

Submission	Themes	Comments
I am aware that these measures are for the 'triangle' however, I would like to suggest that the gateways to the village, particularly from the West are in need of beautification, i.e. screening of the industrial estate with appropriate landscaping. This estate is an eyesore and does not provide an attractive gateway to what is an attractive heritage village.	Gateways to village	Not relevant to this DCP.
<p>Given crafting the intent and language of planning instruments is challenging, I believe the biggest challenge its to avoid ambiguity both within and between supporting planning instruments. In this regard, if an instrument seeks to enshrine objectives of existing scale, bulk, density and character its language is best served by "must" rather that "should".</p> <p>However, with regards architectural treatment the challenge should be left to the client and commissioned architect, and must be supported with rigorous argument where it seeks to break with the vernacular. Zaha Hadid's Centre for Middle Eastern Study is an exemplar on how the prescriptive measures of scale, bulk, density and character can be achieved while avoiding mimicry and providing a unique and respectful solution.</p>	Stronger language	Noted.
<p>Similarly, terminology like "fine grain" and "excessive bulk" are open to interpretation and need to clarified.</p> <p>Do you feel there is adequate clarity in explaining what planning considerations differentiate the "two distinct precincts of Byron Street and Station Street"? Should the planning objectives set out distinct objectives for each?</p> <p>I would prefer to see E.2.4.1/ Prescriptive Measure/ 1. worded as</p>	Definitions needed for fine-grain and others	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. No Change suggested.</p>

<p>follows:</p> <p>.....that include community significant development "must" be designed with the support of a conservation architect commissioned to prepare a heritage impact statement.</p>	<p>More requirements for Heritage Conservation Architect</p>	
<p>The stairs should be rebuilt. They provide a valuable thoroughfare for residents and visitors to Bangalow, and access to the Woods/arts district. There is no reason to remove necessary egress.</p>	<p>Pedestrian permeability a priority</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>ALL IS GOOD - WELL DONE</p>		<p>Noted</p>
<p>I like the focus on a pedestrian friendly town centre and encourages visitors, customer interaction, and 'way-finding'. I support development in the town centre to increase capacity and density, as long as the management of traffic is also considered concurrently with any future development applications. An increase in foot and car traffic will likely result in an accident at the intersection of Byron and Station street (north and south sides) around the pedestrian crossing area, particularly on weekends.</p>	<p>Pedestrian permeability a priority</p> <p>Concerns about traffic</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. Outside the scope of this DCP amendment.</p>
<p>As a business owner in the Arts Precinct at 10 Station Street, I was very disappointed to have the stairs allowing a thoroughfare between neighbouring properties removed by landlord Cath Moonee, at the expense of tenants at from both properties. What was once (simply stairs) connecting business owners, creating an interesting thoroughfare to meander through, has been reduced to a pile of rubble and an ugly metal barricade. This has stopped the flow of customers between both locations, and has befuddled locals who used this a means to get around town. These stairs which were an essential and charming connection with this precinct, as well as for the markets and the pub.</p>	<p>Pedestrian permeability a priority</p>	<p>Noted</p>

<p>Connectivity through the village centre on foot should be a priority. Access from one area to another should be catered for even through private land e.g. from the "arts precinct" where Woods is, directly to the car park on the south side is important for the survival of businesses in that area and the convenience of pedestrians.</p> <p>Ease of crossing Byron Street should also be considered as the high volume of traffic in that street is problematic. The existing pedestrian crossing needs to be supplemented further up the street, either with another crossing or speed reduction on the street.</p>	<p>Request for additional pedestrian crossing</p>	<p>Noted. Outside the scope of this DCP.</p>
<p>As someone who was heavily embedded in the Bangalow village masterplan workshops and process I would like to make the following comments.</p> <p>The overriding unanimous concern, need and desire of the village is that it maintain and develop pedestrian movement and accessibility. Therefore pedestrian connectivity is paramount when looking at any potential development. This particularly applies to the station street precinct, where the rear of the properties are connected from the back of the Bangalow Hotel through to woods cafe, then allowing access to the show ground and its environs. I know that this area is of particular importance to local families that use the area to walk in safety with their children, off the main street, to school. This link also activates the rear of the existing buildings and encourages way finding on foot.</p> <p>Any development on station street needs to compliment the heritage and scale of Bangalow. The Masonic temple and A&amp;I hall are both buildings of height, but are also the only buildings of height in that street. In order to preserve the distinct character of this</p>	<p>Pedestrian permeability a priority</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

<p>street, building height should not exceed 2 stories. There was a lot of discussion on this topic during the masterplan process, council was pushing for a 3 story height limit and we, the community and stakeholders, were consistently pushing back for a maximum of 2.</p> <p>What happens in Station street needs to compliment the original main street, Byron street, not detract from it.</p> <p>Kind regards</p> <p>Jo</p>	<p>Single storey focus in Station Street with maximum of two storeys</p> <p>Station street to complement Byron street</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
---	---	-----------------------------

<p>1. I support the proposed distinction between Byron Street &amp; Station Street.</p> <p>2. I support the proposed height limit for Station Street &amp; want a 2 storey height limit to be prescriptive. Any new DA proposed for over 2 storey would be 'out of context' to the streetscape - which is an historical streetscape.</p> <p>3. I support making any NEW development subservient to existing development esp in the HCA Station Street &amp; Byron Street.</p> <p>4. I support full recognition of the Bangalow HCA as an 'item of heritage' as a whole. Not (only) individually listed items within the HCA.</p> <p>5. I expect (commercial) signage in the village to be low key and 'small' in size and not obtrusive to the historical context.</p> <p>6. I fully support the permeability (walkability) of the town, limiting the need for vehicle movement &amp; making pedestrian movement easy and efficient to access shops, cafes, galleries, venues, etc. I support walkways and laneways around and through the village (even and including on privately owned properties).</p> <p>7. All new development must be compatible with historic (existing) buildings.</p> <p>8. I support - Maintenance of an open fabric streetscape including parking in the rear for future DAs, in ground landscaping &amp; 3m setbacks for Station Street. This allows more natural light and sunshine, more airflow, and allows vistas (7 aspects) east &amp; west, north and south and retains the character of a low-rise, village.</p> <p>9. Infill development must be thoughtfully designed and planned as to its impact on surrounding 'historical' buildings. Infill must not negatively impact vistas, access to open sky, natural light, the privacy or airflow to surrounding buildings. Infill development must not negatively impact parking or vehicle movement for existing properties or on street parking.</p> <p>10. I suggest an attachment of a Glossary of Terms to support the document -- for those unfamiliar with planning terms. Some terms which are important descriptive terms contained in the document may need to be explained. This Glossary might further inform developers, councillors and residents of the development controls included in the Bangalow DCP. COMMENT: The Bangalow DCP must be clear and easily understood by all invested parties and could help prevent money and time wasted on inappropriate development proposals for Bangalow in the future. That to me, is a major goal of the document.</p> <p>Thanks to Byron Council for recognising the essential historical character of Bangalow.</p>	Support for 2 difference precincts	Noted.
	Support for 1-2 storey heights	Noted.
	Supports subservience to Heritage items in the precinct	Noted.
	Would like to see the Heritage conservation area as an 'item of heritage'	Noted. Not directly relevant to this DCP amendment.
	Signage	Noted.
	Pedestrian permeability a priority	Noted.
	Compatibility with heritage buildings desired	Noted.
	Support for parking at rear of developments	Noted. Other factors include access/safety of Station lane and other implications.
	Infill development should be sensitive to site characteristics	Noted. Covered in D1.

<p>Thank you for allowing feedback &amp; comments.</p> <p>\</p>	<p>Suggests definitions/glossary of terms to go with documents</p>	<p>Noted. Updates made to add key terms to glossary.</p>
<p>Re E2.4.2 and E2.4.4 Byron Street precinct Why does this precinct not include the Bottle shop ( cnr station street) and retail and 2 x restaurant/ cafe premises which front onto Byron Street?</p> <p>Support 2 Precincts - station street has a number of important public buildings larger in scale and bulk these need to be protected from being overshadowed by new development that creeps to the edge of blocks.</p> <p>The space around the existing buildings is important to be able to keep the village character as well as continuing to provide long used pedestrian connectivity this encourages more foot traffic thereby reducing the number of cars parked in the village centre.</p> <p>Re: Chapter C1 Re figure C1.11 inclusion of bottle shop and 3 other Byron street premises in same building as part of Byron street.</p> <p>Re Station street Precinct. ( page 34) Include mention of the RSL hall. A smaller wooden hall in close to original condition inside and out.</p> <p>Re Building Height . I am very concerned regarding the recent 38% increase in building height granted for a Byron development. While I appreciate that development is ongoing there is intrinsic value in the current form of the village of</p>	<p>Requests that bottleshop be changed from Station St precinct to Byron Street Precinct</p> <p>Support for two defined precincts</p> <p>Space between buildings important</p> <p>Pedestrian permeability a priority</p> <p>Bottleshop to be included in Byron Street Precinct</p> <p>Requests specific mention of small wooden RSL Hall</p>	<p>Noted. Update the DCP to reflect this change.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>This building has not been individually identified as</p>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the need to better define some of the zones/pockets/precincts,</li> <li>b) the need to include the map of the Bangalow Heritage Conservation Area from the LEP,</li> <li>c) the need to maintain naming consistency throughout both documents when referring to the Bangalow Heritage Conservation Area, and</li> <li>d) the placement of maps vs text in E2.2.3 Place Character Statements.</li> <li>e) ny cross references to the LEP would ideally contain the LEP section and the page number for easy location.</li> </ul>		
<p>Please find more specific comments on the substantive content of both documents below.</p>		
<p><b>1. Draft Byron Shire Development Control Plan 2014 Chapter E2 Bangalow</b></p> <p><b>1.1</b> Figure E2.2 (p.4) if Pocket A is identical to the Bangalow Heritage Conservation Area then can this please be indicated in the description of Pocket A.</p> <p><b>1.2</b> In the Pocket A/BHCA (pp.6-7) is it possible to add one more sentence: Throughout the area basalt retaining walls are a recurring heritage feature.</p> <p><b>1.3</b> Pocket B (p.7) is also defined by wide roads that support its late 20<sup>th</sup> century suburban aesthetic.</p> <p><b>1.4</b> Separate Pockets C1 and C2 (pp.8-9) as they are completely separate developments both geographically and historically.</p> <p><b>1.5</b> Pocket D Clover Hill (p.9) has been a three stage development. Can you check if the original development is covered by this description. I think that the 'smaller pockets of R3 medium Density zoned land' might only apply to the most recent and final stage. If so, this needs to be clarified.</p> <p><b>1.6</b> Perhaps this change needs to go in Landscaping, but I argue strongly that the basalt retaining walls that thread throughout the BHCA are significant heritage items in themselves. They should be protected from development (e.g. DAs that propose new driveways that require the old stone walls to be removed or changed in any way) and new developments should be encouraged to use basalt rather than sandstone. People who move here from Sydney equate 'sandstone' with 'heritage' when in fact sandstone is not a local material and is not part of the heritage built environment of Bangalow.</p> <p><b>1.7</b> E2.4.1 Prescriptive Measures (p.11). I argue that Prescriptive Measure 2. Should be amended to read:</p>	<p>Clearer correlation between character pockets and Heritage Conservation Area</p> <p>Minor updates to character statements Requested.</p> <p>Retaining walls concerns</p> <p>Suggests requiring all development in the BHCA be designed by a</p>	<p>Noted. Adjustments made to DCP chapter.</p> <p>Noted. Updates made to character descriptions.</p> <p>Noted. Outside the scope of this DCP.</p> <p>Noted. Not considered appropriate</p>



<p><i>Proposals within Bangalow Heritage Conservation Area that include community significant development should be designed by a conservation architect and be supported by a heritage impact statement prepared by an appropriately qualified professional.</i></p> <p><b>1.8</b> E2.4.2(p.11): I applaud the inclusion of two distinct precincts on the B2 Local Centre Zone. This is a significant improvement on the existing Chapter and recognises the distinct historical and built character of Station Street. I support the Objectives and Performance Criteria for this section. Could you however define the B2 Local Centre Zone as a commercial zoned area as per the LEP Section xxxxxx.</p> <p><b>1.9</b> Figure E2.1 (p.12) can I suggest that you:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Change the first heading to: Retain and protect items of heritage significance</li> <li>b) Remove the whole block upon which the Bottle Shop building sits from the Station Street precinct and add it to the Byron Street precinct.</li> </ul> <p><b>1.10</b> E2.4.3 and E2.4.4 (p.12-13): I applaud and support the inclusion of both these clauses in this Chapter. E2.4.4 in particular has been a design feature that has been long discussed by the Bangalow community. I believe that this is an essential and not negotiable clause. The popularity, high volume pedestrian use and value to small businesses in 'The Triangle' and the Farmers Market of the current permeable character of The Triangle is testament to high value the community place on this principle. The removal of the steps in The Triangle by one landholder has caused an uproar in the community.</p>	<p>Heritage Architect.</p> <p>Support for two distinct precincts</p> <p>Minor updates to precinct descriptions</p> <p>Support for pedestrian permeability.</p>	<p>for this DCP amendment.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p><b>2. Draft Byron Shire Development Control Plan 2014 Chapter C1 Non-Indigenous Heritage</b></p> <p>Overall, I would like to see much better definition and examples of what makes North Coast Federation a unique building style. It is easy to fall into 'generic heritage' here and to conflate Queensland Federation with North Coast Federation. The following items need to be included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Louvre windows</li> <li>b) Pressed metal/tin to be protected whenever possible</li> <li>c) Basalt retaining walls to be protected whenever possible</li> <li>d) Brick work – chimneys to be protected whenever possible.</li> </ul> <p>I also wonder if we can include a reference or a link to the document <i>Design Guide for Heritage</i> produced by Heritage Council of NSW and Government Architect of</p>	<p>Would like definition of North Coast Federation Style</p>	<p>Noted. Not considered relevant for this DCP amendment. Would need to be considered as a part of a wider review of Chapter C1.</p>

<p>NSW. Whilst it is a bit Sydney-centric, the principles that it articulates are very relevant and useful guides for Bangalow.</p> <p><a href="https://www.governmentarchitect.nsw.gov.au/guidance/heritage">https://www.governmentarchitect.nsw.gov.au/guidance/heritage</a></p> <p><b>2.1</b> Purpose and aims (pp. 5-6) As per comments above, I argue strongly that the basalt retaining walls that thread throughout the BHCA are significant heritage items in themselves. They should be protected from development (for example DAs that propose new driveways that require the old stone walls to be removed or changed in any way) and new developments should be encouraged to use basalt rather than sandstone. People who move here from Sydney equate 'sandstone' with 'heritage' when in fact sandstone is not a local material and is not part of the heritage built environment of Bangalow. The basalt retaining walls should be added to Clause 5.10(2) of Byron LEP 2014?</p>	<p>Stone choices in Byron Shire</p>	<p>Noted. Not considered relevant to this DCP amendment. Would need to be considered as a part of a wider review of Chapter C1.</p>
<p><b>2.2</b> Since the LEP and DCP 2014 the addition of solar panels on rooftops has become the norm. I believe that this new technology needs to be added to this document somewhere, particularly for buildings in the BHCA. For example, our home is an original cottage in the BHCA and we consulted Council's Heritage Advisor as to the positioning of our solar panels. She had clear guidelines against which she assessed the visual impact of the panels. This should apply to all developments at least in the BHCA.</p>	<p>Instructions for solar panels on Heritage Buildings</p>	<p>Not considered relevant to this DCP amendment.</p>
<p><b>2.3</b> Both documents need to be very explicit about the design features of North Coast Federation as opposed to Queenslanders. They differ in significant details and we should favour and distinguish North Coast Federation and not conflate the two styles.</p>	<p>Would like definition of North Coast Federation Style</p>	<p>Not considered relevant to this DCP amendment.</p>
<p><b>2.4</b> C1.4.3 Windows and Doors (p. 16-17) I am not sure that the window in Figure C1.4 (p.16) is an example of North Coast Federation – maybe this could be checked with Council's Heritage Advisor? I'm also not sure about leadlight (mentioned in Prescriptive Measures). Louvres were commonly used, particularly on sleep-out verandahs, and deserve inclusion. Louvres are a fantastic design feature adding to the sustainable design of a building.</p>	<p>Requesting changes to window diagrams</p>	<p>Council's heritage advisor has not requested a change to this.</p>
<p><b>2.5</b> C1.4.4 Building materials (p.17-18). Some old houses and civic buildings, including the iconic A&amp;I Hall used pressed metal/tin as an internal lining or in the case of the Hall for external cladding. These should be conserved wherever possible – maybe this material needs to be added to Clause 5.10(2) of Byron LEP 2014?</p>	<p>Metal/tin cladding of A &amp; I Hall needs to be reinforced.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>


<p><b>2.6</b> Figure C1.10 (p. 25) suggests to me that fibro sheeting is being recommended as cladding when the statement above it is highlighting corrugated steel. Could we align the illustration with the statement.</p> <p><b>2.7</b> C1.6.7 (p.30) amend heading: Bangalow Heritage Conservation Area</p> <p><b>2.8</b> Figure C1.11 (p. 31) Remove the whole block upon which the Bottle Shop building sits from the Station Street precinct and add it to the Byron Street precinct.</p> <p><b>2.9</b> Table C1.2 (p.32) Building Height. I argue that the following item be removed as a Prescriptive Measure: <i>Any third storey elements must be set back from the front façade and carefully designed into the roof area as an attic or mezzanine so they are not visible from Byron Street from a pedestrian viewpoint.</i> There is no place nor precedent in the BHCA, or in fact anywhere in Bangalow, for third storeys, or any third story elements. Bangalow is a single storey village with some civic and commercial buildings of two storeys. This is an absolute feature that helps retain the low, small Federation feel of the BHCA and the whole village.</p> <p><b>2.10</b> Station Street Precinct (pp.34-36) I commend the document on its clear articulation of this precinct as distinct from Byron Street, the need for new developments to be subservient to existing heritage items and for maintaining the A&amp;I Hall as the focal point to the street.</p> <p><b>2.11</b> Table C1.3 (p.35) General I would like to see a clause that supported the inclusion of different sized buildings/spaces in Station Street that created opportunities for micro-businesses like the ones that rent the containers and other small commercial spaces in the current Woods precinct.</p> <p><b>2.12</b> Table C1.3 (p.35) Building Height. I argue that the following item be removed as a Performance Criteria: <i>Any exceedance of this height will only be considered if it is well set back from the existing street and results in additional at-ground public/private space.</i> This statement provides an exemption for developers to the two storey character of Bangalow and I do not support it. I support a definitive statement that maintains the status quo two storey character of Bangalow.</p> <p><b>2.13</b> C1.6.11 (p.38) I applaud and support the principles in this section. I would like to see 8. Include a heritage architect as well as a heritage Impact Statement as per the Clause in the other Chapter.</p> <p>Jenny Bird, 28 September 2021</p>	<p>Illustration not matching statement.</p> <p>Amend all labelling to Bangalow Heritage Conservation Area.</p> <p>Requests removal of third storey caveat</p> <p>Support for clear character direction for Station street and required subservience to Heritage Items.</p> <p>Would like specific wording for micro-spaces.</p> <p>Requests that the two storey character be rigorously upheld.</p> <p>General support for principles.</p>	<p>Not within the scope of this DCP amendment.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Text has been changed to reflect this.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>This is reflected in the 'fine-grain' descriptor.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
---	--	--

<p>E: <a href="mailto:jenny@birdtalk.net.au">jenny@birdtalk.net.au</a> Ph: 0423635320</p>		
<p>My recommendation is for the East Side of Station St to be rezoned B4 Mixed Use.</p> <p>Objectives of this proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>.To integrate and diversify The Triangle.</li> <li>.To allow the opportunity of ground floor residential downsizing while still retaining the option for shop top housing.</li> <li>.To increase the residential component in The Triangle for retaining singles, young couples and aging locals who otherwise are being forced to alternate localities.</li> <li>.To lessen the burden on car parking spaces due to easy walking access to shopping amenity.</li> <li>.To increase local existing retail sustainability. (less oversupply of shops, more people)</li> <li>.To increase patronage of public transport. (more resident occupiers not needing cars)</li> <li>.To encourage walking and cycling.</li> </ul> <p>Concerns for The Proposed Planning Controls.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>.Creating oversupply of retail shops causing duplication of wares.</li> <li>.Creating potential for empty shops having front display windows covered in dead curtains or old newspaper pages.</li> </ul> <p>My experience with owning 11 Station St. Bangalow for 24 years...No problem leasing as residential, but no inquiry for commercial usage.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Jeff Lovett.</p>	<p>Request for mixed use zone on eastern side of Station street to allow for straight residential development.</p>	<p>Noted. Not considered as a part of this DCP amendment. This would be a change to the Local Environmental Plan 2014.</p>
<p>Dear Strategic Planning Team,</p> <p>Bangalow Heritage draft BLEP and DCP Many thanks for the opportunity to provide input on the Bangalow draft heritage area DCP chapters.</p> <p>We have the following comments: DCP14 Chapter C1: Byron Street Precinct Table C1.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parapets: Clarity needed if every storey is to be 3m or just the ground floor</li> <li>• Building Height: There will not be any third storey elements if there is a 9m height limit and all floor to ceiling heights are 3m.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments on building and floor to ceiling height requirements.</p>	<p>Noted. Text updated to remove reference to</p>



		Chapter C1 in general. For the interim item added to glossary.
	Suggest flexibility of wording for this clause around permeability	Noted. No change recommended.
<p>See attachment</p> <p><b>Bangalow Planning Controls Draft DCP</b></p> <p>The Bangalow Progress Association is pleased to provide feedback on proposed changes to Bangalow specific chapters of Byron DCP 2014. This feedback reflects broad community thinking on draft updates and maintains a strong connection to the aspirations of the Bangalow Village Plan. Comments are referenced by page number, and Chapter numbers where possible.</p> <p><b>Chapter E2</b></p> <p>p4 - Map E2.2 Supplement with an additional map showing Bangalow LEP Zones and the Bangalow Heritage Conservation Area boundaries. These two information sets are fundamentally important for any DA assessment and justify inclusion in the DCP.</p> <p>p5 - E2.2.1 Add a reference to BLEP Schedule 5.</p> <p>p7 - Add figure numbers to pics and continue for all following pics.</p> <p>p10 - E2.3.2.2 Use of the term ‘fine grained’ could be assisted by a bracketed brief definition e.g., “smaller individual buildings”.</p> <p>P11 - E2.4.1 – Prescriptive Measure. Replace “should’ with “must” be designed by an architect and use a conservation architect where changes involve a heritage item. Such designs must be supported by a Heritage Impact Statement. BPA’s experience with DA’s confirms</p>	<p>Request for map with Heritage zones</p> <p>Request for better figure identification</p> <p>Glossary terms</p> <p>Stronger language</p>	<p>Noted. Have re-introduced the map with Heritage area.</p> <p>Noted. Updates figure labels.</p> <p>Noted. Glossary included.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

<p>that improved design outcomes are achieved by using architects generally, and conservation architects when needed. Applying this expertise early can greatly reduce DA assessment times and drive better outcomes.</p> <p>P11 – E2.4.2 Change title to Development in Zone B2 Local Centre.</p> <p><b>Chapter C1</b></p> <p>P2 – Add the Chapter numbers – C1.6.8 for Byron St Precinct, Bangalow Conservation Area and C1.6.9 for Station St Precinct, Bangalow Conservation Area.</p> <p>P6 – C1.2.1 a), b) Add comma after Heritage to make this statement consistent with the BLEP.</p> <p>P32 – Table C1.2 Byron St Precinct Performance Criteria/Prescriptive Measures - Building Height, Prescriptive Measure (3). We note the BLEP definition of storey excludes a mezzanine or an attic, allowing roof area conversions to be done without any change to the external façade. Given that qualification, we support this measure, although insulation requirements would need serious consideration.</p> <p>P35 – Table C1.2 Station St Precinct Performance Criteria/Prescriptive Measures - Building Height, Performance Criteria (2). The reference to any exceedance of 2 storeys must be deleted because of a direct conflict with General Conservation Guidelines. Refer p11 - C1.3.1, Performance Criteria (5), floor levels/Prescriptive Measure (5h), floor levels. The 9m height, two-storey development limit was discussed at length by the Bangalow Guidance Group and a firm decision made to continue to apply these limits, as expressed in the Bangalow Village Plan. This Building Height Limit at 9m and 2-storeys is considered fundamentally important to the low-rise character of the Heritage Conservation Area, including the B2 Local Centre.</p> <p>Exhibition of the Draft DCP elicited feedback from two community members who may not do personal submissions but raise pertinent matters. The owner of 11 Station St, Geoff Lovett, would prefer the ongoing use of his property to be directed exclusively to housing diversity for accommodating essential workers and seniors. The location is perfect due to easy walking and shopping amenity, thereby addressing a critical issue for Bangalow. Moreover, recent analysis of business demand indicates adequate existing commercial capacity so more shops could introduce a risk of empty premises and failed businesses. The BPA therefore supports a planning</p>	<p>Refresh table of contents</p> <p>Support for prescriptive measure.</p> <p>Desire for 2 Storey limit with no qualification for third storey.</p> <p>Desire for eastern side of station street to be mixed use zone.</p>	<p>Noted. Table of contents updated.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Updates to these provisions.</p> <p>Noted. Outside the scope of this DCP update.</p>
--	---	---

<p>initiative that removes the requirement for shop top accommodation at this location.</p> <p>A retired architect, involved in earlier (circa 2015) recommendations for the Bangalow DCP update emphasised the potential for streetscaping on Byron St, to improve aesthetics, traffic management, parking, and pedestrian safety. Currently any event causing a traffic build-up in Bangalow quickly leads to severe congestion and random distressed parking, regularly highlighting the need for well signposted peripheral parking.</p> <p>We wish to acknowledge the excellent work done to produce a much improved version of DCP 2014, now with clear guidance for development in the Bangalow Local Centre. Defined criteria and prescriptive measurements for our two notable precincts should enable more orderly and productive development with great outcomes. The emphasis on pedestrian connectivity and permeability will be greatly appreciated by all those who live, work and play in Bangalow as this attribute makes our village a delightful place in which to wander. Although enshrined as a heritage right in the UK it is a rare pleasure in NSW. We thank Council and staff for their continued dedication to making a positive difference.</p>  <p>Ian Holmes President</p>	<p>Desire for peripheral parking.</p> <p>Support for pedestrian permeability.</p>	<p>Noted. Outside the scope of this DCP amendment.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<p>Dear Sir</p> <p><b>RE: Draft Development Control Plan Chapter E2 - Bangalow</b></p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission in relation to the draft Chapter E2 for Bangalow. The writer has a particular interest in the DCP for Bangalow having helped author a submission by the then Design Advisory Panel in May 2014 relating to a Development Control Plan for the village and served on Council's Strategic Planning "Bangalow Village Plan Guidance Group" for the period 2016 – 2019.</p> <p>As a generality, we support the proposals set out in draft Chapter E2. That said, we have some suggestions as follows:</p> <p>1. The requirement in Clause E2.4.4 is onerous in relation to the free of cost "dedication" of "private land" for "public</p>	<p>Considers that the requirement for pedestrian</p>	<p>Noted. No change recommende</p>



<p>purposes". Perhaps Council might consider some incentive in relation to that criteria. For example, providing a parking space generally requires about 25m<sup>2</sup> of land area. Perhaps the DCP could provide a parking credit to the development proposal for each 25m<sup>2</sup> given over in a scheme for public use purposes.</p> <p>2. The DCP is silent in relation to the largest commercially zoned parcel of land in Bangalow. That land is adjacent to Deacon Street near Saint Kevin's Church. Many in the community will be thoroughly surprised if a Development Application is lodged for that land and Council has not provided any guidance in relation to how the planning of that quite large precinct should occur. We respectfully submit that the DCP should provide clarity in relation to this site and specify a "desired future outcome" of this large parcel and give planning parameters much like it has drafted for the "triangle" precinct.</p> <p><i>Zoned land south of Deacon Street</i> 2 1038.3814</p> <p>Should you require any additional information or wish to clarify any matter raised by this letter, please feel free to contact me at any time.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, <b>PLANNERS NORTH</b></p>	<p>permeability is 'too onerous'</p> <p>Requests that the large commercially zoned lot alongside the Catholic church have specific controls applied.</p>	<p>d. Will be considered in the DA assessment process.</p> <p>Noted. No change recommended at this time as this lot is covered by other DCP provisions.</p>
<p>The DCP is to be commended for its excellent content. It provides an intelligent, well observed and accurate assessment of the elements which collectively create the built and landscape identity of Bangalow. Policy documents of this quality are extremely useful in guiding the development of new infill or redevelopment of sites with regard to their context and it is considered that it will be of much benefit to owners, prospective purchasers. The DCP will provides clarity of Councils position for development within the precincts which will assist in plan preparation and assessment.</p> <p><i>Further comments in attachment</i></p>		<p>Noted.</p>
<p>27 - 09 - 2021</p> <p>Sue Taylor PO Box 429 Bangalow, 2479</p> <p>Byron Shire Council Attn: Isabelle Hawton Attn: Andrew Fitzgibbon yoursaybyronshire.com.au</p>		


<p><b>Submission and comments on;</b>  <u>Bangalow DCP &amp; Urban Design Principles for “The Triangle”</u>  <u>Bangalow HCA</u></p> <p>Chapter E2 Bangalow</p> <p>Suggestion; Include a glossary for residents, developers and councillors not familiar with certain terms or wording eg. ‘fine grain’, “active street frontage”.</p> <p>Comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I applaud Council for recognising and providing separate development controls for the Station Street and Byron Street precincts.</li> <li>• I support and highly embrace the concept of a village which is pedestrian friendly, has open lanes and pathways and allows people to meander through the village centre, including past commercial buildings, shops or cafes.</li> <li>• I support the ‘permeability’ of the village for the movement of pedestrians. I support walking paths and cycleways where appropriate to discourage vehicles in the center of the village.</li> </ul> <p>E2.3.1  Character, Bulk and Scale of Development</p> <p>Comment:  I support the emphasis on “low rise” and “heritage character” of any new development.  Also the “bulk” and “density” of any new proposal must be compatible with the ‘low rise, historical character and scale’ of Bangalow.</p> <p>E2.3.2  Infill Development</p> <p>Comment and suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infill development must not impact the streetscape by cutting off vistas, open sky or the ability to experience treetops.</li> <li>• Infill development should not cut off access to winter sun for existing development.</li> <li>• Infill must retain the open fabric of existing development on the block or street..</li> </ul>	<p>Request for Glossary of terms</p> <p>Support for 2 distinct precincts</p> <p>Support for ‘permeability’</p> <p>Emphasis on low-rise, heritage character of Bangalow</p> <p>Suggestions around infill development</p>	<p>Noted. See attachment to Council report.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. No changes to exhibited provisions</p>
--	---	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Infill development should not cut off natural light, airflow, or privacy of existing buildings.</li> <li>● Liveability of any infill development must be considered eg. size of space and ability to control the temperature within the space.(eg.BASIX)</li> <li>● Infill development should not compromise either vehicle or pedestrian access for existing buildings. Infill must not block laneways or block easy access of deliveries to existing shops or premises. ***Please view the unfortunate development behind the laundromat (laneway development) at Station Street which negatively impacted the pick-up and deliveries to the Masonic Hall business, and cut off air circulation and natural light to the businesses fronting Byron Street.</li> <li>● Infill development must not negatively impact the ability for pedestrians to meander through the village centre.</li> <li>● Infill development must not cut off pathways or laneways.</li> <li>● Infill development should be low-key and subservient to existing development and the street.</li> <li>● Infill development should not negatively impact an historical setting or context.</li> </ul>		suggested at this time.
<p>E2.4.1 Urban Design</p> <p>I Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● “Low rise”</li> <li>● “Fine grain pattern” (please explain this in a glossary</li> <li>● ‘Reinforcement of the significance of Heritage Items’.</li> </ul>	Support for principles of urban design.	Noted.
<p>E2.4.2 Local Centre B2 Zone</p> <p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● “Two distinct precincts”</li> <li>● Maintain the Distinct Style of each.</li> <li>● Promote pedestrian connectivity - the walkability of the village centre.</li> </ul>		
<p>E2.4.3 - E2.4.4 ‘Active street frontages’ (please include a definition of this term in the glossary)</p> <p>Support:</p>		



<p>Property: 9 Station Street, Bangalow Commissioner Susan O'Neill</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this draft for the Bangalow DCP &amp; Bangalow HCA.</p> <p>Sue Taylor taylor.sue@gmail.com</p>		
--	--	--

Suggestion	Reference	Themes	Council Response
<p>Review page 8 - commonality with the form, elements and materials of the adjoining Heritage Conservation Area. This includes use of verandahs, a timber and iron material palette and hipped and gabled roofs. ....</p> <p><i>? Tin and timber – roofs were originally wrought iron then steel, maybe this more a queensland expression??</i></p>	<p><b>Pocket C3</b> – The Meadows estate is one of the newer areas in Bangalow, characterised by relocated Queenslanders, generally two-storeys set high on sloping sites with many architectural features that have a commonality with the Heritage conservation area directly adjoining. These include verandahs, tin and timber palette and hipped and gabled roofs. Landscaping is fairly</p>	Proposed changes to section/clauses	Noted. Minor updates made.
<p>Review page 10 - Add eg, use of traditional Galvanised Steel for re-roofing.</p>	<p>low rise, historical character and scale of Bangalow.</p> <p>4. Reflective colours or surfaces are to be avoided unless required for heritage reasons.</p> <hr/> <p>Note: <b>heritage items</b> identified on LEP 2014 <b>heritage map</b> relating to Bangalow must comply with the requirements listed in Chapter C1 Non-Indigenous Heritage.</p> <hr/>	Proposed changes to section/clauses	Noted. Updates made.

Suggestion	Reference	Themes	Council Response
<p>Review page 12 - Suggest you put the HCA hatching over this area as it tends to suggest that only the red buildings are important rather than the whole precinct.</p>	 <p>Retain and protect Heritage</p>	<p>Proposed changes to section/clauses</p>	<p>Noted. Map removed.</p>
<p>Review page 30 - it is a historic township....containing a mix ... It has a distinctive main street comprised of narrow frontages with awnings made interesting by the topography. Station Street precinct.... which contrasts with</p>	<p><b>C1.6.7 Bangalow Conservation Area</b></p> <p><b>Character and Description</b></p> <p>Bangalow has a distinct village character. It is an historic township nestled in verdant landscape. A mix of commercial, civic and residential uses. Distinctive Main Street with awnings and verandahs. Station street precinct has a looser grain, containing mostly individual buildings in landscaped setbaks (including a number of Heritage items), which contrasts Byron Street's tighter urban fabric.</p> <p>Characteristics include:</p>	<p>Proposed changes to section/clauses</p>	<p>Noted. Minor changes made.</p>

Suggestion	Reference	Themes	Council Response
the tighter urban fabric of Byron Street (or the main street)			
Form Page 30, Add a comma after the first 'hipped"		Proposed changes to section/clauses	Noted. Update made.
<p>Materials Page 30</p> <p>First point is encouraged, second is required.</p> <p>This needs to be clearer.eg</p> <p>1. ....Use of these materials within the Conservation Area is required. 'Like for like' timber and galvanised steel, or brick and tile is required for the conservation of traditional buildings and heritage items as appropriate.</p> <p>Complementary modern materials such as cement profiled weatherboards and uncoloured metal Galvanised, Zinalume</p>	<p><b>Materials</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The predominant materials of existing older buildings are generally light painted weatherboard with galvanised iron roofs. The use of these materials is encouraged.</li> <li>2. Conservation and replacements with 'like for like' materials is required.</li> </ol>	Proposed changes to section/clauses	Noted. Some updates made.



Suggestion	Reference	Themes	Council Response						
or light to mid grey colorbond roofing is acceptable for new infill.									
Page 32 Previous comments 1. Existing original shopfronts are to be carefully retained and conserved to original details. 2. New buildings are to incorporate well designed shopfronts compatible with neighbouring traditional shopfronts , generally with timber framed windows or bespoke fine metal framing. 3. Doors to shops are to be recessed to retain the pattern of built form and established character of the precinct.	<table><tr><th>Building Element</th><th>Performance Criteria</th><th>Prescriptive Measures</th></tr><tr><td>Shop Fronts</td><td><ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>Existing original shopfronts are retained and refurbished.</li><li>New buildings incorporate a well-designed shopfront using materials compatible with neighbouring earlier shopfronts, with timber the preferred material.</li><li>Doors to shops are recessed to create interest in the line of shopfronts.</li></ol></td><td><ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>A minimum recessed entrance of 0.9 m to be provided to shopfronts.</li><li>Entranceways are to be designed to be accessible.</li></ol></td></tr></table>	Building Element	Performance Criteria	Prescriptive Measures	Shop Fronts	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>Existing original shopfronts are retained and refurbished.</li><li>New buildings incorporate a well-designed shopfront using materials compatible with neighbouring earlier shopfronts, with timber the preferred material.</li><li>Doors to shops are recessed to create interest in the line of shopfronts.</li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>A minimum recessed entrance of 0.9 m to be provided to shopfronts.</li><li>Entranceways are to be designed to be accessible.</li></ol>	Proposed changes to section/clauses	Noted. Some updates made to provisions.
Building Element	Performance Criteria	Prescriptive Measures							
Shop Fronts	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>Existing original shopfronts are retained and refurbished.</li><li>New buildings incorporate a well-designed shopfront using materials compatible with neighbouring earlier shopfronts, with timber the preferred material.</li><li>Doors to shops are recessed to create interest in the line of shopfronts.</li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>A minimum recessed entrance of 0.9 m to be provided to shopfronts.</li><li>Entranceways are to be designed to be accessible.</li></ol>							

Suggestion	Reference	Themes	Council Response						
Page 32 Previous comments 1. Existing original shopfronts are to be carefully retained and conserved to original details. 2. New buildings are to incorporate well designed shopfronts compatible with neighbouring traditional shopfronts , generally with timber framed windows or bespoke fine metal framing. 3. Doors to shops are to be recessed to retain the pattern of built form and established character of the precinct.	<table><tr><th>Building Element</th><th>Performance Criteria</th><th>Prescriptive Measures</th></tr><tr><td>Shop Fronts</td><td>1. Existing original shopfronts are retained and refurbished. 2. New buildings incorporate a well-designed shopfront using materials compatible with neighbouring earlier shopfronts, with timber the preferred material. 3. Doors to shops are recessed to create interest in the line of shopfronts.</td><td>1. A minimum recessed entrance of 0.9 m to be provided to shopfronts. 2. Entranceways are to be designed to be accessible.</td></tr></table>	Building Element	Performance Criteria	Prescriptive Measures	Shop Fronts	1. Existing original shopfronts are retained and refurbished. 2. New buildings incorporate a well-designed shopfront using materials compatible with neighbouring earlier shopfronts, with timber the preferred material. 3. Doors to shops are recessed to create interest in the line of shopfronts.	1. A minimum recessed entrance of 0.9 m to be provided to shopfronts. 2. Entranceways are to be designed to be accessible.	Proposed changes to section/clauses	Noted. Minor changes made.
Building Element	Performance Criteria	Prescriptive Measures							
Shop Fronts	1. Existing original shopfronts are retained and refurbished. 2. New buildings incorporate a well-designed shopfront using materials compatible with neighbouring earlier shopfronts, with timber the preferred material. 3. Doors to shops are recessed to create interest in the line of shopfronts.	1. A minimum recessed entrance of 0.9 m to be provided to shopfronts. 2. Entranceways are to be designed to be accessible.							
Page 32 Unnecessary caps Suggest External Colours previous comments	1. Paint Colour Schemes are compatible with heritage Colours	Proposed changes to section/clauses	Noted. Minor changes made						

Suggestion	Reference	Themes	Council Response
<p>1. Paint colour schemes for historic buildings must use an appropriate heritage colour scheme for their period of construction.</p> <p>Colour schemes for non historic buildings are to be compatible with, and sympathetic to the heritage precinct, (avoiding passing fashions of black, grey and white).</p>			

Suggestion	Reference	Themes	Council Response
<p>Page 32 Signage</p> <p>Double negatives in column 3.</p> <p>Remove the last parts of the sentences.</p> <p>Previous comment</p> <p>What do you mean by signs propped up above the footpath awning? Pole signs? Little confusing. Keep it simple.</p> <p>a) above awning signs</p> <p>b) internally illuminated signage.</p> <p>C) corporate colour schemes</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Any signage to comply with Chapter B10 of DCP 2014 (See Section B10.3.1).</li> <li>2. The following signage is considered unsuitable for the Village Core: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) above awning signs unless the style of lettering, the location and size of the sign and the materials and colours to be used are compatible with Bangalow's historical signage character.</li> <li>b) cantilevered, illuminated signs off the face of the building and signs propped up above the footpath awning are inappropriate.</li> <li>c) corporate colour schemes and large scale or illuminated advertising signage will not be permitted.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>Proposed changes to section/clauses</p>	<p>Noted. Adjustments made.</p>

Suggestion	Reference	Themes	Council Response
<p>Station Street P 34</p> <p>This is going to be critical when dealing with potential future DAs for demolitions and redevelopment of non listed cottages.</p> <p>Retention of the historic cottages should form part of any future development proposals. The Conservation Area is in place to protect these contributory buildings not just the heritage items.</p> <p>Suggest Station Street is characterised by dispersed one and two storey buildings within a dominant landscaped setting. Most sites retain traditional 'green' front, side and rear setback spaces enhanced by established street tree plantings.</p>	<p><b>Station Street Precinct</b></p> <p>On Station Street, buildings are generally of a smaller scale than the commercial zone of Byron Street, and exhibit landscaping and open spaces. There is a mix of residential, commercial and civic uses in the precinct. Heritage buildings of note include the Masonic Hall, the A &amp; I Hall and the Uniting Church Hall. These are characterised by their extensive curtilage.</p> <p>Street-trees, leafy landscaping and timber and galvanised iron palette create a distinct character different to Byron Street. Notably, there is also space between buildings, and a setback from the road.</p>	<p>Proposed changes to section/clauses</p>	<p>Noted. Some minor updates made.</p>

Suggestion	Reference	Themes	Council Response
<p>Historic two storey civic buildings; notably the A&amp;I Hall, the Masonic Hall, and the Uniting Church punctuate the streetscape. The A &amp; I Hall is a landmark heritage building which anchors the end of the street and the main vista from the main street. Interspersed are single storey original weatherboard and iron traditional cottages and buildings which are contributory to the historic character of the precinct. A domestic scale is retained by the single storey historic cottages in a landscaped setting. Any new infill development must respect the character of this precinct and the significance and setting of these Heritage Items and</p>			

Suggestion	Reference	Themes	Council Response						
retain the contributory historic cottages.									
Page 35 The current wording could be interpreted to get another masonic hall scale building on the site of a cottage. Suggest 1. Development within Station Street precinct must be carefully designed to respect the significance, context, views and settings of existing heritage items and contributory buildings, in terms of form,	<p><b>Table C1.3 – Performance Criteria and Prescriptive Measures for building elements Station Street Precinct</b></p> <table><tr><th>Building Element</th><th>Performance Criteria</th><th>Prescriptive Measures</th></tr><tr><td><b>General</b></td><td>1. Development within the Station street area should integrate with existing heritage features in the commercial centre such as light-weight materials, architectural detailing and scale and bulk of buildings</td><td>1. Upper floor uses for mixed use buildings must have clearly defined and separate entrances from the street frontage. These separate entrances are not to occupy more than 20% of the street frontage.</td></tr></table>	Building Element	Performance Criteria	Prescriptive Measures	<b>General</b>	1. Development within the Station street area should integrate with existing heritage features in the commercial centre such as light-weight materials, architectural detailing and scale and bulk of buildings	1. Upper floor uses for mixed use buildings must have clearly defined and separate entrances from the street frontage. These separate entrances are not to occupy more than 20% of the street frontage.	Proposed changes to section/clauses	Noted. Minor updates made.
Building Element	Performance Criteria	Prescriptive Measures							
<b>General</b>	1. Development within the Station street area should integrate with existing heritage features in the commercial centre such as light-weight materials, architectural detailing and scale and bulk of buildings	1. Upper floor uses for mixed use buildings must have clearly defined and separate entrances from the street frontage. These separate entrances are not to occupy more than 20% of the street frontage.							

Suggestion	Reference			Themes	Council Response
<p>Page 35</p> <p>Building Height</p> <p>This raises some conflicts with the two storey height and retention of original cottages. We may want single storey at the front in places to help maintain an appropriate setting for these cottages.</p> <p>Suggest</p> <p>Infill development must respond to the heritage context of adjoining sites and may require a scaled height up to 9m as appropriate to each site.</p>				Proposed changes to section/clauses	Noted. Some changes made to two-storey/three storeyed references.
<p>P 35 Setbacks</p> <p>Provision of side setbacks are also encouraged to retain the leafy character of this precinct.</p> <p>Suggest</p> <p>New development is to provide a front setback consistent</p>	Setbacks	<p>1. New development should remain setback from the primary street frontage, and achieve subservience to any surrounding Heritage items.</p>	<p>1. Buildings are to be setback a minimum of 3.0m from Station Street.</p> <p>2. The front setback should be landscaped to enhance the leafy character of the street.</p>	Proposed changes to section/clauses	Noted. Updates made.



Suggestion	Reference	Themes	Council Response
<p>with the existing built character and incorporate side setbacks to the front portion of the lot to retain the landscaped values of the precinct.</p> <p>Similarly in controls Buildings are to be setback a minimum of 3.0 m and incorporate side setbacks where possible to enhance the landscape values of the precinct.</p>			

Suggestion	Reference	Themes	Council Response									
Materials P 35/6 Building material complement Change ‘timber and tin’ to ‘timber and iron’ in keeping with the predominant built character...	<table> <tr> <td>Materials</td> <td>1. Building materials compliment existing materials used on historical</td> <td>1. Development to use a palette of timber and tin in keeping with other buildings in the street.</td> </tr> </table> <p>Page 35</p> <div></div> <p>Draft Byron Shire Development Control Plan 2014 Chapter C1 Non-Indigenous Heritage</p> <p>Adopted Effective</p> <table> <tr> <th>Building Element</th> <th>Performance Criteria</th> <th>Prescriptive Measures</th> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>buildings in Station Street precinct.</td> <td>2. Lightweight materials preferred.</td> </tr> </table>	Materials	1. Building materials compliment existing materials used on historical	1. Development to use a palette of timber and tin in keeping with other buildings in the street.	Building Element	Performance Criteria	Prescriptive Measures		buildings in Station Street precinct.	2. Lightweight materials preferred.	Proposed changes to section/clauses	Noted. No changes recommended.
Materials	1. Building materials compliment existing materials used on historical	1. Development to use a palette of timber and tin in keeping with other buildings in the street.										
Building Element	Performance Criteria	Prescriptive Measures										
	buildings in Station Street precinct.	2. Lightweight materials preferred.										
Page 36 business area I still find this reads clunky and I have to re read it.. Suggest 3. Landscaping is to be planted in ground, as the use of planter boxes is not characteristic within Bangalow.	<table> <tr> <td>Fencing and Landscaping</td> <td>           1. Early photographs indicate a general absence of fencing in the Business area and there is therefore no case for reinstatement.             2. Development should be landscaped in a way that enhances Bangalow’s green and leafy character, and is sympathetic to the subtropical climate of the area.         </td> <td>           1. No fencing is provided in front boundary setback.            2. Setback from street is to be suitably landscaped            3. Landscaping is to be in ground – planter boxes are not typically characteristic of Bangalow.         </td> </tr> </table>	Fencing and Landscaping	1. Early photographs indicate a general absence of fencing in the Business area and there is therefore no case for reinstatement.  2. Development should be landscaped in a way that enhances Bangalow’s green and leafy character, and is sympathetic to the subtropical climate of the area.	1. No fencing is provided in front boundary setback. 2. Setback from street is to be suitably landscaped 3. Landscaping is to be in ground – planter boxes are not typically characteristic of Bangalow.	Proposed changes to section/clauses	Noted. No change required.						
Fencing and Landscaping	1. Early photographs indicate a general absence of fencing in the Business area and there is therefore no case for reinstatement.  2. Development should be landscaped in a way that enhances Bangalow’s green and leafy character, and is sympathetic to the subtropical climate of the area.	1. No fencing is provided in front boundary setback. 2. Setback from street is to be suitably landscaped 3. Landscaping is to be in ground – planter boxes are not typically characteristic of Bangalow.										

