

Issues raised at the UPC Meeting 12 December 2011

Issue	Response
Building and Urban Design (Clause 2.3)	
<p><i>Concerns with stripping out the requirements for design excellence. We need fantastic beautiful buildings.</i></p>	<p>In researching the concept of “design excellence”, the following extract is taken from a historical version of the SEPP for Major Development 2005 (Clause 22 State Significant Sites):</p> <p><i>In considering whether proposed development exhibits design excellence, the consent authority must have regard to the following matters:</i></p> <p>(a) <i>whether a high standard of architectural design, materials and detailing appropriate to the building type and location will be achieved,</i></p> <p>(b) <i>whether the form and external appearance of the building will improve the quality and amenity of the public domain,</i></p> <p>(c) <i>whether the building meets sustainable design principles in terms of sunlight, natural ventilation, wind, reflectivity, visual and acoustic privacy, safety and security and resource, energy and water efficiency,</i></p> <p>Design excellence is therefore achieved by a combination of controls.</p> <p>Some of these aspects were already included in the Draft DCP. However, in response to Councillor concerns, these aspects are to be enhanced by copying item (a) from the SEPP as the first objective in clause 2.3 of the Draft DCP. The term “materials” has also been incorporated into control C1.</p> <p>Item (b) above is consistent with the existing objective (1) which now becomes O2.</p> <p>Item (c) is consistent with clause 2.9 Sustainability.</p>
Heritage (Clause 2.4)	
<p><i>Clause 7.0 in the Heads of Consideration of the 1995 DCP for School and College Development includes controls for heritage conservation. Why has this clause been deleted from the Draft DCP?</i></p>	<p>In response to feedback from Councillors, we have re inserted Heritage Conservation as Clause 2.4, and included a heritage objective in part 1.5.</p>
Open Areas (Clause 2.5)	
<p><i>Retain existing provisions in the existing DCP at least – so as to retain all open space and playgrounds – need more open spaces.</i></p> <p><i>Reinforce the objectives of the open areas</i></p>	<p>In response to Councillor concerns we have amended the first objective and control to encourage the retention of all open areas, particularly those that make a significant contribution to the public realm.</p>
<p><i>Why only identify some of our open areas – why not all of them?</i></p>	<p>In response to Cllr concerns we have amended the first objective and first control to include all open areas. Some of these areas have been identified as significant open spaces to reflect their importance to the public realm.</p>

Issue	Response
<i>Why is Dangar Oval not included as a significant open space?</i>	For the purpose of this DCP significant open areas are those that make a significant contribution to the public realm. Dangar Oval does not achieve this as it is surrounded by private properties.
<i>Watered down the control regarding 20m² of open space – see Cl 1 10 of the existing DCP.</i>	<p>The proposed control C3 of clause 2.5 – Open areas, requires new facilities to provide open spaces, but we have not specified at what size/rate. Previously this was identified as 20m².</p> <p>This mechanism is no longer considered appropriate for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The basis of the 20m² figure is unclear; • Over half the schools in our LGA already fall below this ratio and the ratio is therefore unrealistic; • It favours schools that are attached to playing fields (since attached playing fields are counted as recreational space – detached are not); • It favours tall buildings which leave more open space at the ground. <p>The proposed control which requires new open spaces on schools sites is sufficient and practical.</p>
Arrival and departure (Clause 2.6)	
<i>Raise the profile of public transport</i>	New objective inserted (O3): “To encourage staff and students to use public transport”
<i>Traffic and pedestrian management plan– raise priorities of public transport</i>	Priorities in the TPMP have been amended to reflect the prioritisation of walking and public transport.
<i>Discourage student drivers – problems in streets around Kambala, Cranbrook, Scots</i>	Item (f) requires a TPMP to address “Strategies to discourage students from driving to school”.
<i>No loud speakers to be used during drop off and pick up times.</i>	Reference to the term “amplified devices” has been included in item (g) of the TPMP requirements.
<i>Need to consider a wider area when assessing parking/traffic impacts.</i>	Item (i) of the requirements in a TPMP is amended to say “surrounding” road network and not just “local” road network which covers a wider area.
Planting, fencing and hard surfaces (Clause 2.8)	
<i>All significant trees are to be retained - <u>where possible</u></i>	We do not consider it good practice to apply unqualified restrictions on this control. It will be up to an applicant to justify in each case whether this control is unreasonable due to the circumstances of the case.
Community Use (Clause 2.9)	
<i>Review objectives – “appropriate use” is subjective.</i>	Objectives amended and combined into 1.
Sustainability (Clause 2.11)	
<i>O1 – amend to Encourage a reduction in energy demand.</i>	The term “encourage” has been included into O1.
<i>Allow air conditioners in schools</i>	By encouraging a reduction in energy demand we do not preclude the use of air conditioners but encourage more sustainable forms of cooling.