**Attachment C - Urban Design Guidelines compliance table**

The site is subject to the Urban Design Guidelines (UDG) for Catherine Hill Bay Middle Camp. An assessment of the application against the relevant UDG controls is detailed hereunder. Note, the UDG also contains controls relating to building form, which have not specifically been discussed below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Control** | **Details** | **Assessment** |
| B1.1 Public Domain Strategy | This control outlines the overall strategy of the UDG for public domain areas, which is addressed in the subsequent controls. | The overall strategy for public domain areas to be addressed in the subsequent controls is noted. |
| B1.2 Street types | This control describes street typology, and cross sections details for street carriageway, parking and pedestrian facilities (refer to page 5-7 of UDG). | The proposed street typology is generally consistent with the UDG.  The UDG proposes several different road cross sections ranging from narrow one-way streets to very wide carriageways.  The application proposes road reserves and carriageways that do not strictly achieve the widths specified in the UDG, however provide for street trees, pedestrian facilities, parking and utilities as outlined in the UDG.  The wider road verge within the UDG is predominately dictated by the inclusion of bio-swales and informal staggered planting of large trees (Eucalyptus/ Angophora). The proposal does not include bio-swales, instead achieving the same water quality targets through the use of the bio-basins. Further, Council’s Landscape Architect is not supportive of the large street trees proposed, and instead has recommended more appropriate species.  It is noted the road carriageway width within the UDG does not comply with Planning for Bushfire 2019.  The proposed outcomes are consistent with Council’s development guidelines and Planning for Bushfire 2019. |
| B1.3 Parks and open space | This control gives guidance to the landscape outcomes for each of the respective parks and open space areas with the development.  The controls require four parks to be established within the site:   * Workshop Park * Lemon Tree Park * Gateway Park * Linear Park   Refer to page 8-10 of UDG. | The application proposes to create the lots for the four parks.  Park designs are considered to be generally consistent with the UDG, as detailed below.  Satisfactory landscaping details have been provided for all parks that generally reflect the landscape concept plan of the parks approved under the UDG.  **Workshop Park**  Workshop Park provides two distinct areas. The larger portion of the park will include native vegetation, grasses and the like, with footpath and seating opportunities throughout to provide passive recreation opportunities.  The smaller portion of the park is for active recreation and includes a playground, seating and gathering areas, and heritage interpretation of the former Workshop Building.  It is noted that at the time the UDG was written, it was envisioned the Workshop Building would be renovated and repurposed for community use. A separate DA for the demolition of the workshop building has been approved by Council, which determined the structural condition of the building to be unsafe and not suitable for any repurposing. Heritage interpretation of the building in the form of a sculpture was conditioned as part of the demolition.  **Lemon Tree Park**  This park provides passive recreation space, with walking trails and seating opportunities. Landscaping will include tree plantings to revegetated to a natural bushland state. A dedicated heritage garden will be included as per the UDG.  **Gateway Park**  This park is for informal active uses and open space for general community use. Areas of plantings, and open grassed areas have been provided.  **Linear Park**  This park is incorporated into the road reserve and will be planted with native plantings, and is integrated with the heritage walkway. |
| A landscape buffer zone of approximately 20 metres is required through retaining existing vegetation, and providing new planting along Flowers Drive for Hamlet A.  New plantings are to include local native species as specified in the UDG.  Bushfire requirements must also be accounted for.  Refer to page 11 of UDG. | The landscape buffer to Flowers Drive proposed in the UDG includes land within the rear yards of proposed lots. This buffer zone extends from the road reserve boundary and 20 metres into the site. The buffer is also to be managed as an APZ, which will impact upon the ability for the buffer to act as a visual screen. The objectives of the buffer are to allow the heritage streetscape of Middle Camp to maintain the ‘green’ bush landscape setting approach on Flowers Drive, and to minimise the visual impact of Hamlet A.  Notwithstanding the requirements of the UDG, Council is concerned a vegetation buffer that sits wholly within the backyards of private lots is likely to eventually be cleared by the lot owners and fail to provide the intended effect. This is a circumstance Council has experience before and typically no longer supports these outcomes.  To achieve the intended outcomes of UDG, the application proposes to establish a buffer that is at least 10 metres wide within the road reserve and includes existing vegetation within the Flowers Drive road reserve. This will require widening of the road reserve to achieve this outcome. The remaining 10 metres landscape buffer will be located within the lots. Whilst not strictly in accordance with the UDG, it is considered this alternate approach is more likely to achieve a successful permanent outcome of maintaining the ‘green’ approach on Flowers Drive to the village. Further, retaining existing vegetation in Flowers Drive will provide an immediate screen to the development.  The proposal includes a metal fence, that will be of a visually recessive colour, along the rear of the lots that adjoin Flowers Drive. As a result of the bushfire attack level at the proposed location, the fence must be constructed in a non-flammable metal material. In accordance with UDG the fence will be dark in colour.  Under the UDG the alignment of the fence would have been located close to the Flowers Drive carriageway in some sections, which had the potential to be visually obtrusive. The proposed road widening and supplementary planting will ensure a minimum of 10m buffer from the carriageway to the fence.  It is considered that if the fence is not installed by the developer, then ad-hoc fencing by future owners will be installed. |
| This control makes suggestions on plant and tree species and other landscape items.  Refer to page 11 of UDG. | The proposed landscaping is generally consistent with the UDG.  Council’s Landscape Architect has reviewed the proposed landscaping in accordance with the suggested species within the UDG. The officer is satisfied with the proposed landscaping outcomes. In some instances, the officer has substituted species for similar, but more suitable species, and the overall intent of the UDG is achieved. |
| Heritage shared pathway to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists to be provided along the alignment of the existing drainage reserve, then follow the former rail line towards the coast.  Refer to page 12 of UDG. | The application proposes to construct a heritage shared pathway that is 2.5 metres wide along the alignment former railway and in accordance with the UDG.  Satisfactory concept engineering and landscaping details have been provided. |
| B1.4 Plant types and materials | This control gives guidance to the plant types and materials throughout public domain areas in the development, including:   * use of local and endemic species * mixture of small and tall trees * simple public domain materials * kerb ramps at intersections * light pole design * species of tree planting in streets and parking lanes * species for planting in swales * groundcover species.   Refer to page 13 of UDG. | Council’s Landscape Architect has reviewed the proposed landscaping in accordance with the suggested species within the UDG. The officer is satisfied with the proposed landscaping outcomes. In some instances, the officer has substituted species for similar, but more suitable species, and the overall intent of the UDG is achieved. |
| B2.1 Building types | The UDG provides three lot type and building designs:   * Village Courtyard lots – min 450m2 with a min 15m frontage * Hamlet lots – min 520m2 with typically 15m frontage * Traditional Courtyard including all corner lots – min 600m2 with typically 20m frontage   Refer to page 14-16 of UDG. | Lot types are dispersed across Hamlet A and B. Consideration of the lot types is detailed below. |
| Village Courtyard lots include:   * detached dwellings * two-storey * 15m minimum lot frontage * 450m2 lot area | All proposed village courtyard lots comply with the minimum lot area and frontage, and enable future desirable building form to be achieved on the lots. |
| Hamlet lots include:   * detached dwellings * single-storey * courtyard or L-shaped dwellings * typical 15m minimum lot frontage * 520m2 lot area * front vehicle access | All hamlet lots comply with the minimum lot area and frontage, and enable future desirable building form to be achieved on the lots. |
| Traditional Courtyard including all corner lots include:   * detached dwellings * single or two-storey * typical 20m minimum lot frontage * 600m2 lot area * front vehicle access, corner lots may have side access | All traditional lots comply with the minimum lot area and frontage, and enable future desirable building form to be achieved on the lots.  Thirty-three corner lots comply with the minimum lot area and frontage, and enable future desirable building form to be achieved on the lots.  Nine corner lots do not comply with the minimum lot area and/or frontage. The smallest corner lot proposed is 555m2 and the minimum lot frontage proposed is approximately 18m. The proposed variations are considered acceptable as they will still enable the desirable building form to be achieved on the lots. |
| B2.7 Asset protection zones | This control species requirements to provide asset protection zones consistent with *Planning for Bushfire Protection.* | The proposal provides suitable Asset Protection Zones (APZ) along all boundaries that are adjacent to bushland.  A majority of APZs are contained within proposed road reserves with some lots requiring APZs to encroach into their front or rear setback.  This outcome is consistent with the bushfire assessment approved by the NSW RFS.  Where future public lands such as drainage reserves are required to act as APZs, suitable landscaping species are proposed to ensure there is not an unreasonable maintenance burden to Council. |