

Seniors Living Policy: Urban design guidelines for infill development - Checklist

Checklist of design principles and better practices

Guide notes:

This checklist is to be used for:

- all Part 5 applications, excluding group homes and boarding houses
- Part 4 applications, where required by the Housing SEPP.

It has been prepared to ensure that the Seniors Living Policy: Urban Design Guidelines for Infill Development are taken into account as required by the *State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021* (Housing SEPP).

The checklist must be completed and the declaration at the end of the checklist signed by the consultant architect.

The checklist should be completed in conjunction with a review of the guideline document to ensure that a thorough understanding of the design issues, principles and better practices is achieved.

Please provide the appropriate response in the 'Addressed in Design' column. A written design response is required where the response is 'Yes' in relation to that design principle / better practice. A written comment justifying departure from the design principle / better practice is required where the response is 'No' or 'NA'.

PROPERTY DETAILS:

Lot(s) / Sec(s) / DP(s)	Lot 58, Lot 59 DP 35087, Lot C, Lot D DP 35096
Street Address	19-23 Douglas Street & 6 Neal Place
Suburb / Postcode	Wallsend 2287

PROPOSAL DETAILS:

Activity Type (tick box):

Single dwelling	<input type="checkbox"/>	Seniors housing	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dual occupancy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Demolition	X
Multi dwelling housing (villas/townhouses)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tree removal	X
Multi dwelling housing (terraces)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Subdivision – Torrens title	<input type="checkbox"/>

Residential flat building	X	Subdivision – Strata title / Community title [Delete whichever is not applicable]	<input type="checkbox"/>
Manor houses	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Activity Description (please provide summary description):

Demolition of four detached dwellings and construction of a two-storey residential flat building consisting of 20 units over two storeys.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
--	--------------------------------------	---------------------------

1. Responding to Context

Analysis of neighbourhood character

The key elements that contribute to neighbourhood character and therefore should be considered in the planning and design of new development are:

1.01 Street layout and hierarchy – has the surrounding pattern and hierarchy of the existing streets been taken into consideration? (e.g. scale and character of the built form, patterns of street planting, front setbacks, buildings heights)	Yes / No or N/A	The façade is designed to break down the scale of the two-storey development to be more compatible with the local context which is predominately single storey residential detached dwellings. A contemporary terrace style expression has been pursued on this site so that the design recognises and responds to the corner lot prominence and adjacent open spaces
1.02 Block and lots – does the analysis of the surrounding block and lot layout take into consideration local compatibility and	Yes / No	Yes. Façade is broken down into smaller components to break down scale of two storey

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
development suitability? (e.g. lot size, shape, orientation)		building as the context is predominately single storey.
1.03 Built environment – has a compatibility check been undertaken to determine if the proposed development is consistent with the neighbourhoods built form? (e.g. scale, massing, should particular streetscapes or building types be further developed or discouraged?)	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, simple roof forms such as skillion roofs are proposed. This ties into other more contemporary roof forms of adjacent developing suburbs. Refer character statement.
1.04 Trees – do trees and planting in the proposed development reflect trees and landscapes in the neighbourhood or street?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes
1.05 Policy environment – has Council's own LEP and DCP been considered to identify key elements that contribute to an areas character? Does the proposed development respond this?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes

Site analysis

Does the site analysis include:

1.06 Existing streetscape elements and the existing pattern of development as perceived from the street	Yes / No or N/A	Yes
1.07 Patterns of driveways and vehicular crossings	Yes / No or N/A	Yes
1.08 Existing vegetation and natural features on the site	Yes / No or N/A	Yes
1.09 Existing pattern of buildings and open space on adjoining lots	Yes / No or N/A	Yes
1.10 Potential impact on privacy for, or overshadowing of, existing adjacent dwellings.	Yes / No or N/A	Yes

2. Site Planning and Design

General

Does the site planning and design:

2.01 Optimise internal amenity and minimise impacts on neighbours?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, every effort has been made to reduce impacts to the neighbours. The buildings facing the north and south neighbour has skillion roofs that fall down to the respective boundaries.
---	----------------------------	---

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
2.02 Provide a mix of dwelling sizes and dwellings both with and without carparking?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, refer drawings for bedroom mix. On grade carparking spaces provided as per required parking rates.
2.03 Provide variety in massing and scale of build form within the development?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, a variety of massing and scale has been implemented, by stepping the façade and varying materials

Built form

Does the site planning and design:

2.04 Locate the bulk of development towards the front of the site to maximise the number of dwellings with frontage the public street?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, bulk of development is located at front of site with carparking at rear.
2.05 Have developments more modest in scale towards the rear of the site to limit impacts on adjoining neighbours?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, the bulk and mass of the development has been minimised as much as possible to reduce impacts to the neighbours
2.06 Orientate dwellings to maximise solar access to living areas and private open space, and locate dwellings to buffer quiet areas within the development from noise?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, refer drawings. Solar compliance is achieved.

Trees, landscaping and deep soil zones

Does the site planning and design:

2.07 Retain trees and planting on the street and in front setbacks to minimise the impact of new development on the streetscape?	Yes / No or N/A	Trees have been retained where possible – Norfolk pine within lot boundary at corner of Douglas St and Neal Place required removal
2.08 Retain trees and planting at the rear of the lot to minimise the impact of new development on neighbours and maintain the pattern of mid block deep-soil planting?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes
2.09 Retain large or otherwise significant trees on other parts of the site through sensitive site planning?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, all significant trees have been retained.
2.10 Where not possible to retain existing trees, replace with new mature or semi-mature trees?	Yes / No or N/A	Refer to landscape plan for significant tree coverage of site
2.11 Increase the width of landscaped areas between driveways and boundary fences and between driveways and new dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, planting buffer is located either side of driveway.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
2.12 Provide pedestrian paths?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, pedestrian paths have been provided
2.13 Reduce the width of driveways?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, width of driveways have been reduced as much as possible and planting strips either side are proposed
2.14 Provide additional private open space above the minimum requirements?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, POS has been maximised where possible
2.15 Provide communal open space?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, communal open space has been provided at rear of property to provide privacy
2.16 Increase front, rear and/or side setbacks?	Yes / No or N/A	Setbacks minimums have been met with encroachment into street setback – attempts have been made to stagger building form adjacent to neighbours to reduce impact
2.17 Provide small landscaped areas between garages, dwellings entries, pedestrian paths, driveways etc.	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, small, landscaped areas between driveways and pedestrians have been incorporated
2.18 Provide at least 10% of the site area, at the rear of the site, for deep soils zones to create a mid-block corridor of trees within the neighbourhood?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, at least 10% of the site area, at the rear of the site, has been incorporated.
2.19 Replicate an existing pattern of deep soil planting on the front of the site?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, front courtyard areas are created with opportunities for deep soil planting/
2.20 Use semi-pervious materials for driveways, paths and other paved areas?	Yes / No or N/A	Concrete driveways and paths have been proposed for maintenance reasons.
2.21 Use on-site detention to retain stormwater on site for re-use?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes OSD tanks has been proposed to retain stormwater.

Parking, garaging and vehicular circulation

Does the site planning and design:

2.22 Consider centralised parking in car courts to reduce the amount of space occupied by driveways, garages and approaches to garages?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, on grade parking has been located at rear of site and design ensures that cars are not visible from street.
2.23 Maintain, where possible, existing crossings and driveway locations on the street?	Yes / No or N/A	Minor adjustment to existing crossing location

3. Impacts on Streetscape

General

Does the site planning and design:

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
3.01 Sympathise with the building and existing streetscape patterns? (i.e. siting, height, separation, driveways locations, pedestrian entries etc.)	Yes / No or N/A	The façade is designed to break down the scale of the two-storey development to be more compatible with the local context which is predominately single storey residential detached dwellings.
3.02 Provide a front setback that relates to adjoining development?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, lobby is located in between units facing the street to break down the scale.

Built form

Does the site planning and design:

3.03 Break up the building massing and articulate building facades?	Yes / No or N/A	Use of cantilevering 1F balconies provides the desired outcome.
3.04 Allow breaks in rows of attached dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	
3.05 Use a variation in materials, colours and openings to order building facades with scale and proportions that respond to the desired contextual character?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, skillion roofs achieve the result.
3.06 Set back upper levels behind the front building façade?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, simple skillion roofs are proposed to highlight the simplicity of forms of adjacent buildings as well as provide a contemporary design outcome.
3.07 Where it is common practice in the streetscape, locating second storeys within the roof space and using dormer windows to match the appearance of existing dwelling houses?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, no painted render proposed and a mix of materials have been proposed.
3.08 Reduce the apparent bulk and visual impact of the building by breaking down the roof into smaller roof elements?	Yes / No or N/A	The façade is designed to break down the scale of the two-storey development to be more compatible with the local context which is predominately single storey residential detached dwellings.
3.09 Use a roof pitch sympathetic to that of existing buildings in the street?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, lobby is located in between units facing the street to break down the scale.
3.10 Avoid uninterrupted building facades including large areas of painted render?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, simple materials have been chosen to reflect the context.

Trees, landscaping and deep soil zones

Does the site planning and design:

3.11 Use new planting in the front setback and road reserve where it is not possible or not desirable to retain existing trees/planting?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, new planting within front set back is proposed as well as retention of existing trees
---	----------------------------	--

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
3.12 Plant in front of front fences to reduce their impact and improve the quality of the public domain?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, planting have been proposed at the front fences to improve quality of public domain.

Residential amenity

Does the site planning and design:

3.13 Clearly design open space in the front setback as either private or communal open space?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, building is largely consistent with front setback.
3.14 Define the threshold between public and private space by level change, change in materials, fencing, planting and/or signage?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes material changes, planting and fencing denote public and private
3.15 Design dwellings at the front of the site to address the street?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, dwellings are designed to address the street through use of balconies and windows
3.16 Design pedestrian entries, where possible, directly off the street?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, pedestrian entries are directly off the street
3.17 Provide a pedestrian entry for rear residents that is separate from vehicular entries?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes pedestrian entries are separate from vehicular entries
3.18 Design front fences that provide privacy where necessary, but also allow for surveillance of the street?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes front fences are designed to provide privacy but open for passive surveillance
3.19 Ensure that new front fences have a consistent character with front fences in the street?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes front fences are consistent with the front fences in the street – though this is minimal as there are not a lot of front fences in the street
3.20 Orientate mailboxes obliquely to the street to reduce visual clutter and the perception of multiple dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	Letterboxes have been integrated into the design of the front fence and is sensitive to the streetscape.
3.21 Locate and treat garbage storage areas and switchboards so that their visual impact on the public domain is minimised?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, garage areas are located at rear of site

Parking, garaging and vehicular circulation

Does the site planning and design:

3.22 Vary the alignment of driveways to avoid a 'gun barrel' effect?	Yes / No or N/A	Not possible due to site constraints, however, we have achieved SLUDG intent of not seeing cars down the driveway when standing on street.
3.23 Set back garages behind the predominant building line to reduce their visibility from the street?	Yes / No or N/A	Garages not proposed.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
3.24 Consider alternative site designs that avoid driveways running the length of the site?	Yes / No or N/A	Not possible due to site constraints
3.25 Terminate vistas with trees, vegetation, open space or a dwelling rather than garages or parking?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, driveway is designed to terminate with landscaping buffer.
3.26 Use planting to soften driveway edges?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes planting strips have been provided either side of drive ay
3.27 Vary the driveway surface material to break it up into a series of smaller spaces? (e.g. to delineate individual dwellings)	Yes / No or N/A	Concrete driveway proposed for maintenance reasons.
3.28 Limit driveway widths on narrow sites to single carriage with passing points?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, single carriage has been provided
3.29 Provide gates at the head of driveways to minimise visual 'pull' of the driveway?	Yes / No or N/A	Driveway gate not part of brief.
3.30 Reduce the width where possible to single width driveways at the entry to basement carparking rather than double?	Yes / No or N/A	Basement parking not proposed.
3.31 Locate the driveway entry to basement carparking to one side rather than the centre where it is visually prominent?	Yes / No or N/A	Basement parking not proposed.
3.32 Recess the driveway entry to basement car parking from the main building façade?	Yes / No or N/A	Basement parking not proposed.
3.33 Where a development has a secondary street frontage, provide vehicular access to basement car parking from the secondary street?	Yes / No or N/A	No secondary vehicle entry from Neal Ave
3.34 Provide security doors to basement carparking to avoid the appearance of a 'black hole' in the streetscape?	Yes / No or N/A	Basement parking not proposed.
3.35 Return façade material into the visible area of the basement car park entry?	Yes / No or N/A	Basement parking not proposed.
3.36 Locate or screen all parking to minimise visibility from the street?	Yes / No or N/A	Cars not visible from street.

4. Impacts on Neighbours

Built form

Does the site planning and design:

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
4.01 Where possible, maintain the existing orientation of dwelling 'fronts' and 'backs'?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, balconies and POS to dwellings facing street have been designed to address the street.
4.02 Be particularly sensitive to privacy impacts where dwellings must be oriented at 90 degrees to the existing pattern of development?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, buildings have been set back as much as possible from side boundaries.
4.03 Set upper storeys back behind the side or rear building line?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes upper storeys are set back as much as possible
4.04 Reduce the visual bulk of roof forms by breaking down the roof into smaller elements rather than having a single uninterrupted roof structure?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, the façade is designed to break down the scale of the two-storey development to be more compatible with the local context which is predominately single storey residential detached dwellings.
4.05 Incorporate second stories within the roof space and provide dormer windows?	Yes / No or N/A	Dormer windows not compatible with local character.
4.06 Offset openings from existing neighbouring windows or doors?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, openings are offset to provide privacy to neighbours
4.07 Reduce the impact of unrelieved walls on narrow side and rear setbacks by limiting the length of the walls built to these setbacks?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, walls are broken up by varying materials or providing articulation.

Trees, landscaping and deep soil zones

Does the site planning and design:

4.08 Use vegetation and mature planting to provide a buffer between new and existing dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, landscaping is used along boundaries to provide privacy.
4.09 Locate deep soil zones where they will be provide privacy and shade for adjacent dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, deep soils have been provided to provide privacy and shade for adjacent dwellings
4.10 Plant in side and rear setbacks for privacy and shade for adjoining dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes planting has been provided at side and rear setbacks for shade and privacy
4.11 Use species that are characteristic to the local area for new planting?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, species have been provide that are local to the area

Residential amenity

Does the site planning and design:

4.12 Protect sun access and ventilation to living areas and private open space of	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, there is minimal overshadowing impacts to neighbours.
--	----------------------------	--

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
neighbouring dwellings by ensuring adequate building separation?		
4.13 Design dwellings so that they do not directly overlook neighbours' private open space or look into existing dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, dwellings have been designed so they minimise impact to neighbour's privacy
4.14 Locate private open space in front setbacks where possible to minimise negative impacts on neighbours?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, POS has been provided to minimise negative impacts to neighbours through fencing and planting
4.15 Ensure private open space is not adjacent to quiet neighbouring uses, e.g. bedrooms?	Yes / No or N/A	Private open spaces located at front or rear of apartments and generally aligned to neighbouring open spaces
4.16 Design dwellings around internal courtyards?	Yes / No or N/A	No internal courtyards proposed
4.17 Provide adequate screening for private open space areas?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes adequate screening has been provided to POS of units for their privacy
4.18 Use side setbacks which are large enough to provide usable private open space to achieve privacy and soften the visual impact of new development by using screen planting?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, side set backs are maximised where possible to provide useable POS to achieve privacy and soften visual impact through screen planting

Parking, garaging and vehicular circulation

Does the site planning and design:

4.19 Provide planting and trees between driveways and side fences to screen noise and reduce visual impacts?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, planting and trees have been provided adjacent to driveways
4.20 Position driveways so as to be a buffer between new and existing adjacent dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, driveway is located between blocks to provide buffer

5. Internal Site Amenity

Built form

Does the site planning and design:

5.01 Maximise solar access to living areas and private open space areas of the dwelling?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, units are designed to maximise solar access to living areas and POS.
5.02 Provide dwellings with a sense of identity through building articulation, roof form and other architectural elements?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, dwellings have a sense of identity through building articular, stepped façade, and variety of materials
5.03 Provide buffer spaces and/or barriers between the dwellings and driveways or	Yes / No or N/A	Not a villa or townhouse style development

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
between dwellings and communal areas for villa or townhouse style developments?		
5.04 Use trees, vegetation, fences, or screening devices to establish curtilages for individual dwellings in villa or townhouse style developments?	Yes / No or N/A	Not a villa or townhouse style development
5.05 Have dwelling entries that are clear and identifiable from the street or driveway?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, dwellings have distinct lobbies which are visually separate from residents units to provide clear entrances
5.06 Provide a buffer between public/communal open space and private dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, a buffer is created between public open and space and private dwellings through fencing and screening
5.07 Provide a sense of address for each dwelling?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, for street facing dwellings, through balcony and window design
5.08 Orientate dwelling entries to not look directly into other dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, dwelling entries are designed so they do not look directly into other dwellings as much as possible


Parking, garaging and vehicular circulation

Does the site planning and design:

5.09 Locate habitable rooms, particularly bedrooms, away from driveways, parking areas and pedestrian paths, or where this is not possible use physical separation, planting, screening devices or louvers to achieve adequate privacy?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, habitable rooms moved away from driveways as much as possible. Where not possible, window sills have been raised to avoid car lights.
5.10 Avoid large uninterrupted areas of hard surface?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, hard surfaces are broken up by planting
5.11 Screen parking from views and outlooks from dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, parking is screened from view as much as possible, or windows are raised to avoid car lights.
Reduce the dominance of areas for vehicular circulation and parking by:	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, a single driveway is proposed
5.12 Considering single rather than double width driveways?		
5.13 Use communal car courts rather than individual garages?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, a communal cart court has been provided
Reduce the dominance of areas for vehicular circulation and parking by considering:	Yes / No or N/A	No garages proposed

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
5.14 Single rather than double garages?		
5.15 Communal car courts rather than individual garages?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, a communal car court has been provided
5.16 Tandem parking or a single garage with single car port in tandem?	Yes / No or N/A	No garages or carports proposed
5.17 Providing some dwellings without any car parking for residents without cars?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes based on the parking rate there is not a 1 to 1 ratio for parking and resident
Residential amenity		
Does the site planning and design:		
5.18 Provide distinct and separate pedestrian and vehicular circulation on the site where possible, where not possible shared access should be wide enough to allow a vehicle and a wheelchair to pass safely?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, driveway is clearly separated from pedestrian routes with landscaping.
5.19 Provide pedestrian routes to all public and semi-public areas?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, paths have been provided for pedestrians to access the communal spaces
5.20 Avoid ambiguous spaces in building and dwelling entries that are not obviously designated as public or private?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, ambiguous spaces have been minimised and dwelling entries are distinct
5.21 Minimise opportunities for concealment by avoiding blind or dark spaces between buildings, near lifts and foyers and at the entrance to or within indoor car parks?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, concealment / dark corners are minimised with passive surveillance maximised
5.22 Clearly define thresholds between public and private spaces?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, fences and planting provide clear thresholds
5.23 Provide private open space that is generous in proportion and adjacent to the main living areas of the dwelling?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, POS is generous in proportion and adjacent to living spaces
5.24 Provide private open space area that are orientated predominantly to the north, east or west to provide solar access?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, POs is oriented to north east and west as much as possible
5.25 Provide private open space areas that comprise multiple spaces for larger dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, each unit has paved hardscape and softscape in their POS.
5.26 Provide private open space areas that use screening for privacy but also allow casual surveillance when located adjacent to public or communal areas?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, POS areas use screening and planting whilst allowing for passive surveillance
5.27 Provide private open space areas that are both paved and planted when located at ground level?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, POS have a combination of paved and planted areas

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
5.28 Provide private open space areas that retain existing vegetation where practical?	Yes / No or N/A	Minimal existing vegetation on site.
5.29 Provide private open space areas that use pervious pavers where private open space is predominantly hard surfaced to allow for water percolation and reduced run-off?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, POS have a combination of paved and planted areas
5.30 Provide communal open space that is clearly and easily accessible to all residents and easy to maintain and includes shared facilities, such as seating and barbeques to permit resident interaction?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes. Shared facilities not part of brief.
5.31 Site and/or treat common service facilities such as garbage collection areas and switchboards to reduce their visual prominence to the street or to any private or communal open space?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes, communal area, garage, and carpark is located at rear of site to reduce visual impact from street

Declaration by consultant architect	
I/we declare to the best of my/our knowledge and belief, that the details and information provided on this checklist are correct in every respect.	
Name:	Benjamin Chan
Capacity/Qualifications:	Architect
Firm:	Sam Crawford Architects
Signature:	
Date:	27 July 2023