and convenient car parking arrangements for child care facilities are provided and avoid adverse traffic and on-street parking impacts on the surrounding neighbourhood.</p> <p>However, the draft Harmonisation DCP includes <b>C.11</b> within <b>Section 4.6</b> in the event there are specific site</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>considerations that require a variation to the carparking rates. <b>C.11</b> states:</p> <p><i>Any variation to the minimum parking requirement, is to be justified by a traffic and transport impact assessment. The assessment must demonstrate that the proposed parking provision will not result in any adverse impacts on on-street parking in surrounding residential areas or any loss of amenity for users of the childcare centre.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, and the flexibility permitted via C.11, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>j. Submitter provides comment in relation to <b>Table 4.8.1 – Development provisions for childcare facilities</b> within <b>Section 4.6 – Centre-based Child Care Facilities</b>, stating that the requirement for any structures greater than 1.8m to be setback 2m is excessive.</p> <p>The submitter states it should be altered to state the building is to be setback 2m from side boundaries; and any acoustic barriers should be assessed on merit or otherwise barriers greater than 2.1m be setback 1m behind landscaping to provide visual relief and screening.</p>	<p>See response to No.42.i regarding the preparation of childcare provisions within the draft Harmonisation DCP and the interrelationship between the Transport and Infrastructure SEPP and a DCP.</p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP includes updated setback controls specific to each land use zone where childcare centres are permissible (i.e. R2, R3, R4 and business zones). These have been prepared to ensure proposals for new and enlarged childcare facilities respond positively to their context and setting.</p> <p>In R2 and R3 zones, the draft Harmonisation DCP requires the following side setback:</p> <p><i>Any structures greater than 1.8 metres in height (including acoustic barriers) are to be setback at least 2 metres from side boundaries. This setback is to incorporate a minimum 1 metre densely landscaped setback, comprising trees and shrubs and cannot be included in the total outdoor play space area required for unencumbered outdoor play space.</i></p> <p>The control as currently drafted assists in minimising the impacts on the amenity of the surrounding neighbourhood; and in ensuring childcare building forms are compatible with the character of existing surrounding residential development. Reducing the side setback to 1m for acoustic barriers greater than 2.1m as suggested by the submitter would visually encroach on adjacent properties, impact on solar access, limit opportunity for significant landscaping and tree planting, and reduce side egress.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>k. Submitter provides comment in relation to <b>Section 4.6 – Centre-based Child Care Facilities</b>, stating that the one storey and play area limitation to ground floor only be removed and be subject to merit assessment under the NSW Childcare Planning Guidelines. This is because the context of a particular site- i.e., a corner site, or a site with interface to a park/reserve/school has a different context, and on those sites, a first-floor play area</p>	<p>See response to No.42.i regarding the preparation of childcare provisions within the draft Harmonisation DCP and the interrelationship between the Transport and Infrastructure SEPP and a DCP.</p> <p>Response 42.j above describes why Council Officers consider that childcare centres should be limited to single storey structures</p> <p>Whilst the CCPG contains provisions regarding play spaces, due to the DCP height provision of one storey (which the SEPP enables to take precedence), there is no opportunity for play spaces to be delivered anywhere other than the ground floor. The provision of play spaces on the ground floor ensures the necessary access, shading, privacy, and noise attenuation measures can be implemented to manage the operation of this land use within low density areas.</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>may be suitable.</p> <p>The submitter also notes that the NSW Childcare Planning Guidelines discourages first floor play areas within the R2 zone unless good design is demonstrated. Therefore, the DCP should remove <b>C.02 of Section 4.6</b> to be consistent.</p>	<p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>i. Submitter states they are not aware of Sydney Water providing sewage treatment plants that provide a non-drinking water supply which require dual reticulation systems to connect to for areas outside of the Parramatta CBD. Therefore, requests requirement for dual reticulation system requirement is not proceeded with for rest of LGA. The submission is related to <b>C.12</b> within <b>Section 5.4.2 – Water Efficiency</b>.</p>	<p>As explained in <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2023, new objectives have been proposed to increase resilience and water security by requiring an alternative water supply to buildings, and by reducing barriers to connecting to future non-drinking water supply infrastructure. Controls have also been strengthened building on existing Parramatta DCP 2011 controls, and controls from the Parramatta City Centre DCP.</p> <p>The planning and delivery of sewerage and water infrastructure are managed by Sydney Water. Sydney water have advised Council that they are supportive of Council introducing dual reticulation systems in growth precincts in the LGA as they continue to look at how recycled water can be managed and this would help future-proof buildings to enable an efficient and non-costly transition to an alternative water supply when available in the future.</p> <p>The controls contained in the draft Harmonisation DCP regarding dual reticulation pipping allow for a change-over to an alternative water supply in the future which can be achieved without significant civil or building work, disruption or cost. The intent of the control is to reduce the technical and financial barriers in upgrading buildings to connect to future non-drinking water supply infrastructure and are considered necessary in promoting water security and resilience.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
43 J	Epping Civic Trust	<p>a. The submitter, the Epping Civic Trust represents residents in Epping and has prepared two detailed submissions covering several planning matters with a particular focus on tree and vegetation preservation and management.</p> <p>It is noted that one of the submissions was received prior to the exhibition of the draft DCP, which provided detailed recommendations on tree and vegetation controls. The second submission was received during the exhibition period of the draft DCP following a review of the draft DCP.</p>	Noted.

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>b. The Trust notes that trees within the LGA should be recognised as <i>intergenerational assets</i> and must be protected and viewed as a collective rather than individually. The Trust recommends that the draft Harmonisation DCP place greater emphasis on tree canopy and tree preservation identifying that this is an integral element of the City’s urban and social fabric.</p>	<p>Council recognises the importance of trees within the City. Council’s prioritisation of tree canopy and tree preservation is outlined in existing strategic documents, including the Parramatta <a href="#">Local Strategic Planning Statement</a> (LSPS), the <a href="#">Environmental Sustainability Strategy 2017</a> (featured in Urban Forest action) and as seen on Council’s <a href="#">Trees</a> webpage.</p> <p>The objectives <b>O.01 - O.08</b> of <b>Section 5.3.4 – Tree and Vegetation Preservation</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP identify the value of trees within the City, and specifically recognise the need to conserve trees of ecological, heritage, aesthetic and cultural significance. They also recognise the need to protect and manage individual and stands of trees as an important community asset.</p> <p>Further work on tree canopy and tree preservation will be subject to and delivered via future tree protection strategies, as detailed in the <a href="#">Council meeting on 26 April 2022 (Item 12.5)</a>. Council’s City Strategy team are currently reviewing the <a href="#">Environmental Sustainability Strategy 2017</a> and are in the process of developing an Urban Canopy Plan. These documents will work in unison to protect and improve the tree canopy of Parramatta.</p> <p><b>It is considered that the draft Harmonisation DCP and broader strategic framework in association with trees recognises the importance of trees in the City’s urban and social fabric. For the above reasons, no changes to the draft DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>c. Requests an update of DCP provisions to align with current legislation and the Vegetation SEPP.</p>	<p>As recommended in the <i>Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</i> (Discussion Paper), the draft Harmonisation DCP’s provisions have been updated in accordance with current legislation. Since the preparation of the <a href="#">Discussion Paper</a>, <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Vegetation in Non Rural Areas) 2017</i> was repealed by <a href="#">State Environmental Planning Policy (Biodiversity and Conservation) 2021</a>. These legislation references have been updated throughout the draft Harmonisation DCP to ensure accuracy. For more information on changes to the DCP to align with new legislation, please refer to <a href="#">Attachment 2 – Summary of Draft DCP and Response to Discussion Paper Recommendations</a>.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p><b>LEP Matters</b></p>	
		<p>d. The submitter notes that there is no E2 Commercial Centre zoned land in Epping under the Parramatta LEP 2023 and encourages further uptake of this land use zone to promote significant commercial development in Epping, to provide jobs for the future population due to increasing density.</p>	<p>Land use zoning is stipulated through the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i> and is outside of the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project.</p> <p>The primary function of the draft Harmonisation DCP is to support the implementation of the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i>. The draft DCP provides design guidance for the land uses permitted with consent in the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i>. Further information about how the DCP and LEP work together can be accessed via <a href="#">Planning Information Sheet</a>.</p> <p>In the City of Parramatta, the E2 Commercial Centre zone is only found in the Parramatta City Centre. Which is the Western CBD of Sydney. The key feature of this zoning is that residential development is not permitted in this zone.</p> <p>Epping is a strategic centre and the objectives for these category of centres is to provide a mix of housing and jobs. Increasing use of the E2 zoning would necessitate a reduction in residential development permitted which</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>would be unlikely to be supported by the State Government. The E1 Local Centre Zoning is more appropriate for the Epping centre.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		e. Submitter supports the minimum land size of 550sqm for subdivision, noting that owners of smaller lot sizes would remove trees to meet lot size requirements.	<p>Submitter’s support for the minimum land size of 550m2 for subdivision is noted.</p> <p><b>No changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		f. Submitter supports the retention of the Old Epping Bowling Club Site as RE1 in the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i> as the Trust considers it essential public recreation for the intense population increase as a result of nearby high-rise development.	<p>The submitter’s support for the retention of the zoning for 725 Blaxland Road (known as the former Epping Bowling Club site) is noted.</p> <p>The site is currently zoned RE1 Public Recreation and identified within the Land Reservation Acquisition Map (LRA map) under the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i>. Its annotation in the LRA map indicate that it can be acquired by Council for Local Open Space. These planning controls were carried over from the <i>Hornsby LEP 2013</i> as part of the Harmonisation LEP process.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<b>Tree Management and Removal (Private Land)</b>	
		g. The submitter raises concern regarding the definition of a tree in the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i> . The Trust states that using height as the sole criteria for the definition of a tree is limiting and will allow many trees to be removed.	<p>There is no definition of a tree in the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i>.</p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP in the Glossary of <b>Section 5.3.4 – Tree and Vegetation Preservation</b> includes the following definition of a tree:</p> <p><b><i>Tree is a long-lived woody perennial plant with one or relatively few main stems with the potential to grow to a height greater than 3 metres (Australian Standard AS 4373-2007 “Pruning of amenity trees”).</i></b></p>
		h. The submitter comments that the current criteria for trees that require council approval for removal is inadequate.	<p>This definition is from the Australian Standards and is commonly used (including within the <i>Hornsby DCP 2013</i>).</p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP in <a href="#">Section 5.3.4 – Tree and Vegetation Preservation</a> requires written consent (via Development Application or Tree Permit Application) for works (pruning or removal) to the following;</p>
		i. The submitter suggests incorporating a combination of height (> 4m), trunk diameter (0.45m at 0.3m height), and canopy spread (over 3m) to define a tree and points towards other councils’ methods as a more inclusive criterion.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. A tree or palm with a height equal to or exceeding five metres.</b></li> <li><b>2. 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):</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <i>that is or forms part of a heritage item, or that is within a heritage conservation area (existing in PDCP 2011),</i></li> <li>b. <i>that is located within a <b>Special Character Area</b> as defined by this DCP (added as part of Harmonisation process).</i></li> </ol> </li> </ol>
		j. The Submitter recommends amending the definition of a tree to reduce the height criteria to 3m minimum.	

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p><i>c. Vegetation on land identified as ‘Biodiversity’ on the Parramatta LEP 2023 Natural Resources Map.</i></p> <p><i>NOTE: The above two tree controls have been included above in response to the submitter as these relate to trees on privately owned land and the most relevant to the submitter’s concerns about tree removal. However, it is noted that the draft DCP also includes controls relating to trees on public land (including land mapped as high sensitivity on the Aboriginal sensitivity map).</i></p> <p>Council officers reviewed the possibility of including a canopy spread and trunk diameter as part of the above controls. However, it was determined that the controls would be difficult to apply as they are difficult to measure and monitor; create confusion within the community; and deliver a more onerous control with little benefit as protecting trees with a minimum canopy spread/trunk width when under 5 metres has a minimal contribution to canopy cover. In addition, a height only threshold can be administered consistently as height is captured by survey plans and communicated easily to the public. More detail on the formulation of these thresholds is contained within <a href="#">Attachment 2 – Summary of Draft DCP and Response to Discussion Paper Recommendations</a> and <a href="#">Attachment 3 – Key Policy Matters</a> to the Council report of 28 November 2022.</p> <p>In summary, the submitter’s request to consider diameter was investigated during the preparation of the draft controls and were not considered suitable. The definition of a tree does include a 3 metre height. However as explained above, the draft harmonisation DCP then details what trees will be protected. Council has applied protections for trees of 3m in sensitive areas.</p> <p>The draft controls have been developed to strike a balance between allowing new development and preserving the well-established tree coverage to protect amenity, canopy coverage, character and liveability of neighbourhoods. The proposed controls also considered the practicality and interpretation of the controls, which will assist in managing compliance and community expectations around preservation. In addition, the draft controls respond to learnings from previous approaches to tree management from the last decade (i.e. the strict and conservative controls in 2011 vs less restrictive controls in 2015) to deliver a well-considered, practical framework.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>k. Submitter suggests an increase in monitoring of compliance with tree replacement, with a review of the Offset Program to ensure enforcement, and the provision of a list of recommended tree species for residents within the LGA. Cites Ryde Council’s Tree Planting List as an example of good practice.</p>	<p>In instances where Council does consent to tree removal, tree replacement is conditioned as part of consent where possible. Applicants must wholly comply with conditions of consent as per their DA approval. Regarding compliance, as per the <a href="#">Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</a>, post-consent certificates (construction and occupation certificates) are only issued subject to the fulfilment of the conditions of consent outlined in the DA determination.</p> <p>Control <b>C.03</b> contained in <b>Section 5.3.4 - Tree and Vegetation Preservation</b> details an Offset Program that makes provisions in events where trees cannot be replaced due to site or design constraints (e.g. small townhouse courtyard). In this case, Council will collect a financial fee to source a suitable tree, location (on public land) and provide 6 months maintenance to ensure the tree grows healthily and to maturity. Furthermore, conditions of consent will be attached to the replacement tree planting to ensure enforcement. <i>See response to submission No.43.m below for more information regarding offset tree planting.</i></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>The list of appropriate tree species for planting (<b>Table 5.3.1.1 – Endemic species to be considered in planting in the City of Parramatta</b> contained in <b>Section 5.3.1 – Biodiversity</b>) has been updated following a review of the species contained and their suitability subsequent to the boundary adjustments following the Proclamation of the City of Parramatta in 2016. 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 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.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>l. Submitter requests Council provide further clarity and transparency regarding how trees are planted and maintained.</p>	<p>As explained within <a href="#">Attachment 2</a>, the management of existing trees and the planting of new trees are managed across multiple parts of the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p><b>Section 2.7 – Open Space and Landscaping</b> includes 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 and landscaping with new development. Approved landscape plans will also specify any new vegetation which must be planted, conditions of consent could also provide additional requirements for tree planting and maintenance. This approach also creates a link to the Tree Preservation controls and reinforces requirements the applicant must satisfy.</p> <p><b>Section 5.3.4 – Tree and Vegetation Preservation</b> contains controls relating to an Offset Program (<b>C.03</b>). Where a tree is approved to be removed, Council will seek the replanting of a suitable canopy replacement tree or trees in a suitable location on the site. Any replacement trees will need to be grown to maturity and replaced if the planting fails to survive and thrive.</p> <p>Should the submitter seek further clarification, landscaping and tree controls are explained within <a href="#">Attachment 2 – Summary of Draft DCP and Response to Discussion Paper Recommendations</a>.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>m. Submitter also requests clarity on what the offset fees will be used for as stated in <b>C.03</b> within <b>Section 5.3.4 – Tree and Vegetation Preservation</b>, and additional information regarding how the offset policy will be used to ensure tree canopy is maintained.</p>	<p>In accordance with the draft Harmonisation DCP and <a href="#">State Environmental Planning Policy (Biodiversity and Conservation) 2021</a>, Council's preference is to retain canopy trees on private land to protect the City's urban forest cover and ensure trees are retained to reach maturity. As explained in response to <i>submission No.43.1 and No.43.aa</i>, Landscape Plans need to demonstrate how established trees have been integrated and protected in relation to the development.</p> <p>In instances where trees are unable to be retained due to site constraints, Council will seek the replanting of a suitable canopy replacement tree or trees in a suitable location on the site. Any replacement trees will need to be grown to maturity and replaced if the planting fails to survive and thrive.</p>



Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>Council recognises that there are instances trees are unable to be retained on site or suitable new trees cannot be replanted on site due to site or design constraints. In these instances Council will seek a financial contribution to be paid to support public tree planting. Offset fees are contained within <a href="#">Council’s published fees and charges</a>.</p> <p>The Offset Program aims to ensure canopy trees continue to be planted in the event trees need to be removed as part of the tree permit application process. In the event the replanting of a tree on site is unsuitable, the financial contribution collected from the Offset Program are used specifically to fund and support public tree planting within the areas where they were removed including sourcing the tree and 6 months maintenance.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>n. Recommends a provision to retain dead trees as habitat for native fauna in areas of bushland and reserves.</p>	<p>In line with Council’s <a href="#">Community Strategic Plan 2018-2038</a> and <a href="#">Environmental Sustainability Strategy 2017</a>, the following objective was added to <b>Section 5.3.4 – Trees and Vegetation Preservation</b> to help achieve Council’s green targets: <i>"O.08 Protect native fauna habitat."</i></p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP controls built on the recommendations of the Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper, see <a href="#">Attachment 2 – Summary of Draft DCP and Response to Discussion Paper Recommendations</a> (i.e. the Parramatta and Hornsby DCP controls which provide stronger tree preservation controls), and retained provisions relating to dead trees as habitat for native fauna in <b>C.07</b> and <b>C.12</b> of <b>Section 5.3.4 – Tree and Vegetation Preservation</b>. Specifically, if a tree that is dead or dying but provides habitat to native animals and is not posing a risk to human life or property, it does not warrant removal or pruning.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary as this request has already been fulfilled.</b></p>
		<p><b>Street Tree Policy (Council Land)</b></p> <p>o. Submitter expresses concern for species selection in defining a streetscape (particularly within HCAs where it might be more appropriate to provide a limited number of species).</p>	<p>The list of appropriate tree species for planting (<b>Table 5.3.1.1 – Endemic species to be considered in planting in the City of Parramatta</b> contained in <b>Section 5.3.1 – Biodiversity</b>) has been updated following a review of the species contained and their suitability subsequent to the boundary adjustments following the Proclamation of the City of Parramatta in 2016. See <i>response to submission No.43.k for more information regarding list of appropriate tree species for planting</i>.</p> <p>Currently Council has multiple teams with tree planting programs, each program has specific installation requirements, standards and contracted installation maintenance periods. Council’s programs consider the context to determine the appropriate trees are planted and maintenance provided.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>p. Submitter expresses concern for the location of new street tree plantings.</p>	<p>The location of new tree plantings are informed by Council arborist, following a review of the site, an appropriate location and tree species is selected, as seen in Council’s <a href="#">Tree Planting Program</a> and <a href="#">2022 Greening Parramatta scheme</a>.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>q. Submitter expresses concern for adherence to street tree protection zone policy within DA approvals, and Council checks before development construction.</p>	<p>Any necessary Tree Protection Zones (TPZ) must be clearly marked on plans lodged to support Development Applications. A Tree Protection Plan which generally are required to accompany an application that Includes the protection of a tree will demonstrate the methodology as to how the retained trees will be protected during demolition and construction. Submitted plans are an integral part of the development consent, approved plans are stamped by Council and alongside the development consent conditions must be complied with as a legal requirement through the provisions of the <a href="#">Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</a>.</p> <p><i>See response to submission No.43.k for more information regarding the compliance with DA conditions of consent and response to submission No.43.aa for plan details required for landscaping and tree protection.</i></p> <p>The <a href="#">Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</a> (the Act) establishes the development procedures in NSW, this includes processes to ensure development is in accordance to the development consent. The Act stipulates the requirement of an appointment of a Principal Certifier who must ensure the conditions of the development consent have been complied with. Members of the public may file a complaint to Council if requirements of development consents have not been complied with.</p> <p>Please see Council's <i>Building Compliance Policy</i> on Council's <a href="#">website</a> for more information.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>r. Submitter expresses concern for care of new trees (suggesting the use of 4 robust stakes and protection measures, particularly within the commercial core).</p>	<p>The recommendation for general landscaping controls within the <a href="#">Discussion Paper</a> (page 95) states that technical specifications for landscaping design and construction in the DCP (such as pot sizes, tree stock standards, certification of completed works and maintenance works) are not considered necessary as many of these overlap with Australian Standards and are addressed through special conditions of consent (page 95).</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>s. Submitter recommends an investigation of an Urban Forest Management Register and substantial update of the Parramatta Street Tree Plan 2011 with a trial within the Epping/Eastwood area of the LGA.</p>	<p>Council is in the process of developing an Urban Canopy Plan. This document will establish Council's vision for the urban canopy and recommend a range of actions to protect and improve canopy in both the public and private domain. It is anticipated that existing tree related plans, strategies and policies will be reviewed and updated to ensure consistency with the Urban Canopy Plan. This review may lead to the creation of additional plans/strategies/policies to address any identified gaps or shortcomings of current documents of which a forest management register may be one. <i>Please see response to submission No.43.al for more Information regarding further work on tree canopy strategies.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p><b>New Street Tree Planting Location</b></p>	
		<p>t. Submitter raises concerns that the outsourcing of labour for street tree planting has resulted in inappropriate planting locations, either too close to or under an existing tree, leaving gaps in areas that</p>	<p>Currently Council has multiple teams with tree planting programs that including Natural Resources (Bushland, Greening Parramatta, Parramatta Light Rail Tree Planting) Capital works, the Property and Place teams, the Public tree replenishment program, and the East Epping heritage precinct grant. Each program has differing installation requirements, standards and contracted installation maintenance periods. The Council is working on</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		need shading.	<p>minimum standards documentation that will be applied across all future projects to increase the quality of the assets installed and then ensure assets receive appropriate maintenance by Council.</p> <p><i>See response in No.43.p for more information regarding the location selection of tree, and No.43.r for more information on technical specifications for landscaping design and construction within the DCP.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		u. Submitter recommends Council develop a policy to ensure street tree plantings are located in the best and most appropriate areas whilst providing contractors with a reliable point of reference.	
		v. Submitter recommends Council allocate dedicated in-house staff to provide maintenance for new street tree plantings.	
		w. Submitter comments that contractors do not comply with set rules. Recommends the development of a structured and mapped tree planting program over a minimum 5 year period (informed by resident consultation, species selection, traffic visibility, overhead wires, underground plumbing, location of existing trees), which contractors should adhere to.	
		x. Submitter suggests continuation of the Tree Champion program with renewed promotion efforts.	<p>The 2022 Tree Champion program will not be extended. However, the community were welcome to participate in Council's 2023 round of Tree Champions as part of our Parramatta Light Rail tree planting program. As part of Council's ongoing commitment to the delivery of tree targets within the City, this initiative will again be evaluated to determine its ongoing roll out following the completion of the Parramatta Light Rail project.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<b>Street Tree Planting (Heritage Conservation Areas)</b>	
		y. Submitter comments on the need for a proactive replanting strategy (possibly funded by heritage grants) for heritage streets which have experienced a loss of trees, including monitoring and maintenance of new planted trees and removal and replacement of dead trees. Selection of tree species should be consistent with HCA streetscape pattern.	<p>The use of the City of Parramatta Local Heritage Fund to replace privately owned trees in heritage streets is supported by the <a href="#">City of Parramatta Local Heritage Fund Guidelines 2022-23</a>. However, the aim of the fund is to encourage appropriate conservation work for privately owned heritage properties in the City, rather than any tree planting on public Council streets or for any other Council activities.</p> <p>The objectives <b>O.01 - O.08</b> of <b>Section 5.3.4 – Tree and Vegetation Preservation</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP identify the value of trees and the need to protect and manage trees (both those of public and private land) as an important community asset. <b>C.01</b> requires consent for any works for any tree located on public land (irrespective of size), unless the works are carried out by Council or an authorised agent of Council as part of maintenance and management.</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>Furthermore, in response to the submitter’s concerns regarding the management and conservation of trees within heritage streets (i.e. Heritage Conservation Areas (HCAs)), <b>Section 7.4 - General Provisions of Part 7 - Heritage and Archaeology</b> includes the following control in relation to landscaping and gardens:</p> <p><i>C.64 Heritage listed gardens or significant landscape should retain layouts and primary features and structures, including native or indigenous species or exotic species such as mature trees, gardens shrubs, outbuildings, fences, stonework, pathways and the like.</i></p> <p>This provides direction on the suitability of species within a heritage setting. Furthermore, <b>Part 2 – Design in Context</b> and <b>Part 5 – Environmental Management</b> also contain controls relating to landscaping and ensuring consideration of surrounding streetscape and contexts. Collectively the three parts of the draft Harmonisation DCP are sufficient in supporting landscaping and planting within the City, but specifically with heritage streets (i.e. HCAs).</p> <p><i>See response No.43.ac for more information on the monitoring and maintenance of new trees, No.11.d for more information on a future heritage review, and No.43.b on future work to update Council’s environmental strategies.</i></p>
		<p><b>Tree Policy (Private Land)</b></p> <p>z. Submitter expresses concerns for existing landscaping provisions (deep soil percentage), and the planting of trees vs shrubs.</p>	<p>The draft Harmonisation DCP promotes minimum levels of landscaping and tree preservation. This is consistent with the recommendations of the Land Use Planning Harmonisation <a href="#">Discussion Paper</a>, and in line with Council’s <a href="#">Environmental Sustainability Strategy</a> and <a href="#">Council Resolution of 26 April 2022 (Item 12.5)</a> to review tree management controls. Additional objectives and controls were added to provide deep soil areas for canopy trees and vegetation planting.</p> <p>The proposed controls for landscaping and tree management have been adapted in consultation with Council’s Landscaping and Tree Management Team and City Design Team to ensure suitable protection of established trees and design outcomes that integrate existing healthy trees with new development and landscaping.</p> <p><a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to the Council Report from 28 November 2022 provides detail on the preparation of landscaping controls in relation to different residential accommodation types and more broadly across the City.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p><b>Protection of Trees on Development/Construction Sites</b></p> <p>aa. Submitter states that Ryde Council’s Tree Management Technical Manual is more accessible and transparent and should be followed by Council. Examples of better practices include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• clear diagrams of TPZs</li> <li>• the holistic incorporation of trees throughout the project timeline.</li> </ul>	<p>Feedback relating to technical manuals that operate separately to a DCP are out of scope for the Harmonisation DCP project.</p> <p>Tree Protection Zones (TPZs) are required to be identified within Site Plans as part of the Development Application package. The landscape plan which forms part of an application will identify new plantings within the site, inclusive of trees to be retained or removed. A Tree Protection Plan which may accompany an application will demonstrate the methodology as to how the retained trees will be protected during demolition and construction. <i>See response to submission No.43.q for more information on the protection of trees through TPZs.</i></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>signage with name and contact details of the project arborist</li> <li>mandatory tree replacement that is monitored by Council’s staff; and</li> <li>regular monitoring/reports and consistent involvement of the same, impartial, project arborist (whose name is clearly displayed)</li> </ul>	<p>Controls reinforcing the requirement of existing healthy trees to be incorporated into Landscape Plans during the design phase of a development has been included in the draft Harmonisation DCP. This is to ensure suitable protection of established trees and design outcomes that integrate existing healthy trees with new development and landscaping.</p> <p><i>See responses No.43.ac addressing the monitoring and maintenance of new trees.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>ab. Submitter states wording on the Trees and Development webpage is ambiguous (e.g. “Council may request that an AIA and TPP accompany... the DA.”).</p>	<p>Council’s <a href="#">Trees and Development</a> webpage has been updated to expand these acronyms and a dictionary is included in <b>Section 5.3.4 - Tree and Vegetation Preservation</b> containing definitions for terms used in this section of the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>ac. Submitter requests that clear penalties for non-compliance be developed and implemented, with revenue being directed to Council’s tree replacement program, and outcomes of non-compliance be included in Council’s communication to residents.</p>	<p>Any development related breaches are investigated in accordance with the current legislation and guided by <a href="#">Council’s Regulatory Enforcement Policy</a> and related procedures.</p> <p>Where a tree is approved to be removed, Council will seek the replanting of a suitable replacement tree or trees in a suitable location on the site. Any replacement trees will need to be grown to maturity and replaced if the planting fails to survive and thrive. This will usually be a condition of development consent via the development assessment process. Penalties, including fines, may be issued to a person found guilty of contravening these controls.</p> <p>In addition to a penalty, the Court may also order the repair, remedial pruning or replacement of a damaged, destroyed, poisoned or severely pruned or removed tree and impose an order to maintain such replacement to maturity.</p> <p>Income collected by Council from penalties (i.e. fines for non-compliance, tree matters, parking, environmental health etc) is not separated based on type of offence. For Council funding allocation, see Council’s <a href="#">General Purpose Financial Statements</a> and for further information on how funds are spent see Council’s <a href="#">Delivery Program and Operational Plan</a>. This information is reported to public via Council’s annual report and can be accessed via <a href="#">Quarterly and Annual Reporting   City of Parramatta (nsw.gov.au)</a>.</p> <p>A DCP cannot stipulate the required penalties or how the income from penalties are allocated. Council has a clear strategy to achieve increases in canopy tree cover which do not require funding from penalty income or rely on non-compliance for the strategy goals to be achieved.</p> <p><i>See response to submission No.43.b above for information on broader work on environmental strategies currently being undertaken by Council.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>ad. Submitter suggests tree replacement post-</p>	<p>The CDC pathway is regulated by the <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008 (Codes SEPP)</i> and managed by the State Government. The <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i>,</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>construction for CDC developments to be mandatory and followed up by Council staff rather than private certifiers.</p>	<p>as well as the draft Harmonisation DCP, do not override a State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP) due to the hierarchy of Environmental Planning Instruments. A SEPP does not need to consider the requirements of a Local Environmental Plan or Development Control Plan. Any requirement for CDC development contained in a DCP has no influence on the development therefore, Council cannot implement additional controls or requirements to ‘CDC development’, including follow up of post construction tree planting.</p> <p>The <i>Codes SEPP</i> contains provisions for planting and protection of trees within the setbacks of dwellings under certain complying development codes (Schedule 6) and the Low Rise Housing Diversity Code (Schedule 6A).</p> <p><i>See response to submission No.20.b addressing Council’s limitations regarding the CDC pathway.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p><b>Tree Removal (Council Land)</b></p> <p>ae. Submitter requests that residents of the immediate area should be notified of street tree removals. Notes that mature, healthy trees have been removed to the detriment of local amenity and to the detriment of residents.</p>	<p>Notification requirements are not contained in the draft Harmonisation DCP - all notification requirements are contained in Council's <a href="#">Community Engagement Strategy 2022-24</a>. Any works on prescribed trees or vegetation requires written consent from Council, as outlined in <b>C.02 of Section 5.3.4 - Tree and Vegetation Preservation</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p>Any development application which proposes to remove a tree on public land will be notified as part of the notification process for development applications as outlined in Council’s Community Engagement Strategy 2022-24. All development applications are to be publicly notified for 14 days as per Council’s Community Engagement Strategy and public exhibition requirements contained within the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i>.</p> <p>Street trees may be removed by Council, government agencies, service providers or contractors acting on their behalf without notification. Tree removal by government agencies or service providers generally occurs without consent, and only if considered necessary therefore, notifying street tree works (including removal) is not practical as Council may not be aware of intended tree works.</p> <p>It should be noted that provisions which allow the removal of trees without consent are contained in higher order Acts and State Environmental Planning Provisions. Such provisions take precedence over DCP requirements, and therefore do not need to consider DCP controls for tree works.</p> <p><i>See response to submission No.43.ad above for more information on hierarchy of Environmental Planning Instruments.</i></p> <p><i>See response to submission No.43.ar below for more information on tree removal on public land.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p><b>Pruning of a Tree</b></p>	

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>af. Submitter states the reference of tree pruning as “minor tree works” is ambiguous and vague. The Trust requests clarifying the definition as less than 10% of a tree crown or less than 20% of a hedge within a year (in line with Ryde Council’s definition).</p>	<p><b>Table 5.3.4.1 – Type of Tree Application</b> required contained in <b>Section 5.3.4 – Tree and Vegetation Preservation</b> specifies when an application is required, and what type of application is required where works involve pruning trees in excess of exemptions prescribed in the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p><b>C.10</b> in <b>Section 5.3.4 – Tree and Vegetation Preservation</b> provides conditions for when tree pruning may be considered exempt development, the conditions for some instances provide a branch diameter for trees. Council considers the application of a branch diameter more appropriate for trees, and this approach prevents issues administering the DCP requirements. Council does however, provide a percentage for the exempt requirement for the trimming of hedges, as there is less ambiguity administering a percentage for hedges due to the shape and form of hedges. <i>See response to submission No.43.ag below for details on exemptions on pruning.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>ag. Submitter further states the term “selective pruning” (C.10) within Section 5.3.4 is ambiguous, and requests clearer terminology to be used.</p>	<p>The use of the term “selective pruning” within <b>C.10</b> of <b>Section 5.3.4 – Tree and Vegetation Preservation</b> is followed by a detailed description of the nature of the works:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selective pruning for building clearance, being only minor pruning to remove branches no larger than 50mm diameter at the nearest branch collar where branch encroachment is within 2m of such, and where the owner of <i>the land where the tree originates, provides written consent.</i></li> <li>• Selective pruning of branches or foliage emanating over public land from <i>privately owned trees where access is required to be restored or created by Council or the State Emergency Services, or</i></li> <li>• Selective pruning to remove any species of parasitic mistletoe or parasitic plant from any part of a tree.</li> </ul> <p>As detailed in <b>C.10</b>, such works are considered selective pruning when undertaken in the above listed scenarios in accordance with AS4373-2007 ‘Pruning of Amenity Trees’ and SafeWork NSW Code of Practice ‘Amenity Tree Industry’ – 1998.</p> <p>Any ambiguity is clarified in the following control (<b>C.11</b>) which details instances that do not warrant removal/pruning of trees.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>ah. Submitter advocates for the preservation of vegetation in bushland or HCAs.</p>	<p>Protection of vegetation is undertaken through numerous existing processes, including: <i>Section 5.10 Heritage conservation</i> and the Natural Resources – Biodiversity Map within the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i>, <a href="#">Biodiversity Values Map and Threshold Tool</a> associated with the <a href="#">Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</a>, and Chapter 2 of the <a href="#">State Environmental Planning Policy (Biodiversity and Conservation) 2021</a>.</p> <p>Additional controls to protect vegetation in bushlands have been incorporated in the draft Harmonisation DCP via <b>C.02</b> of <b>Section 5.3.1 – Biodiversity</b> regarding the requirement for a Statement of Flora and Fauna Impact (prepared by a suitably qualified ecologist) for all development in or adjacent to bushland and/or waterways. This statement must also determine whether the development triggers the Biodiversity Offsets Scheme (BOS) as per Part 7 of the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Regulation 2017</i>.</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>The controls proposed in the draft Harmonisation DCP provide the same level of protection to vegetation in HCAs to those provided to vegetation contained on Heritage listed sites. This is the highest level of protection Council can practically apply through the DCP and administer throughout the LGA.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>ai. Submitter requests amending <b>C.12 of Section 5.3.4 – Tree and Vegetation Preservation</b>, regarding scenarios which do not warrant the removal/pruning of trees, to remove wording “usually”. As a result of this change, the control will read:</p> <p><i>The following issues do not warrant removal / pruning of trees:</i></p>	<p>Council officers have identified the numbering of this control (previously <b>C.12</b>) as an administrative error; this has been amended to <b>C.11</b> for clarity within the draft Harmonisation DCP. Council’s response to the submission is below.</p> <p>Council is determined to retain, protect and manage trees within the Parramatta LGA. The intention of the control is to provide a list of scenarios which do not warrant the removal/pruning of a tree. However, in the case of these scenarios, a degree of flexibility is required due to the case-by-case nature of the works. Whilst these examples generally do not warrant any tree works, certain scenarios listed in <b>C.11</b> may be justified. As such, the inclusion of the word “usually” is recommended to be retained.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p><b>New Tree Maintenance Program</b></p>	
		<p>aj. Submitter highlights Council’s current DCP controls which state that ‘trees will be mulched, watered and staked’ and ‘added to our asset and maintenance program’.</p> <p>The Trust raises that there is little sign of this in practice and notes that new street trees are generally poorly maintained.</p>	<p>The control referenced by the submitter could not be found within the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p>Council has multiple tree planting programs that including Bushland, Greening Parramatta, Parramatta Light Rail Tree Planting, the Public Tree Replenishment Program and the East Epping Heritage Precinct Grant. Each program has differing installation requirements, standards and contracted installation maintenance periods. As a result, a standardisation of the installation and maintenance of tree assets has not been efficiently implemented. To address this, Council is working on minimum standards documentation that will be applied across all future projects to increase the quality of the assets installed and ensure appropriate maintenance is provided.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>ak. Suggests increased monitoring of new trees through more Tree Management Officers, and introduction of fines for unauthorised damage or removal of street trees.</p>	<p>As mentioned in the <i>response to submission No.43.aj above</i>, Council is working on standards that will be applied across all future projects to increase the quality of the assets installed. This will ensure greater monitoring of the City’s public tree asset population as the appropriate maintenance requirements will also be contained in the standards.</p> <p>Prioritisation of resources to increase the number of Tree Management Officers (TMOs) needs to be considered against all the priorities seeking Council funding. Council budgets and resourcing are constantly under review to seek to resource all Council’s competing priorities at an appropriate level. Any increase in resources for TMOs can only be considered as part of the Council budget preparation process and is not a matter for the Draft DCP</p> <p>Fines are issued by Council where they can be justified. <i>See response to issue (ca) of this submission provided above which deals with the issues of fines issued for unauthorised works on trees.</i></p>



Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p><i>Please see response to submission No.43.ac above for more information on the monitoring and maintenance of new trees and penalties for illegal tree removal.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<b>Tree Cover Canopy Objectives</b>	
		<p>al. Comments that Council does not have a clear tree canopy objective in key policy and planning instruments, noting that Council should seek to manage trees as a collective canopy (and as ‘an intergenerational asset’) rather than individual trees.</p>	<p>Further work on tree canopy and tree preservation will be subject to and delivered via future tree protection strategies, as detailed in the Council meeting on <a href="#">26 April 2022 (Item 12.5)</a>. Council’s City Strategy team are currently reviewing the <a href="#">Environmental Sustainability Strategy 2017</a> and are in the process of developing a Urban Canopy Plan. These documents will seek to protect and improve the tree canopy of Parramatta. The Urban Canopy Plan will establish Council’s vision for the urban canopy and recommend a range of actions to protect and improve canopy in both the public and private domain. To ensure consistency across Council’s broader strategic framework, current targets will be retained until these strategies are finalised.</p> <p><i>Please also see response to submission No.43.b above for more information on Council’s broader tree strategies.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>am. Suggests that Council aligns their tree policy to NSW Government targets (40% by 2030) and create a Tree Management Technical Guide and Street Tree Masterplan for the LGA. Highlights Ryde Council’s existing Tree Preservation Policy and Tree Management Technical Manual as exemplar practices.</p>	<p>As mentioned in response to <i>submission No.43.al</i> above, Council’s current target of 40% by 2050 (as well as other frameworks such as the Parramatta Street Tree Plan 2011) will be retained until the Urban Canopy Plan has been developed and endorsed by Council.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<b>Significant Tree Register</b>	
		<p>an. Recommends that Council should develop a Significant Tree Register, which invites input from the local community and details the process for listing a tree. Points towards Ryde and Hunters Hill Council’s existing platforms. Submitter states that the platform should be transparent in the objectives and implications of tree registration.</p>	<p>As detailed in the Council meeting of <a href="#">26 April 2022 (Item 12.5)</a>, the implementation of a Significant Tree Register is not a feasible exercise. It has been determined that a Significant Tree Register provides limited additional protection as the draft Harmonisation DCP already protects trees suitable for a register (i.e. trees with a height of 5m or more).</p> <p>The strategic framework’s protection of public and private trees is deemed to be sufficiently undertaken through existing processes, via the <a href="#">Biodiversity Values Map and Threshold Tool</a> associated with the <a href="#">Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</a>, <a href="#">SEPP (Biodiversity and Conservation) 2021</a>, the <a href="#">Parramatta LEP 2023</a>, and Parramatta DCP 2011 (and the draft Harmonisation DCP).</p> <p>These instruments specifically provide protections to sensitive sites such as the requirement for DA consent as opposed to a Tree Permit within Heritage Conservation Areas, the protection of ecologically endangered communities and any heritage associated tree requiring approval before removal.</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>Council notes a more effective approach for protection would be legislative change (through advocacy) to align the <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Exempt and Complying Codes) 2008</i> provisions with Council tree protection provisions on an on-going basis.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p><b>Development &amp; Tree Application Notification Requirements</b></p>	
		<p>ao. Requests that requirements for DA notice at the front of a property should be reinstated, and make the inclusion of an arborist report, heritage and environmental impact statement, and landscape plan mandatory for all DAs.</p>	<p>Notification procedures are outlined within the City of Parramatta <a href="#">Community Engagement Strategy (2022-24)</a>, which was informed by the notification requirements of the <a href="#">Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</a>.</p> <p>Advertised development specified within the Strategy (i.e relates to heritage items and HCAs) requires a DA notification to be adhered to the front of properties during the notification procedures. Otherwise, surrounding and potentially impacted residents and property owners are notified of Development Applications.</p>
		<p>ap. Notes that the current wording of ‘additional information may be required’ is too ambiguous</p>	<p>Council will request documentation such as an arborist report, heritage and environmental impact statements, tree protection plan and a landscape plan when relevant to the development scheme. The requirements for DA lodgement are also provided at a pre-lodgement meeting with Council where the documentation needed to address and respond to the site conditions and constraints are identified.</p> <p>As it is not practical to account for the documentation needed for every site within the City, wording such as ‘additional information may be required’ is used to allow flexibility in lodgement requirements in response to the unique characteristics of each site.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p><b>Power Lines</b></p>	
		<p>aq. Submitter requests proactive dialogue with energy providers and Ausgrid to ensure the retention of mature trees where possible. The Trust notes that this dialogue needs to begin at the protection of existing canopy rather than removal.</p>	<p>Noted. City of Parramatta Council is committed to protect mature trees and retain our tree canopy across the City of Parramatta LGA. Council has previously raised concerns regarding tree pruning work around power lines to Endeavour Energy. Council has also written to the Planning Minister at the time to advocate change to the Vegetation Management Plan of Endeavour Energy. However, it is understood that limited actions have been undertaken by the energy provider as well as the Minister. Endeavour Energy acknowledged instances of tree pruning work carried out by their contractor did not strictly follow the technical specification outlined in the Tree Management Plan. Endeavour Energy’s Tree Management Plan defines their approaches to managing vegetation near energy supply network assets and associated infrastructure in accordance with the Electricity Supply (Safety and Network Management) Regulation 2014. Further information on how a tree will be pruned around powerlines by Endeavour Energy can be accessed via <a href="#">Tree Management Plan (endeavourenergy.com.au)</a></p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP makes provisions to protect and retain mature trees unless subject to exempt works or an application for removal.</p> <p>Under the <a href="#">Electricity Supply Act 1995</a>, where trees are deemed to possibly destroy, damage, interfere or cause a bushfire in relation to power lines, Endeavour Energy or Ausgrid may remove or trim the tree or request the</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>owner of the premises to do so. Any controls contained in a DCP do not have to be considered. Additionally, Council is undertaking additional work to protect and expand our tree canopy via future tree protection strategy as detailed in the Council meeting on <a href="#">26 April 2022 (Item 12.5)</a>. Council's City Strategy team are currently reviewing the <a href="#">Environmental Sustainability Strategy 2017</a> and are in the process of developing a Urban Canopy Plan. The Urban Canopy Plan will establish Council's vision for the urban canopy and recommend a range of actions to protect and improve canopy in both the public and private domain.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>ar. Submitter requests Council review guidelines regarding choice of contractors selected to prune trees adjacent to powerlines and information presented to residents to upcoming tree works. Submitter suggests additional training for staff and monitoring by an accredited arborist to enable this.</p>	<p>The appointment of contractors for the pruning of trees adjacent to powerlines is not a function carried out by Council. Energy providers and suppliers appoint their own contractors to carry out such work. The provisions for this type of work are contained in the <a href="#">Electricity Supply Act 1995</a>, these provisions take precedence over controls contained in the draft Harmonisation DCP. Therefore, any provisions relating to pruning of trees adjacent to powerlines in a DCP have no effect on energy providers or suppliers when done in accordance with the Electricity Supply Act 1995 and the associated Regulations.</p> <p>Council is currently working on a program to set minimum standards that will be applied across all future projects to increase the quality of assets installed and ongoing maintenance provided by Council. This will provide guidelines and enable process review for future tree works.</p> <p>Council has numerous qualified professionals including arborists, who contribute to ensuring Council is on track to achieving Council's tree vision and policy including targets set by <a href="#">Environmental Sustainability Strategy 2017</a> and any other future strategies.</p> <p>All upcoming non-exempt tree works will need to be assessed by Council either through the application of a Tree Permit or a Development Application. Trees that are either heritage or located in a Heritage Conservation Area require assessment through a Development Application for tree works. For works requiring development assessment, Council's <a href="#">Community Engagement Strategy (2022-24)</a> requires tree works related to heritage to be publicly notified for 14 days.</p> <p><i>See response to submission No.43.b and No.43.aj above for information on broader work on environmental strategies currently being undertaken by Council.</i></p> <p><i>See response to submission No.43.bj addressing work to improve the quality of new trees plantings and their maintenance.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p><b>Communication</b></p>	
		<p>as. States that Council should improve communication with the local community, commenting that different internal teams present inconsistent information to</p>	<p>Council's communication policies are detailed in the <a href="#">Community Engagement Strategy 2022-24</a>. As required by the Office of Local Government's <a href="#">Integrated Planning &amp; Reporting Guidelines for Local Governments in NSW</a>, Council's Community Engagement Strategy will be reviewed in 2025 the year of the upcoming local government election. It is through this process that Council will review matters related to communication, including the themes</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		customers.	raised by the submitter. This will be subject to a separate public exhibition process, which Council officers encourage the submitter to provide a submission to.
		at. Suggests a review of internal communications strategy, community communication plan, and an improvement in shared knowledge on key tree policies.	See response to submission No.43.au below for information regarding Council communication policies. <b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b>
		<b>Community Education &amp; Engagement with Schools</b>	
		au. Submitter states that clear information, written in community languages, should be provided along with existing communication channels to local residents (rates notice and the like), including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the value of trees for the environment (e.g. reduction of energy costs)</li> <li>uplift on real estate value;</li> <li>rules and regulations regarding planning, removal and pruning of private trees;</li> <li>and the definition of a tree.</li> </ul>	Council’s website currently contains messaging on the value and importance of trees (as referenced in <i>response to submission No.43.b</i> ) including a video on the benefit of trees. This material outlines the environmental, economic and social benefits of trees and detail the positive impact trees have on communities. The <a href="#">Environmental Sustainability Strategy 2017</a> equally emphasises the importance of trees as assets and the need to protect these into the future.  The content and usage of community engagement and communication tools and programs for Council’s tree vision and policy (and any environmental or planning matter) is out of the project scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP. However, Council (through its City Engagement Directorate) regularly communicates to residents the details of new tree planting, bushland rehabilitation, and plant give-away programs. Recently, this work has focussed on the success of the <a href="#">Greening Parramatta program</a> and promoting the <a href="#">2023 Parramatta Light Rail Tree Planting Program</a> . This information is communicated in Council’s monthly eNewsletters, publications and webpages and from time to time included in Lord Mayor’s Column within Parramatta News.
		av. Submitter suggests increased accountability and engagement with schools and through language-inclusive notifications that are specific to information regarding trees.	There have been programs that invited schools to participate in tree planting programs including National Tree Day. Council’s Greening Parramatta program in particular attracted a number of school children who became enthusiastic Tree Champions. Where resources are available, environmental programs are shared with schools in the LGA and their participation encouraged.
		aw. Submitter recommends more articles relating to trees on public land in the Council Newsletter and quarterly events to promote planting of suitable tree stock, with free stock and instructions for residents.	Council hosts a biannual “Free Plant Day” at Cowell’s Lane Nursery, giving away approximately 2,400 plants (inclusive of 200 large tree species). This popular community event allows the community to interact with Council horticulturalists and asks questions about growing and developing green spaces in our LGA.  <b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b>
		ax. The Trust suggests integration of the above vision referenced in No.43.b on Council’s website and other community communication tools (such as the back of the rates notice).	
		ay. Submitter expresses concern for tree-related consultation with residents (including	

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		educational signage to communicate the benefits of new tree plantings).	
		az. Submitter suggests increased surveillance of street trees by residents regarding detrimental actions of neighbours and energy providers.	<p>The community are encouraged to contact Council and/or police to report any detrimental behaviours of neighbours and energy providers at <a href="mailto:council@cityofparramatta.nsw.gov.au">council@cityofparramatta.nsw.gov.au</a>.</p> <p><i>See response to submission No.43.ac for more information on Council's regulatory policy in relation to the monitoring and maintenance of new trees.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<b>Approved DA Determinations</b>	
		ba. Submitter states weak or vague tree recommendations in DA determinations greatly reduce tree protection or new planting, recommends detailed statements in approved DA determinations that protect trees on the building site and on Council land (providing example of Council's determination letter for 15 Wyralla Avenue, DA/708/2021)	<p>Standard and tailored tree protection conditions of consent are included to all applicable development applications informed by relevant sections of the DCP. The draft Harmonisation DCP contains sections such as <b>Section 2.7 - Open Space and Landscaping</b> and <b>Section 5.3.4 - Tree and Vegetation Preservation</b> to be considered specific to landscaping, trees and vegetation. Details of development conditions for tree protection vary depending on site conditions (i.e. significance and number of existing trees). Detailed arboriculture impact assessments and tree protection plans may also form part of development application supporting documentation dependent upon the scale or complexity of the development application.</p> <p><b>Section 5.3.4 – Tree and Vegetation Preservation</b> contains controls relating to an Offset Program (<b>C.03</b>). Where if a tree is approved to be removed, Council will seek the replanting of a suitable canopy replacement tree or trees in a suitable location on the site. Any replacement trees will need to be grown to maturity and replaced if the planting fails to survive and thrive. This will usually be a condition of development consent via the development assessment process.</p> <p>In addition, as part of the harmonisation process, <b>Section 2.7 – Open Space and Landscaping</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP includes additional controls reinforcing the requirement of existing healthy trees to be incorporated into landscape plans (standard document to be provided as part of a development process) during the design phase of a development. This is to ensure additional protection of established trees and design outcomes that integrate existing healthy trees with new development and landscaping. Landscape plans will also specify any new planting and will be conditioned as part of consent, this also creates a link to tree preservation controls and reinforces the requirements the applicant must comply with.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		bb. Submitter recommends consent documents to include substantial detailed statements that protect trees on building sites and on Council land.	<p>Council Landscape and Tree Management Officer's review each development application involving tree removal or applications which require tree protection prior to Council issuing consent. The Landscape and Tree Management Officer's also ensure appropriate conditions are included in as part of the development consent. Conditions of consent are out of scope of the Harmonisation project, <i>see response to submission No.43.ba above.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p><b>Part 2 – Design in Context</b></p> <p>bc. Submitter states that the DCP should provide clear controls in general landscaping provisions, including setbacks and deep soil zones for landscaping following the removal of trees on private land.</p>	<p>The draft Harmonisation DCP contains setbacks and landscaping controls (including deep soil) specific to development type within <b>Part 3 - Residential Development</b> and <b>Part 4 – Non-residential Development</b>. These controls have been prepared to achieve the objectives in the respective sections, this includes ensuring sufficient landscaping and deep soil are provided. The provisions ensure adequate amenity is provided for all development sites (whether a tree is being removed or not).</p> <p>Additional objectives and controls were added in <b>Part 2 – Design in Context</b> to provide deep soil areas for canopy trees and vegetation planting. This includes increasing the requirement for soil depth from 1.0m to 1.2m; and defining deep soil to not be located above any structure (such as a basement). This will support larger tree plantings and deliver deep soil zones capable of accommodating trees to meet Councils tree canopy targets. See <i>response to submission No.43.b regarding Council's broader environmental policies</i>.</p> <p>The overall landscaping controls for residential building typologies (which includes dwelling houses, dual occupancies, townhouses, and terraces) within Part 3 are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A minimum of 40% of the total site area needs to be landscaped, including deep soil which needs to be a minimum of 30% of the total site area.</li> </ul> <p>Apartment buildings require a minimum 30% of the site area to be provided as deep soil (50% of this being located at the rear), with minimum dimensions in alignment with the Apartment Design Guide. Shop-top housing and mixed-use developments require the entire rear setback to be provided as deep soil where the ground level interacts with residential uses (including adjoining sites).</p> <p>As outlined within the <a href="#">Land Use Planning Harmonisation Discussion Paper</a>, controls relating to landscaping across the five DCPs for residential building typologies ranged between 10% to 50% of total lot size. Consistent with the <a href="#">Discussion Paper</a>, the draft Harmonisation DCP retains controls from the Parramatta DCP 2011 for landscaping and deep soil area as they are considered the more suitable controls from the five DCPs. The proposed controls deliver feasible building envelopes whilst reducing hardstand areas (i.e. concreted or paved areas) and deliver deep soil areas that accommodate canopy trees, vegetation plantings, and the infiltration of ground water. <i>Submission No.43.I and No.43.aa</i>, discuss how landscape plans required to be lodged with any DA need to demonstrate how established trees have been integrated into the development.</p> <p>Whilst Council’s preference is to retain trees on private land (<i>see response to submission No.43.I, No.43.aa and No.43.ba</i> for details relating to landscape plans and their contribution to retaining established trees as part of the assessment process), should tree removal form part of the consent, the Offset Program (<b>C.03</b>) in <b>Section 5.3.4 – Tree and Vegetation Preservation</b> would require a replanting of a suitable equivalent. This would be conditioned within the consent and would apply concurrently with the landscaping and deep soil controls outlined above.</p> <p>A separate set of controls for private land where a tree has been removed is not considered necessary. The objectives of the proposed controls outlined above achieve the intention of the delivering landscaped areas with</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>deep soil suitable for planting of canopy trees.</p> <p><a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to the Council Report from 28 November 2023, provide detail on how the controls were formulated with consideration to the five DCPs. Furthermore, Section 2.3 and 3.2 of the <a href="#">Discussion Paper</a> provide detail on how setback and landscaping controls for residential typologies were reviewed as part of the harmonisation process. As outlined in <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> and <a href="#">Attachment 4</a>, further urban design testing was carried out to inform suitable controls for dual occupancy and multi-dwelling housing to achieve the desired amenity and built form outcome for the context of the new City of Parramatta.</p> <p><b>In summary, the draft landscaping provisions, deep soil areas, and setbacks have been informed by detailed analysis of the existing five DCPs and additional testing to ensure controls are robust in delivering landscaping and protecting trees. For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>bd. The submitter is broadly in favour of the development controls proposed in <b>Part 2 – Design in Context</b>. However, the submitter raises concern with the application of the guidelines and how compliance with these guidelines is achieved.</p>	<p>Development assessment is completed under the provisions of the <a href="#">Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</a> with particular focus on <i>Section 4.15 Evaluation</i>. It is a requirement for applicants to demonstrate compliance with relevant legislation and Environmental Planning Instruments (including DCPs). This may be done through the provisions of supporting documents provided with the development applications. See response to submission No.43.ba for details relating to landscape plans.</p> <p><b>Part 2 – Design in Context</b> contains the overarching development controls, supported by a set of design objectives, that must be applied to all development types in the City. This is to ensure design outcomes are compatible with their surrounding context and promote quality design outcomes. The objectives state the desired outcome, while the controls show ways in which that outcome is to be achieved. This part must be read in conjunction with the development types contained in <b>Part 3 – Residential Development</b> and <b>Part 4 – Non-residential Development</b>.</p> <p>The development assessment report completed as part of Council's assessment of development applications against <i>Section 4.15 Evaluation</i> contained in <a href="#">Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</a> comments on the application of relevant parts of the DCP, and as explained above, Part 2 is applied to all development types in the City.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>be. Submitter requests <b>O.06 of Section 2.1 – Design in Context</b> (encouraging ecologically sustainable development to protect/improve the natural environment) to be referenced further throughout the DCP. States that there is a lack of attention raised regarding the natural environment in development.</p>	<p>The draft Harmonisation DCP has taken a theme-based approach to improve functionality and group relevant policies together to assist in the navigation of controls and policies. The draft Harmonisation DCP includes 11 Parts that cover the matters that need to be considered when planning for development.</p> <p>All parts of a DCP are to be read in conjunction with each other to ensure the relevant themes for a site are considered when planning for development; this is common practice for all DCPs – not just the draft Harmonisation DCP. The introduction to each part of the draft Harmonisation DCP provides a direction on which part would prevail in the instance of an inconsistency.</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>Council officers direct the submitter to <b>Section 1.7 – Structure of this Development Control Plan</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP which outlines the relationship and application of the different Parts of the draft Harmonisation DCP, and what should be considered when planning for development. As stated in this Section of the draft Harmonisation DCP, all types of development should have regard for <b>Part 2 – Design in Context</b> (and thus the references objective O.06) and <b>Part 5 – Environmental Management</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>bf. In relation to the controls within <b>Section 2.3 – Preliminary Building Envelopes</b> (which relates to heights, setbacks and other building exterior elements to do with its primary form), the submitter raises concerns in relation to wind currents (i.e. tunnelling) generated by taller and denser buildings and the negative impact this has on amenity.</p>	<p>The draft Harmonisation DCP Includes controls (see <b>Section 5.4.8 – Wind Mitigation</b>) to help ensure that the buildings deliver a safe and comfortable pedestrian level wind environment, including at street frontages, outdoor eating areas, and open spaces.</p> <p>As explained within <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2022, Environmental Performance controls (including wind mitigation) have been introduced to align with environmental performance controls that currently apply within the Parramatta City Centre (i.e. Part 6 of the existing Parramatta DCP 2011). These controls respond to industry benchmarks, and are consistent with the Land Use Planning Harmonisation <a href="#">Discussion Paper</a> recommendations. Council Officers considered the suitability of applying such controls across the whole City. As a result of this assessment, wind assessment reports are required for all buildings greater than 20m (therefore will be applicable in strategic centres where the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i> permits such heights, including Epping).</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>bg. Submitter raises concern that <b>C.05</b> within <b>Section 2.3 - Preliminary Building Envelope</b>, which relates to adherence with height limits in metres and the noted number of storeys, is not consistently applied across developments.</p>	<p>The maximum building height for developments is regulated by <i>Section 4.3 – Height of Buildings</i> and the <i>Height of Buildings Map</i> of the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i>. A DCP can provide further guidance regarding development height distribution across a site (for example, <b>Part 4 – Non-residential Development</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP further limits townhouses with no street frontage to one storey plus attic).</p> <p>Both environmental planning instruments are applied when assessing the height of development. The <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i> is a ‘higher order’ planning instrument and holds legislative weight therefore must be consistently applied across developments, while also responding to any storey limitations within the DCP. <b>C.05</b> adequately captures this:</p> <p><i>C.05 Development must not exceed the height limit in metres and the noted number of storeys where specified in this DCP</i></p> <p>Whilst the height specified within the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i> is a planning control with legislative weighting, an applicant can request to vary this under a Clause 4.6 variation. The applicant is required to justify the height variation which is assessed by Council within the development assessment report. <i>See response to submission No.43.bd for details relating to assessment reports.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>bh. Submitter strongly supports <b>C.07 of Section</b></p>	<p>Support for this control is noted.</p>



Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p><b>2.4 – Building Form and Massing</b> relating to the transition in form and massing where development adjoins land use zone boundaries to ensure consistent height, scale, landscape, appearance, and setbacks. Submitter recommends that Council provide a question on Development Application forms to specify if a development is being undertaken at a zoning boundary, to ensure that Council officers do not oversee this matter.</p>	<p>Whilst the content of a Development Application form is out of scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP, the request to note whether development adjoins a zone boundary on Development Application forms to ensure Council do not oversee this matter is not necessary. Council officers during the assessment process view key planning maps within the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i> (including, but not limited to, zoning, height, and FSR) to understand the strategic planning context of the site. This assists with assessing the likely impacts of that development, including environmental impacts on both the natural and built environments, and social and economic impacts in the locality required under <i>Clause (1)(b) of Section 4.15 Evaluation of the <a href="#">Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</a></i>. See response to submission No.43.bd for details relating to assessment reports.</p> <p>Furthermore, the statement of environmental effects that is a requirement of lodgement must consider the land use zoning context and the relevant DCP. It is the responsibility of the applicant to take the relevant DCP controls and site characteristics into consideration, including whether their site adjoins land use zone boundaries (as outlined in <b>C.07 of Section 2.4 – Building Form and Massing</b>).</p>
		<p>bi. Submitter suggests that <b>O.04 of Section 2.5 – Streetscape and Building Address</b>, which relates to contemporary design integrated with the streetscape, is not appropriate for Heritage Conservation Areas. Submitter requests that the section's objectives should specifically note that Heritage Conservation Areas should not have to meet this expectation.</p>	<p>The draft Harmonisation DCP includes 11 Parts that cover the matters that need to be considered when planning for development. All parts of a DCP are to be read in conjunction with each other to ensure the relevant themes for a site are considered when planning for development. This is common practice for all DCPs – not just the draft Harmonisation DCP. The introduction to each part of the draft Harmonisation DCP provides a direction on which part would prevail in the instance of an inconsistency.</p> <p>Specifically in relation to Heritage planning, the introduction to <b>Part 7 – Heritage and Archaeology</b> states that <i>“This part must be read in conjunction with other relevant controls of this DCP. Should there be any inconsistency between this Section and any other part of this DCP, this Section prevails to the extent of the inconsistency.”</i></p> <p>Part 7 contains the general provisions for heritage items and heritage conservation areas (<b>Section 7.4 – General Provisions</b>) and a dedicated section which applies specific controls for Heritage Conservation Areas (<b>Section 7.10 – Heritage Conservation Areas</b>). As explained within <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to the Council Report from 28 November 2023, the HCAs from the five former DCPs have been transferred across into the draft Harmonisation DCP. This retains the specific objectives and controls for each HCA and their heritage significance, development design must be sympathetic and reflective of the heritage context; and materials and finishes reflective of the heritage character and streetscape.</p> <p>As <b>Part 7 – Heritage and Archaeology</b> prevails over <b>Part 2 – Design in Context</b>, the objective <b>O.04 of Section 2.5 – Streetscape and Building Address</b> requiring contemporary design would not be applicable.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>bj. The submitter requests additional information to be provided in <b>C.07 (Section 2.7 – Open Space and Landscape)</b> to explain how Council can ensure that appropriate replacement trees are planted</p>	<p>Council's preference is to retain trees and vegetation wherever possible (<i>see response to submission No.43.l, No.43.aa and No.43.ba above for details relating to landscape plans and their contribution to retaining established trees as part of the assessment process</i>), should tree removal form part of the consent, the Offset Program (<b>C.03</b>) in <b>Section 5.3.4 – Tree and Vegetation Preservation</b> would require a replanting of a suitable</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>and maintained in development. The submitter requests that clarification of offset fees needs to be provided in the DCP, as well as how Council will ensure that the tree canopy is maintained as a result of the offset policy.</p>	<p>equivalent. This would be conditioned within the consent and would apply concurrently with the landscaping and deep soil controls outlined above.</p> <p><i>See response to submission No.43.m above for more information regarding offset tree planting.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>bk. The submitter considers objectives relating to garden and tree plantings, deep soil zones, surface permeability, energy efficiency and conservation to be appropriate. Questions how Council is able to ensure that all objectives within <b>Section 2.7 – Open Space and Landscape</b> are met in each Development Application.</p>	<p>The submitter’s support for the draft DCP’s landscaping provisions is noted.</p> <p>Development Applications submitted to Council require detailed landscape plans showing compliance with the open space and landscaping controls outlined in <b>Section 2.7 - Open Space and Landscape</b>. The controls are additionally assessed against the relevant development types as specified in <b>Part 3 - Residential Development</b> and <b>Part 4 - Non-Residential Development</b> (as indicated in <b>C.02 of Section 2.7</b>). <b>Section 5.3.4 - Tree and Vegetation Preservation</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP provide further specifications in relation to tree works and landscaping.</p> <p>Furthermore, the supporting documentation provided as part of a development application must demonstrate to Council how the applicable controls have been achieved, this is generally done in the statement of environmental effects.</p> <p><i>See response No.22.a addressing the assessment and application of the DCP (including <b>Part 2 - Design in Context</b>).</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>bl. With regards to <b>Section 2.9 – Public Domain</b>, the submitter emphasises the importance of external lighting being downwards-facing and shielded from above to ensure that nocturnal light pollution is reduced.</p>	<p><b>Section 2.9 – Public Domain</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP provides guidance and provisions on ensuring development on private property has regard to, and makes a positive contribution to, the interface with the public domain (i.e. public spaces). Whilst the contribution lighting makes to the public domain is referenced within <b>Section 2.9</b>, it does not provide specifications for external lighting.</p> <p><b>Section 5.4 – Lighting</b> of the <a href="#">Parramatta Public Domain Guidelines</a> provides more detail regarding light specifications. <b>Section 5.4</b> (specifically <b>5.4.1, 5.4.2, 5.4.3, 5.4.4, 5.4.5</b> and <b>5.4.6</b>) specifies “a light source that emits no light above the horizontal plane”. This aims to reduce nocturnal light pollution and can be achieved by facing the light downwards and/or by adding shields to the luminaire (which depends on the type of luminaire and specific situation). This applies to all post and pole types and in parks, open space, civic places, car parks and laneways. In addition, all lighting installations must abide by the Requirements of Australian Standard (AS1158), which is also required by the Public Domain Guidelines.</p>
		<p>bm. Submitter raises issue of nocturnal light pollution in through-site links, specifically referenced in <b>C.03 of Section 2.10 – Accessibility and Connectivity</b>. Choosing downwards-facing lighting should be the preferred use of lighting.</p>	<p>Therefore, the request of the submitter to minimise nocturnal light pollution is already policy with the public domain guidelines.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>bn. Submitter agrees with <b>C.18 of Section 2.15 - Signage</b>, which relates to external lighting of signs to be downward-facing. Submitter requests that the intention of this control be extended to all light pollution, rather than signs only.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that <b>C.18 of Section 2.9 – Public Domain</b> in the draft Harmonisation DCP requires the external lighting of signs is to be downward pointing and focused directly on the sign. This is to prevent or minimise the escape of light beyond the sign, and therefore, specifying the type of lighting is suitable in the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p>However, as explained above in response No.43.bm, the Public Domain Guidelines contain provisions that specifies “<i>a light source that emits no light above the horizontal plane</i>”, which in essence is delivering on the request of the submitter.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>bo. With regards to <b>Section 2.14 – Safety and Security</b>, the submitter notes that the safety and security of buildings is considered important. The submitter requests that the DCP should also consider fire safety and a safe exit plan, requiring an easy, clear escape plan and appropriate.</p>	<p>This comment is out of scope of Harmonisation Project and the function of a DCP. Fire safety is not directly addressed in <b>Section 2.14 - Safety and Security</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP, as this primarily addresses Crime Prevention through Environmental Design. Fire safety controls to be considered in development are addressed in <i>Clause 62 Consideration of Fire Safety in the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2021</i> and throughout the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment (Development Certification and Fire Safety) Regulation 2021</i>.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>bp. Submitter raises the omission of “pollution” in <b>O.08 of Section 2.15 – Signage</b>. States that the objective should read as follows:</p> <p><b>O.08</b> Limit the overall amount of signage through the provision of fewer, more effective signs, to avoid the creation of visual <u>pollution</u> on buildings and streetscapes.</p>	<p>This has been identified as a drafting error, where the word “pollution” was incorrectly omitted from the exhibited draft Harmonisation DCP. As a result of this submission, <b>O.08 of Section 2.15 – Signage of the draft DCP</b> has been corrected to include the word “pollution” and will read as recommended by the submitter.</p> <p><b>Refer to Table 1 – Changes that are supported of Attachment 4 – Summary of Changes to the Draft DCP for further information.</b></p> <p><b>As a result of the submission, amendments will be made to the relevant part of the draft Harmonisation DCP to include the word ‘pollution’ in O.08 in Section 2.15 – Signage.</b></p>
		<p><b>Part 3 – Residential Development</b></p> <p>bq. Submitter suggests Council review the dwelling mix for residential flat buildings, shop top housing and the residential component of mixed-use developments that contain 10 or more dwellings as per the control in the draft Harmonisation DCP (Section 3.1.1 - Dwelling Mix). The drafted dwelling mix is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10% - 20% of dwellings to have 3 or more bedrooms</li> <li>• 60% - 75% of dwellings to have 2</li> </ul>	<p>As outlined in <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to the Council Report from 28 November 2023, the recommendations from the <a href="#">Discussion Paper</a> have been adopted into the draft Harmonisation DCP and informed the housing mix contained in <b>C.02 Section 3.1.1 - Dwelling Mix of Part 3 - Residential Development</b>.</p> <p>Consistent with the scope of the harmonisation framework, the dwelling mix has been adapted from dwelling mix controls found within <b>C.13 and C.14 of Section 6.10 – Dwelling Layout and Mix</b>, Part B of Holroyd DCP 2013 and Section 3.2.11 – Housing Choice, Part 3 - Residential of The Hills DCP 2012. Whilst not consistent, both controls require a minimum 10% one-bedroom or three-bedroom dwellings for larger developments, with a maximum of 20% of total dwellings being studio or one-bedroom dwellings.</p> <p>As stated by the submitter, <b>C.03 of Section 3.1.1 – Dwelling Mix</b> provides flexibility for refinement of the dwelling house mix in response to key conditions such as location, population trends, public housing or whether the applicant is a community housing or non-profit organisation. Therefore, should a different mix be</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p><i>bedrooms</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10% - 20% of dwellings to have 1 bedroom/studio</li> </ul> <p>The Trust states that it may be more beneficial to increase the mix of 3+ bedroom apartments above the current range, noting that the control <b>C.03</b> provides for refinement subject to certain conditions.</p>	<p>demonstrated suitable, and delivers on the intent of the objectives to meet the diverse needs of the community, then the mix can be refined and tailored to the development context.</p> <p>The submitter’s request to review the dwelling mix is noted. A review of dwelling mix is outside the scope of this project, and would be subject to a separate Council process. At the time of finalising this report, Council was due to consider the draft Social Sustainability Strategy at its meeting of 14 August 2023. That draft strategy sets out action progressing a review of dwelling mix, and pending Council’s approval post-exhibition, would guide next steps on this matter.</p> <p>The controls included in the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered suitable and that the combined application of <b>C.02</b> and <b>C.03</b> of <b>Section 3.1.1</b> provide suitable guidance and flexibility in relation to housing mix. Any changes to dwelling mix requirements will be subject to further investigation which will occur outside of the Harmonisation process.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>br. Submitter supports the guidelines on solar access and cross-ventilation within <b>Section 3.2.1 – Solar Access and Cross Ventilation</b>. Suggests the following control to be added:</p> <p>A proposed development may not contribute to the loss of more than 10% of the hours of sunlight between 9am and 3pm on June 21 that an adjoining property enjoys before the development.</p>	<p>Council officers direct the submitter to <b>C.01</b> of <b>Section 3.2.1 – Solar Access and Cross Ventilation</b>, which dictates the minimum level of sunlight availability between 9am and 3pm on 21 June:</p> <p><b>C.01</b> Dwellings within the development site and on adjoining properties are to receive a minimum 3 hours of sunlight to primary living areas between 9am and 3pm on 21 June.</p> <p>As outlined in <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to the Council Report from 28 November 2022, controls relating to residential development within the draft harmonisation DCP were largely prepared using retained Parramatta DCP 2011 controls (consistent with the recommendations of the Land Use Planning Harmonisation <a href="#">Discussion Paper</a>).</p> <p>Any proposed changes to controls were developed based on detailed urban design testing and with considerations to the requirements of the <a href="#">Apartment Design Guide</a>. It is noted that Section 4A Solar and Daylight Access of the Apartment Design Guide requires a 3-hour minimum of solar access for primary living areas between 9am and 3pm at mid-winter.</p>
		<p>bs. Submitter raises concern over the <b>Section 3.4.3.3 – Building Separation</b> controls for manor houses regarding potential overshadowing on neighbouring lots. Recommend that the following control be inserted into the DCP:</p> <p>Manor houses and other developments should not reduce the solar energy access for neighbouring dwellings by more than 10% of its previous value as measured between 9am and 3pm on June 21.</p>	<p>As detailed in <b>C.01</b> of <b>Section 3.2.1</b>, the draft Harmonisation DCP goes beyond this provision by explicitly requiring both the development site and adjoining properties to also receive a minimum of 3 hours of solar access to primary living areas between 9am and 3pm during the winter solstice.</p> <p>The controls within each residential development typology contained within Part 3 are to be read in conjunction with <b>Section 3.2.1 - General Residential Controls</b> (plus other Parts of the DCP).</p> <p>See response to No.30.f regarding the preparation of general residential controls in the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p><b>Therefore, the control C.01 that addresses solar access is required for all residential accommodation and for the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>bt. Submitter requests a figure to explain the minimum recess requirements detailed in <b>C.13 of Section 3.3.2.2 – Preliminary Building Envelope</b> regarding dual occupancy development.</p>	<p>The 1.5m depth and 2m length requirements of recesses (as well as the maximum length of wall along side boundaries) for dual occupancy development is detailed in <b>Figure 3.3.2.2.2 – Dual occupancy site setbacks</b> (previously labelled as Figure 3.3.2.2).</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>bu. Submitter notes their support of deep soil control <b>C.01 in Section 3.3.1.4 – Open Space and Landscape</b>, requiring 30% of a site’s total area to be provided as deep soil, with a minimum dimension of 4 metres x 4 metres. Submitter requests for this to be enforced by Council in assessing Development Applications.</p>	<p>The submitter’s support is noted.</p> <p>Development assessment is completed under the provisions of the <a href="#">Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</a> with particular focus on Section 4.15 Evaluation. It is a requirement for applicants to demonstrate how their development complies with relevant legislation and environmental planning instruments (including DCPs) through their Statement of Environmental Effects. The assessment report carried out under Section 4.15 Evaluation is required to assess against the relevant parts of a DCP (including the open space and landscaping controls). See <i>response to submission No.43.bd for details relating to assessment reports</i>.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>bv. Submitter supports <b>C.07 in Section 3.3.1.4 – Open Space and Landscape</b> (Dwelling Houses) which specifies tree rates per lot size to grow to a minimum mature height of 13 metres but raises concern that this control may not be enforced in a development’s assessment.</p>	<p>The submitter’s support is noted.</p> <p><i>See response No.43.ac addressing the process and penalties for breaching the condition of development consent via the Development Application process.</i></p> <p>Development Applications must be considered against any relevant environmental planning instrument under Section 4.15 of the <a href="#">Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</a>. For development approval, applicants must show compliance with these controls prior to determination.</p> <p>It must be demonstrated that a suitable tree has been planted on the lot which can be enforced through the conditions of consent. Applicants must wholly comply with the conditions of consent as per their DA approval. Regarding compliance, as per the <a href="#">Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</a>, post-consent certificates (construction and occupation certificates) are only issued subject to the fulfilment of the conditions of consent outlined in the DA determination. <i>See response to submission No.43.bd for details relating to assessment reports.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>bw. Submitter expresses concern regarding <b>C.04 of 3.3.1.5 – Parking Design and Vehicular Access</b> (dwelling houses) relating to the requirement of a new development’s garage/carport to be provided at the property’s rear if this is the prevailing pattern of development.</p>	<p><b>C.04 of Section 3.3.1.5 – Parking Design and Vehicular Access</b> explicitly states that garages/carports locations must mirror the prevailing pattern of development, <u>provided it does not compromise deep soil or landscaping requirements</u>. The overall landscaping controls for residential building typologies (which includes dwelling houses, dual occupancies, townhouses, and terraces) within <b>Part 3</b> are as follows:</p> <p><i>A minimum of 40% of the total site area needs to be landscaped, including deep soil which needs to be a minimum of 30% of the total site area. Additionally, the requirement for soil depth has been increased from 1.0m to 1.2m.</i></p> <p>These controls have been updated to ensure adherence to built form controls that compliment and integrate into</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>Submitter notes that this may lead to the removal of vegetation that would otherwise be kept.</p>	<p>the existing streetscape (including the location of garages/carports). As part of the Development Application package, applicants will need to demonstrate how the development satisfies landscaping and deep soil requirements, including the retention of significant trees and vegetation.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>bx. Submitter raises the question of ambiguity around the minimum area of master bedrooms, being 10m<sup>2</sup>, where all other bedrooms have an area of 9m<sup>2</sup> which excludes wardrobe space, as specified in <b>C.02 of Section 3.3.1.6 – Internal Amenity</b> regarding the minimum area of bedrooms in dwelling houses, secondary dwellings and dual occupancies. Queries whether master bedrooms also exclude wardrobe space in their minimum area.</p>	<p>Noted. Council officers have reviewed <b>C.02 of Section 3.3.1.6 – Internal Amenity</b> and proposed to amend the draft Harmonisation DCP to clarify the required minimum area for master bedroom and all other bedrooms excluding the wardrobe space.</p> <p><b>C.02 Master bedrooms are to have a minimum area of 10m<sup>2</sup>, and all other bedrooms are to be a minimum of 9m<sup>2</sup> (in all cases the Minimum area must exclude any wardrobe space).</b></p> <p><b>As a result of the submission, amendments will be made to the relevant section of the draft Harmonisation DCP to clarify the requirement for minimum area for master bedroom and all other bedrooms excluding wardrobe space.</b></p>
		<p>by. Submitter requests greater detail in <b>C.01, C.02 and C.03 in Section 3.3.2.1 – Minimum Site Frontage and Site Area</b> to specify the requirements for dual occupancies on cul-de-sacs and battle-axe lots.</p> <p>This is in relation to the measurement of site frontage for dual occupancies proposed on sites in cul-de-sac bulbs and whether the handle of a battle-axe lot is included in the calculation of the site area.</p> <p>Raises concern that Hornsby Council was challenged on their controls in the Land and Environment Court over the wording in their DCP.</p>	<p>Council officers have reviewed <b>C.01 – C.03 of Section 3.3.2.1 – Minimum Site Frontage and Site Area</b> (regarding dual occupancy development) and agree that explanatory diagrams would be beneficial to clarify the policy intent of these controls.</p> <p>Any confusion relating to the measurement of site frontages for dual occupancies proposed on sites in cul-de-sac streets have been clarified by the insertion of <b>Figure 3.3.2.1.1 – Site frontage requirements for dual occupancies proposed within cul-de-sac.</b></p> <p>Any confusion relating to the calculation of site area for battle-axe lots have been clarified by the insertion of <b>Figure 3.3.2.1.2 – Minimum site area for battle-axe lots.</b></p> <p>Refer to Attachment 4 – Summary of Changes to the Draft Parramatta Development Control Plan.</p> <p><b>As a result of the submission, amendments will be made to the relevant section of the draft Harmonisation DCP to include explanatory diagrams for minimum site frontage requirement for dual occupancy sites located within the bulb of a cul-de-sac and how the minimum site area for battle axe lots is to be calculated.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>bz. Submitter requests that open space and landscaping provisions for dual occupancies currently contained within <b>Section 3.3.2.4 – Open Space and Landscape</b> be uniformly applied across all dwelling types within <b>Section 3.3, Section 3.4, and Section 3.5</b> of the draft DCP.</p> <p>These controls (<b>C.01, C.02, C.07 and C.08</b>) are in relation to requirements for minimum landscaping; deep soil; and the location, size and number of trees for dual occupancy development.</p>	<p>As explained within <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2023, 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. Whilst the focus of this testing and design work was to address the building envelope, bulk and scale, and address to the streetscape for dual occupancy development (see <a href="#">Attachment 3</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2023), controls were also reviewed to guide private open space (including landscaping, deep soil, and the location, size and number of trees).</p> <p>The controls will promote adequate amenity, landscaping, and usability for residents and assists in delivering consistency in the provision of quality usable private outdoor living areas for recreational and outdoor activities for the various forms of residential accommodation permitted in low density neighbourhoods. In other words, the predominant residential land uses within the R2 zone deliver the same level of private space and amenity for residents, and deliver the objectives of the zone from the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>to maintain the low density residential character of the area.</i></li> <li>• <i>to protect and enhance tree canopy, existing vegetation and other natural features.</i></li> </ul> <p>Such requirements for residential uses permitted in the R3 Medium Density Residential zone (i.e. townhouses) and R4 High Density Residential zone (i.e. residential flat buildings) are not comparable to the requirements for the uses within the R2 Low Density Residential zone due to the different contexts. Therefore, the submitter’s assertion that minimum landscaping, deep soil, and tree provisions for dual occupancies should be mirrored across all dwelling types is not supported as these are within different zones, with different objectives, and building densities/typologies.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>ca. Submitter does not support controls <b>C.01</b> of <b>Section 3.3.3.1 – Minimum Site Frontage and Lot Size</b> regarding the minimum lot size for secondary dwellings, and <b>C.01</b> and <b>C.02</b> of <b>Section 3.3.3.4 – Open Space and Landscape</b> regarding the minimum provision of private open space associated with a secondary dwelling.</p> <p>Considers these controls to provide insufficient private outdoor space for secondary dwellings. Expresses concern that only a 12m<sup>2</sup> patio or balcony can be provided as private outdoor space.</p>	<p>As detailed in <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to the 28 November 2022 Council report package, <b>Section 3.3.3 – Key Development Standards for Secondary Dwellings</b> has generally retained the objectives and controls in PDCP 2011 as these provisions are considered to be relatively strong and well-established in the City.</p> <p>The minimum lot size (MLS) requirement for secondary dwellings is aligned with the MLS detailed within <b>Table 3.1.3.4 – Secondary dwellings</b> of PDCP 2011 and the requirements of the <a href="#">State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021 (Housing SEPP)</a> for secondary dwellings.</p> <p>It is noted that PDCP 2011 did not require the delivery of any private open space for secondary dwellings, as it was considered sufficient for the secondary dwelling to share private open space with the principal dwelling. The <i>Housing SEPP</i> for secondary dwellings requires a minimum of 24m<sup>2</sup> for private open space which could be shared with the principle dwelling. As detailed in <b>C.01</b> and <b>C.02</b> of <b>Section 3.3.3.4 – Open Space and Landscape</b>, the draft harmonisation DCP allows for a minimum 12m<sup>2</sup> of private open space for a secondary dwelling. This is to ensure the secondary dwelling receives at least the minimum 12m<sup>2</sup> dedicated private open space however, generally private open space would be shared between the principle and secondary dwelling. The allowance for private open space to be provided as a patio or balcony is in line with the <i>Housing SEPP (Schedule 1 Complying Development – Secondary Dwellings, Part 4, Clause 17(2))</i>.</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>cb. Submitter supports <b>C.08 of Section 3.4.1.2 – Preliminary Building Envelope (regarding townhouses)</b> requiring a 6m street boundary setback for lots with an absence of street trees directly in front of the lot. This is to support future canopy tree planting within the front setback.</p> <p>Submitter requests that a minimum mature tree height of 13m is explicitly noted, in line with <b>C.08 of Section 3.4.1.5 – Open Space and Landscape</b> (regarding townhouses).</p>	<p>It is noted that this control has been amended to provide further clarity on setback requirements for medium density residential development: <b>C.07 A minimum front setback of 6 metres is required however, a lesser front setback, to a minimum of 4 metres may be considered subject to a local street character assessment that includes existing street trees and the ability of the street to accommodate the future planting of canopy trees.</b> This control supersedes <b>C.07</b> and <b>C.08 of Section 3.4.1.2 – Preliminary Building Envelope (regarding townhouses)</b> contained in the <u>exhibited</u> draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p><b>C.07</b> requires townhouse development to facilitate sufficient space in front of the property (i.e. a minimum 6 metre front setback) to allow large canopy trees onsite. Where it is demonstrated that a canopy street tree could be accommodated on the public verge adjacent to the front setback, a 4 metre setback could be considered. It is considered unnecessary to specify the requirement for tree planting under <b>C.07</b>, as requirements for tree planting, landscape and open space are contained under <b>C.08 of Section 3.4.1.5 Open Space and Landscape</b> which requires a minimum mature height of 13 metres must be planted per parent lot (regarding townhouses) with a minimum number of trees at the following rates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a minimum of 2 trees for sites less than 600sqm.</li> <li>• a minimum of 4 trees for sites between 600sqm to 1500sqm.</li> <li>• A minimum of 5 trees for site greater than 1,500sqm.</li> </ul> <p>The requirement of this control is to facilitate canopy tree planting either in the front setback of the dwelling or future street tree planting undertaken by Council, the type of tree that will be planted is subject to a case-by-case review of the specific street or property. These factors will include the size of the nature strip, power lines and underground services, driveway, parking and footpath locations, and other trees within the streetscape. As such, it is the role of Council's Open Space Team to determine the appropriate street tree type to be planted, including its height where the tree will be accommodated on the public verge.</p> <p>Where the tree is located in the front setback, the details of the tree will need to be contained in the Landscape plan supporting the development application. The context must be considered when selecting a tree to plant within the street setback and must comply with the provisions of the DCP as mentioned above.</p>



Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>Refer to Attachment 4 – Summary of Changes to the draft DCP for further information regarding the change to this control.</p> <p><b>As a result of this submission, amendments will be made to the relevant part of the draft Harmonisation DCP.</b></p>
		<p>cc. Submitter queries why there is no minimum lot size specified for Terraces despite the minimum site frontage control specified as 21 metres within <b>Section 3.4.2 - Key Development Standards for Terraces</b>.</p>	<p>As detailed in <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to the 28 November 2022 Council report package, the controls in <b>Section 3.4.2 – Key Development Standards for Terraces</b> were prepared with regards to the requirements of the <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008</i> (Codes SEPP), with further detailed design testing aimed at supporting good design outcomes for multi-dwelling housing. As it is possible to develop terraces and other types of multi-dwelling housing as complying development under the Codes SEPP, the proposed DCP controls have been reviewed to ensure a degree of consistency but where development is pursued as complying development the controls in the draft Harmonisation DCP will not apply.</p> <p>Under the Codes SEPP, the minimum lot size for multi-dwelling development (which includes terrace housing) is 600sqm, unless a higher lot size is indicated within the Lot Size Map of the <i>Parramatta Local Environment Plan 2023</i> (PLEP 2023).</p> <p>The minimum frontage alone does not qualify a site to be suitable for terrace housing development. The proposal must also demonstrate compliance with other matters including but not limited to; landscaped area, side and rear setback.</p> <p>A <a href="#">Planning Information Sheet</a> is available to understand more about the difference between an LEP and DCP and how they work together to guide development.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>cd. With regards to <b>Section 3.4.3.1 – Key Development Standards for Manor Houses</b>, the submitter objects to the minimum development lot size (600qm, as detailed <b>C.01</b>) and site frontage (15m, as detailed in <b>C.02</b>) for manor houses.</p> <p>States that these requirements would substantially reduce the availability of private open space to individual residents within the development.</p>	<p>The minimum lot size for manor houses is regulated under the <i>Parramatta Local Environment Plan 2023</i> (PLEP 2023), as indicated in <i>Clause 4.1C</i> of the plan. The objectives of this clause states that the minimum lot size for manor houses must be 600m<sup>2</sup> to ensure that lots are large enough to accommodate development that provides a high level of residential amenity and is consistent with development controls (including setbacks, tree retention, adequate areas for vehicle and pedestrian access, private open space and landscaping).</p> <p>Council officers direct the submitter to <b>C.03</b> and <b>C.04</b> of <b>Section 3.4.3.5 – Open Space and Landscape</b> (regarding manor houses), which provide detailed requirements for private open space for individual apartments. This, as well as the minimum site frontage requirements, is in line with the recommendations of the <a href="#">Discussion Paper</a> (Section 4.4, Table 4), which was informed by detailed urban design testing as well as consideration of the Low Rise Medium Density Housing Code and Apartment Design Guide.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>ce. Submitter suggests that <b>O.04 of Section 3.5 – Apartment Buildings</b>, which relates to the provision of a range of community</p>	<p>The controls within <b>Section 3.5 – Apartment Buildings</b> are general design controls to guide specific residential typologies permissible in the R4 High Density Residential zone (being residential flat buildings, shop top housing, and mixed-use development). Whilst <b>O.04 of Section 3.5</b> does not explicitly mention shop-top housing and</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>facilities, could be expanded upon. Requests respective and specific controls depending on the surrounding area to allow for shop-top housing and mixed-use development.</p> <p>Specifies that shops should be included in apartment developments.</p>	<p>mixed-use development, <b>O.2</b> states that proximity to other land uses that provide facilities or services (including retail services) for residents is encouraged.</p> <p>It is not a function of the DCP to specify what types of development must be built in the R4 zone. Residential development that includes any retail premise would be considered shop top housing or mixed-use development, each of which have their own specific key development standards as detailed in <b>Section 3.5.2</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP. Refer to the below extract from the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i> Dictionary regarding the difference between these development types:</p> <p><b>Mixed use development</b> means a building or place comprising 2 or more different land uses.</p> <p><b>Residential flat building</b> means a building containing 3 or more dwellings, but does not include an attached dwelling, co-living housing or multi dwelling housing.</p> <p><b>Shop top housing</b> means one or more dwellings located above the ground floor of a building, where at least the ground floor is used for commercial premises or health services facilities.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>cf. Submitter would like to see additional provisions for wind currents and wind effects of high buildings, as these do not support human-scale streetscapes. Suggested that stepped heights may be used.</p>	<p>See responses No.43.bf addressing the wind mitigation measures within the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p>Detailed wind mitigation measures have been integrated into the draft Harmonisation DCP to ensure that safe and comfortable pedestrian level wind environments are maintained (<b>Section 5.4.8 – Wind Mitigation</b>).</p> <p>Whilst general building envelope controls are present within the draft Harmonisation DCP, the suitability of a development’s form in minimising wind currents and wind effects is subject to its specific context. The draft Harmonisation DCP’s requirement for a wind assessment report to demonstrate how the proposed development interacts with its wind environment to (including minimising adverse wind currents and effects) is considered sufficient in supporting human-scale streetscapes.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>cg. Submitter states the maximum number of storeys for apartment buildings do not correctly align with the Height of Buildings Map in the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i> (<b>C.01</b> within <b>Section 3.5.1.2</b>). The Trust points out that the maximum height of buildings in the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i> for 7 storeys should be 23 metres.</p> <p>Based on <b>C.01</b>, submitter believes that the height requirement for 7 storeys should be 23m, not 24m.</p>	<p>The building height for 7 story buildings, as indicated in <b>C.01</b> of <b>Section 3.5.1.2 – Preliminary Building Envelope</b>, has been identified as an error within the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p><b>As a result of the submission, Council officers have amended the control to indicate that the height of building (as per the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i> Height of Buildings Map) should be 23m, and not 24m, for 7 storey buildings.</b></p> <p>Refer to Table 1 of Attachment 4 – Summary of Changes to the Draft Parramatta DCP.</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>ch. Submitter objects to the <b>C.07</b> within <b>Section 3.5.1.4 – Open Space and Landscape</b> for apartments, allowing rooftop open space in lieu of ground level open space. The Trust argues that by meeting the criteria for rooftop open space, this provision may negate development of appropriately landscaped communal open space at ground level, as referenced in <b>C.06</b> within <b>Section 3.5.1.4 – Open Space and Landscape</b> for apartment buildings.</p>	<p><b>C.07</b> of <b>Section 3.5.1.4 – Open Space and Landscape</b> directly states that communal open space may be provided on elevated gardens or roof tops <u>only</u> for constrained sites; in order to achieve this, applicants must demonstrate that the minimum consolidated area of common open space cannot be provided at ground level.</p> <p>The requirements of <b>C.07.c</b> also ensures that communal open spaces in elevated gardens or roof tops must <i>provide a similar level of amenity as common open space at ground level</i>. Such amenities include the criteria listed in <b>C.06</b>.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>ci. The submitter recommends that the minimum site frontage control of 6m on <b>C.01 (Section 3.5.2 – Housing and Mixed Use Development)</b> for shop top development be reviewed.</p> <p>Considers the 6m minimum site frontage control to be unsuitable.</p>	<p>As detailed in <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to the 28 November 2022 Council report package, <b>Section 3.5.2 – Key Development Standards for Shop Top Housing and Mixed Use Development</b> has been prepared to align with the <a href="#">Apartment Design Guide</a> and <i>State Environmental Planning Policy No 65 – Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development</i> (SEPP 65). It has also retained some controls from PDCP 2011 as these provisions are considered to be relatively strong and well-established in the City.</p> <p>The minimum site frontage of 6m for shop top houses in the E1 zone was introduced in the draft DCP in line with the recommendations of the <a href="#">Discussion Paper</a>. This is to retain the fine grain characteristic of the shop top typology within the City.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>cj. Submitter does not consider <b>C.02</b> in <b>Section 3.5.2.4 – Open Space and Landscape</b> (regarding shop top housing and mixed-use development) to be appropriate, in particular the part of the control that allows for deep soil to be provided on merit when not meeting specific residential requirements.</p>	<p>See responses No.43.ci detailing the preparation of controls for <b>Section 3.5.2 – Key Development Standards for Shop Top Housing and Mixed Use Development</b>.</p> <p>Deep soil requirements within <b>C.02</b> of <b>Section 3.5.2.4 – Open Space and Landscape</b> (regarding shop top housing and mixed-use development) were prepared in alignment with the Parramatta DCP 2011 as these provisions are considered to be relatively strong and well-established in the City.</p> <p>As detailed in <b>C.02</b>, developments are required to provide the rear setback area as deep soil if part of the residential component is proposed at ground level, or if the site adjoins a residential development or residential zone. This is to improve the amenity of residents living on the ground floor and minimise conflict between land uses within the MU1 Mixed Use zone and adjoining zones. In all other instances, deep soil may be provided on merit.</p> <p><b>C.02</b> is appropriate as it allows for flexibility for mixed use developments to responds to the site’s context and uses. This provision also supports the following objectives of the MU1 Mixed Use zone, as detailed in <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To minimise conflict between land uses within this zone and land uses within adjoining zones.</li> <li>• To encourage business, retail, community and other non-residential land uses on the ground floor of</li> </ul>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p><i>buildings.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>ck. Submitter questions the calculated minimum dimensions required for deep soil in <b>C.01</b> and <b>C.02 of Section 3.4.3.5 – Open Space and Landscape</b> regarding manor houses, stating that if the minimum lot size is required to be 600m<sup>2</sup>, 30% of this would be 180m<sup>2</sup>. Submitter states that this will need to be reconsidered, as the minimum dimension for deep soil is specified as being 16m<sup>2</sup>.</p>	<p>The landscaping and deep soil requirements (including minimum dimensions) for manor houses within <b>Section 3.4.3.5 – Open Space and Landscape</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP have been prepared in line with the recommendations of the <a href="#">Discussion Paper</a> (Section 4.4, Table 4).</p> <p>As no legacy DCP provided controls for manor houses, recommendations were informed by detailed urban design testing as well as consideration of the Low Rise Medium Density Housing Code and Apartment Design Guide. The intention of the 16m<sup>2</sup> minimum dimension for deep soil areas is to ensure that deep soil zones support medium to large canopy tree plantings.</p> <p>Additionally, these provisions mirror the landscape and deep soil requirements for other medium and high density residential development types within the draft Harmonisation DCP, which were carried over from the Parramatta DCP 2011 as these provisions are considered to be relatively strong and well-established in the City.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>cl. Submitter recommends a requirement for clear address signage (property numbers) for larger residential or mixed-use developments.</p>	<p>The submitter’s comment regarding the display of property numbers is the responsibility of the property owner and a condition of the consent for new developments.</p> <p>This matter is out of scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP and covered by City of Parramatta Council’s <a href="#">Property Numbering and Display of Property Numbers Policy</a> (Policy Number 248).</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>cm. The submitter recommends that subdivision of land in fire-risk areas close to bushland should be regulated with additional care. Reference to Rural Fire Service (RFS) Guidelines is not considered sufficient and should be emphasised in <b>C.10 of Section 3.6 – Residential Subdivision</b>.</p>	<p>Under <i>Clause 4.14</i> of the <a href="#">Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</a>, all development on bush fire prone land is required to be undertaken in accordance with the NSW Rural Fire Service’s <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2019</i>. As this takes precedence over the controls within the draft DCP, detailed additional DCP controls are not considered necessary.</p> <p><a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to the 28 November 2022 Council report package details that <b>Section 5.2.7 – Bush Fire Prone Land</b> has generally retained the objectives and controls from Hornsby DCP 2013. The provisions adopted from Hornsby DCP 2013 address a small number of additional matters for consideration relating to asset protection zones and minimising the need for bush fire hazard reduction.</p> <p>The addition of <b>C.10</b> within <b>Section 3.6 – Residential Subdivision</b> is to direct applicants to the <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2019</i> guidelines, which identifies best practice guidelines for developing in bush fire prone areas.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>cn. Following a recent boarding house Development Application which was unsympathetic to surrounding dwellings, the submitter proposes three additional objectives within <b>Section 3.7 – Boarding Houses</b> to retain consistent character within neighbourhoods.</p> <p>The proposed objectives are as follows:</p> <p><b>O.15</b> Proposed boarding houses should respond to the existing and expected future character of the residential development zone.</p> <p><b>O.16</b> New development should complement and enhance the neighbourhood and streetscape character, minimising proposed bulk and scale through consistent articulation, materials and setbacks.</p> <p><b>O.17</b> New development should deliver high-quality development with a clear sense of address from the street, and visual prominence of dwelling entries in the front façade.</p>	<p>As detailed in the <a href="#">Discussion Paper</a>, the existing controls relating to boarding houses within the legacy DCPs were largely aligned with the requirements of the <a href="#">State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021</a> (Housing SEPP). The Housing SEPP provides a number of development standards that takes precedence over the controls in a DCP, including solar access, private open space, parking and maximum floor area.</p> <p>It is noted Part 3 Residential Development (i.e. Section 3.7 Boarding Houses) must read in conjunction of Part 2 Design in Context of the draft Harmonisation DCP, which contains the overarching development controls supported by a set of design objectives that apply to all development types (including all residential development), specifically through the following sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Section 2.1 Design in Context</b> includes objectives to encourage development to respond to its context and contribute to the overall character of existing place and reinforce the distinctive attributes and qualities of the City’s neighbourhoods and centres.</li> <li>• <b>Section 2.4 Building Form and Massing</b> contains objectives supported with detailed controls (i.e. C.02, C.03, C.05, C.06) to ensure proposed building scale, mass and/or height for new development sensitively respond to existing amenity and surrounding environment.</li> <li>• <b>Section 2.5 Streetscape and Building Address</b> contains objectives supported with detailed controls (i.e. C.01-C.05, C.07, C.09) to ensure the appearance of development reinforce and enhance neighbourhood and streetscape character.</li> <li>• <b>Section 2.8 Views and Vistas</b> specifies objectives supported with detailed controls (i.e. C.02, C.05, C.04, C.06) for new development to protect public views and vistas from street and public places and encourage high quality urban design compatible with surrounding setting and place of significance.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, Objectives <b>O.03, O.07, O.08, O.14</b> of <b>Section 3.7 – Boarding Houses</b> ensure that boarding house developments are of an appropriate scale, size, and bulk, and are to be designed to minimise the adverse impacts on its adjoining properties. It is also noted that the applicants are required to demonstrate how the development complements the character of its neighbourhood, as stipulated in <i>Clause 4.15 Evaluation</i> of the <a href="#">Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</a>.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>co. Submitter suggests changes to where ensuite bathrooms are not provided, communal bathroom facilities shall be provided with the minimum requirement of a bath or shower (<b>C.41</b> in <b>Section 3.7 – Boarding Houses</b>) adjusted from 1 for every 6 residents to 1 for every 10 residents.</p>	<p>The scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project is largely to consolidate the five former DCPs with some policy changes to reflect changes in planning legislations and following up actions identified in Council resolutions.</p> <p><a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to the 28 November 2022 Council report package details that <b>Section 3.7 – Boarding Houses</b> has generally retained the objectives and controls from Parramatta DCP 2011, which covers access, building envelope, privacy and acoustic amenity. As part of this, <b>C.41</b> regarding the provision of communal bathrooms was carried over. Due to the scope of the Harmonisation DCP project, a review of the minimum requirement of a bath/shower for communal bathroom facilities was not undertaken. The existing provision of 1 for every 10 residents, as stated in <b>C.41</b>, is considered to be relatively strong and well-established in the City.</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>The Trust notes that gender specific communal bathrooms may make this difficult for non-binary residents.</p>	<p>With regards to gendered bathroom facilities, both PDCP 2011 and the Housing SEPP contain no explicit requirements to provide gendered bathroom facilities. It is also noted that the provision of individual ensuite bathrooms for each room is highly encouraged within the draft DCP (<b>C.40</b>).</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p><b>Part 4 – Non-Residential Development</b></p>	
		<p>cp. In reference to <b>C.02</b> within <b>Section 4.1.1 – Consideration of Adjoining Uses</b>, stating "Any proposal must ensure the level of effects on adjoining properties is acceptable", the submitter queries who and what determines the level of 'acceptable'.</p>	<p><b>C.02</b> of <b>Section 4.1.1. – Consideration of Adjoining Uses</b> requires non-residential development' which adjoin residential properties, to acceptably satisfy the objectives of Section 4.1.1 and the remainder of the DCP.</p> <p>As outlined in <b>C.03</b>, <i>Any proposal that may have an impact on the adjoining use must be assessed under its ability to satisfy the relevant objectives under Part 2 – Design in Context, Part 3 – Residential Development, Part 5 – Environmental Management, and Part 6 – Traffic and Transport of this DCP depending on the adjoining property use. The controls of the less intense zone must be satisfied to the extent on the effect on the neighbouring property if the proposal is on a zone boundary.</i> The sections referred to in C.03 contain controls relating to effects on amenity and what Council considers acceptable. Compliance with this section must be demonstrated to Council as part of the development application process and will be assessed by Council's Planners.</p> <p>In addition, Council officers during the assessment process view key planning maps within the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i> (including, but not limited to, zoning, height, and FSR) to understand the strategic planning context of the site. This assists with assessing the likely impacts of that development, including environmental impacts on both the natural and built environments, and social and economic impacts in the locality required under <i>Clause (1)(b) of 4.15 Evaluation of the <a href="#">Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</a></i>.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>cq. Submitter supports the emphasis on dense landscaping being used for acoustic and visual privacy, as seen in <b>O.05</b> and <b>C.05</b> of <b>Section 4.6 – Centre Based Child Care Facilities</b> regarding development provisions for childcare facilities. Submitter recommends that vegetation used in the front setback is compatible with nearby residential gardens in low-density residential areas.</p>	<p>Submitter's support of the draft Harmonisation DCP's intention for acoustic and visual privacy for childcare is noted.</p> <p>Within the draft Harmonisation DCP, to ensure that Centre Based Childcare align with the surrounding neighbourhood, <b>O.05</b> of <b>Section 4.6 – Centre Based Child Care Facilities</b> requires applicants to align the building envelope to be compatible with the character of existing surrounding residential development. Additionally, a list of endemic species to the Parramatta area is provided in <b>Table 5.3.1.1 – Endemic species to be considered in planting in the City of Parramatta</b>, which are the recommended vegetation species to be included in landscaping. While centre based childcare centres do not have development-specific landscaping controls, <b>Table 5.3.1.1</b> and <b>Section 5.3 – Protection of the Natural Environment</b> can be used to inform recommended landscaping controls.</p> <p>Within the Transport and Infrastructure SEPP, a key objective of Section 3.4 - Landscaping of the NSW Childcare Planning Guidelines (CCPG) (which accompanies the SEPP) is to provide landscape design that contributes to the local streetscape and amenity. This is demonstrated in C17 of Section 3.4 of the CCPG which requires high-quality landscaped areas to reflect and reinforce the local context of the development (including</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>nearby residential gardens).</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>cr. Submitter addresses the appropriate location of sex services premises, restricted premises and adult entertainment premises. The submitter particularly refers to <b>O.04 of Section 4.7 – Sex Service Premises and Restricted Premises</b> regarding the prevention of similar establishments (such as massage parlours) transitioning to sex service premises without development consent.</p> <p>Submitter recommends that the location of these premises be extended from 200m to at least 500m from schools and child-care centres (C.02, Section 4.7 – Sex Service Premises, Location).</p>	<p>As detailed in <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to the 28 November 2022 Council report, no other legacy DCP contained controls as detailed as the PDCP 2011 relating to these land uses. As a result, the provisions for sex service and restricted premises from PDCP 2011 were retained and carried over into the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP controls require other sex services premises, restricted premises and adult entertainment premises to not be within 200 metres; and for these uses to not be within 200 metres of a licensed premises being a hotel, public bar nightclub or the like; as well as not being located within shopping malls/arcades.</p> <p>Distances from schools and child-care centres is governed by <i>Parramatta LEP 2023, Clause 6.10 (2)(b)</i> Location of sex services premises in of PLEP 2011 which requires sex services premises to not be within 200 metres of (a) residential accommodation or land in a residential zone, and places of public worship, hospitals, schools, centre-based child care facilities, community facilities and recreation areas.</p> <p>The <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i> is a ‘higher order’ planning instrument and holds legislative weighting and the review of these controls is outside of the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project. Council consulted with the community on land use planning matters as part of the Land Use Planning Harmonisation <a href="#">Discussion Paper</a> in 2019, and the <a href="#">Harmonisation Planning Proposal (i.e. draft Harmonisation LEP) in 2020</a>. These two consultation processes were the opportunity for the community to provide feedback on this issue.</p> <p>With regards to the requirements of <b>O.04</b>, the draft Harmonisation DCP requires any changes in ownership, management, register or business on trading name to be reported to Council during the premises’ period of context (<b>C.01</b>). This is to ensure that restricted premises do not operate outside their development consents.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p><b>Part 5 – Environmental Management</b></p>	
		<p>cs. Submitter notes that the introduction for <b>Section 5.1.1 – Flooding</b> states that:</p> <p><i>As a first step in the Development Application process, proponents are strongly advised to seek flood information for their site from Council and consult with Council officers at a pre-lodgement stage, particularly for proposals located in the medium and high flood risk categories.</i></p>	<p>Council strongly advises applicants consult with Council officers at the pre-lodgement stage, particularly for proposals located in the medium and high flood risk categories, please see introduction to <b>Section 5.1.1 – Flooding</b>. Council does not support making this requirement mandatory for all applications, as the scale and type of development varies, some of which may not require consultation. Also, there are instances in which the applicant is familiar with the requirements and therefore can clearly demonstrate the necessary requirements have been achieved without pre-lodgement consultation.</p> <p>The approach of the draft Harmonisation DCP is to ensure the necessary considerations are spelt out in the DCP controls, the onus is placed on the applicant to demonstrate how the DCP requirements have been satisfied. This is achievable without pre-lodgement consultation however, pre-lodgement consultation may lead to a more efficient application process.</p> <p>Sites which are flood affected require an applicant to apply for a Flood Enquiry Application, as is identified in</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>Submitter recommends that flood consultation should be mandatory on all development undertaken in a medium or high-risk flood category identified site.</p>	<p><b>Section 5.1.1 – Flooding</b>, controls <b>C.08 - C.10</b> set out the requirements for sites that are flood affected and may be subject to additional studies to inform the flood modelling of the subject Development Application.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>ct. Submitter recommends the insertion of an additional objective at the end of the <b>Floodplain Risk Management</b> subsection of <b>Section 5.1.1 – Flooding</b>:</p> <p><b>O.16</b> No high-rise development with impermeable concrete landscaping along the banks of Parramatta River and its tributaries so that runoff and drainage can be managed safely.</p>	<p>Council Officers direct the submitter to <b>C.01</b> of <b>Section 3.5.1.4 - Open Space and Landscape</b> for apartments, which addresses the landscaping requirements through the provision of deep soil:</p> <p><i>C.01 A minimum 30% of the total site area is to be provided as deep soil, of which at least 50% is located to the rear of the site.</i></p> <p>Landscaping and deep soil requirements for non-residential developments are also indicated in <b>Part 4 - Non-Residential Development</b>. Additionally, <b>C.12</b> of <b>Section 5.1.2 - Water Sensitive Urban Design</b> provides landscape-based methods to safely manage runoff and drainage in new developments.</p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP also includes controls specific to land abutting C2 Environmental Protection zone and W1 Natural Waterways zone. The controls contain additional requirements for development which adjoins such zones with the aim to preserve aquatic biodiversity, protect and enhance water quality, and maintain the stability of a creek and its bank. Please see <b>Section 5.3.2 – Waterways and Riparian Zone</b>, and <b>Section 5.3.3 – Development on land Adjoining Land Zoned C2 Environmental Protection or W1 Natural Waterways Zone</b>.</p> <p>As such, the draft Harmonisation DCP sufficiently addresses the submitter's concerns of water sensitive urban design for high-rise development.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>cu. Submitter objects to <b>C.07</b> of <b>Section 5.1.1 - Flooding (Floodplain Risk Management)</b>, which relates to development permissibility in areas with reliable access for evacuation.</p> <p>Submitter believes that no development should be permitted in areas that are potentially flood affected. Evacuation is not considered a solution to flood risk.</p>	<p>Restrictions do apply to development types and development permitted in areas based on flood risk as outlined in <b>Table 5.1.1.2 – Floodplain Matrix Planning and Development Controls</b>. See response to submission no. 51. a. regarding evacuation requirements.</p> <p>As stated in <b>Section 5.1.1</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP, a Flood Emergency Response Plan (FERP) may be submitted with any Development Application in relevant affected areas. <b>C.26</b> of <b>Section 5.1.1</b> provides requirements to be considered as part of the FERP, including evacuation measures (including safe evacuation routes and areas) for <u>all building occupants</u>. Any further considerations would be discussed with Council or relevant state and local agencies in preparation of the FERP, and must be evidenced as part of the Development Application.</p>
		<p>cv. Objects to <b>O.12</b> of <b>Section 5.1.1 – Flooding</b>, with the submitter considering any development within high flood risk or floodway areas to be inappropriate.</p>	<p>Council officers direct the submitter to the <b>Flood Warning and Emergency Response Planning</b> subsection of <b>Section 5.1.1 - Flooding</b>, which outlines objectives and controls to address evacuation for development in flood affected areas. As detailed in <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to the 28 November 2022 Council report, these provisions are</p>



Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>cw. Submitter suggests an additional control is recommended within <b>Section 5.1.1 – Flooding</b>, to provide safe access and egress for disabled occupants and pets from buildings in the event of a flood emergency.</p> <p>cx. Submitter recommends the following additional requirement to Flood Emergency Response Plans (FERPs) submitted with Development Applications (<b>C.26</b>) within Section 5.1.1 – Flood Warning and Emergency Response Planning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Include evacuation measures for disabled occupants and for pets.</i></li> </ul> <p>cy. Submitter recommends additional requirements to shelter in place or vertical evacuation measures (<b>C.29</b>) within <b>Section 5.1.1 – Flood Warning and Emergency Response Planning</b>. The Trust notes the following should be added to the control:</p> <p><i>f) safe area of refuge for pets (in cages etc)</i></p> <p>CZ. Submitter expresses concern that permeable surfaces are not clearly encouraged within the <b>Section 5.1.2 – Water Sensitive Urban Design</b>. Submitter recommends the insertion of an additional objective as O.08 within: <i>Use permeable landscaping surfaces, such as grass not concrete, so that water runoff is minimised and local heating is reduced in summer.</i></p>	<p>consistent with the NSW Floodplain Development Manual (the Manual) and the Floodplain Risk Management Plan. It is noted that the Manual supports development in high risk flood areas, as well as evacuation as a solution to flood risk, and provides guidance on safe evacuation procedures.</p> <p>The accessibility requirements stipulated in the draft Harmonisation DCP for shelter in place, evacuation, access and egress are considered suitable for all potential occupants of the development to which they apply. <b>C.26 – Section 5.1.1 – Flooding</b> requires FERPs to accompanying development applications must include warning and evacuation measures for all building ‘occupants’.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p><i>See response to No.15.g that explains the controls proposed to aid in the cooling of the urban environment in the City in Section 5.4.4 of the draft Harmonisation DCP.</i></p> <p>The submitters suggestion that the draft harmonisation DCP does not clearly encourage the use of permeable surfaces is not supported. Objective <b>O.06</b> of <b>Section 5.1.2– Water Sensitive</b> in the draft Harmonisation DCP promotes the use of permeable landscaping surfaces and includes the measures suggested by the submitter:</p> <p><b>O.06</b> <i>Use simple landscape-based WSUD solutions wherever appropriate that achieve water management objectives without unusual or complicated maintenance demands, and mindful of other stormwater management requirements outlined in this DCP.</i></p> <p>Similarly, the control at <b>C.03</b> of <b>Section 5.1.2</b> discourages the use of impervious surfaces, with a preference for permeable landscaping surfaces to reduce stormwater run-off:</p> <p><b>C.03</b> <i>Impervious surfaces are to be minimised and soft landscaping used to promote infiltration and reduce stormwater run-off.</i></p> <p>With regards to the benefits of permeable landscaping surfaces in reducing urban heat (particularly in summer),</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p><b>O.07</b> of <b>Section 5.1.2</b> is sufficient in capturing this intention:</p> <p><i><b>O.07 Use WSUD to increase evapotranspiration, urban heat reduction and to reduce uncontrolled runoff.</b></i></p> <p>As such, it is considered that the objectives and controls contained within the draft Harmonisation DCP are sufficient in addressing the submitter’s concerns for encouraging permeable landscaping surfaces.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>da. Submitter requests additional information to be provided on how to avoid mosquito breeding in rainwater tanks. This is in response to <b>C.05</b> of <b>Section 5.1.2 – Water Sensitive Urban Design</b> regarding the preferred use of rainwater harvesting and use in any water management system for individual lots and the public domain.</p>	<p>As detailed in the report for the Council Meeting on 31 October 2022 (<a href="#">Item 14.1</a>), Council endorsed the "<a href="#">Get Mosquito Ready this Summer</a>" educational campaign that ran in the 2022-23 summer. As part of this, it was recommended that rainwater tank openings (including overflows) are covered or securely fitted with mosquito-proof screens. Steel or plastic mesh can also be installed around any pipes, valves or access points that mosquitoes can get through.</p> <p>It is not the role of a DCP to aid occupants/ residents with ongoing maintenance issues. Education on these issues is best addressed via other education mechanism such as the one described above.</p> <p>For further information, refer to the BASIX help notes webpage regarding <a href="#">Potential hazards and treatments</a>.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>db. Submitter expresses support for <b>C.09 of Section 5.1.2 – Water Sensitive Urban Design</b> regarding the reduction of stormwater runoff directly entering waterways or neighbouring bushland. Submitter requests a list of options to prevent water runoff directly entering waterways.</p>	<p>The draft Harmonisation DCP contains a series of practical measures to achieve water sensitive urban design objectives and controls (including the harvesting/redirection of stormwater runoff) within <b>C.11 of Section 5.1.2 – Water Sensitive Urban Design</b>. These methods list options for different components of development (open space, landscaped areas, roofs, driveways and the like) and provide appropriate solutions to manage stormwater runoff. Similarly, <b>Table 5.1.2.1 – Required for specific development types in Section 5.1.2 – Water Sensitive Urban Design</b> lists required water sensitive design measures for different land uses and development scales.</p> <p>As such, the draft Harmonisation DCP’s controls are considered sufficient in addressing various options to reduce stormwater runoff directly entering waterways.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>dc. Submitter recommends that the table in <b>C.11 of Section 5.1.2 – Water Sensitive Urban Design</b>, which identifies methods to achieve WSUD Objectives and Controls based on different elements, should explicitly specify that no concrete should be used for landscaped areas.</p>	<p>In line with the <a href="#">Dictionary</a> in <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i>, and <a href="#">Part 10 – Glossary</a> of the draft Harmonisation DCP “landscaped area” is defined as <i>a part of a site used for growing plants, grasses and trees, but does not include any building, structure or <u>hard paved area</u></i>. Additionally, the definition of a “landscaped area” explicitly excludes <i>impervious surfaces such as driveways, paved areas, roofed areas, carparking and stormwater structures, decks and the like and any area with a width or length of less than 2m</i>.</p> <p>Based on this, the submitter’s request to specify that no concrete should be used for landscaped areas in <b>C.11 of Section 5.1.2 – Water Sensitive Urban Design</b> is not necessary as such surfaces are not considered landscaped areas.</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>dd. Submitter requests that more information should be provided on “passively irrigated street trees”, as detailed as a method to reach WSUD objectives and controls within <b>C.11 of Section 5.1.2 – Water Sensitive Urban Design</b>. Comments that this infers that no care is provided to the street trees.</p> <p>Submitter requests an additional statement to detail that developers are responsible for the health of street trees at their development sites during all phases of construction.</p>	<p>As explained within <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2022, controls relating to stormwater management have been reviewed and updated for clarity, more effective implementation, and to reflect new industry benchmarks. This includes the landscape-based approach to meet stormwater quality controls, in line with the broader intentions of water sensitive urban design (WSUD) principles. As part of this, the draft Harmonisation DCP has introduced the specification of landscape-based measures and methods to achieve WSUD, as detailed in <b>C.12 of Section 5.1.2 - Water Sensitive Urban Design</b>.</p> <p>Tree and vegetation planting in new developments are required to be detailed in landscape plans (prepared by a qualified landscape architect) as part of the development application package. This includes the care, maintenance, and establishment of new trees (including passively irrigated trees) of which the applicant is responsible for as stipulated in the development consent conditions or as outlined in any approved management plan. Additionally, Council’s Public Domain Guidelines states that a two year maintenance period for street tree planting that include WSUD devices must be carried out by the developer following final OC approval of the public domain works by Council Officers. As such, the submitter’s request for an additional statement to clarify applicants’ responsibilities regarding new street trees is not required.</p> <p>A two year (104 week) maintenance and defects period is required for any public domain works that include WSUD devices, including bio-retention tree pit, rain garden, swale etc., to be carried out by the developer following final OC approval of the public domain works by Council Officers.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>de. Submitter supports the initiatives of <b>O.08</b> within <b>Section 5.1.3 – Stormwater Management</b> regarding the return of swimming to the Parramatta River and other waterways.</p>	<p>The draft Harmonisation DCP’s initiatives supports Planning Priority 13 of Council’s <a href="#">Local Strategic Planning Statement 2036</a> (page 68) regarding the improvement of health and swimability of Parramatta River, its waterways and catchment. Please refer to Council’s <a href="#">Our Living River webpage</a> and <a href="#">10-step Masterplan Overview</a> for further information on Council initiatives to support the return of swimming in Parramatta River and other waterways.</p> <p>Submitter’s support is noted.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>df. Submitter requests <b>C.04 of Section 5.1.5 – Groundwater</b> (regarding reasons for waterproofing requirements where groundwater could be encountered) to be amended to include the following reasoning as a subpoint:</p> <p><i>Electricity outages in storms could prevent pumping out of water.</i></p>	<p><b>C.05 of Section 5.1.5 – Groundwater</b> sates;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Failure of mechanical systems to treat and pump groundwater creates structural and environmental risks.</i></li> </ul> <p>Council officers consider the requirements contained in the abovementioned control sufficient in capturing the Submitter’s suggested addition.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>dg. Submitter requests greater emphasis on minimising the impact of development on the city’s biodiversity (<b>O.01, Section 5.3.1 – Biodiversity</b>) by having specific Council policies to prevent developers from clearing all vegetation from a site and prevent them from lopping or cutting significant trees and street trees. To promote this, <b>C.06</b>, which states “development should seek to retain unique environmental features of the site” needs to be enforced.</p>	<p><i>See responses No.43.ac addressing the process and penalties for illegal tree removal.</i></p> <p>Provisions relating to the management of trees contained in <b>Section 5.3.4 - Tree and Vegetation Management</b> are designed to manage and preserve canopy trees coverage across the City to maintain amenity, retain urban forest, canopy cover, reduce urban heat, and protect habitat.</p> <p>The removal of a tree on individual sites requires an assessment as part of Tree Permit Application (or DA within certain special areas within the City such as Heritage Conservation Areas). This is consistent with the <a href="#">Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</a> and Chapter 2 of the <a href="#">State Environmental Planning Policy (Biodiversity and Conservation) 2021</a>. Trees and vegetation that are categorised as protected are protected by law, irrespective whether it is located at private or public land. This is because trees are an important community asset and contribute to the urban forest and their removal or excessive pruning needs to be assessed by Council to the necessity of the work proposed.</p> <p>A Tree Permit application is not required to remove a tree where Council is satisfied that the tree is dead or dying and is not required as the habitat of native animals and/or not located on land mapped as ‘Biodiversity’ under <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i>. Additionally, <b>C.11 in Section 5.3.4 – Tree and Vegetation Preservation</b> states a tree that is dead or dying that provides habitat to native animals and is not posing a risk to human life or property does not warrant removal of pruning.</p> <p>As such, the draft Harmonisation DCP controls are considered sufficient to minimise the impact of development and specifically the clearing of vegetation on individual sites on the city’s biodiversity.</p> <p><a href="#">Attachment 2</a> and <a href="#">Attachment 3</a> to the Council report from 28 November 2022 contain more information on the approach to tree preservation and management.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>dh. The submitter requests more oversight to ensure developers meet their obligations in relation to the submission of a Statement of Flora and Fauna Impact (SFFI) for all</p>	<p>As is required by <b>C.02 in Section 5.3.1 – Biodiversity</b>, a Statement of Flora and Fauna Impact (SFFI) is required when development poses a potential change to the healthy function of the surrounding environment, and the submission of an SFFI is enforced by the <a href="#">Biodiversity Conservation Regulation 2017</a>.</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>development in or adjacent to bushland and/or waterways, including vegetation mapped as ‘Biodiversity’ or ‘Riparian Land and Waterways’ on the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i> Natural Resources Map as outlined by <b>C.02</b> within <b>Section 5.3.1</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p>	<p>As such, the draft Harmonisation DCP controls are considered sufficient to ensure developers meet their obligations in relation to the submission of a Statement of Flora and Fauna Impact (SFFI) and conditions requiring the application of the recommendations deemed appropriate would be imposed on any consent.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>di. The submitter agrees with <b>C.09</b> within <b>Section 5.3.1</b> but requests that strong Council oversight is required to prevent developers clearing all vegetation on sites. This includes trees with culturally significant heritage value and gardens on a site at commencement.</p> <p><b>C.09</b> - Development is to be sited and designed to minimise the impact on cultural heritage trees and plantings and consideration is to be given to further planting of cultural landscapes where appropriate.</p>	<p>Additional protection measures are provided to trees that are either heritage or located in a Heritage Conservation Area, this includes an assessment through a Development Application for tree works rather than a Tree Permit application. For works requiring development assessment, Council’s <i>Community Engagement Strategy (2022-24)</i> requires tree works related to heritage to be publicly notified for 14 days.</p> <p>Generally any tree equal to or greater than 5m is protected throughout the LGA however, C.01 in <b>Section 5.3.4 – Tree and Vegetation Preservation</b> propose the following control in Heritage Conservation Areas of heritage listed sites;</p> <p><i>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; and/or is required to be planted and maintained as part of a development consent or tree permit determination notice):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- that is or forms part of a heritage item, or</li> <li>- that is within a heritage conservation area; or</li> <li>- that is located within a Special Character Area as defined by this DCP.</li> </ul> <p>See response to submission No.43.ah. Addressing additional requirements for trees on heritage items or within HCAs.</p> <p>See response No.43.ac addressing the process and penalties for illegal tree removal.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>dj. Submitter requests further requirements for new residential developments to address climate change, specifically all strata developments to cater for solar panels and electric vehicle charging. Requests that all vehicle parking for dwellings should have electric charge points.</p>	<p>As explained within <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2022, the draft Harmonisation DCP is introducing new Electric Vehicle(EV) controls as well as comprehensive requirements to reduce new development’s contribution to greenhouse gas emissions and urban heat as part of the harmonisation process.</p> <p><b>Section 6.1.3 of Part 6 – Traffic and Transport</b> includes new provisions where all garages in single dwellings and dual occupancies require a Private EV connection demonstrated on development application plans. For residential accommodation outside of dwelling houses, secondary dwellings and dual occupancies, car parking must provide an EV Ready Connection to at least one car space for each dwelling/apartment.</p> <p>The provision of photovoltaic solar panels has also been addressed in the draft Harmonisation DCP for development (including strata titled developments) that are best positioned to capture solar energy (<b>C.10</b> and <b>C.11 Section 5.4.1 – Energy Efficiency</b> and <b>C.04 of Section 3.2.1 – Solar Access and Cross Ventilation</b>).</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p><b>C.03</b> of <b>Section 5.4.4.1</b> requires the material of a roof to demonstrate either a combination of or satisfactory compliance with a minimum solar reflectivity index between 39-82 depending on its slope, or vegetation coverage of 75% of the total roof/podium surface.</p> <p>It is noted that the installation of solar panels is not recommended for development that are not well positioned to capture solar energy (new developments which receive less than 3 hours of direct sunlight between 9am and 3pm during the winter solstice).</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>dk. Submitter proposes that all roofing materials be light in colour and designed to reflect as much light as possible to reduce heat absorption.</p>	<p>As explained within Table 4 – Environmental Performance of <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2022, the draft Harmonisation DCP has introduced comprehensive requirements to reduce new development’s contribution to urban heat.</p> <p><b>Section 5.4.4.1 – Roof Surface</b> of <b>Part 5 – Environmental Management</b> includes new provisions that require development to demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>a) Materials used have a minimum solar reflectivity index (SRI) of 82 if a horizontal surface or a minimum SRI of 39 for sloped surface greater than 15 degrees; or</i></li> <li><i>b) 75% of the total roof or podium surface be covered by vegetation; or</i></li> <li><i>c) A combination of (a) and (b) for the total roof surface.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Section 5.4.4.1 - Roof Surface</b> addresses the issue of heat absorption and <b>C.03</b> specifies the requirements of minimum solar reflectivity index for roofing types.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>dl. With regards to <b>C.01</b> of <b>Section 5.4.4 – Urban Cooling</b>, the submitter requests a greater emphasis on the value of mature tree canopy and vegetation in mitigating the impacts of urban heat, and recommends this approach to be taken throughout the entirety of the DCP.</p>	<p>See <i>Submission No.43.b</i> for further information on the value of the tree canopy and vegetation within the draft DCP and the City.</p> <p>As outlined in the Introduction to <b>Part 5 – Environmental Management</b>, all controls (including those within <b>Section 5.4.4 – Urban Cooling</b>) must be read in conjunction with any other relevant parts of the draft Harmonisation DCP. This is to ensure that all developments address the necessary planning matters detailed in the separate technical themes of the DCP.</p> <p>Further information on the retention and protection of tree canopy and vegetation can be found in <b>Section 5.3.1 – Biodiversity</b> and <b>5.3.4 – Tree and Vegetation Preservation</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP. These sections include detailed objectives and controls to ensure that tree canopy is maintained throughout the City, in turn contributing to a reduction in urban heat. Collectively, the three sections are sufficient in addressing the relationship between tree canopy and vegetation in mitigating the impacts of urban heat.</p> <p>As it is a requirement for development to address the controls and objectives of all relevant parts of the draft Harmonisation DCP (including urban cooling and tree and vegetation preservation requirements in <b>Part 5 – Environmental Management</b>), it is not necessary to duplicate these controls across the entirety of the draft</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>dm. Submitter suggests that flat roof developments should install roof-top gardens to reduce heat absorption. Suggests that this is beneficial for roofs where solar panels are proposed to increase energy efficiency from a cooler roof.</p>	<p>As explained within <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2022, the draft Harmonisation DCP is introducing refined controls for green roofs and walls (consistent with the recommendations of the <a href="#">Discussion Paper</a>).</p> <p><b>Section 5.4.4.5 – Green Roofs or Walls</b> includes specific controls outlining the requirements and specifications for green roofs and walls (in accordance to Section 4P Planting on Structures of the <a href="#">Apartment Design Guide</a>). Whilst the draft Harmonisation DCP does not specify any controls to address a combination of solar panels and green roofs, the draft Harmonisation DCP does specify building configurations that are best positioned to capture solar energy.</p> <p><i>See response to No.43.dk regarding the reduction of new development’s contribution to urban heat.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>dn. Submitter requests Council consider wind mitigation when narrow and tall buildings are constructed in addition to noise amenity.</p>	<p>As explained within <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2022, <b>Section 5.4 - Environmental Performance</b> has carried over wind mitigation controls contained within from the Parramatta DCP 2011 (consistent with the recommendations of the <a href="#">Discussion Paper</a>). Objective <b>O.01</b> in <b>Section 5.4.8 - Wind Mitigation</b> requires that a <i>building form enables the provision of a safe and comfortable pedestrian level wind environment, including street frontages, outdoor eating areas, open spaces.</i></p> <p>Additionally, <b>C.01</b> requires <i>comfort in and around new buildings</i> along with appropriate wind speed exceedance limits to improve the pedestrian experience as a result of new development, as indicated in <b>Table 5.4.8.1</b>. Adherence to these specifications are expected to reduce noise pollution that can result from undesirable wind speeds.</p> <p><i>See responses No.43.bf and cf addressing the wind mitigation measures within the draft Harmonisation DCP.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p><b>Part 6 – Traffic and Transport</b></p> <p>do. The submitter states there is no reference to bicycles or cycleways in <b>Section 6.1 – Sustainable Transport</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP. They note that “<i>the City is well connected by train, bus, road and cycle networks</i>” but state that this may refer to the Parramatta CBD and not necessarily to the whole of the City of Parramatta. Submitter recommends the</p>	<p>The use of the term "City" is inclusive of the whole City of Parramatta Local Government Area (LGA), and replaces previous terminology used to describe the LGA.</p> <p>The role of the DCP is to guide new development - it is not a function of the DCP to provide comprehensive transport strategies. Such strategies are prepared through separate transport planning projects.</p> <p>Council officers direct the submitter to the draft Parramatta Bike Plan 2023, which was recently endorsed by Council for public exhibition. This plan provides a framework to deliver identified cycleways within the City, with a key objective to improve bike riding to and within centres, neighbourhoods and key destinations. For more</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>DCP include a map showing the existing cycleway network, and identify areas that are poorly connected with a plan for the network connectivity to be improved, . particularly north and south of Epping railway station as an example.</p>	<p>Information, refer to the 10 July 2023 Council meeting (<a href="#">Item 13.4</a>).</p> <p>Specific provisions for bicycle parking for new developments have been provided in <b>Section 6.3 – Bicycle Parking</b> of the draft DCP, which were informed by the recommendations of the <a href="#">Discussion Paper</a>.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>dp. Submitter recommends that developments close to major transport hubs include pedestrian access routes to ensure pedestrians are able to find safer, more “attractive” methods of transport, as Council have restricted parking spaces and seek alternative transport options to private cars.</p>	<p>It is noted that precinct-specific controls for areas close to major transport hubs (such as the Parramatta City Centre and Epping Strategic Centre) are present within the draft Harmonisation DCP. Within these sections, desired future pedestrian lanes to public transportation are indicated (as seen for Epping Central in <b>Figure 8.1.1.1.3 – Pedestrian Connections and Laneways</b>). It is expected that these connections will be delivered through the Development Application process. Additionally, Council have identified land throughout the City to be acquired by Council for the improvement of traffic and transport outcomes (either through road widenings or the like), as seen in the Land Reservation Acquisition Map of the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i>.</p> <p>The role of the DCP is to guide new development - it is not a function of the DCP to provide comprehensive transport strategies, including services for public transport and bus shelters. Such strategies are prepared through separate transport planning projects. Similar to the above response, delivery of safe walking paths to bus stops and shared-use paths is undertaken either through Council-led projects or in negotiation with land owners during the Development Application process.</p>
		<p>dq. The submitter recommends that Council provide appropriate services for public transport, including bus shelters, safe walking paths to bus stops and pedestrian and cycleway bridges over busy roads. This is to facilitate safe access with Council’s policy to reduce car parking spaces.</p>	<p>Council officers direct the submitter to the draft Parramatta Bike Plan 2023 (Item 13.4 of the <a href="#">10 July 2023 Council meeting</a>), which details an indicative future bicycle network including shared paths for the City.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>dr. The submitter proposes that a maximum number of parking spaces for residential dwellings within 800 metres and 400 metres of a frequent transport service be implemented.</p>	<p>As explained within <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2022, the minimum car parking rates within <b>Section 6.2 – Parking and Vehicle Access</b> have been prepared by Council’s Traffic and Transport team, consistent with TfNSW’s <i>Guide to Traffic Generating Developments</i>. Table 5.3 of the guideline informed car parking rates for residential development both inside and outside of public transport radius thresholds.</p> <p>As such, residential development within 800m of major rail stations have a lower minimum parking rate to encourage the use of public transportation. Additionally, the requirement of a traffic and transport impact assessment as part of the Development Application package ensures that an appropriate number of parking spaces (relevant to the site’s context and maximum parking rates indicated in Division 4 of <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i>) are provided for new development.</p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP retains precinct specific parking rates which include areas that utilise maximum parking rates, this includes areas such as Parramatta CBD and Epping CBD where there is a high concentration of public and active transport accessibility. The draft Harmonisation DCP includes reduced minimum parking rates for residential flat buildings, multi dwelling housing or the residential component of mixed Use development</p>



Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>(within 800 metres walking distance of a train station or light rail stop, or within 400 metres walking distance of a transitway bus stop).</p> <p>It is considered that the introduced car parking rates and requirements in <b>Section 6.2</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP are consistent with relevant guidelines, and are sufficient in delivering the required car parking spaces for new development.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>ds. Recommends the definition for “accessible area” be amended for developments near public transport which requires the minimum frequency for bus services to be provided at least every 30 minutes.</p>	<p>It is noted that this terminology is not used or defined within <b>Part 6–Traffic and Transport</b> or any other parts of the draft Harmonisation DCP. As such, the submitter’s request to incorporate the definition of “accessible area” in accordance with the <a href="#">State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021</a> it is not considered necessary.</p> <p><i>See response to submission No. 18. b. in relation to ‘accessible area’ definition.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>dt. Recommends Council prohibit off-road parking on narrow roads throughout the City, for consistency with RMS’s <i>Off-road Parking Provision on Narrow Roads</i>, particularly road rule no. 197, which prohibits parking on footpaths and nature strips.</p>	<p>As stated in the City of Parramatta <a href="#">Parking Enforcement Policy</a>, the prohibition of parking on rollback kerb streets of Newington was inherited from parking requirements set out by the previous Auburn Council. The policy also states that a future amendment of this policy may be undertaken, subject to a review of the current provisions (including community consultation, and Council adoption).</p> <p>This review is not within scope of the draft Harmonisation project, and is subject to a separate review of the Parking Enforcement Policy to address the off-road parking provisions.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>du. The submitter recommends the controls contained within the current City of Parramatta Parking Enforcement Policy, that prohibits parking on “rollback kerb and gutter” in Newington, to be implemented throughout all suburbs in the City</p>	
		<p>dv. Clarification is requested to differentiate between bicycle storage and bicycle parking facilities, particularly referencing <b>C.12</b> within <b>Section 6.3 – Bicycle Parking</b>.</p> <p>If these two mean the same thing, the submitter suggested to alter <b>C.12</b> (regarding the provision of e-bike charging outlets) to provide charging outlets for 10% of provided bicycle parking spaces in bicycle storage facilities, where:</p>	<p>The bicycle parking controls contained in <b>Section 6.3 - Bicycle Parking</b> do not differentiate between bicycle parking or storage. Additionally, the Land Use Planning Harmonisation <a href="#">Discussion Paper</a>, Australian Standards (AS2890.3 – <i>New Bicycle Parking Requirements 2015</i>) and the State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021 does not provide a definition for bicycle storage facilities. does not provide a definition for bicycle storage facilities.</p> <p>The terms ‘bicycle storage facilities’ and ‘bicycle parking’ are used interchangeably within the draft Harmonisation DCP; however Council officers acknowledge this may cause confusion, and therefore it is recommended that the term ‘bicycle storage’ be replaced with ‘bicycle parking facilities’ to remove ambiguity and ensure the controls in <b>C.12</b> in <b>Section 6.3 – Bicycle Parking</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP are applied correctly.</p> <p>As <b>Section 6.3</b> applies to residential, commercial and industrial zones it is not required to include additional</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The number of bicycle parking spaces provided is greater than 10</li> <li>The bicycle parking spaces are found within a residential premise</li> <li>The bicycle parking spaces are for use by staff</li> </ul>	<p>criteria where e-bike charging outlets are to be provided. The wording of <b>C.12</b> requiring a 10A e-bike charging outlet to 10% of provided bicycle parking spaces with no spaces being more than 20 metres away from a charging outlet is considered adequate in encompassing the criteria suggested by the submitter.</p> <p>See response to submission No. 18. e. and f. regarding bicycle storage and bicycle parking charging requirements.</p> <p><b>As a result of this submission, amendments will be made to the relevant section of the draft Harmonisation DCP to replace the reference to bicycle storage with bicycle parking facilities.</b></p>
		<p><b>Part 7 – Heritage and Archaeology</b></p>	
		<p>dw. Submitter questions the language of <b>C.01 Table 7.2.1 of Part 7 – Heritage and Archaeology</b>. Comments that the following wording (relating to consent requirements for types of works on the maintenance or repair work on external fabric and gardens) is unclear and can cause confusion:</p> <p><i>“General maintenance or repair may not need the consent of Council, but a Heritage minor work application must be submitted.”</i></p>	<p>Works that do not require approval via the Development Application process are detailed in <i>Section 5.10 (3) Heritage conservation of Parramatta LEP 2023</i>, and are generally works that are of minor nature (or for the maintenance of the heritage item) and would not adversely affect the item’s heritage significance. Applications for works of this kind can be lodged with Council via a Heritage Minor Works Application. Where “consent” is mentioned in <b>C.01</b>, this refers to approval through the Development Application pathway. For more information on Heritage Development Approvals, see Council’s <a href="#">Heritage Conservation webpage</a>.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>dx. Submitter agrees with the wording of <b>C.23</b> (incorrectly referenced as <b>O.05</b>) of <b>Section 7.4 – General Provisions</b> regarding the importance of Heritage Conservation Areas and emphasis of design that is compatible with neighbourhood character. Submitter comments that it would be ideal to see more new buildings that follow this.</p>	<p>Council notes submitters support.</p>
		<p>dy. Submitter comments that <b>Figure 7.4.3 – New subdivisions, battle-axe and amalgamation of lots</b> within <b>Section 7.4 – General Provisions</b> (relating to heritage subdivision patterns within heritage contexts) is not clear on the preferred and non-preferred subdivision options. Requests clarification on the preferred method of subdivision.</p>	<p>The intention of the controls relating to subdivision patterns in <b>Part 7 – Heritage and Archaeology</b> is to preserve the historical pattern of subdivision (<b>C.02</b>), which is unique to each Heritage Conservation Area (HCA). It is noted that each HCA (<b>Section 7.10 – Heritage Conservation Areas</b>) provides information on the significance of their subdivision patterns, as well as tailored controls for each HCA.</p> <p>In <b>Section 7.4 – General Provisions, Figure 7.4.3 – New subdivisions, battle-axe and amalgamation of lots</b> provides examples of possible scenarios that <i>may</i> be suitable within a heritage context, however applicants must consider the requirements of the distinctive characteristics (including subdivision patterns) of the HCA in which the item is situated. Such subdivision requirements are found in the Distinctive Characteristics and Provisions sub-sections of each specific HCA (<b>Section 7.10</b>).</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>As such, the draft Harmonisation DCP controls are considered sufficient in addressing the requirements for subdivision within heritage areas <b>and no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>dz. The submitter disagrees with the requirement that design elements of new extensions to heritage items (<b>C.18</b>) within <b>Section 7.4 – General Provisions</b> which relates to heritage alterations and additions. The proposed control requires design elements to be consistent with those of the original building, however the submitter believes that using a simpler version of design details is appropriate and is preferred.</p>	<p>As detailed in <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to the 28 November 2022 Council report package, <b>Part 7 – Heritage and Archaeology</b> has generally retained the objectives and controls in Parramatta DCP 2011 as these provisions are considered to be relatively strong and well-established in the City. This process has followed the recommendations of the <a href="#">Discussion Paper</a>, which also states that the intent of the general heritage provisions (including the treatment of design elements) is broadly consistent across all legacy DCPs.</p> <p><b>Section 7.4 – General Provisions</b> of the draft DCP contains clear objectives (O.02, O.03, O.06, O.07, O.08, O.10) and controls (C.07, C.10, C.13, C.24, C.26, C.34, C38, C.45, C.46, C.50) that require detailing, materials and finishes of any new additions to complement the period and style of the heritage item or heritage conservation area.</p> <p>This is further communicated in <b>C.18</b>:</p> <p><i>It is inappropriate to use a simpler version of the design details used in the original building so that the new additions are in keeping with, and still able to be differentiated, from the original structure.</i></p> <p>As such, the draft Harmonisation DCP controls are considered sufficient in addressing the stylistic requirements for additions on heritage items and are adequate to maintain the character of heritage items within the City.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>ea. Submitter raises concern raised over the neglect of heritage sites, which leads to significant deterioration and is not uncommon currently (<b>Section 7.4 – General Provisions</b> which relates to the demolition of heritage items).</p>	<p>See response to No.17.a that explains the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP in relation to Part 7 Heritage and Archaeology and its drafting.</p> <p>Heritage items are protected under the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i> (Section 5.10 Heritage conservation) and the requirements of the <a href="#">Heritage Act 1997</a> which takes precedence in the hierarchy of environmental planning instruments (EPI).</p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP provides guidance in the maintenance of heritage buildings and items, as detailed in <b>C.52 - C.69</b> of <b>Section 7.4 – General Provisions</b>. Where elements of a heritage item are proposed to be</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>eb. The submitter also questions how Council is expected to manage the demolition of heritage items, as <b>C.19 (Section 7.4 – General Provisions</b> which relates to the demolition of heritage items) states that Council do not support their demolition.</p> <p><b>C.19 Council does not generally support demolition of heritage items. Poor structural condition or costs associated with restoration and conservation works are not sufficient justifications. Demolition by neglect is also a serious issue and a concern for Council, the poor conditions could affect not only the subject site liveability but also the safety and liveability of the nearby properties. Unkempt items negatively impact the character of the conservation area, as well as the context and view surrounding heritage items.</b></p>	<p>replaced (such as fences, walls, and the like), the draft Harmonisation DCP requires the character of the heritage item or conservation area to be maintained. Replacement elements’ materiality, style, size, colours, and technology are required to complement the period or style of the heritage item. Council also provides heritage grant funding to landowners to assist them retain and maintain heritage items and buildings in Heritage Conservation Areas.</p> <p>Whilst Council have provided a framework to maintain heritage items, Council do not have the power to mandate what people do with their property (including demolition by neglect). However where reported Council can investigate identified unlawful activity or failure to comply with terms or conditions of approvals, licences and orders and decide whether to take enforcement action.</p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP seeks to create an environment that discourages applications for demolition of Heritage items but it cannot stop a landowner/applicant from lodging an application with their justification for demolition and when it is lodged. In the assessment stage, Council officers will determine the application based on the requirements of the , <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i>, and relevant DCP. The integrity of this assessment process must be maintained and it is possible that a case may be made for demolition of a heritage item but this would be in extreme cases. The DCP reflects Council preference but it is not a rule that cannot be applied without proper assessment of the circumstances of the application lodged with Council.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>ec. The submission notes the list of contributory items for Heritage Conservation Areas is only partially completed for the Epping Ward. It recommends the DCP record contributory items for the East Epping, Essex Street and Rosebank Avenue Heritage Conservation Areas. Maps for these are provided in previous documents from Hornsby Council.</p>	<p>Identifying heritage contributory items across the new City area is out scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project.</p> <p>Council is aware that not all legacy DCPs identified contributory items; where a current DCP identified contributory items (such as the Parramatta DCP 2011) these have been transferred into the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p>The scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project is largely to consolidate the five former DCPs with some policy changes to reflect changes in planning legislations (i.e. Codes SEPP and Sustainability SEPP) and following up actions identified in Council resolutions. For further details of the scope of consolidating heritage controls can be found in <a href="#">Attachment 2 – Summary of Draft DCP and Response to Discussion Paper</a> to the Council Report from 28 November 2022.</p> <p>Council officers are currently considering options for exploring an LGA wide integrated heritage study. Council Officers are currently in a scoping phase of working out how the study might be completed given resources available. It is expected that a budget for a future study will be included in preparation of the 2024/25 budget. Further community consultation will be undertaken for any new heritage controls that are recommended in any future study. This process is the appropriate process for determining whether contributory items should be added or removed for the various HCA’s.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>ed. With regards to the provisions of Heritage Conservation Areas (<b>Section 7.10 – Heritage Conservation Areas</b>), the submitter recommends ensuring that all wording concerning demolition is consistent. As an example, the submitter suggests the following wording amendments (shown as <u>underlined text</u>) within <b>Section 7.10.9 – Essex Street Conservation Area</b>:</p> <p><b>C.01</b> <i>Buildings from the Federation and Inter-war periods or relevant building style of the designated HCA should be retained.</i></p> <p><b>C.02</b> <i>Contributory buildings from the Federation and Inter-war periods or relevant building style of the designated HCA should be retained.</i></p>	<p>The identified buildings (and building styles) to be retained are specific to each individual heritage conservation area (HCA), and follow the previous structure used by the legacy DCPs. For example, <b>Section 7.10.8 – East Epping Conservation Area</b> identifies buildings from the Victorian, Federation, Inter-war and Post-war periods to be retained (<b>C.01</b>). Additionally, area-specific provisions for HCAs inherited from the previous Parramatta LGA DCPs identify existing significant buildings that are to be retained (and list these by their relevant historic period).</p> <p>As the scope of the Harmonisation DCP project was largely to consolidate the five former DCPs with some policy changes to reflect changes in planning legislations (i.e. Codes SEPP and Sustainability SEPP) and follow up actions identified in Council resolutions.</p> <p>Council officers conclude that, whilst inconsistent across the various HCAs, the relevant provisions to protect heritage buildings of relevant historic periods within HCAs is sufficient within the draft DCP. This comment may be addressed as part of a future review of heritage items and conservation areas within the City.</p> <p><i>See the response in No.11.d for more information on a future heritage review within the City.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p><b>Part 8 – Centres, Precincts, Special Character Areas &amp; Specific Sites</b></p>	
		<p>ee. Submitter identifies incorrect labels in <b>Figure 8.1.1 – Epping Strategic Centre</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• #5 requires amendment to “Oxford Street Precinct”</li> <li>• #7 requires amendment to “Essex and Pembroke Streets Precinct”</li> </ul>	<p><b>Noted and amended.</b></p> <p>Council officers have also found and amended further administrative errors with regards to <b>Figure 8.1.1 – Epping Strategic Centre</b>. These errors are in relation to the labelling of Cliff Road (previously labelled as “Cliff Street”) and Ray/Beecroft Roads (previously labelled as Essex and Pembroke Street) precincts, as well as the precinct boundaries for the Derby Street Precinct and Langston Place Precinct, as outlined within their Key Principle Diagrams (<b>Figure 8.1.1.3.1.1 – Key principles diagram, Derby Street Precinct</b> and <b>Figure 8.1.1.4.1 – Key principles diagram, Langston Place Precinct</b>, respectively).</p> <p>These changes have also been reflected in <b>Figure 8.1.1.3.1 – Epping Strategic Centre</b> as well as <b>Figure 8.1.1 Epping Strategic Centre</b>.</p> <p>Note: Figure 8.1.1 and Figure 8.1.1.3.1 are identical figures referenced in different section of the draft DCP.</p> <p><b>Refer to Attachment 4 – Summary of Changes to the Draft DCP for further information.</b></p> <p><b>As a result of this submission, amendments will be made to the relevant part of the draft Harmonisation DCP.</b></p>
		<p>ef. Submitter states there are multiple terms used to refer to the area west of the Epping</p>	<p>As part of consolidating the provisions for <b>Section 8.1.1 – Epping Strategic Centre</b>, the following changes were</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>Railway Station in different figures (Figure 8.1.1 and Figure 8.1.1.1.1, for example). Some of these are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Epping Central</li> <li>• Epping Town Centre Strategic Core</li> <li>• Epping Town Centre Core</li> </ul> <p>The Trust suggests naming this area ‘Epping Central West Precinct’ and possibly ‘Boronia Park Precinct’ whilst removing references to ‘core’ and ‘strategic centre’.</p>	<p>made:</p> <p>Epping Town Centre from Section 4.5 of Hornsby DCP 2013, retained as Epping Town Centre within the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p>Epping Town Centre (which houses Epping Town Centre Strategic Core in the eastern part of its boundary) from Section 4.1.5 of Parramatta DCP 2011, renamed as Epping Central within the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p>These changes were made to differentiate the two precincts, as both are currently known as Epping Town Centre. As detailed in Attachment 2, the recommendations from the <a href="#">Discussion Paper</a> to consolidate the controls for Epping was not undertaken due to the prioritisation of the Harmonisation DCP project. Further work to review the Epping controls (including the naming of the identified precincts within the Epping Strategic Centre) will form part of a future review of the DCP.</p> <p><b>As a result of this submission, amendments will be made to the relevant part of the draft Harmonisation DCP.</b></p>
		<p>eg. Submitter raises that the shared path between the southern end of the Epping Community Centre (Boronia Grove) to Rawson Street is currently marked, heavily used and should be retained. The Trust notes that this shared path is not reflected in <b>Figure 8.1.1.1.3</b> and <b>8.1.1.2.13.2</b> in the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p>	<p>The primary goal of the draft Harmonisation DCP is to introduce a consolidated set of controls based on existing policy contained within the five current DCPs. A review of the controls to amend the policy direction, application, flexibility, or intent was not within scope of the project.</p> <p>As explained in <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to the Council report from 28 November 2022, existing site-specific controls for precincts located within the City (including Epping Strategic Centre) will be retained in the consolidated DCP. As such, the current precinct controls for Epping Strategic Centre (including <b>Figure 8.1.1.1.3</b>) have been retained and carried over into the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p>It is noted that the shared path in <b>Figure 8.1.1.1.3</b> referenced by the submitter is marked within the figure as “new pedestrian lane” and has not been removed as part of the Harmonisation DCP process. This pedestrian lane has been directly carried over from Parramatta DCP 2011 with no changes. Changes to site specific provisions in Epping Centre, including moving the shared path to the southern end of the Epping Community Centre will be subject to outcomes from any subsequent strategy reviews for Epping Centre.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no change to the draft DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p>The insertion of <b>Figure 8.1.1.2.13.2 – Existing and proposed through-block connections</b> into the exhibited draft Harmonisation DCP has been identified as an administrative error, as a result of the concurrent work that was undertaken for the Harmonisation DCP project and the Epping Planning Review project. To correct this error, the figure has been removed from the draft DCP.</p> <p><b>For further information, refer to Tables 1 and 2 of Attachment 4 – Summary of Changes to Draft Parramatta Development Control Plan.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>eh. Submitter states that the draft Harmonisation DCP does not address improvements to local connections such as effective and high quality pedestrian links across the railway line in Epping within the Epping Town Centre.</p>	<p>Current pedestrian links across the railway line within the Epping Town Centre are serviced by the pedestrian overpass over Beecroft Road and Epping Bridge between Epping Road, Blaxland Road and Beecroft Road. Transport for NSW (TfNSW) are leading a project to upgrade Epping Bridge and the project has recently received \$220 million in commitment funding for upgrade works that involves widening of the shared pedestrian and bike paths on either side of the bridge. The connection between Epping Road and Beecroft Road will benefit from road and shared path widening improving safety, traffic flow and access to both sides of the railway line.</p> <p>More information on the project can be found on the TfNSW website: <a href="#">Epping Bridge Project</a>. City of Parramatta’s updated Bike Plan 2023 has recently been endorsed by Council and will proceed to its formal public exhibition in the near future. Council invites comments during exhibition for feedback on the future bicycle network within Parramatta LGA.</p> <p><i>See response No.43.eg for information related to the primary goals and scope of the draft Harmonisation project, and the Epping Planning Review project.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>ei. Submitter suggests pedestrian and cycleway links are required between the east and west side of Epping and that the draft Harmonisation DCP does not outline how this will be achieved. The Trust notes that a significant part of the eastern side of Epping Railway Station has been developed and major DAs have been proposed for sites between Beecroft Road and Rawson Street.</p>	<p>This comment regarding precinct-specific controls for Epping are out of scope for the draft Harmonisation DCP project.</p> <p>As detailed in the 10 July 2023 Council meeting (<a href="#">Item 13.4</a>), the draft Parramatta Bike Plan 2023 provides a framework to deliver cycleways within the City. A key objective of this strategy is to improve bike riding within the Epping Town Centre and connect to the larger active transport network. The Bike Plan in tandem with the Parramatta Ways Walking Strategy will help deliver and encourage the use of pedestrian and cycleway links between Epping.</p> <p>Future development within the Epping Town Centre will consider the activation and use of existing laneways as important pedestrian thoroughfares. Additionally, the State-led <a href="#">Epping Bridge Project</a> will provide upgraded and widened pedestrian/bicycle shared paths across the railway line.</p> <p><i>See response No.43.eg for information related to the primary goals and scope of the draft Harmonisation project, and the Epping Planning Review project.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no change to the draft DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>ej. Submitter notes that the footbridge across Beecroft Road is inadequate and needs to be widened. Additionally, the Trust notes <b>C.29</b> under <b>Section 8.1.1.1.1</b> infers the retention of this bridge and also that a developer is to provide a second parallel bridge.</p>	<p>The pedestrian footbridge across Beecroft Road is noted as a significant pedestrian link between Epping Railway Station and the Town Centre. The draft Harmonisation DCP controls relating to development across Beecroft Road (C.28, C.29 &amp; C.30) is to accommodate future development of the sites between Beecroft Road and Rawson Street. These prospective developments will need to consider up to four levels of retail/commercial space and effective connections over Beecroft Road to the railway station with continued access to Rawson Street.</p> <p>The approach of the draft Harmonisation DCP for site specific controls is to integrate them into the consolidated DCP without policy changes as they have generally been implemented through detailed studies. Any changes to site specific controls should be informed by a detailed study, this is not within the scope of the draft</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>Harmonisation DCP project.</p> <p><i>See response No.43.eg for information related to the primary goals and scope of the draft Harmonisation project, and the Epping Planning Review project.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>ek. Submitter raises concern that the Epping Bridge project (by TfNSW) will only relocate traffic jams further north-west onto Beecroft Road. The Trust also requests Council to consult directly with TfNSW on the Epping Bridge project to manage traffic flow and connectivity in the area.</p>	<p>The concerns by the submitter are noted.</p> <p>This comment regarding the Epping Bridge project are out of scope for the draft Harmonisation DCP project as it is a State-led project to replace the existing bridge with widened roads and pedestrian/bicycle shared paths. With regard to Council-led work, City of Parramatta’s updated Bike Plan 2023 connects the Epping Bridge into the wider active transport network and will encourage alternative transport modes to ease congestion within Epping.</p> <p><i>See response No.43.eh for more information on the Epping Bridge Project, see response No.43.dp for more information on Council’s Bike Plan and No.43.eg for information related to the primary goals and scope of the draft Harmonisation project, and the Epping Planning Review project.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>el. Submitter requests Council develop a traffic strategy that connects cycleway and pedestrian pathways to major destinations within the draft Harmonisation DCP. The Trust suggests that this will help in managing traffic congestion.</p>	<p>As detailed in the 10 July 2023 Council meeting (<a href="#">Item 13.4</a>), the draft Parramatta Bike Plan 2023 provides a framework to deliver cycleways within the City. A key objective of this strategy is to improve bike riding to and within centres, neighbourhoods and key destinations.</p> <p>Additionally, the <a href="#">Parramatta Ways Walking Strategy</a> plans to create a safe and accessible walking network across the City to support the Greater Sydney Green Grid. The delivery of these cycleway and pedestrian connections support the strategic actions of Council’s <a href="#">Community Strategic Plan 2018-2038</a>. These improvements will allow better access to the centre and the public transport node in Epping for residents in the walking and cycling catchment.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>em. Submitter states <b>Figure 8.1.1.2.13.2 – Existing and proposed through-block connections</b> does not convey how the pathways indicated can connect together into a cycleway/pedestrian network.</p>	<p>The through-block paths in the exhibited version of the draft Harmonisation DCP in <b>Figure 8.1.1.2.13.2 – Existing and proposed through-block connections</b> are indicative of desired future connections only, and has been removed from the draft Harmonisation DCP because Council is working with landowners through the Development Application process to deliver the most appropriate connections to improve pedestrian connectivity.</p> <p><i>See response No.43.ec information on Figure 8.1.1.2.13.2 – Existing and proposed through-block connections.</i></p> <p>Such initiatives can be seen in the proposed pedestrian through-site link between Beecroft Road and Rawson Street as part of the 59-77 Beecroft Road and 78 Rawson Street, Epping Development Application (DA/944/2021).</p> <p><i>See response No.43.el for information on initiatives to improve cycle and pedestrian networks in Epping.</i></p> <p>The insertion of <b>Figure 8.1.1.2.13.2 – Existing and proposed through-block connections</b> into the exhibited</p>



Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>draft Harmonisation DCP has been identified as an administrative error, as a result of the concurrent work that was undertaken for the Harmonisation DCP project and the Epping Planning Review project. To correct this error, the figure has been removed from the draft DCP.</p> <p><b>For further information, refer to Attachment 4 – Summary of Changes to Draft Parramatta Development Control Plan.</b></p>
		<p>en. Submitter raises concerns that the parking rates outlined in <b>Table 8.1.1.1.2</b> are more restrictive than those prescribed in <b>Table 6.3.1</b>. The Trust notes limits are prescribed to improve traffic conditions but raises that a decrease in residential amenity, congestion and other traffic problems will arise as a consequence of more on-street parking.</p>	<p>The parking rates within <b>Table 8.1.1.1.2 – Parking Rates of Section 8.1.1 – Epping Central</b> have been carried over from the site-specific parking rates contained within Section 4.1.5 – Epping Town Centre of Parramatta DCP 2011.</p> <p>The controls seek to achieve a balance between meeting the needs of local residents and businesses whilst encouraging visitors to the centre to access services and facilities using other forms of public transport. If parking rates were increased this would increase the number of people who chose to access the centre by car and add other negative amenity impacts due to congestion</p> <p>As detailed in <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to the 28 November 2022 Council report package, the parking rates within <b>Part 6 – Traffic and Transport</b> (including <b>Table 6.3.1 – Minimum car parking rates</b>) were prepared by Council’s Traffic and Transport team in accordance with TfNSW’s <i>Guide to Traffic Generating Development</i>. Precinct-specific parking rates include areas that utilise maximum parking rates, including the Epping precinct where there is a high concentration of public and active transport accessibility. The business premises car parking rate contained in the draft Harmonisation DCP reduces the required car parking spaces by 25% for sites within 800m of a train or light rail stop or 400m from a frequently served bus stop. This is to encourage use of public and active transportation.</p> <p><i>See response No.43.eg for information related to the primary goals and scope of the draft Harmonisation project, and the Epping Planning Review project.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>eo. Submitter queries whether accessible parking is included or in addition to the prescribed maximum parking rates in <b>Table 8.1.1.1.2</b>.</p>	<p><i>See response No.18.c and No.18.d for information related to ‘accessible’ parking and No.43.ej for information on the determination of parking rates within Epping Central.</i></p> <p>As informed by the Harmonisation <a href="#">Discussion Paper</a>, the parking rates for the Epping Town Centre are considered sufficient and have been carried over from the previous DCP. <b>Table 8.1.1.1.2 – Parking Rates</b> specifies that each accessible parking space must be allocated specifically to the adaptable/accessible unit and must be designed in accordance with the requirements of relevant Australian Standards. As any adaptable/accessible unit forms part of the apartment mix, accessible parking is included as part of the prescribed maximum parking rates.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>ep. Submitter requests transparency regarding Council’s intentions for the future master</p>	<p>This comment regarding the master planning of the Rawson Street Car Park site is beyond the scope of draft Harmonisation DCP project, and subject to a separate planning investigation to determine the most appropriate</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>planning of Rawson Street Car Park as specified within <b>Section 8.1.1.1.1</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP. The Trust requests future development of the car park retains the area as a community plaza.</p>	<p>future use of the site. As expressed in the <a href="#">Epping Planning Review Phase 1 Discussion Paper</a>, redevelopment of the car park intends to utilise the area for social infrastructure involving a mix of community uses.</p> <p>Council officers are not currently able to provide a further update on work undertaken for this project. However, any proposal to change the planning controls or redevelop this site would be subject of further public consultation which would allow the Trust to comment on the proposal at that time.</p> <p><i>See response No.43.eg for information related to the primary goals and scope of the draft Harmonisation project, and the Epping Planning Review project.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>eq. Submitter suggests that to accommodate development with a height up to 48 metres (as per <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i>) along the Rawson Street end of the Rawson Street Car Park, the Trust suggests <b>Figure 8.1.1.1.13</b> should show future possible access into the car park.</p>	<p>The 48m maximum height of building control for this area as identified by the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i> has been carried over from the Parramatta LEP 2011, and is reflective of the planning controls that have related to that site since 2014. As indicated in <b>Figure 8.1.1.1.2 – Future Investigation Site</b>, this site will be subject to a separate planning investigation to determine the most appropriate future use of the site, including car park access points.</p> <p><i>See response No.43.eg for information related to the primary goals and scope of the draft Harmonisation project, and the Epping Planning Review project.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>er. Submitter proposes changes to <b>C.41</b> within <b>Section 8.1.1.1</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP to make the Design Competition processes mandatory for buildings greater than 45 metres in height rather than encouraged to improve design quality of large-scale developments.</p>	<p>The nature and scale of development that must undertake the Design Competition process is set out in PLEP 2023 and is not a matter for the Harmonisation DCP. The <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i> is a ‘higher order’ planning instrument and holds legislative weighting and the review of these controls is outside of the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project. Council consulted with the community on land use planning matters as part of the Land Use Planning Harmonisation <a href="#">Discussion Paper</a> in 2019, and the <a href="#">Harmonisation Planning Proposal (i.e. draft Harmonisation LEP) in 2020</a>. These two consultation processes were the opportunity for the community to provide feedback on this issue.</p> <p>Design competitions are not required for the Epping Strategic Centre. However, Design Excellence is required to be demonstrated for all new buildings within the Town Centre Core through referral to the Design Excellence Advisory Panel (<b>C.40</b>).</p> <p>As expressed in the Harmonisation <a href="#">Discussion Paper</a>, this makes provisions for design excellence across precinct specific developments where the design competition clauses from the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i> do not apply. This provision ensures that all development at a minimum, will be subject to a formal design excellence pathway.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>es. Submitter notes an administrative error regarding <b>C.50</b> within <b>Section 8.1.1.1</b> as it incorrectly references <b>Figure 8.1.1.1.11</b> rather than <b>8.1.1.1.13</b> for the identification of</p>	<p>Noted and amended.</p> <p>Council officers have also found and amended further administrative errors with regards to other figures related to the Epping Strategic Centre.</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		vehicular access points.	<p><b>Refer to Table 1 – Changes that are supported of Attachment 4 – Summary of changes to the draft DCP for further information.</b></p> <p><b>As a result of this submission, amendments will be made to the relevant part of the draft Harmonisation DCP.</b></p>
		<p>et. Submitter requests ‘kiss and ride’ zones continue to be located on the eastern side of Rawson Street to maintain as much space of Rawson Street Car Park as a plaza or open space as part of the investigation of Epping Central (<b>Section 8.1.1.1</b>).</p>	<p>The request for ‘kiss and ride’ zones to continue to be located on the eastern side of Rawson Street for the maintenance of the car park as a plaza or open space is noted. As stated in the draft Harmonisation DCP, the Council owned Rawson Street Car Park (<b>Figure 8.1.1.1.2</b>) is considered as a future investigation area.</p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP requires development within the Epping Central to consider Epping’s strategic role as an important interchange and how the existing car park and laneways facilitate access to and from kiss and ride zones. As the car park and existing laneways between Beecroft Road and Rawson Street are subject to future redevelopment considerations, the matter of ‘kiss and ride’ zones will be considered as part of an integrated development and planning process to ensure the locating of these zones are appropriate.</p> <p><i>See response No.43.eq for further information related to the Rawson Street Car Park site.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>eu. Submitter states ‘kiss and ride’ zones are required for both sides (east and west) of Epping Railway Station.</p>	<p>Council recognises the importance of kiss and ride zones within Epping as it functions as an important interchange that can use both the car park and existing laneways to facilitate movement between both sides of Epping. Council’s website lists <a href="#">Epping Railway Station set-down/pick-up areas</a> (kiss and ride zones). Kiss and ride zones will continue to be considered in the future development of Epping to retain effective access to major links within the Town Centre. There are already kiss and ride zones on both the east and west side of the station.</p> <p><i>See response No.43.et for information regarding future development in the Epping Town Centre and the integration of ‘kiss and ride’ zones.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>ev. Submitter raises concern regarding an apparent loss of green space at Pembroke Street to the north of the Epping Branch Library.</p> <p>This is in regards to the wording in the introductory text under <b>Section 8.1.1.2.1</b> highlighting better space and place opportunities which “include a new civic space located on Pembroke Street to the north of Epping Branch Library”.</p>	<p>The site north of the Epping Branch Library, 8 Pembroke Street (Pembroke Reserve), is currently zoned RE1 Public Recreation and received an upgrade of playground equipment in 2019.</p> <p>It is noted that the introductory text of <b>Section 8.1.1.2.1</b> has created some confusion due to the use of the word “civic space”, however no changes to the site’s zoning and use is proposed. Pembroke Reserve has been retained as open green space for the community.</p> <p>Previous proposals to redevelop the library adjoining the Reserve have looked at how the Reserve might be redesigned but there is no intention to remove public access to this space. Should redevelopment of the library site occur in the future the impact on Pembroke Reserve will be part of the consultation process.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>ew. Submitter queries why there are no setback and frontage controls for sites north of</p>	<p>As stated in the introductory text of <b>Section 8.1.1.2 – Epping Town Centre</b>, the controls contained within this</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>corner Carlingford Road and Beecroft Road in relation to the Epping Town Centre (<b>Figure 8.1.1.2.5.2</b> and <b>8.1.1.2.5.3</b>).</p> <p>ex. Submitter queries whether there will be plans for an improved pedestrian crossing at Epping Road (bridge, lights or crossing) to accommodate a north to south connection at the western end of the Austino development making reference to the pedestrian connections in <b>Figure 8.1.1.3.3.1 - Key principles diagram, Epping Road / Forest Grove precinct</b>. The Trust requests this to be considered as part of the Epping Bridge project (by TfNSW).</p> <p>ey. Submitter raises inconsistencies regarding height limits for developments on the eastern corner of Essex Street and Pembroke Street (<b>Figure 8.1.1.3.4.1</b>). The Parramatta LEP specifies the height limit as 12 metres in contrast to the draft Harmonisation DCP which sets it at 5 metres. The submitter questions which instrument takes precedence in this situation.</p>	<p>section only apply to land zoned E1 Local Centre within the Epping Town Centre precinct.</p> <p>The sites north of the corner of Carlingford and Beecroft Roads are zoned R4 High Density Residential, and are subject to the controls within <b>Part 3 – Residential Development</b>. Therefore, setback or frontage controls are not present or required for these sites within <b>Figure 8.1.1.2.5.2</b> and <b>Figure 8.1.1.2.5.3</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p>Pedestrian access across Epping Road is via the signalised intersection of Epping and Blaxland Road. Council officers are unaware of any proposals to improve this access across Epping Road.</p> <p>It is noted that a north to south pedestrian link from Epping Road to the Old Bowling Club site has been proposed as part of the architectural <a href="#">plans approved by the NSW Land and Environment Court</a>. Rather than the location provided in <b>Figure 8.1.1.3.1</b>, this connection is centrally located within the site, between the proposed Building B and C (as per the approved plans in link above). As such, the delivery of this pedestrian connection is anticipated to be delivered as part of the Austino development at 2-16 Epping Road and 2-4 Forest Grove (DA/397/2020).</p> <p>The <a href="#">Epping Bridge Project</a> is led by Transport for NSW, and is in an early planning phase. All considerations will be subject to Transport for NSW's investigation of future traffic growth and existing vehicular traffic congestion.</p> <p><i>See response No.43.eh for information related to TfNSW's Epping Bridge project.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p>The annotation referenced by the submitter in <b>Figure 8.1.1.3.4.1 – Key principles diagram, Essex / Pembroke Street Precinct</b> indicates a maximum height in <u>storeys</u> control, rather than metres. This is referenced in the figure's legend.</p> <p>Maximum height of building controls for these sites are defined by the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i>, which mirror the heights contained in <i>Hornsby LEP 2013</i>. These heights are not being amended as part of the draft Harmonisation DCP. A <a href="#">Planning Information Sheet</a> is available to understand more about the difference between an LEP and DCP and how they work together to guide development.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
44	Energy Efficient Council	<p>a. Submitter generally supports the objectives of the proposed <b>Environmental Performance Section</b> (Part 5) of the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p>b. Submitter strongly supports the position that new buildings should be all-electric for general building services, noting that</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>efficient electrification uses technology that are readily commercially available and ready to take advantage of renewable energy generation and can operate without emissions once the electricity grid decarbonises.</p> <p>c. Raises concerns that all-electric buildings should include residential developments, stating that detached or semi-detached residential dwellings are the easiest building types to electrify, with no substantial barriers existing to create new all-electric homes; and high density residential developments should be prioritised as all-electric buildings to avoid future financial costs to convert such developments to all-electric.</p>	<p><b>Section 5.4.3 – All- Electric Buildings</b> contained in the draft Harmonisation DCP requires all new development that is <u>non-residential</u> State Significant development (specified in <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Planning Systems) 2021, Schedule 1, Section 13-15</i>) <b>or</b> any commercial development to use only electricity (grid provided and on-site renewables) for all energy requirements associated with normal operations.</p> <p>This provision is intended to apply to the City of Parramatta LGA except areas subject to site specific controls such as the Parramatta CBD.</p> <p>Council’s ability to require building to be completely electric ( ie effectively prohibit use of gas appliances in homes) due to the State Policies that apply the BASIX tool to residential development.</p> <p>In the CBD Policy framework controls were inserted where a bonus FSR is available if you achieve outcomes in access of BASIX minimum standards. In this context a requirement to limit development to electric power is more defensible.</p> <p>Outside the CBD a ban on gas appliances for all forms of residential development is not supported given the inconsistency with the BASIX SEPP.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
45	GoGet Carshare	<p>a. Submitter supports Council's commitment to more sustainable and green building practices across the City, particularly by new sustainable transport requirements for new development within Parramatta City Centre, Epping, Westmead, Granville and Harris Park town centres.</p> <p>b. States that the proposed provisions will enable the City's carshare network to grow in line with the City of Sydney's success.</p> <p>c. Recommends altering <b>C.01</b> and <b>C.02</b> of <b>Section 6.1.1 – Carshare</b> to indicate a minimum carshare parking spaces rather than a maximum, and in ratio to the number</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP controls require a minimum carshare parking space for development specified. This includes residential development containing 50 or more units, and any business development with a floor space of 5,000m<sup>2</sup> or above each to provide a minimum of one carshare space. This is the same rate provided in the Parramatta DCP 2011.</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>of units proposed in a residential development (minimum 1 plus an additional 1 per 50 additional units).</p>	<p>The Harmonisation project intent is to create a consistent set of development controls for the whole LGA, and as a higher rate of carshare parking space provision does not exist within the LGA, a higher rate was not considered. Therefore, the introduction of a higher carshare parking space rate would not be considered within scope of the Harmonisation project as this provision would require further investigation.</p> <p>The proposed rate is provided as a minimum which does allow applicants to provide additional carshare parking spaces.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>d. Recommends altering <b>C.04 of Section 6.1.1 - Carshare</b> to provide 1 carshare space in lieu of up to 10 private car parking spaces. Any greater parking reduction must be supported by a traffic and parking study.</p>	<p>Generally, the draft Harmonisation DCP requires minimum parking rates where there is less access to public transport or where there is higher percentage of private car use. As there is a higher percentage of personal car usage and ownership, reducing the number of parking spaces required for such development may create on street parking issues.</p> <p>Carsharing has been more successful where they are provided on-street, easily available for public use.</p> <p>Where maximum rates apply, this would reduce the number of parking spaces which developers could provide, this would make this provision only an incentive where minimum rates apply.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>e. Requests that onsite carshare requirements are included in a DA's conditions of consent, and located in front of the car park security barrier where possible. Maintains that legal access to the designated off-street carshare parking space should be available from the day the development is occupied.</p>	<p>The draft Harmonisation DCP maintains that “<i>Carshare parking spaces must be publicly accessible at all times, adequately lit and sign posted and located off street</i>”. This would require the provided carshare parking space to be in front of security barriers to ensure it is publicly accessible. The requirement for carshare spaces are generally conditioned as part of the development consent, and the building cannot be occupied unless an occupation certificate has been issued as required by the <a href="#">Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</a>. An occupation certificate cannot be issued unless all conditions of consent have been satisfied, this would include any condition requiring carshare parking spaces.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>f. Recommends altering <b>C.06 of Section 6.1.1 – Carshare</b> to include a system that ensures all Council-approved carshare providers are contacted for developments that require onsite carshare.</p>	<p>Council generally requires written evidence to be provided to the Principle Certifying Authority (PCA) demonstrating that offers of a car space to car share providers have been made, together with the outcome of the offers or a letter of commitment to the service. The PCA shall ascertain that agreement with a commercial operator is subscribed prior to issue of the construction certificate. Details are to be illustrated on plans submitted with the construction certificate.</p> <p>Currently Council does not maintain a system of approved carshare providers which must be contacted, with flexibility provided to the applicant to provide a suitable provider. Generally, the types of developments which require carshare parking spaces are within areas which are attractive to carshare providers to service.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
46	North	<p>a. Two individuals have prepared separate</p>	

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
	Parramatta Residents' Action Group	<p>submissions both on behalf of the North Parramatta Residents' Action group. Both submissions cover similar planning matters with a particular focus on the Parramatta North Transformation Area and the North Parramatta Place Strategy – now known as the Church Street North State-led Rezoning.</p>	<p>The two separate submissions on behalf of the North Parramatta Residents' Action Group (NPRAG) are largely the same in terms of content, structure, tone and as such the issues in the two submissions and the Council officer responses are collated into one submission (i.e. submission No.46).</p> <p>One of the submissions contains additional points under the common headings, and where there are significant differences of opinion in the two submissions Council officers have identified and responded to accordingly. For example, one individual requests that the height limit for the area should be 5-7 storeys, while the other individual requests that the height limit should be 4-6 storeys for part of the same area</p>
		<p>b. The North Parramatta Residents' Action Group (NPRAG) welcomes the release of the draft Harmonisation Development Control Plan 2023 for the City of Parramatta which is generally supported, and states the focus of this submission is on the provisions of DCP in <b>Section 8.2.2 Parramatta North Urban Transformation Precinct</b> and the relationship and planning processes underway for the North Parramatta Place Strategy – now known as the Church Street North State-led Rezoning.</p> <p>NPRAG supports the decision of the State Government to recognise North Parramatta as a special precinct to be covered by a dedicated North Parramatta Place Strategy (NPPS). NPRAG submits that the Parramatta North Urban Transformation (PNUT) Precinct Indicative Layout Plan within the exhibited draft DCP should be accepted as a suitable 'template' for part of a future NPPS – subject to amendments, or as might arise as the NPPS is prepared under the guidance of the proposed Community Commissioner.</p> <p>Submitter strongly opposes the draft Harmonisation DCP provisions in relation to the maximum height of buildings control as identified for the PNUT site specified under <b>Section 8.2.2.12 – Development Lot Controls – Individual</b>. Two different height</p>	<p>The issues raised by NPRAG listed to the left are positions the NPRAG would like to see implemented as part of current planning reviews underway that apply to the following precincts and the land surrounding it:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PNUT Site – which is State Government land which is often referred to as the former Cumberland Hospital</li> <li>2. North Parramatta Place Strategy (NPPS) – which is land North of the Parramatta River which was excluded from the CBD Planning Proposal by DPE when they finalised that Planning Proposal.</li> </ol> <p>The controls in the Harmonisation DCP for these precincts reflect the following:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PNUT - These controls were developed as part of State Government-led master planning process in 2015 and guided by design principles as explained in detail above. Following the rezoning process and to further support the proposed land uses, the site specific DCP controls for the PNUT site (i.e. <b>Section 8.2.2</b>) were finalised in 2017 after being publicly exhibited.</li> <li>2. NPPS – The existing controls that applied prior to Council pursuing changes via the CBD Planning Proposal these controls have been in place since 2011</li> </ol> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP Council is considering does not make any changes to the DCP.</p> <p>However, the Department of Planning is pursuing planning studies /reviews that will review the controls that apply in these precincts and therefore may result in future changes to Council's DCP these studies are</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. PNUT – Urban Growth are undertaking a review of the planning controls for this site because since the work undertaken between 2015 and 2017 above a proposal has arisen for part of the site to be used as a University Campus and so a review of the planning controls is underway to determine how this might be achieved and whether this impacts on the current planning controls</li> <li>2. NPPS - The Department is preparing a State-Led Rezoning which will include urban design and other technical studies, to inform recommendations about future land uses, density, built form, and LEP &amp; DCP planning controls for these precincts</li> </ol> <p>The questions, issue and suggestions listed in the column to the left are questions relevant to these two planning processes rather than necessitating any amendment to the Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p>Any change to the development controls that apply in these precincts will be the subject of further consultation</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>suggestions were submitted throughout North Parramatta (west of Church Street – Brickfield Street).</p> <p>Submitters believe the draft Harmonisation DCP failed to explain the relationship between the DCP controls subject to the Parramatta North Urban Transformation Precinct and the numerous other planning documents and instruments, apart from including references to these.</p> <p>Submitter seeking clarification of the detailed work undertaken by Council to inform the current controls specified for PNUT area under the draft DCP.</p> <p>Submitter seeks clarification from DPE on how the proposed Community Commissioner will operate within the framework of the Council’s draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p>Submitter seeks clarification on the relationship/legal weight between the existing DCP controls for the PNUT area and the planning documents referenced in <b>Section 8.2.2 - Parramatta North Urban Transformation Precinct</b> of the draft DCP.</p> <p>Submitters raises concern that there is lack of consideration for sustainable energy-saving building design in the draft Harmonisation DCP for the PNUT area, such as natural cross ventilation, and heat reduction in hard surface areas.</p> <p>Submitters seek to clarify whether the existing DCP controls for the PNUT area will be an input into the new North Parramatta Place Strategy, or whether this Section of DCP will require revision or amendment.</p>	<p>and the submitted is encouraged to refer their questions and comments to these Government Agencies as part of these future consultation processes.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>



Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>Submitter raised concerns that existing boundary of the PNUT is not well justified, particularly with the exclusion of the important sites such as the gaol and the area between the river and Eastern Circuit North. Concerns the opportunity to include the Church Street spine and all the territory in the Department’s own map of the North Parramatta Place Strategy area appears to have been inexplicably abandoned.</p> <p>It is the view of NPRAG that a boundary amendment for the PNUT area which includes the area to the east of PNUT specified under the draft DCP will provide the most appropriate framework for a holistic planning exercise. And facilitate the provision of low-medium density residential accommodation in response to demand from the creative industries on the west.</p> <p>Submitter specifically commented on the detailed DCP controls for the PNUT area specified under <b>Section 8.2.2</b> of the draft DCP, including the existing maximum height of building controls for Lot F4 and Lot F1, residential development and design quality, existing planning statement for precinct desired future character and reference to Parramatta North historical site.</p> <p>Submitter is in the view of that the statutory Planning for North Parramatta should be reviewed and informed by a new planning proposal including a zoning amendment and supported by a DCP control for the entire North Parramatta area, including the PNUT site. The existing LEPs zonings and controls should prevail in absence of the new proposal.</p>	

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>Submitters strongly advocate that a single North Parramatta Plan should be prepared to replace other plans in the area.</p> <p>Submitters believe that North Parramatta should be permanently protected from speculative high rise building and towers, and instead be developed as a model of a medium density mixed use heritage precinct as a contrast with the intense high-rise commercial precinct south of the river.</p> <p>NPRAG strongly advocates for the permanent designation of North Parramatta – including the Church Street corridor - as the city’s primary arts, culture, heritage, tourism and creative industries precinct.</p> <p>One submitter makes additional points that no building should exceed 7 storeys in height and that the Floor Space Ratio should be abandoned as a statutory design control. Submitter references examples for managing building height to improve urban design outcomes specifically: Boston Back Bay, Paris’ Left Bank, New York’s Greenwich Village and The Rocks in Sydney.</p> <p>Submitters strongly support the DCP provisions relating to Built Heritage Significance specified under Figure 8.2.2.9.3.1 and Key Views, Landmarks and View Axes contained in Figure 8.2.2.9.5.1.</p> <p>One of the submitters requests an area to the east of heritage core of the PNUT be a designated as a Heritage Conservation area.</p> <p>Submitter also comments that the PNUT area should be integrated into the future North Parramatta Place Strategy Program</p>	

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>together with all the country between the river and Brickfield Street rather than regulated in isolation under the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p>Submitters support the concept of the mixed use ‘town square’ adjoining the Factory Street-Fleet Street Light Rail station, but note the description in the DCP needs amending to reflect that this is an idea and not developed. One of the submitters makes additional points on this matter specifically that town square would create local jobs and encourage new enterprises.</p> <p>NPRAG submits that new residential development and adaptive re-use of existing buildings should be for town houses, villas, group homes and dual-occupancies as well as apartments, but not social housing projects.</p> <p>Submitters both support the statement from Property and Development NSW that “Parramatta North will deliver a diversity of education, research, commercial, cultural and residential developments, supported by social and community infrastructure”, stating the current MU1 Mixed Use Development zone and R4 High Density Residential zone and relevant DCP controls need to be reviewed to support this statement from Property and Development NSW.</p> <p>Submitters also suggests that the future LEP/DCP should consider the opportunities within the PNUT site to ensure adequate supply of sites for affordable housing and related community uses to support the creation of a cultural hub.</p> <p>NPRAG is strongly opposed to the introduction of higher-order educational</p>	

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>facilities (university, TAFE, specialist tertiary establishments, etc) within the PNUT precinct and in North Parramatta generally. NPRAG would support small-scale private teaching and instruction enterprises related to the creative sector (art, music, writing, design, domestic skills, etc.)</p> <p>NPRAG reiterates its long-held view that the boundary of the publicly-owned DCP precinct should be extended to include Parramatta Park, which should be utilised to provide public benefits for the Parramatta community in perpetuity.</p> <p>In addition, NPRAG advocates for Landcom, Property NSW and the Aboriginal Land Council to commit to the eventual creation of a single property title for the lands currently owned separately. NPRAG noted the unified management on these property titles (i.e. single ownership) would assist the planning for Parramatta North to contribute to the creation of the Greater Sydney Parklands.</p>	
		<p>c. Submitters raise concerns that the draft Harmonisation DCP provision for PNUT area does not make reference to flooding or flood plain management.</p> <p>d. Submitters suggest the DCP should include a requirement for solar panels on roof surfaces of new buildings and heritage buildings for the PNUT site specified under <b>Section 8.2.2.10</b> of the draft Harmonisation</p>	<p><b>Part 8 - Centres, Precincts, Special Character Areas and Specific Sites</b> (including PNUT site under <b>Section 8.2.2</b>) should read in conjunction with other parts of the draft DCP including Part 5 Environmental Management. <b>Section 5.1 Water Management</b> of the draft DCP includes detailed flooding and water management controls that apply across the Parramatta LGA, including the PNUT site. In addition, development within the PNUT sites, like all development affected by flooding, is required comply with relevant policies and plans including Flood Risk Management Manual 2023 and Council Flood Risk Management Policy 2014.</p> <p><i>See response contained under No.46.a and No.46.b regarding PNUT for further information.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p>As noted above, <b>Part 8 - Centres, Precincts, Special Character Areas and Specific Sites</b> (including PNUT site under <b>Section 8.2.2</b>) should read in conjunction with other parts of the draft DCP including <b>Part 5 - Environmental Management</b> and <b>Part 7 - Heritage and Archaeology</b>. This is to ensure that all developments address the necessary planning matters detailed in the separate technical themes of the DCP.</p> <p>It is noted <b>Section 5.4.1 Energy Efficiency</b> of the draft DCP includes provisions to encourage new buildings to</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>DCP where appropriate.</p> <p>e. Submitter suggests that controls to be included to encourage the choice of paving materials which minimise solar heat absorption and do not contribute to heat island effects.</p>	<p>demonstrate compliance with the design principles embodied in the Building Sustainability Index (BASIX), which including considerations of utilising solar panels to achieve its energy score.</p> <p>In addition, <b>Section 7.6 Solar Energy System</b> of the draft DCP includes provisions to encourage sensitive installation of solar energy systems (Solar panels and equipment) on heritage items and within conservation areas as long the proposal protects heritage values and maintains the integrity, the significance, and the character of the area. Solar energy systems can include solar panels and related equipment.</p> <p>As noted, change to the detailed development controls are beyond the scope of the Harmonisation process. Any change to the site specific development controls will be subject to the outcomes of above mentioned two planning projects both led and managed by State Government through a separate planning process.</p> <p><i>See response contained under No.46.a and No.46.b regarding PNUT for further information.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p>It is considered that the controls in <b>Section 5.4.4 Urban Cooling</b> address the concern from the submitter. <b>Section 5.4.4 Urban Cooling</b> in Part 5 Environmental Management includes provisions to aid in cooling and removing heat from the urban environment in the City. These are innovative controls based on Australian and international evidence on cites and the urban heat island effect. The controls address the reflectivity of building roofs, podiums and facades and considerations of building materials used in new developments to encourage higher solar heat reflection (i.e. reduce the solar heat absorption).</p> <p>These controls are required to be read in conjunction with other parts of the draft DCP as per the statement at the beginning of <b>Part 8 Centres, Precincts, Special Character Areas and Specific Site</b> (including PNUT site under <b>Section 8.2.2</b>). This is to ensure that all developments address the necessary planning matters detailed in the separate technical themes of the DCP.</p> <p><i>See response contained under No.46.a and No.46.b regarding PNUT for further information.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>f. Both submitters from NPRAG support the DCP provisions for the PNUT site relating to Open Space (<b>Figure. 8.2.2.4.1</b>) and Street Network (<b>Figure. 8.2.2.5.1</b>) as well as Pedestrian and Cycle Network (<b>Figure. 8.2.2.5.2</b>).</p> <p>One submitter strongly opposes any ‘sell-off/sale/disposal of public lands (such as the Fennel Street Car Park – adjacent to Church Street) suggesting open space is the appropriate use.</p>	<p>Support for the DCP provisions are noted. The sale of any land is not a matter for the Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p>Council cannot sell any community land (i.e. public open space) without undertaking extensive legal processes and community consultation.</p> <p>The Fennel Street carpark site is currently being utilised as a Parramatta Light Rail works yard. When it is returned to Council a decision will be made at that time on the future use of the site taking into consideration competing demands of different stakeholders which include requirements for extra open space for residents and the reinstatement of the carparking for local businesses.</p> <p><i>See response to No.31.a in relation to the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>g. NPRAG opposes provisions supporting large-scale social or community housing within the DCP precinct (i.e. PNUT). NPRAG would support a limited provision of small scale low-rise rental housing designed to cater for local workers in the health and creative sectors.</p>	<p>Given the housing supply issues across Sydney and the affordability issues the position that North Parramatta is not a location for affordable housing cannot be supported but ultimately this is a matter for the State Government and other landowners who will determine whether they wish to develop affordable housing on these sites as landowners. If it is proposed there would be no planning justification for opposing it. <i>See response to No.31.a in relation to the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>h. Generally supports <b>Section 8.2.2.2 - Design Quality</b> of the draft DCP, and seeks an explanation for the reference made to the Parramatta North Historic Sites under the planning objective <b>O.03</b> of <b>Section 8.2.2.2 Design Quality</b> of the draft DCP.</p>	<p>A key planning objective within Parramatta DCP <b>Section 8.2.2 PNUT</b>, is to ensure development complies with the principles, policies and guidelines contained in the Parramatta North Historic Sites Conservation Management Plan (PNHS CMP) as per objective <b>O.03</b> being:</p> <p><i><b>O.03</b> New buildings will integrate positively with the surrounding streetscape, public domain and existing buildings, in particular the Parramatta North Historic Sites (PNHS).</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>i. Submitter seeks involvement as the concept develops further.</p>	<p>Noted. Council will continue to work closely with our community and collaborate with DPE on the Parramatta North State Significant planning process and future precinct planning work for the Church Street North State-led Rezoning Precinct.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
47	<p>Parramatta Floodplain Risk Management Committee member  (Note these comments have not been endorsed by the Committee)</p>	<p>a. Submitter generally supports the requirements for merit-based flood hazard and flood impact risk assessment, however notes that it is costly, expansive, and onerous. Ponders the discrepancy in costs between preparing a DA for a residential project on and off the floodplain.</p> <p>b. Submitter comments that the numerous requirements for new floodplain construction projects are daunting, that some requirements are significantly more onerous, and Council must provide additional support for development subject to these conditions (whether digitally or through hydraulic engineering assistance for smaller developers).</p> <p>c. Queries whether a hydraulic engineer would be required to complete some of the requested reports.</p>	<p>Support for controls is noted.</p> <p>In relation to submission requirements for development on flood prone land, in the explanatory text at the beginning of <b>Section 5.1.1 Flooding</b>, it states that, “As a first step in the Development Application process, proponents are strongly advised to seek flood information for their site from Council and consult with Council officers at a pre-lodgement stage, particularly for proposals located in the medium and high flood risk categories.”</p> <p>This allows Council’s engineers to assess application requirements on merits and not require a full flood study with flood modelling where it is deemed unnecessary.</p> <p>Application requirements will vary depending on the development type and site conditions, with sites that have more property conditions such as flooding, land slope, bushfire prone, adjacent to transport corridors etc... generally requiring further investigation. The investigation is necessary to ensure suitable development is being proposed with acceptable outcomes. This generally requires more reports and studies to be provided as part of the application process which incurs additional costs. This is an important step in the process to ensure development being approved has satisfied the provisions of the <a href="#">Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</a> and is safe to occupy.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p>Development proposed in the flood plain generally requires more information than is required for development outside the flood plain. This is necessary to ensure development is appropriate to the flood hazard and risk at a particular location.</p> <p>The controls in the current DCP (Parramatta DCP 2011) requires submission of similar information, however in the Harmonisation DCP, more detail is provided to help remove ambiguity surrounding application requirements. <i>See response No.47.a above.</i></p> <p>Applicants are strongly advised to seek flood information for their site from Council and consult with Council officers at a pre-lodgement stage. Applicants are also able to contact Council and request to speak to a Development Engineer for stormwater and flooding advice.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p>Yes - Generally reports and studies need to be prepared by a suitably qualified professional. Council’s Development and Engineering Design Guidelines provide further details on the type of professionals that can supply reports and studies to support Development Applications.</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b>
		d. Comments that the 10% reduction in pre-development stormwater runoff rates for major commercial developments would be controversial and costly for property owners who purchased land prior to the proposed controls (noting that some developers would fraudulently seek approval).	<p>Continual improvements in technology means that achieving stormwater reduction targets is easier and more affordable, as outlined in the Harmonisation <a href="#">Discussion Paper</a> (2019) position.</p> <p>To demonstrate compliance with the 10% target (where required by the control <b>C.12</b> in <b>Section 5.1.2 Water Sensitive Urban Design</b>), Applicants are required to utilise the Model for Urban Stormwater Improvement Conceptualisation (MUSIC) (or equivalent modelling tool, subject to agreement by Council) to determine total runoff quantity for pre and post development scenarios and pollution load reduction. This is to ensure developers could not fraudulently provide unachievable figures, and the necessary requirements to achieve the target are conditioned as part of the development consent.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		e. States that some specific sites would need to reduce parking spaces or relocate them above ground, impacting the development's yield and resulting in an increase in pressure for Council to increase maximum building heights.	<p>It is not uncommon for Council to require amendments to building designs to accommodate for flood hazard and risk mitigation. Applications will be assessed on their merits in instances the proposal provides an increase in height due to flood hazards and risk mitigation measures.</p> <p>Sites generally have provisions for floor space ratio (FSR) and minimum setbacks; however, there may be other site conditions which could prevent the maximum FSR amount from being utilised or require additional setbacks. An FSR is not a development right. It is up to the applicant to demonstrate the site is capable of accommodating that FSR on the site in a way that does not result in unacceptable impacts. This requires good design and the provisions for merit assessment to ensure the best outcome for the site is possible. The draft Harmonisation DCP allows merit assessment for flooding matters, and provides details on what must be demonstrated to satisfy Council's concerns have been adequately addressed.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		f. Recommends that emergency service providers receive information about new floodplain developments from initial stages to completion.	<p>Following consideration by Council engineers, applications are referred to state agencies when considered appropriate. Referrals are generally done early in the Development Application process, as part of the application assessment. Providing</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		g. Parramatta Weir (Charles Street Weir)  Notes current issues due to increased flooding resulting from climate change and ongoing developments.  States the current design of the Charles Street Weir is insufficient to manage the increased waterflow in flood scenarios and is susceptible to blockage with large	<p>Objectives and controls contained in the draft Harmonisation DCP require “development to minimise the risk to life and property from flooding and it’s impacts”. The draft Harmonisation DCP requires proposed development to consider Increases in local rainfall intensity, other rainfall and flood behaviour resulting from climate change, please see <b>C.09</b> in <b>Section 5.1.1 - Flooding</b>.</p> <p>The draft Parramatta River Flood Study has been endorsed by Council for exhibition, this study will update flood maps which currently apply to the City of Parramatta LGA. The new Parramatta River flood Study will provide updated flood and flow information at Charles Street Wier. The redesign of the Charles Street Weir would be subject to detail design. It will require detailed hydraulic analysis of the design options to ensure that proposed</p>



Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>branches and debris. Notes that this exacerbates flooding of riverbanks, fence damage, and pedestrian risks.</p> <p>Adds that removing access to pedestrian links along the river (and thus access to public transport) during heavy rain is unrealistic, risks legal action, and increases potential for injury.</p> <p>Requests expert investigation of this area to investigate options to manage regular flooding, recurring damage and associated costs, limited accessibility, and safety risks associated with Charles Street Weir.</p> <p>Suggests that Council access funding to upgrade the Charles Street Weir via DPE’s 2022-23 NSW Flood Recovery and Resilience Grant Program (noting that the application period is over, but that a convincing case could be submitted).</p>	<p>design does not adversely impact flooding.</p> <p>The Charles Street footbridge is scheduled for upgrades, please see the Parramatta River Transformation <a href="#">website</a> for more detail.</p> <p>The assessment of the weir requested is beyond the scope of the Harmonisation process, <b>this comment has been forwarded to the relevant team to consider as part of broader flood risk management work scheduled to follow Parramatta River Flood Study Finalisation.</b></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
48	Beecroft Cheltenham Civic Trust	<p>a. Submitter states that Council must attempt to condition new developments that will meet future development requirements, specifically associated with climate change.</p> <p>b. Submitter suggest all strata development to be designed to cater for solar panels/EV charging, all vehicle parking to have EV charging points, roof materials to reflect as much heat as possible, and to encourage the installation of roof top gardens for flat roofs (specifically where solar panels are present, to maximise efficiency).</p>	<p>As outlined in <a href="#">Attachment 3</a> to the Council report of 28 November 2022, the draft Harmonisation DCP proposed new requirements associated with climate change, this included strengthening tree canopy protection, promoting all electric buildings and requirements for electric vehicle charging infrastructure for new development. In addition, the draft DCP in <b>Section 5.1.1 Flooding</b> includes requirements for flood modelling to account for any projected changes to flood levels or behaviour as a result of climate change over the design life of the development (see controls <b>C.09</b> and <b>C.10</b>).</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p><b>Section 6.1.3 – Electric vehicle charging infrastructure</b> of the draft DCP include requirements for all new residential accommodation (excluding dwelling houses, secondary dwellings and dual occupancy) requires an EV Ready Connection to at least one car space for each dwelling/apartment. This is to ensure new development in Parramatta provides the necessary infrastructure to support the charging of electric vehicles.</p> <p><b>Sections 5.4.1 – Energy efficiency</b> and <b>5.4.4 – Urban cooling</b> of the draft DCP includes requirements for provision of photovoltaic solar panels (<b>C.10</b> and <b>C.11</b>) and for roof surfaces to dissipate heat and provide for user comfort where used for open space (<b>C.01</b> and <b>C.02</b>). The purpose is to reduce the contribution of development to urban heat and promote sustainable development which uses energy efficiently and minimises non-renewable energy usage in the construction and use of buildings.</p> <p>Some of the new controls in the Harmonisation DCP were adapted from the recently finalised DCP controls for</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>c. Comments that C.02 of <b>Section 3.3.1.6 - Internal Amenity</b> should explicitly state whether a wardrobe is included in the calculation of floorspace.</p> <p>d. Suggests that more explanatory diagrams should be provided to detail lot width and areas requirements for battle-axe lots and cul-de-sac sites (C.01 and C.02 of <b>Section 3.3.2.1 - Minimum Site Frontage and Site Area</b>)</p>	<p>the City Centre and consider the different development typologies which exist outside of the City Centre. <b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p>Noted. Council officers have reviewed <b>C.02 of Section 3.3.1.6 – Internal Amenity</b> and proposed to amend the draft Harmonisation DCP to clarify the required minimum area for master bedroom and all other bedrooms excluding the wardrobe space. <i>C.02 Master bedrooms are to have a minimum area of 10m<sup>2</sup>, and all other bedrooms are to be a minimum of 9m<sup>2</sup> (in all cases the Minimum area must exclude any wardrobe space).</i> <b>As a result of the submission, amendments will be made to the relevant section of the draft Harmonisation DCP to clarify the requirement for minimum area for master bedroom and all other bedrooms excluding wardrobe space.</b></p> <p>Council officers agree that explanatory diagrams would help clarify Council's requirements for battle-axe lots and cul-de-sac sites. Two diagrams have been inserted into <b>Section 3.3.2 – Key Development Standards for Dual Occupancies</b> to provide further detail and clarification specifically <b>Figure 3.3.2.1.1 – Site frontage requirements for dual occupancies proposed within cul-de-sacs</b> and <b>Figure 3.3.2.1.2 – Minimum site area for battle-axe lots.</b> This amendment is identified in Table 1 of <a href="#">Attachment 4 – Summary of changes to Draft Parramatta Development Control Plan</a>. <b>For the above reasons draft Harmonisation DCP has been amended to include two new explanatory diagrams.</b></p>
49	Endeavour Energy	<p>a. Submitter generally supports the Harmonisation DCP project and reiterates the importance that future development applications and planning proposals within Parramatta LGA align with Endeavour Energy's <i>Standard Conditions for Development Applications and Planning Proposals</i>.</p>	<p>Noted. The <i>Standard Conditions for Development Applications and Planning Proposals</i> provided by the submitter are applicable for development applications and planning proposals and has been forwarded to Council's application assessment teams for consideration. Matters raised in relation to consistency with Endeavour Energy's relevant guidelines for future development is out of scope for the draft Harmonisation DCP as they are related to development consent conditions not development controls. The scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project is largely to consolidate the five former DCPs with some policy changes to reflect changes in planning legislation and following up actions identified in Council resolutions. <b>The information provided in the submission has been forwarded to Council's application assessment teams for consideration.</b> <b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
50	Hornsby Shire Council (Council Officer level)	<p>a. Submitter supports the draft Harmonisation DCP, noting that its consolidation alleviates issues with the application of Hornsby DCP 2013 across LGAs.</p> <p>b. Submitter requests Hornsby Council’s Strategic Land Use Planning team be kept informed of the progression of the draft Harmonisation DCP; and sufficient notice of the adoption of the draft Harmonisation DCP be provided finalised to enable Hornsby Council to make the necessary changes to the Hornsby DCP to remove the current Parramatta controls contained in the Hornsby DCP as a result of amalgamation.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Council will advise Hornsby Council of the project timeline in relation to the finalisation and adoption of the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p>
51	Transport Asset Holding Entity NSW	<p>a. Submitter states that any new developments that are in proximity to Transport Asset Holding Entity (TAHE) owned land (which includes commuter car parks and train station) should not disturb TAHE assets during the construction and operation phases and development should in no way rely on TAHE owned land or assets in terms of traffic management, car parking, variation to setbacks and the like.</p> <p>b. Submitter requests that a Traffic Management Plan be required for future developments near TAHE assets to show how the proposed development does not rely on adjacent car parks and land for customer car parking, loading/unloading deliveries and the like.</p>	<p>All development is subject to the requirements of the <a href="#">Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</a>. Any encroachment onto any land other than the applicable development site will require the appropriate owner’s consent. If encroachment is necessary or assets may be disturbed, Council will make the required referrals to TAHE are made as part of the development application process.</p> <p><a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to the Council Report from 28 November 2023 explains how car parking rates were resolved across the five DCP as part of the Land Use Planning Harmonisation Framework project. All new development has specified amounts of parking provided per their development type and location in <b>Table 6.3.1 – Minimum Car Parking Rates in Section 6.2 – Parking and Vehicular Access</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP. These rates do not rely on the use of other facilities to provide parking to proposed development. Additional site/centre-specific car parking rates can be found in <b>Part 8 – Centres, Precincts, Special Character Areas and Specific Sites</b>. Adherence with these rates is assessed as part of the development assessment process.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP requires mandatory traffic and transport impact assessments for development outlined in <b>Section 6.2 – Parking and Vehicular Access</b>. Providing specific controls to mandate a Traffic Management Plan for all new development in proximity to TAHE owned land is not considered necessary as the draft Harmonisation DCP specifies that parking and loading is to be located on the development’s property. Should a particular development application seek to rely on parking available on other sites then the applicant will need to justify why use of that carparking is legal and/or appropriate and the intention of the applicant to use parking on any adjoining land will be advertised to adjoining owners as part of the exhibition of the Development Application. <i>Please see response to No.51.a above.</i></p> <p>Development applications (DA) must address the statutory requirements provided in <i>Section 4.15 Evaluation of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i>, which outline the consultation requirements in the DA stage. The <a href="#">State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021</a> also provides requirements</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>for agency consultation and concurrence. TAHE would be notified of application on adjoining property as part of this process</p> <p>The controls contained in the draft Harmonisation DCP ensure that all development proposals are adequately provided with appropriate loading/unloading and servicing facilities. The controls also ensure adequate off-street parking is provided to serve the needs of development to minimise adverse impacts on surrounding streets. There is no need to require all applications prepare a study to show they will not impact on TAHE land as the matter will be properly assessed via the processes described above.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>c. Submitter states that Council should consider how future development in proximity to TAHE land will be serviced, and that no work is permitted within any easements which benefit TAHE, at any time, unless TAHE approval has been obtained by the applicant.</p>	<p>As is identified in <i>response to No.52.a</i>, owner’s consent must be obtained prior to the use of other sites during the construction and post-construction phases of development.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>d. Submitter comments that any easements must remain unaffected by future proposed developments.</p>	<p>Easements are protected by legislation and cannot be encroached without owner’s consent. <i>Please see response to No.52.c above</i>. Proposed development will be assessed against the requirements of the <a href="#">Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</a>. Any impacts development may cause will be considered as part of the assessment and will not be granted consent unless proper assessment of the potential impacts development may have is considered.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
52	Transport for NSW (TfNSW) - Sydney Trains	<p>a. Submitter suggests that the DCP should include advice for applicants to engage in a pre-lodgement discussion with Council and TfNSW - Sydney Trains if proposing a large-scale development near a rail corridor.</p> <p>Submitter states that pre-lodgement discussions would consider relevant setback requirements and other issues to be addressed based on site location and proximity to assets as part of the DA.</p>	<p>Council’s <a href="#">website</a> contains requirements and advice for pre-lodgement meetings, there are instances where Council may seek advice from other government agencies or recommend applicants seek advice from government agencies as part of the pre-lodgement process. Such advice is provided following a review of applications. Referrals are generally established through the provisions of <a href="#">State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021</a>, not a DCP. The general approach of the draft Harmonisation DCP is not to replicate provisions of a SEPP, as often the case is when a SEPP is amended the provisions replicated in the DCP become inconsistent with the requirement.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>b. Notes the pre-lodgement process allows for information to be provided in regard to the type of reports and studies that are required as part of the DA package.</p>	<p>Development application supporting documentation requirements are generally contained on Council’s <a href="#">website</a>. The Draft exhibited DCP includes text directing applicants to this website. The website contains a list of documents which are required to support an application based on the development being proposed. Development application requirements will vary from site to site, proposal type and scale, therefore it is more</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>appropriate for application requirements to be contained on Council’s website. This also allows Council to update application requirements more easily as requirements around application supporting documents evolve. The pre-lodgement process is where Council is best able to provide definitive advice on what information will be required, from the extensive list on Council’s website, for the particular development proposed</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>c. Requests that Council engage in future consultation to relay this information in a suitable format via the DCP.</p>	<p><i>Please see response to submission No.52.b above explaining Council’s approach to providing development application information on the Council’s website.</i></p> <p>Council also lists information required for pre-lodgement applications on Council’s <a href="#">website</a> this includes development types which must apply for pre-lodgement meetings prior to lodging a development application. There is no reason for TfNSW pre-lodgement requirements to be included in the Council’s DCP. It is considered that the better location for any information TfNSW wants applicants to consider prior to lodgement should be located on Council’s Website with all the other information on the pre-lodgement process and requirements.</p> <p><b>For the above reason, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>d. Suggests the DCP make the applicant/developer aware of engaging Council for pre-lodgement meetings to address Sydney Trains/Transport for NSW issues early in the DA submission process.</p>	<p>Council generally requires larger developments to engage with Council in a pre-lodgement meeting, this ensures the proposed development design adequately addresses the context.</p> <p><i>Please also see response to No.52.a above.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
53	Cumberland City Council (Council - Officer level)	<p>a. Submitter suggests changes to be made in relation to provisions for sustainability, stormwater management, bicycle storage, active transport and electric vehicles applying within the Granville Centre area, to be consistent with other local centres within Parramatta LGA such as Telopea and Carlingford.</p>	<p>Council officers note provisions for sustainability, stormwater management, bicycle storage, active transport and electric vehicles applying within the Granville Centre area have merit for further consideration. Provisions in relation to site-specific controls for Granville Town Centre have been directly transferred from former Parramatta DCP 2011 into the draft Harmonisation DCP. The approach of the draft Harmonisation DCP for site specific controls is to integrate them into the consolidated DCP without policy changes as they have generally been implemented through detailed studies.</p> <p>It is noted that Council is managing the precinct planning for Granville Town Centre and currently preparing the required technical studies (i.e. sustainability, flooding, heritage, transport etc). Council will consider the change to these planning controls through the precinct planning process with further opportunities for consultation. Cumberland City Council will be invited for further comments on any change to the development controls. This process will be the opportunity to consider the controls Cumberland Council is asking Parramatta Council to apply in the Granville Centre area when precinct specific controls are developed for the precinct and replace the controls currently included in the DCP.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary at this point in time.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>b. In relation to <b>Section 8.2.3 - Granville Local Centre</b>, submitter requests that references made to areas south of the railway line be removed as they are now within the Cumberland City Council area.</p> <p>c. References to South, Carlton, William and Jamieson Street are also recommended for removal.</p> <p>d. Submitter requests that the desired future pedestrian link between East Street and Memorial Drive be reconsidered, due to recent redevelopment of the properties on East Street affecting the feasibility of delivering this pedestrian link. Suggests that, should Council seek to progress with a pedestrian connection at this point, collaboration with Cumberland City Council would be ideal (similar to work currently being undertaken along the Toongabbie to Westmead active transport route).</p>	<p>Noted, reference to the area outside of the Parramatta LGA boundary within <b>Figure 8.2.3.1 – Granville Local Centre (PRCUTS)</b> has been graphically delineated to reflect the current boundary and avoid confusion.</p> <p><b>As a result of the submission, amendments will be made to the relevant section of the draft DCP to remove Cumberland Council areas from DCP illustrations.</b></p> <p>Noted, the draft Harmonisation DCP has been updated to remove references within <b>Section 3.2.3 – Granville Local Centre</b> and <b>Section 3.2.3.1 – Granville Town Centre</b> to areas within Cumberland City Council LGA.</p> <p><b>As a result of the submission, amendments will be made to the relevant section of the draft DCP to remove Cumberland Council areas from DCP illustrations.</b></p> <p>Council Officers acknowledge the Parramatta DCP 2011 and the <a href="#">Parramatta Road Corridor Urban Transformation Strategy</a> include an indicative pedestrian link from East Street (currently located within Parramatta LGA) to Memorial Drive (currently located within Cumberland LGA). The delivery of the desired future pedestrian link identified under the indicative layout plan for Granville Town Centre falls under the responsibility of both Parramatta Council and Cumberland City Council due to the local government boundary change in 2016.</p> <p>The recent development on East Street particularly the development for land located at 10-42 East Street Granville have facilitated the future delivery of the pedestrian link. Where the development consent (DA/738/2014) specifically required that a pocket park including a 3m wide right of carriage way must be delivered within the development site and dedicated to Council as a public space at no cost to Council. The pocket park and right of carriage way have been dedicated to Council following the completion of the development and is to form part of the pedestrian link connecting East Street across the railway corridor to the Memorial Drive. A temporary fenced communal open space for the occupants of the apartments is being arranged and will not be accessible by the public until the construction of the new pedestrian bridge or link to the railway line.</p> <p>It is noted the remaining portion of the indicative pedestrian link/bridge (crossing the rail line) is located within Cumberland City boundary. Should this remaining link be realised, future planning work is required by Cumberland City Council and should involve City of Parramatta Council, TfNSW and Sydney Trains.</p> <p>Therefore, it is considered appropriate to retain the indicative pedestrian link in the draft Harmonisation DCP as development consent issued by City of Parramatta Council considered and reserved land for the purpose of facilitating this link in the future.</p> <p><i>Please also see response to submission No.53.a regarding draft Harmonisation DCP approach to site-specific controls.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
54	Environment and Heritage	a. In relation to flood gates and basement parking, EHG comments that the proposed	The draft Harmonisation DCP provides protection of basement parking proposed within the floodplain, please see <b>C.20</b> and <b>C.21</b> in <b>Section 5.1.1 – Flooding</b> which includes “ <i>effective floodproofing and flood exclusion of</i>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
	Group (DPE)	<p>controls are not in accordance with best practice for new developments. States that passive protection should be provided to the PMF level due to the risk profile of basement car parks.</p> <p>b. In regard to shelter in place (SIP) requirements within <b>Section 5.1.1 - Flooding</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP, EHG notes that SES (as the lead combat agency for flood emergencies) do not support SIP as a primary flood emergency response strategy. Notes that evacuation should take precedence over SIP, and that endorsement of SIP in new development on such a broad scale is inadvisable.</p> <p>Objects to the suggestion that SIP is synonymous with an "area free of risk from flooding" (<b>C.07, Section 5.1.1</b>), stating that this control and the rest of the DCP should be reworded to clarify that evacuation does not include SIP.</p> <p>Additionally requests that "relevant flood evacuation strategy" should be replaced with Local Flood Plan or SES flood emergency strategy for the area. Strongly advises that specific guidance be sought from the SES regarding this matter.</p> <p>c. In regard to sub-point 3 of <b>C.17, Section 5.1.1 - Flooding</b>, EHG recommend</p>	<p><i>the basement against all floods up to the PMF</i>". <b>C.22 in Section 5.1.1 – Flooding</b> requires the basement to “<i>be protected from the ingress of floodwater by passive measures at least up to the flood planning level</i>” This allows applicants to provide active measures of flood protection for ingress of flood water via the driveway between the 1% AEP plus 500mm freeboard and the PMF. The resultant design outcome from passive design protection of basement driveways to the PMF render basement car parking unfeasible and require above ground parking which have significant urban design impacts, especially on smaller sites.</p> <p>Passive flood protection to the PMF is required for stairwells and other openings to the basement.</p> <p>Council strongly discourages basement parking in the floodplain, and where provided, Council’s preference is to have passive protection up to the PMF. Notwithstanding, it is noted that there are instances passive protection up to the PMF does not provide for suitable design outcome for the site and protection up to the PMF may be achieved through active measures.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p>The current Parramatta DCP 2011 permits ‘refuge’ or ‘shelter in place’ in instances outlined in the floodplain matrix. The draft Harmonisation DCP does not allow ‘shelter in place’ beyond what the current DCP permits it, the proposed controls are a consolidation of existing controls. The draft Harmonisation DCP adds requirements outlining what must be provided where shelter in place is proposed.</p> <p><b>C.07 in Section 5.1.1 - Flooding</b> is further clarified by the floodplain matrix (<b>Table 5.1.1.2 in Section 5.1.1 – Flooding</b>) which outlines what evacuation measures are permitted. Please also see <b>C.28 in Section 5.1.1 – Flooding</b> which further elaborates on shelter in place.</p> <p>Flood evacuation strategy is defined in the glossary; <i>Meaning the strategy for the evacuation of areas within effective warning time during periods of flood as specified within Council’s Floodplain Risk Management Plan, the relevant State Emergency Services (SES) Flood Plan, by advice received from the SES or as determined in the assessment of individual proposals.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p>Wording has been amended to remove any ambiguity about the requirement. The word ‘including’ has been added to ensure the requirement is clear, please see below excerpt of <b>C.17</b> within <b>Section 5.1.1 – Flooding</b>;</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>additional text to ensure that the 1% AEP and PMF events are included ("Building access and egress do not require people to traverse hazardous floodwaters - that is Hazard Level H3 and above in any flood including and between the 1% AEP and the PMF.")</p> <p>d. Comments that the requirement of a flood emergency response plan for all development and site types, including open space, where the site is affected by the 1% AEP flood is onerous and difficult to enforce. Expects that this requirement would not be needed in any adopted floodplain risk management plan, stating that "good land use planning is preferable to requiring flood emergency response plans for new developments". States that further discussion with the floodplain management committee would strengthen the rationale for this proposed control.</p> <p>e. Submitter suggests that consideration should be given to nominating home-based childcare and group homes as a sensitive land use. EHG note that small children and infants may be unable to self-evacuate and additionally highlights the characteristics of occupants in a group home would cause vulnerability and difficulty evacuating.</p>	<p>“...Building access and egress does not require people to traverse hazardous floodwaters – that is Hazard Level H3 and above <b>including</b> any flood between the 1% AEP and the PMF.”</p> <p><b>A minor change is proposed to the draft Harmonisation DCP, which maintains the policy intent however, provides clarification.</b></p> <p>The wording proposed in <b>C.25</b> within <b>Section 5.1.1 – Flooding</b> states “<b>If required by Council...</b>”, this aligns with the point raised by the submitter that good site planning and building design is preferred. However, Council may request a flood emergency response plan be provided if Council deems it necessary.</p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP states “<i>it is necessary to recognise that flood emergency response plans ...cannot be solely relied upon to be effective in all flood events and therefore cannot be considered to reduce the hydraulic hazard. At best they reduce flood risk in events where they operate effectively and as such, flood emergency response plans should not form the basis of development consent</i>” – <i>Floodplain Development Manual (2005)</i>.”</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p>The provisions for home-based child care are contained within <a href="#">State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021</a>. Home-based childcare development is generally carried out as exempt development through the provisions of <a href="#">State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021</a>. Therefore, development control plan provisions are generally not considered as a development application is not submitted for such proposals and assessment against the DCP does not occur.</p> <p>The explanation provided by the submitter for a group home is more appropriately defined as a ‘residential care facility’. If an application is made for the purposes of a ‘group home’ following an assessment Council may adopt the position the proposal better fits the term ‘residential care facility’ council will apply the requirements for a ‘residential care facility’ which is identified as a ‘sensitive use’ in the draft Harmonisation DCP. For more information on definitions please see the <a href="#">Parramatta PLEP 2023 dictionary</a>.</p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP land use categories for the purposes of determining flood risk lists ‘residential’ and ‘sensitive uses’ separately. Early education and care facilities, and residential care facilities are identified as ‘sensitive uses’ in the draft Harmonisation DCP and are generally not permitted anywhere in the flood plain, this includes the PMF. A group home is considered a ‘residential use’, residential uses are not permitted in the high flood risk areas.</p> <p>Early education and care facilities, and residential care facilities are considered ‘sensitive uses’. They are</p>



Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>recognised to generally include vulnerable occupants which could create difficulty during evacuation and may also include higher densities of individuals who may not have the ability to self-evacuate.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
55	State Emergency Services NSW (SES)	<p>a. SES notes that the safest mode to address flooding is to evacuate at-risk communities to an area out of the floodplain. States that human psychology does not favour rationality in the event of flooding, regardless of building modifications to reduce flooding risk.</p> <p>b. Adds that evacuation alleviates the pressure on SES to monitor trapped populations that are surrounding by hazards. Notes that Shelter in Place could be safer if a building is structurally sound and there are sufficient services and accessible space above the PMF for all occupants.</p>	<p>Noted, the proposed flooding controls applied to development on flood prone lands are consistent with the NSW Floodplain Development Manual and the draft Harmonisation DCP is prepared to guide development and building design to achieve the desired outcomes for the community across the City.</p> <p>The current Parramatta DCP 2011 permits ‘refuge’ or ‘shelter in place’ in instances outlined in the Floodplain Matrix Planning and Development Controls (<b>Table 5.1.1.2 in Section 5.1.1 – Flooding</b>). The Floodplain Matrix Planning and Development Controls stipulates which development may consider shelter-in-place based on flood risk level. Shelter-in-place may be considered for the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High flood Risk – Concessional development</li> <li>• Medium flood risk – Residential, commercial, industrial and subdivision development.</li> <li>• Low flood risk – critical uses, residential, commercial, and industrial development.</li> </ul> <p>Although the matrix may identify a development type based on flood risk, this does not ensure Council will provide consent to development which proposes shelter-in-place. There are other provisions which must be satisfied, see <b>C.27 to C.33 in Section 5.1.1 – Flooding</b>. Development proposal must also demonstrate to Council that shelter-in-place is a suitable method of evacuation which does not increase risk to lives.</p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP does not allow ‘shelter in place’ beyond what the current Parramatta DCP 2011 permits it, the proposed controls are a consolidation of existing controls. The draft Harmonisation DCP adds requirements outlining what must be provided where shelter in place is proposed.</p> <p>A flood management study and plan will be carried out following completion of the exhibition and finalisation of the draft Parramatta River Flood Study, this work may inform and update DCP controls.</p> <p><b>C.07 in Section 5.1.1 - Flooding</b> is further clarified by the floodplain matrix (<b>Table 5.1.1.2 in Section 5.1.1</b>) which outlines what evacuation measures are permitted. Please also see <b>C.28 in Section 5.1.1 – Flooding</b> which further elaborates on shelter in place.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP specifies requirements for shelter in place, this includes the requirements for the applicant to ensure areas of shelter are structural adequate. Please see <b>C.25 to C.33 within Section 5.1.1 – Flooding</b>.</p> <p><b>For the above reason, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>c. Notes that the Plan Finalisation Report for the PLEP 2023 did not include comments from NSW SES provided on 15 December 2021.</p>	<p>Council received a submission from the SES dated 15 December 2021 during the exhibition period for the <b>draft City Centre DCP</b> (15 November 2021 to 13 December 2021) and was responded to within the post exhibition report to the Council Meeting on <a href="#">28 November 2022</a>.</p> <p>A submission from the SES was not received by Council when Council consulted with public authorities consistent with the Conditions 2 and 4 of the Gateway Determination for the <b>Parramatta CBD Planning Proposal</b> (the application to amend the Local Environment Plan (LEP) controls).</p> <p><b><u>Parramatta CBD Planning Proposal / PLEP Amendment no. 56</u></b></p> <p>Pre-exhibition consultation on the CBD PP with nominated public authorities including the SES occurred between 19 December 2019 and 10 February 2020; and exhibition consultation on the CBD PP with nominated public authorities including the SES occurred between 23 September 2020 and 2 November 2020. In the Post exhibition report to the <a href="#">Council meeting on 15 Jun 2021</a> it was noted that, <i>The SES have not made any formal submissions to date [on the draft City Centre LEP] despite contact being made via the statutory requirements of the Gateway determination Conditions 2 and 4 to invite a submission. Should the SES provide a submission after the CBD PP is endorsed by Council, Council will rely on the DPE to address any matters arising from a late submission</i></p> <p>In the Department's <a href="#">Plan Finalisation Report</a> dated April 2022 for the Parramatta LEP – Parramatta CBD – Amendment No. 56, a suggestion by the Environment, Energy and Science Group (EES) that endorsement by the SES was essential was responded to by the Department as follows, <i>“The Department notes that consultation with the SES occurred through both formal consultation periods and through briefing and discussions on the proposal including following exhibition, however, a formal submission was not provided... Council has provided many opportunities for feedback from SES and has suitably considered flood risk and proposes appropriate mitigation measures”</i>.</p> <p>The determination of the Plan Finalisation Report was that the draft LEP be made and then on 6 May 2022 Parramatta City Centre LEP (LEP Amendment 56) was finalised with the amendment effective on 14 October 2022.</p> <p><b><u>Draft City Centre DCP</u></b></p> <p>The issues raised by the SES in the 15 December 2021 submission to the City Centre DCP were dealt with as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supported matters resulted in amendments to the controls</li> <li>- Non supported based on policy or urban design grounds resulted in no changes to the controls, and</li> <li>- Matters that were beyond the scope of the City Centre DCP were either:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- referred to the relevant team within Council for consideration;</li> <li>- noted as a matter that could be considered as part of a future review of the DCP controls at a later time</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>following the endorsement of the Harmonisation DCP, or</p> <p><b><u>Harmonisation DCP</u></b></p> <p>The issue of the height of the floor level for residential development was investigated as part of the draft Harmonisation DCP, with the recommendation being the draft controls as exhibited allow for this assessment to occur at this time through a merit-based flood hazard and flood impact risk assessment by Council. The appropriate time to consider a fixed floor level like that in place for the CBD in Section 6.7.2 is as part of the preparation of a new Floor Risk Management Study and Plan for the LGA.</p> <p><b><u>Parramatta River Flood Study</u></b></p> <p>Council will soon be exhibiting the draft Parramatta River Flood Study which is a comprehensive five year investigation into all types of flooding across the LGA - both riverine and overland flow. This study will provide Council with an understanding of flood risk across the LGA so it can manage existing development and plan for future development.</p> <p>Following the exhibition and finalisation of the Parramatta River Flood Study, a flood risk management study and plan will be carried out, and it is expected that this work may inform and update DCP controls.</p> <p><i>Please also see response to submission No.55.a and No.55.d regarding ongoing studies being carried out and anticipated by Council.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary; however, the matter has merit for consideration as part of a broader review of flood management measures following the finalisation of the Parramatta River Flood Study and commencement of the preparation of a new Floor Risk Management Plan. The relevant team within council have been forwarded this submission from the SES for their consideration as part of this process. Council also encourages the SES to put in a submission on the exhibition of the Parramatta River Flood Study which at the time of writing is expected to commence in the coming months.</b></p>
		<p>d. Requests a Flood Planning Map to be introduced as soon as practical to assist with planning for residual flood risks.</p>	<p>The scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP is to consolidate the existing five DCPs into one consolidated set of controls to support the implementation of the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i>. <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i> includes the <a href="#">Standard Instrument – Principal Local Environmental Plan 2006</a> Provision being clause (<i>Clause 5.21 Flood Planning</i>) which requires development consent for development within the ‘flood planning area’ (FPA), with Council’s existing Flood Prone Land maps identifying the FPA.</p> <p><i>Clause 7.11 Floodplain risk management</i> in PLEP 2023 requires buildings on flood affected land, up to the PMF within the Parramatta CBD and as shown on the <a href="#">Floodplain Risk Management Map</a> to provide for specific evacuation measures and withstanding the forces of floodwater up to the PMF. This clause is in addition to controls under the prescribed Standard Instrument <i>Clause 5.21 Flood Planning</i>.</p> <p>Council was able to include this additional local provision clause for the CBD because as part of the CBD PP and the review and update of the Floodplain Risk Management Plans (upper and lower Parramatta River catchments), Council was granted ‘exceptional circumstances’ which enabled Council to prepare a flood risk</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>management control for its LEP, beyond the flood planning level.</p> <p>Reducing the residual flood risk that remains even with flood risk management and land use planning measures in place is the continuing challenge for councils, the State Government and emergency service agencies, because while improvements can be made, risks from flooding cannot be completely eliminated for the community.</p> <p>The soon to be exhibited draft Parramatta River Flood Study includes for the first-time flood modelling of overland flow areas in addition to more accurate mainstream flooding extents. This information is one way Council is reducing residual risk by improving Council’s existing flood information that will enable emergency services to understand more completely the impacts on people’s safety and help landowners understand their flood risk so they can be better prepared.</p> <p>Council’s current approach to providing flood details is through a Flood Enquiry Application, this approach provides detailed information specific to sites. A broader approach, such as LEP Maps may not consider site specific conditions and could lack critical details during the design phase of development.</p> <p>As noted above, Council is currently progressing a separate piece of work which looks at updating flood maps and will be subject to a separate exhibition process. This is a process separate to the draft Harmonisation DCP and will be subject to its own exhibition process which will include consultation with the SES.</p> <p>For further information on the flood planning for the Parramatta CBD see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <a href="#">Plan Finalisation Report</a>, Section 4.4 Flooding</li> <li>- Council report for the Council meeting on <a href="#">11 October 2021 (Item 17.2)</a>.</li> <li>- <a href="#">Updated and reviewed Flood Risk Management Plan for the upper and lower Parramatta River</a></li> </ul> <p><b>For the above reason, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>e. Supports the adoption of sea level rise and climate change patterns in modelling requirements within <i>Clause 5.21</i> of PLEP 2023.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
		<p>f. Encourages consistency with the NSW Flood Prone Land Policy within the NSW Floodplain Development Manual 2005 (the Manual). Development must not result in an increase in risk to life health or property of people living on the floodplain.</p>	<p>The requirement for consistency with the <i>NSW Floodplain Development Manual</i> is provided in discussed in the draft Harmonisation DCP, please see <b>C.01</b> within <b>Section 5.1.1 – Flooding</b>. The draft Harmonisation DCP also requires “<i>that development minimises the risk to life and property from flooding and its impacts</i>” within <b>O.03</b> of <b>Section 5.1.1 – Flooding</b>.</p> <p><b>For the above reason, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>g. Comments that frequent flash flooding from Wallis and Swamp Creek tributaries (Wallis and Swamp Fishery Creek Flood Study 2019) must be considered during the assessment of any DA or PP.</p>	<p>The Wallis Creek and Swamp/Fishery Creek catchments are situated inland from the central coast of New South Wales, about 30 kilometres due west of Newcastle. This catchment and the Parramatta River and Sydney Harbour catchments are separated by the Hawkesbury-Nepean, Macquarie Tuggerah and Hunter catchments.</p> <p>Assessment of development applications and planning proposals include assessment of flood affection, which includes an assessment of the proposal against all adopted flood maps which affect the property/properties subject to the application. The draft Parramatta River Flood Study is expected to go on public exhibition soon following Councils endorsement of the draft plan at the Council Meeting on 11 July 2023. This study includes updated flood maps for a wider area of the City of Parramatta LGA.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>h. Supports the reduction of potential dwelling numbers in areas at risk of flooding within the R3 and R2 Residential zones, noting that the increase of HOB from 9m to 11m for R3 zoned land and permitting dual occupancy development in areas identified as “Low Flood Islands” is not supported.</p>	<p>It is noted that there are areas which may be mapped as R3 Medium Density Residential and R2 Low Density Residential which permit multi-dwelling housing or dual occupancy development and are flood affected, However, an application must demonstrate compliance with Council’s DCP and this requires applicants to demonstrate suitable access and egress to safety dependent on flooding hazard and risk. If compliance cannot be demonstrated with Council’s DCP, this generally results in refusal.</p> <p><i>Please see response to submission No.55.a and No.55.c above.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>i. Does not support the subdivision of dual occupancies under PLEP 2023 for areas within the PMF extent or isolated during a PMF, due to the residual risk transferred to NSW SES.</p>	<p>This is not a Harmonisation DCP matter. Prohibitions on subdivision can only be implemented via the Council Local Environmental Plan. Council may review controls following the adoption of the draft Parramatta River Flood Study.</p> <p><i>Please see response to submission No.55.a above</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>j. Risk assessment should consider the full range of flooding, including events up to the PMF and not focus only on the 1% AEP flood.</p>	<p>Risk and hazard assessment is required for all development within the floodplain, this includes the PMF. <b>C.18 – Floodplain Risk Management</b> in <b>Section 5.1.1 Flooding</b> requires development to consider flood hazard for the 1% AEP and PMF events (<b>Section 5.1.1 – Flooding</b>). <b>C.24 – Floodplain Development Matrix</b> in <b>Section 5.1.1 – Flooding</b> requires development to consider flood risk for all flooding events including the PMF.</p>
		<p>k. Supports the intent of <i>Clause 5.21</i> and <i>7.11(3b)</i> of the PLEP 2023, highlighting the importance of planning to the PMF, including emergency access points and hazard categorisation considerations.</p>	<p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>l. The SES suggests that when considering risk assessment, there should be regard to flood warning and evacuation demand on</p>	<p>Applications proposed within the floodplain are generally required to demonstrate access and egress routes capable of suitable evacuation independently of surrounding sites, this includes localised flooding. The floodplain development matrix includes evacuation requirements dependent on development proposed. Please</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>existing and future access/egress routes with additional consideration given to impacts of localised flooding on evacuation routes. The submitter comments that access and egress routes should provide rising road access and/or be passable up to at least a 1 in 500 year local flooding.</p>	<p>see <b>C.27</b> in <b>Section 5.1.1 – Flooding</b>;</p> <p><b>C.27</b> <i>Horizontal evacuation measures are preferred for all building occupants (residents, workers and visitors) where the following can be satisfied:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Pedestrians can evacuate safely from a building via a flood free pedestrian access on a ‘rising road’ to an area of refuge located above the PMF. The evacuation pathway must not require passage through deepening or high hazard (H3 to H6) floodwaters.</i></li> <li>• <i>An exit from a building is provided above the PMF that is accessible internally to all occupants...</i></li> </ul> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>m. In the context of future development, self-evacuation should be achieved in a manner consistent with SES’s principles for evacuation.</p> <p>- Future development must not conflict with the SES’s flood response and evacuation strategy for the existing community.</p>	<p>Evacuation requirements are assessed based on risk and hazard, the draft Harmonisation DCP includes requirements for evacuation and shelter in place. These requirements include suitable access and egress, please see <b>C.27</b> in <b>Section 5.1.1 – Flooding</b>. Please also see <i>responses to no.55.f. and no.55.l. above</i>.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>n. Evacuation must not require people to drive or walk through flood water; “rising road access” away from the flood risk, particularly for areas subject to flash flooding without a formal warning system, for new development is preferred.</p>	<p><i>Please see response to No.55 l. above for access and egress requirements.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>o. States development strategies relying on isolation/SIP are not equivalent to evacuation. Requests to amend <i>Clause 7.11</i> of PLEP 2023 to communicate a preference for evacuation.</p>	<p><i>Clause 7.11</i> of PLEP 2023 was subject to a separate planning proposal which consisted of its own flood studies and assessment. The scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project is to consolidate the five former DCPs with some policy changes to reflect changes in planning legislation and Council resolutions. The shelter in place controls have been retained in the draft Harmonisation DCP as part of the consolidating process. Council may review controls following the adoption of the draft Parramatta River Flood Study.</p> <p><i>Please see response to submission No.55.a above.</i></p> <p>The submission requests changes to existing policy that has been harmonised and applied consistently into the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>p. Strategies that rely on mass rescue for SIP not supported, due to the residual risk (in terms of emergency response activities) and</p>	<p>The instances where shelter in place is permitted has not been extended beyond where the Parramatta DCP 2011 permitted onsite refuge. The draft Harmonisation DCP sets the requirements which must be achieved for the shelter in place to be considered, including what must be provided as part of the proposed shelter in place</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		increased requirements of SES.	<p>facilities. <i>Please see response to submission No.55.a and No.55.l</i> above regarding shelter in place and scope of harmonisation project.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>q. States that SIP is only preferred to reduce risk for existing development currently at risk. Notes that other emergencies (such as fire and medical emergencies) may occur in buildings isolated by floodwater, and a reduced capacity for the relevant emergency service to respond will occur in SIP situations.</p>	<p>Council’s preference is for horizontal evacuation, the draft Harmonisation DCP sets requirements which must be satisfied for the appropriate evacuation procedure to be considered, please see <b>C.27</b> in <b>Section 5.1.1 – Flooding</b>.</p> <p><i>Please see response to submission No.55.a and No.55.l</i> above regarding shelter in place and scope of harmonisation project.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>r. Objects to development consent conditions requiring private flood evacuation plans rather than the application of sound land use planning and flood risk management.</p>	<p>The draft Harmonisation DCP states it is necessary to recognise that flood emergency response plans “...cannot be solely relied upon to be effective in all flood events and therefore cannot be considered to reduce the hydraulic hazard. At best they reduce flood risk in events where they operate effectively and as such, flood emergency response plans should not form the basis of development consent” – <i>Floodplain Development Manual (2005)</i>. Council does not replace sound land use planning and flood risk management with the use of development consent conditions and flood evacuations plans.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>s. Requests Council considers the cumulative impact of developments to the risk of life in current/future communities and emergency services in the future.</p>	<p>The draft Harmonisation DCP sets objectives and controls which require the consideration of flooding impacts on current and future development as well as emergency services. <b>Section 5.1.1 – Flooding</b> contains the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Ensure that development minimises the risk to life and property from flooding and its impacts.</i></li> <li>- <i>Ensure development does not adversely increase the potential flood affectation on other development or properties, either individually or in combination with similar developments that are likely to occur within the same catchment.</i></li> <li>- Controls which require proposed development to consider increases in local rainfall intensity, other rainfall and flood behaviour resulting from climate change, please see <b>C.09</b>.</li> <li>- Matrix Development Controls <b>Table 5.1.1.3</b> states “adequate flood warning is to be available to allow safe and orderly evacuation without increased reliance upon SES or other authorised emergency services personnel”.</li> </ul> <p>As outlined above, the draft Harmonisation DCP contains adequate provisions which require applicants demonstrate any proposed development addresses the matters raised in the SES Submission.</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>t. Notes that the following resources would be beneficial to adapt:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reducing Vulnerability of Buildings to Flood Damage</li> <li>• Designing Safer Subdivisions</li> <li>• Managing Flood Risk Through Planning Opportunities</li> </ul>	<p>A flood management study and plan will be carried out following the completion of the exhibition and finalisation of the draft Parramatta River Flood Study.</p> <p><i>Please also see response to submission No.55.a above regarding ongoing studies being carried out and anticipated by Council.</i></p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP contain provisions addressing building structural adequacy within the floodplain, subdivision of property within the floodplain and the management of flood risk through planning and design. However, the Harmonisation DCP is a consolidation of existing controls within the City of Parramatta. The flood management study and plan will include a comprehensive review of Councils floodplain development controls following the finalisation of the Parramatta River Flood Study. The suggested resources could be integrated further during the flood management study and plan’s review of the DCP controls.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
56	Transport for NSW (TfNSW)	<p>a. TfNSW notes and supports development control <b>C.09</b> in <b>Part 6 – Traffic and Transport</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP that aims to restrict vehicular access on arterial roads where alternative access is available or can be acquired.</p> <p>b. Suggests Council to consider the application of maximum parking rates over minimum rates for precincts within the LGA that have high level of public and active transport accessibility.</p> <p>c. Suggests Council to consider inclusion of the following noise attenuation clause in the draft Harmonisation DCP for residential development located adjacent to major arterials roads and/or mass transit stations</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The proposed car parking rate in the draft Harmonisation DCP is based on the <a href="#">Discussion Paper</a> recommendations, consistent with the TfNSW Guide to Traffic Generating Developments and retains precinct specific car parking rates. Precinct specific parking rates include areas that utilise maximum parking rates, this includes areas such as Parramatta CBD and Epping CBD where there is a high concentration of public and active transport accessibility. The business premises car parking rate contained in the draft Harmonisation DCP also reduces the required car parking spaces by 25% for sites within 800m of a train or light rail stop or 400m from a frequently served bus stop.</p> <p><i>See response to submission No. 43. dr. regarding reduced parking rates for areas serviced by public transport.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP contains provisions aligned with the requirements suggested by the submitter in <b>Section 3.2.2 – Visual and Acoustic Privacy</b> which requires;</p> <p><b>C.04</b> <i>Development is to contribute to minimising the impact of any local noise generating sources within a site’s vicinity such as traffic, rail, or industry.</i></p>



Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>and corridors:</p> <p><i>Future development should consider appropriate noise attenuation measures through design measures, architectural treatments, setbacks, durable materials, and landscaping particularly along the site’s frontage to major arterial roads and/or mass transit stations and corridors to mitigate future residents against road and rail passenger noise. Council should be satisfied that any noise mitigation controls throughout the relevant DCP is appropriately aligned with this requirement.</i></p>	<p><b>C.05</b> Windows are to be located and designed to reduce the transmission of noise.</p> <p><b>C.06</b> Appropriate building materials should be used to provide acoustic privacy and double glazing utilised where required due to adjacent noise generating sources.</p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP also requires a minimum setback to state and regional roads of 10 metres which must include landscaping as stated in the key development standards for each residential typology in <b>Section 3.3, 3.4</b> and <b>3.5</b>.</p> <p><a href="#">State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021</a> also contains additional requirements for development adjacent to <a href="#">rail</a> and <a href="#">road corridors</a> which includes requirements that specify LAeq levels are not exceeded within the building. [Note: LAeq means Equivalent Continuous Sound Pressure Level and is a measure of the average sound energy over a given time].</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>d. TfNSW notes that development controls relating to the Parramatta CBD precinct are currently a deferred matter subject to finalisation of the Parramatta CBD Planning Proposal and will be incorporated into the Harmonisation DCP later. TfNSW welcomes the opportunity to provide further comment during public exhibition of the Parramatta CBD draft Harmonisation DCP.</p>	<p>The Parramatta City Centre LEP (formally known as the CBD Planning Proposal) was finalised by the Department of Planning and Environment on 6 May 2022 and came into effect on 14 October 2022, these provisions have been consolidated in the <i>Parramatta LEP 2023</i>. As part of the finalisation of the Parramatta City Centre LEP, the Department did not support certain precincts to progress as part of the new plan. Refer to the Department’s finalisation report <a href="#">here</a> for further information (specifically Figure 2, detailing the areas supported by the Department).</p> <p>The DCP controls relating to the CBD Planning Proposal were endorsed by Council in November 2022 and came into effect on 2 December 2022. Due to the deferred areas of the Parramatta City Centre LEP, the <a href="#">new City Centre DCP (Part 6)</a> only applied to areas supported by the Department. The controls within <b>Section 4.3.3 – Parramatta City Centre – Deferred Area A</b> of PDCP 2011 currently apply to the deferred areas. As part of the integration of the Parramatta City Centre controls into the draft Harmonisation DCP, Council officers made necessary administrative changes to the current Part 6 and Section 4.3.3 to maintain consistency with the draft DCP.</p> <p>Several of the deferred areas are subject to separate planning processes (such as the Department-led Parramatta North Place Strategy), which may result in future reviews of the DCP controls for the areas deferred and subject to separate planning processes.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>e. Suggests the draft Harmonisation DCP to consider relevant objectives and station precinct controls for Westmead and Parramatta Station that are consistent with Future Transport Strategy 2061, the Movement and Place Framework, Better Placed and NSW Guide to Activation -</p>	<p>Provisions in relation to site-specific controls for Parramatta City Centre and Westmead Local Centre have been directly transferred from former Parramatta DCP 2011 into the draft Harmonisation DCP. The approach of the draft Harmonisation DCP for site specific controls is to integrate them into the consolidated DCP without policy changes as they have generally been implemented through detailed studies.</p> <p>Council continues to have good dialogue with the State government around the major infrastructure projects, with the role of the draft Harmonised DCP limited because of the hierarchy of Environmental Planning</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>Public Spaces.</p>	<p>Instruments such as those mentioned by the submitters.</p> <p>Council's preference is to implement station precinct controls via site specific provisions which consider site conditions and requirements. Changes to Parramatta City Centre controls should occur via an Access Strategy for the City Centre as recommended in <a href="#">Parramatta CBD Integrate Transport Plan</a> (July 2021) prepared as part of the City Centre LEP amendments. An Access Strategy may identify future public domain initiatives through future amendments to the DCP instead, over time with proper underpinnings.</p> <p>Westmead is subject to a precinct specific place strategy which included the Westmead Place Based Transport Strategy. This Strategy identifies initiatives for Council and other stakeholders to implement. State agencies in collaboration with Council are identified to prepare an integrated transport and traffic study to progress the initiatives.</p> <p>Council supports planning pathways where TfNSW and Council could collaborate to develop controls that meet both objectives identified in State Transport plans and other community objectives</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>f. TfNSW suggests the draft Harmonisation DCP make reference to the parking rates in TfNSW Guide to Traffic Generating Developments for land uses that are not referenced in the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p>	<p>Noted, the draft Harmonisation DCP makes references to the <i>TfNSW Guide to Traffic Generating Developments</i>, specifically under <i>Table 6.3.1 – Minimum Car Parking Rate</i> of the draft Harmonisation DCP.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
57	National Trust (Parramatta branch)	<p>a. The National Trust expresses disappointment that the Harmonisation DCP has not made substantial changes to the DCP to address improvements they think should be made to the DCP including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify and strengthen the existing heritage controls (i.e. strengthen heritage protection, regulate ‘corporate’ development colour schemes, view line and demolition) for the whole LGA and include new heritage controls informed by a comprehensive heritage planning review for the LGA.</li> </ul>	<p>It is acknowledged that a comprehensive heritage study of the whole LGA has not occurred following the Proclamation of the City of Parramatta in 2016. Council recognises the City of Parramatta’s importance as it is a place of significance for the Darug people, and is the second European settlement of Australia. Council values the City’s unique heritage setting and has recognised the importance and priorities in Parramatta Local Strategic Planning Statement to protect the heritage significance across the City of Parramatta LGA supported with actions (A53, A54, A55).</p> <p>Council officers note matters raised by the National Trust in relation to seeking further protection of the City of Parramatta’s heritage. Implementing further protection cannot occur without undertaking a detailed heritage review across the LGA, this is out of scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project. Such a review would require extensive studies not feasible through the DCP consolidation project. As the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project is to consolidate the five former DCPs with some policy changes to reflect recent changes in legislation and following up actions identified in Council resolutions. The existing heritage controls generally retained the objectives and controls in Parramatta DCP 2011 and adopted suitable heritage controls from other DCPs applying within the LGA where controls are stronger or supplement those within the Parramatta DCP. Further details of the project scope to consolidating heritage controls are explained within <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2023.</p> <p>Council officers are currently considering options for exploring an LGA wide integrated heritage study. Council</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include heritage vision statements and development controls for site specific precincts within the draft DCP.</li> <li>• Provide definitions in the document rather than referring to existing instruments (e.g. local centre, neighbourhood precinct, strategic centre, special character area, special area).</li> <li>• The draft DCP to include specific mechanisms/requirements that ensure objectives for Country can be met.</li> <li>• The Trust requests the draft Harmonisation DCP include new tree planting references and should be emphasised and expanded.</li> <li>• The draft DCP to consider the views and vistas for those Trust-owned properties at Old Government House and Experiment Farm in relation to their heritage value, relationship with the Parramatta River and the surrounding area’s history.</li> <li>• Controls for development in the vicinity of heritage items be expanded to include development visible from a heritage item or the public domain of a conservation area. They note the size and scale of new developments have unintended consequences on heritage items such as shading of historic gardens and extreme light reflections that can damage historic interiors and collection objects.</li> </ul>	<p>Officers are currently in a scoping phase of working out how the study might be completed given resources available. It is expected that a budget for a future study will be included in preparation of the 2024/25 budget. Further community consultation will be undertaken for any new heritage controls that are recommended in any future study.</p> <p>Further community consultation will be undertaken for any new heritage controls as a result of the heritage study and the National Trust may provide comments part of the exhibition process of any heritage study and LEP and DCP changes as a result of the study.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The draft DCP explicitly recognise the principles of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples for free, prior and informed consent for all decision regarding Aboriginal heritage and that Council undertake consultation with Indigenous communities to establish a process for identifying and protecting their heritage.</li> </ul>	
	b.	<p>The Trust seek clarification on the order hierarchy in relation to the heritage controls between <b>Part 7 – Heritage and Archaeology</b> and <b>Part 9 – Parramatta City Centre</b>, as both stating the sections take precedent over the other in the situation of a conflict in controls.</p>	<p><b>Part 9</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP applies to land subject to the Parramatta City Centre and was dealt with through a separate planning process under the <i>Parramatta CBD Land Use Planning framework</i>. Following the public exhibition, Council officers included the Parramatta City Centre DCP under <b>Part 9</b> of the draft Harmonisation DCP with administrative updates to ensure that the draft Harmonisation DCP is consistent and up to date as required.</p> <p>The Parramatta City Centre controls within <b>Section 9.6 – Heritage</b> are applicable to all sites within the City Centre (not just heritage items), and are intended to improve all new developments’ relationship to heritage within the Parramatta City Centre. They are less prescriptive in nature, focus on a context-specific understanding of a site and its wider relationship to the City Centre, and must be substantiated by detailed heritage analysis. This is in contrast to the general heritage controls within <b>Part 7</b> and are not considered competing provisions as they are prescriptive to heritage items and buildings within heritage conservation areas. Whilst <b>Section 9.6</b> is intended to be read in conjunction with <b>Part 7 – Heritage and Archaeology</b>, there are no anticipated conflict of controls due to the differing purposes of the provisions.</p> <p>Site-specific controls within <b>Section 9.10</b> contain tailored heritage controls for the heritage items that are relevant to the specific site. In instances where site-specific controls are applicable, Council’s general approach is that the site-specific controls take precedence. Any application involving heritage items or that is within a heritage conservation area will be assessed on its merits, this will include consideration of the proposed development, site conditions, and a review of the applicable controls to ensure the appropriate controls are being implemented at the time of assessment.</p> <p>Therefore, the draft Harmonisation DCP is considered sufficient to addressing any inconsistencies between <b>Part 7- Heritage and Archaeology</b> and <b>Part 9 - Parramatta City Centre</b>.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
	c.	<p>The Trust suggests that <b>Part 2 – Design in Context</b> to specify that heritage controls for heritage items and heritage conservation areas override other DCP</p>	<p>Council officers consider the current phrasing within <b>Part 7 – Heritage and Archaeology</b> to be sufficient in clarifying any inconsistencies between the heritage controls and <b>Part 2 – Design in Context</b>: for more information on which controls take precedence.</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>controls generally. The Trust also notes that <b>Section 2.13 – Culture and Public Art</b> does not recognise the significance of Parramatta’s heritage as an integral part of the area’ culture and heritage underpins many cultural identities and expressions.</p>	<p><i>Please see response to submission no.57.b above.</i></p> <p>It is also noted that <b>Section 2.13 – Culture and Public Art</b> recognises the significance of the City’s heritage as an integral part’s the area’s culture, specifically the following reference:</p> <p><i>The City’s heritage assets and public art have a visible presence in the city. The development of historical interpretation and contemporary public art has created a distinctive urban environment that signifies and articulates the history of the area while reflecting the culture of the contemporary community, particularly within the City’s major local centres.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p><b>Heritage Significance of Harris Park</b></p>	
		<p>d. The Trust supports the objectives of the draft Harmonisation DCP to conserve the heritage character of Harris Park and to protect and enhance the Parramatta River and Clay Cliff Creek. However, the Trust expresses disappointments that the draft Harmonisation DCP does not introduce substantial changes to address improvements they think should be made to protect and strengthen the heritage significance within Harris Park, this including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conducting a heritage study to inform detailed heritage controls and ensure ongoing preservation of Harris Park’s heritage significance.</li> <li>• New or amended controls to protect and manage significant heritage items in Harris Park (Elizabeth Farm, Experiment Farm, Hambledon Cottage)</li> <li>• New controls to protect the heritage integrity of the area north of Prospect Street (as it is identified as an area of National Significance).</li> <li>• Investigation the Parramatta River as National and State heritage significance</li> </ul>	<p>A detailed heritage study must be undertaken prior to implementing substantial changes to strength heritage protection or add new listings.</p> <p><i>Please see response to submission No.55.a above.</i></p> <p>A detailed heritage review for the Harris Park is out of scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project. The existing heritage controls for Harris Park have been transferred directly from the Parramatta DCP 2011 to the draft DCP.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>as it has been a major public thoroughfare since 1788.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration to expand the heritage conservation areas in Harris Park to protect a larger area including the Parramatta River and Clay Cliff Creek.</li> <li>• Address concerns of identifying Ruse Drive as a ‘gateway’ to Parramatta for managing heritage values as it is ambiguous as to its function as a ‘gateway’ and the locations it will service.</li> <li>• New controls to restrict the building height to a maximum of two storeys in Harris Park (particularly in areas identified as an Area of National Significance).</li> <li>• Include thorough assessment of significant historic views, vistas and setting within Harris Park.</li> <li>• Include Clay Cliff Creek and that Elizabeth Farm, Experiment Farm and Hambledon Cottage on the Figure 8.3.1.1.1 Design Control Map: Landscape Treatment due to the heritage significance and further enhance the controls of regenerate Clay Cliff Creek.</li> <li>• New controls to support the vision for Key Block One and require no development taller than two storeys high should be permitted due to its effect on national and state heritage significance.</li> </ul>	

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend the height controls along Arthur Street and James Ruse Drive as it will significantly negatively impact on the heritage values of Harris Park, specifically the Key Blocks Two and Three given their critical land within the area of national significance.</li> <li>Identify Key Block Four as a unique opportunity to improve and enhance the Parramatta River landscape and biodiversity, due to its setting with surrounding areas such as Female Orphan School.</li> <li>Investigation the visual curtilage for Elizabeth Farm (which includes Harris Park, Rosehill and Camellia) to enable it as a place of potential world heritage significance with Clay Cliff Creek and Parramatta River.</li> </ul>	
		<p><b>Comments on Section 8.2.2 Parramatta North Urban Transformation Precinct (PNUT)</b></p>	
		<p>g. The Trust generally objects to the <b>Section 8.2.2 – Parramatta North Urban Transformation Precinct</b> under the draft DCP and concerns that the density, scale, and height of buildings that are permissible under this draft Harmonisation DCP are inappropriate for its heritage context. The Trust states the provisions under this section are not reflective of various place strategies and are not reflective of strategic plans that have been finalised in previous years. Key comments/concerns are outlined below:</p>	<p>The scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project is to consolidate the five former DCPs and retain existing site specific controls. Comments in relation to site specific DCP controls (i.e. Parramatta North Urban Transformation precinct(PNUT)) is out of scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project, as those controls have been directly transferred from former DCPs to the current draft DCP with no changes proposed.</p> <p><i>Please also see response to submission No.53.a</i> regarding draft Harmonisation DCP approach to site-specific controls.</p> <p>PNUT was rezoned in 2015 by the Minister for Planning and the master planning process was led by Property and Development NSW. The master planning process included detailed considerations of planning, design and heritage objectives/principles.</p> <p>Following the rezoning process, site specific DCP controls for PNUT (i.e. <b>Section 8.2.2</b>) were developed in 2017 to further support the proposed land uses. The DCP process involved consultation with the community and State Agencies including the NSW heritage Office. The controls were subject to a separate community consultation</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Trust states that the PNUT precinct should be reviewed at all levels of government and should be considered as ‘the Parramatta North Special Conservation Precinct’.</li> <li>• Concerns the Parramatta North Historic Sites Consolidated Conservation Management Plan (CMP) does not protect the conservation values of the associated sites.</li> <li>• The Trust reiterates its position as stated in the National Trust Position Paper dated September 2015 – A Vision for North Parramatta. The Trust requests only development with the greatest consideration of heritage to be contemplated for the area and should follow similar controls to those for Callan Park in Sydney’s Inner West.</li> <li>• The Trust requests that any proposed changes or subdivision of the site should be for leases, not for any freehold titles and that all government land should remain in government ownership. The Trust states that the PNUT precinct should be managed by a single government authority to ensure long term preservation of the area.</li> <li>• Comments that the PNUT precinct must remain as green space for the current and future local population, particularly considering its proximity to the City</li> </ul>	<p>process and are considered to be appropriate.</p> <p>It is noted the study area for Westmead Place Strategy and North Parramatta Place Strategy, both led by the State Government, encompassed the entire PNUT site specified under the draft Harmonisation DCP. A specific review of the controls for the PNUT site are being considered as part of a proposal to potentially include a university campus via the Parramatta North State Significant Planning process in this precinct.</p> <p>As such, any change to the development controls (i.e. HOB, heritage curtilage) applying to PNUT will be subject to the outcomes of above mentioned projects: North Parramatta Place Strategy and the progress of Westmead Precinct Planning through separate planning process that outside of the draft harmonisation DCP project. These processes will both involve community consultation which will allow the Trust to express their views and have them considered as part of those processes.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>



Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>Centre. Submitter objects to the sale of PNUT sites to private developers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter voices their weariness of an increase of planning controls for the site, due to the volume of site-specific planning proposals approved in recent years.</li> <li>• The Trust raised detailed comments/objections to controls relating to buildings specified under a number of indicative layout plans within section 8.2.2 of the draft DCP, which including Lot E3, Lot E1, C75, C52a &amp; C52 and C55b &amp; C55, C61,C62,C64,C59,C63,C65, C70,C75,C82,C83 Lot F1,F2, F4, F5, F6,F7,F8,F9 and Lot H1, H2, H3, H4, H5 and Lot G1 and Lot G2. The Trust opposes the controls on the ground of: building height controls impacting on heritage/heritage core significance and skyline and park amenity; lack of inclusion of large trees in the heritage controls; loss of heritage significance from demolition of buildings adjacent to heritage items;</li> </ul>	
		<p><b>The North Parramatta Heritage Conservation area</b></p> <p>h. The Trust suggests an update to the North Parramatta HCA boundary by including the St Patrick’s Primary School building on the corner of Ross and Villiers Street as it should link to the Cumberland Hospital heritage lands.</p>	<p>As noted in above responses contained in <i>submission No.57.a</i>, detailed changes to the heritage controls are not within the scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project. Any future change to the North Parramatta HCA boundary will need to be informed by a future heritage study.</p> <p>As outlined in above response, Council officers are currently considering options for exploring an LGA wide integrated heritage study. Council Officers are currently in a scoping phase of working out how the study might be completed given resources available. It is expected that a budget for a future study will be included in preparation of the 2024/25 budget. Further community consultation will be undertaken for any new heritage controls that are recommended in any future study. The National Trust may provide comments part of the</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>exhibition process of any heritage study</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<b>Roxy Theatre</b>	
		<p>i. The Trust does not support the building heights and setbacks of adjacent sites to the Roxy Theatre. The submitter states that the setbacks would result in building forms that would negatively impact the amenity of the theatre’s setting.</p>	<p>The planning controls for sites surrounding the Roxy Theatre was considered and finalised as part of the Parramatta CBD Planning Framework (i.e. Parramatta City Centre DCP and Parramatta CBD Planning Proposal) in 2022. It is noted the Trust made submission to the Parramatta CBD DCP project and was considered as part of the planning process. The Parramatta CBD DCP was adopted by Council (i.e. planning controls for the sites surrounding the Roxy Theatre) in November 2022, as those controls have recently been reviewed, further changes are not considered necessary.</p>
		<p>j. The lack of a significant setback above six storeys combined with the height controls would impact upon the heritage of the site. The Trust states that heritage conservation will provide an opportunity for Parramatta and the risk of inappropriate built form adjacent to the site will result in negative consequences.</p>	<p><i>Please also see response to submission No.53.a regarding draft Harmonisation DCP approach to site-specific controls.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<b>Future DCP for Parramatta City Centre</b>	
		<p>k. The Trust states that delivering controls to protect heritage value of the Parramatta City Centre, Parramatta Park and North Parramatta is a matter of urgency due to the levels of developmental activity in the areas.</p>	<p>As outlined above, the planning controls for Parramatta City Centre, Parramatta Park and North Parramatta was considered and finalised by Council as part of the Parramatta CBD Planning Framework (i.e. Parramatta City Centre DCP and Parramatta CBD Planning Proposal) in 2022. It is noted the Trust made submission to the Parramatta CBD DCP project and was considered as part of the planning process. As those controls reflect recent development practice and standard, it is therefore considered no changes are necessary to be made to the draft harmonisation DCP project.</p> <p><i>Please also see response to submission No.57.e.</i></p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
58	School Infrastructure NSW	<p>a. SINSW welcome additional assistance from Council in locating potential schools at Parramatta South.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>b. SINSW would like to continue to work with Council to explore sustainable transport planning at Westmead precinct.</p>	<p>Sustainable transport planning within the Westmead precinct is currently subject to the initiatives of the NSW Government-led <a href="#">Westmead Place-based Transport Strategy</a>.</p> <p>Any changes to the future Parramatta DCP 2023 regarding this matter will be investigated as part of the finalisation and implementation of this strategy, and is separate to the draft Harmonisation DCP project.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>c. SINSW recommends improvement to pedestrian access within the Rydalmere Precinct.</p>	<p>This submission does not make specific request for amendments to the DCP but the principle of improving pedestrian access in Rydalmere is accepted and will be considered when future work is undertaken on the precinct and as part of Council traffic and pedestrian management strategies.</p> <p>This comment is out of scope of the draft Harmonisation DCP project. As explained within <a href="#">Attachment 2</a> to Council Report from 28 November 2023, existing site-specific controls for precincts located within the City (including Camellia and Rydalmere) will be retained in the consolidated DCP.</p> <p><b>Amendments to the existing precinct controls are out of scope of the project and therefore no changes are made as a result of this submission.</b></p>
		<p>d. SINSW request that Council considers the application of a maximum parking rate for the Carter Street Precinct to address concerns raised regarding increased traffic volumes, carparking and congestion on the local roads.</p>	<p>Table 3 in <i>Carter Street Precinct Development Framework December 2020</i>, sets out the car parking rates for the Carter Street Precinct. The table contains maximum rates for parking, not minimum rates. The current controls employ the approach that the submission is suggesting.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>
		<p>e. SINSW request that the draft Harmonisation DCP remove minimum parking rates related to educational establishments as they do not align with the Department of Education’s <i>Educational Facilities Standards and Guidelines</i>. Development for new schools will require comprehensive transport assessments that will be assessed on a site-by-site basis. Stating this will assist to achieve a mode shift toward public transport (where possible) and will be contained in further details within each school site Transport Management Plan and Green Travel Plan.</p>	<p>It is considered that the draft Harmonisation DCP is consistent with the <i>Educational Facilities Standards and Guidelines</i>, as minimum parking rates for educational establishments (<b>Table 6.3.1 – Minimum car parking rates</b>) requires a merit-based assessment to be justified by a traffic and transport impact assessment. Similarly detailed in <b>C.54 of Section 6.2 – Parking and Vehicular Access</b>, any variation to parking rates (including the exclusion of parking) would be subject to a supplied traffic and transport impact assessment.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>

Submission Response Table – Draft Parramatta ‘Harmonisation’ DCP 2023

Item No.	Respondent	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		<p>f. SINSW states sound transport planning at regional precinct and local level is of critical importance to reduce risk of injury or harm to students as they travel to and from school.</p> <p>It is critical that the pedestrian environment in Parramatta meets pedestrian volumes. SINSW request that transport planning for the Parramatta LGA be guided by the NSW Governments Movement and Place Framework and its Built Environment Performance Indicators, as these indicators are based on qualities and will contribute to a well-designed built environment.</p>	<p>The issues raised are sound planning principles that Council seeks to apply whenever undertaking a precinct or broader policy work but these comments do not point to specific changes that should be made to the exhibited DCP.</p> <p>The draft Harmonisation DCP provides clear objectives (<b>O.08 - O.11</b> of <b>Section 4.5 – Educational Establishments</b>) to maintain and protect pedestrian safety, including their travel to and from school. It is required within the draft Harmonisation DCP that clear distinctions should be made for vehicular traffic and pedestrian movements, both onsite and off-site.</p> <p><b>For the above reasons, no changes to the draft Harmonisation DCP are considered necessary.</b></p>