

Labels	Current General Housing Code	Current Rural Housing Code	Proposed Inland Housing Code	Issues
Maximum Gross Floor area	200-250m ² 90% >250m ² -300m ² 85% >300m ² -450m ² 270m ² >450m ² -600m ² 330m ² >600m ² -900m ² 380m ² >900m ² 430m ²	Dwelling house R5 lots <4000m ² -430m ²	>200m ² -400m ² 75% >400m ² -700m ² 65% >700m ² -1000m ² 50% >1000m ² 500m ²	Why do we have to stop at >1000m ² here but >1500m ² below can these not be the same to stop confusion in regards to m ² . We have more large lot rural subdivisions happening are we not planning for future uses here
Landscaped Area	200m ² -300m ² 10% >300m ² -450m ² 15% >450m ² -600m ² 20% >600m ² -900m ² 30% >900m ² -1500m ² 40% >1500m ² 45% (Min width 1.5m)	R5 lots < 4000m ² – 45% (min width 2.5m)	200-400m ² 15% >400-700m ² 25% >700-1000m ² 35% >1000-1500m ² 40% >1500m ² 60% (Min width 1.5m)	Why do we have to stop at >1500m ² here but >1000m ² above below can these not be the same to stop confusion in regards to m ² . We have more large lot rural subdivisions happening are we not planning for future uses here

Labels	Current General Housing Code	Current Rural Housing Code	Proposed Inland Housing Code	Issues
Landscaped area forward of building line	<18m 25% >18m 50%	R5 lots 50%	<18m 25% >18m 50%	Please explain is this just 25% of the area forward of the building line as this is how I read it and what happens to RU lands, is landscaping being defined to include natural grasses etc on larger lots.

Labels	Current General Housing Code	Current Rural Housing Code	Proposed Inland Housing Code	Issues
Garages	<p>Primary Rd Setback Setback $\geq 4.5\text{m}$ 1m behind building line $< 4.5\text{m}$ 5.5m from boundary Lot Width Garage Width $> 8 \leq 12\text{m}$ 3.2m wide $> 12\text{m}$ 6.0m wide Lot width $< 8\text{m}$ garage access only from secondary rd. parallel rd. or lane. Hardstand 2.6m x 5.4m</p>	<p>Applies to R5 lots $< 4000\text{m}^2$ Primary Rd Setback Setback $\geq 4.5\text{m}$ 1m behind building line $< 4.5\text{m}$ 5.5m from boundary Frontage Width Garage Width $> 15\text{m}$ 50% width of building $< 15\text{m}$ 60% width of building</p>		Issues Below
Issues For Above	<p>My issue here and I cannot believe that it has not been brought up by the reference group is this, the 1m setback was originally brought in for City based CDC so as to allow for vehicles to be parked on the property again 5.5m, in regional nsw we can be back 8, 10 upto 25m from road frontage and we need a 1m setback for garage, is this fair as clients then do a DA thru council more money and time and councils approve garage in line with building.</p> <p>I think should read Where setback are closer than 7m the garage that are under the main roof of the dwelling must be located at least 5.5m from the front boundary, and upto 7m must be 1m behind the building line.</p> <p>Garage etc doors etc I agree with and third garage should be 1m behind initial attached garage.</p>			
Car parking	<p>At least 1 space on a lot which house is erected (may be a hardstand, carport or garage)</p> <p>Lot width $< 8\text{m}$ Off street parking not required $> 8\text{m}$ 1 Off street parking space required Alterations and additions- 1 off street parking space must be retained</p>	<p>Zone R5 $< 4000\text{m}^2$ At least 1 space on a lot on which a house is erected (may be a hardstand, carport or garage) Alterations and additions- 1 off street parking space must be retained</p>		I agree but should be in line with what I have written above.

Labels	Current General Housing Code	Current Rural Housing Code	Proposed Inland Housing Code	Issues
Outbuildings				
Maximum GFA	<div> <div>>200-300m²</div> <div> <div>36m²</div> <div>>300-600m²</div> <div>>600-900m²</div> <div>>900m²</div> </div> <div> <div>45m²</div> <div>60m²</div> <div>100m²</div> </div> </div>	R5 lots <4000m ² — 500m ² 100m ² for other use	10% lot area to max 100m ² 35m ² for habitable rooms (detached studios)	<p>What happens here on lots greater than 22 hectares</p> <p>20,000m² surely we can have a better setup for this as most of the land at 4 hectares and above can be used for horses, so stables, feed shed etc and also required as per the commentary 5 vehicles, so 2 under main roof, 100m² shed 3 more vehicles what about slasher, caravan and or boat etc. This needs more work and I suggest => 4 hectares then 150m² upto 180m²</p>

Other issues other than those above to help speed up and get more complying development would be

Stormwater

Approvals should not have to be gained from Councils where stormwater is marked on the plan as being connected to an existing stormwater line that connects to street and or Council stormwater main.

Certifiers must check this but to wait for an approval can take 10-15 days, and as no infrastructure is being touched should not require council approval.

Road access

Where a new access is required then this shall be as per councils driveway policy, and where on rural lands and the road is sealed , there must be sealed access from edge of road to property boundary or 6m. This must also be in compliance with councils rural roads access policy. No Section 138 approval required.

Reason. Owners normally do this work without the 20 mill public liability and pay council to seal when in the area.

BASIX.

Why are we still using this when once Occupation Certificate is lodged people do what they want anyway, example's Air conditioners, Wood Fires, Take out landscaping.

In rural NSW and in the commentary we talk about Flood lands etc but what about drought, can there be a clause for drought conditions not requiring BASIX Commitments, and have we thought about drought for landscaping clauses, it would be great to never have water restrictions but hey this is Australia, and unless landscaping is defined to include available native and or grasses that are mowed then we possible only achieve Landscaping requirements of BASIX and Codes SEPP when not in drought or water restrictions.

HOW DO WE ISSUE OC's LEGALLY

Fire Prone Land Maps or Bushfire prone Land

Bushfire Hazard Maps although diagrammatic in rural areas should be part of all LEPs in any Council area and must be reassessed in line with the new LEP's, all councils should be made to put these maps on their web sites as part of the LEP maps as part of this process, even if they are not correct.

This is becoming a major issue with still not enough Bpad accredited certifiers in the rural areas and with some developments being upto >100m from the bushfire Buffer or Zone, the maps need updating and there should be a short course for certifiers to be able to determine BAL low and at least BAL 12.5.

Also I think that it is high time that NSW either joins the NCC or creates Bushfire Conditions that easily read for differing BAL Levels rather than the confusing Planning for Bushfire document and NCC requirements as this is costing owners and developers money, Bushfire assessments should not be BAL levels but rather Bushfire Hazard Assessments, so it is clear what is required on the plans and on the building.

Application Forms

Can anything be done to have 1 form which allows for Application, PCA Appointment, and Notice to commence all in one form, and that councils cannot hide the tick box for a DA/CC on the one form, as I do not believe the statistics provided by Dept of Planning from the data provided by Councils on DA and CC times, maybe the data should provide names and phone numbers for the Dept of Planning to follow up on as these time frames can be distorted to provide the outcomes that the Dept wants.

Soil types

It may also be pertinent to make it part of all applications or a Condition of consent for CDC's that soil sampling is completed by a competent person and that this must form part of the application for all building types, this comes about as the new Australian Standard for footings and Slab design has made Moderately reactive soils now Class H Highly Reactive soils. This has Happened as Engineers have taken the Safety approach to avoid risks later, this again would help with costly building issues at later times in the after the completion of the building.\

Transportable buildings

Can we get a Definition for DA, CC or CDC for these types of buildings, my suggestion

Definition

Any building that can be removed from site in a single lift within 48 hours is a Section 68 approval and should include Footings and Verandah at original approval only. These building must have identification plates as per LGA Section 68.

Any other building that is moved in 2 or more parts and built as per the deemed to satisfy provisions of the NCC and then transported to site may be approved as DA, CC or CDC if the covenants allow.

Reason.

Again this could cut costs for affordable housing and allow for a different dwelling type on all lands.