

# 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 365,36,37 DP21115 / <b>LOT 56,57,58 DP21115</b>
Street Address	18-22 SPRING STREET / <b>21-25 NORTH PARADE</b>
Suburb / Postcode	WAGGA WAGGA 2650

### PROPOSAL DETAILS:

#### Activity Type (tick box):

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

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

**Activity Description (please provide summary description):**

SPRING STREET - DOUBLE STOREY RESIDENTIAL FLAT BUILDING COMPRISING OF 12 UNIT IN TOTAL

6 TO EACH FLOOR. (8 X 1 BEDROOM + 4 X 2 BEDROOM) OF WHICH 2 ARE ADAPTABLE UNITS

NORTH PARADE - DOUBLE STOREY RESIDENTIAL FLAT BUILDING COMPRISING OF 12 UNIT IN TOTAL

6 TO EACH FLOOR. (8 X 1 BEDROOM + 4 X 2 BEDROOM) OF WHICH 2 ARE ADAPTABLE UNITS

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:

<b>1.01 Street layout and hierarchy</b> – 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 / <del>No</del> or <del>N/A</del>	YES, A SITE ANALYSIS HAS BEEN CONDUCTED TO REVIEW THE EXISTING STREET CHARACTER FOR BOTH SITES.  REFER TO DRAWING: SK-002
<b>1.02 Block and lots</b> – does the analysis of the surrounding block and lot layout take into consideration local compatibility and development suitability? (e.g. lot size, shape, orientation)	Yes / <del>No</del>	YES, THE DESIGNS TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION FUTURE PLANNING CONCEPTS BY LAHC AND THE PROPOSED HEALTH PRECINCT PLANS BY WAGGA COUNCIL

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
<b>1.03 Built environment</b> – 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 / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES THE PROPOSED GOVERNMENT BLOCKS THAT FLANK BOTH SITES ARE MARKED TO EVENTUALLY BE REDEVELOPED THIS WILL LIKELY TAKE THE FORM OF MULTI-RESIDENTIAL.
<b>1.04 Trees</b> – do trees and planting in the proposed development reflect trees and landscapes in the neighbourhood or street?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES, REFER TO THE LANDSCAPE DESIGN PACKAGE TO BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH ARBORISTS REPORTS
<b>1.05 Policy environment</b> – 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 / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES
<b>Site analysis</b>		
Does the site analysis include:		
<b>1.06</b> Existing streetscape elements and the existing pattern of development as perceived from the street	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES, A SITE ANALYSIS HAS BEEN CONDUCTED REVIEWING THE EXISTING STREET AND PREDOMINANT FEATURES OF THE SURROUNDING CONTEXT FOR BOTH SITES.  REFER TO DRAWING: SK-002
<b>1.07</b> Patterns of driveways and vehicular crossings	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES, A SITE ANALYSIS HAS BEEN CONDUCTED REVIEWING THE EXISTING STREET AND PREDOMINANT FEATURES OF THE SURROUNDING CONTEXT FOR BOTH SITES.  REFER TO DRAWING: SK-002
<b>1.08</b> Existing vegetation and natural features on the site	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES, A SITE ANALYSIS HAS BEEN CONDUCTED REVIEWING THE EXISTING STREET AND PREDOMINANT FEATURES OF THE SURROUNDING CONTEXT FOR BOTH SITES.  REFER TO DRAWING: SK-002
<b>1.09</b> Existing pattern of buildings and open space on adjoining lots	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES, A SITE ANALYSIS HAS BEEN CONDUCTED REVIEWING THE EXISTING STREET AND PREDOMINANT FEATURES OF THE SURROUNDING CONTEXT FOR BOTH SITES.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
		REFER TO DRAWING: SK-002
<b>1.10</b> Potential impact on privacy for, or overshadowing of, existing adjacent dwellings.	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES, A SITE ANALYSIS HAS BEEN CONDUCTED REVIEWING THE EXISTING STREET AND PREDOMINANT FEATURES OF THE SURROUNDING CONTEXT FOR BOTH SITES.  REFER TO DRAWING: SK-002

## 2. Site Planning and Design

### General

Does the site planning and design:

<b>2.01</b> Optimise internal amenity and minimise impacts on neighbours?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES, SPRING STREET COMPRISES OF TWO UNIT BLOCK REFER TO AS "Block 1 & Block 2" WITH A CENTRALISED CARPARK. MAXIMUM SETBACK FROM THE ADJOINING BOUNDARIES HELP REDUCE THE IMPACT ONTO THE NEIGHBORING PROPERTIES  <b>YES, NORTH PARADE'S BULK IS TO THE STREET FRONTAGE AND MAXIMUM SETBACKS FROM THE ADJOINING BOUNDARIES TO REDUCE IMPACT ONTO NEIGHBORING PROPERTIES. THE ADJOINING BLOCK TO THE EAST IS CURRENTLY VACANT</b>
<b>2.02</b> Provide a mix of dwelling sizes and dwellings both with and without carparking?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES BOTH SITES FEATURE A MIXTURE ON 12 UNITS TOTAL 4 X 2 BEDROOM – 8 X 1 BEDROOM WITH A MIXTURE OF COMMUNAL PARKING AND DEDICATED PRIVATE ACCESSIBLE PARKING.
<b>2.03</b> Provide variety in massing and scale of build form within the development?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES, VARYING ROOF PLANES / PITCHES COMBINE WITH ADJUSTED HEIGHTS AND STAGGERING OF FAÇADE ELEMENTS TO BREAK UP THE BULK OF THE FAÇADES

### Built form

Does the site planning and design:

<b>2.04</b> Locate the bulk of development towards the front of the site to maximise the number of dwellings with frontage the public street?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES, BOTH SITES FEATURE THE BULK OF THE BUILT FORM TOWARDS THE STREETScape
<b>2.05</b> Have developments more modest in scale towards the rear of the site to limit impacts on adjoining neighbours?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES.



Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
<b>2.06</b> 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 / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES. WHERE POSSIBLE CONSIDERING SITE LOADING AND FEASIBILITY STUDIES THE MAJORITY OF UNITS ADDRESS NORTH OR NORTH WEST AND HAVE BEEN PROVIDED WITH ADEQUATE SCREENING TO P.O.S AND BALCONY SPACES.
<b>Trees, landscaping and deep soil zones</b>		
Does the site planning and design:		
<b>2.07</b> Retain trees and planting on the street and in front setbacks to minimise the impact of new development on the streetscape?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES.  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>2.08</b> 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 / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES.  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>2.09</b> Retain large or otherwise significant trees on other parts of the site through sensitive site planning?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES.  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>2.10</b> Where not possible to retain existing trees, replace with new mature or semi-mature trees?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES.  REFER TO LANDSCAPE DRAWING PACKAGE
<b>2.11</b> Increase the width of landscaped areas between driveways and boundary fences and between driveways and new dwellings?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES.  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>2.12</b> Provide pedestrian paths?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES.  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>2.13</b> Reduce the width of driveways?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES. WHERE APPLICABLE BOTH SITES HAVE AIMED TO ACHIEVE MINIMUM DRIVEWAY WIDTHS WHILST STILL REMAINING FUNCTIONAL TO CAPACITY  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>2.14</b> Provide additional private open space above the minimum requirements?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES.  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>2.15</b> Provide communal open space?	<del>Yes</del> / No or <del>N/A</del>	NO. HOWEVER AMPLE GARDEN BEDS AND GREEN RELIEFS HAVE BEEN PROVIDED TO LESSEN THE QUANTITY OF HARD SURFACES TO BOTH SITES.
<b>2.16</b> Increase front, rear and/or side setbacks?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES. WHERE POSSIBLE CONSIDERING SITE LOADING AND FEASIBILITY STUDIES.  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
<b>2.17</b> Provide small landscaped areas between garages, dwellings entries, pedestrian paths, driveways etc.	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES.  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>2.18</b> 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 / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES.  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>2.19</b> Replicate an existing pattern of deep soil planting on the front of the site?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES.  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b> & SK-002
<b>2.20</b> Use semi-pervious materials for driveways, paths and other paved areas?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES.  REFER TO LANDSCAPE DRAWING PACKAGE
<b>2.21</b> Use on-site detention to retain stormwater on site for re-use?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES.  REFER TO CIVIL DESIGN DRAWING PACKAGE

### Parking, garaging and vehicular circulation

Does the site planning and design:

<b>2.22</b> Consider centralised parking in car courts to reduce the amount of space occupied by driveways, garages and approaches to garages?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES, SPRING STREET MAKES USES OF TWO BLOCKS TO CREATE A CENTRALISED CARPARK.  <b>NORTH PARADE SHELTERS THE BULK OF CARPARKING BEHIND THE BUILDING TO REDUCE THE VISUAL IMPACT OF HARD SURFACES.</b>  BOTH SITES TAKE ADVANTAGE OF PRIVATE CARPORTS TO FURTHER REDUCE THE POINT MASS OF CARPARKING
<b>2.23</b> Maintain, where possible, existing crossings and driveway locations on the street?	<del>Yes / No or N/A</del>	NO

### 3. Impacts on Streetscape

#### General

Does the site planning and design:

<b>3.01</b> Sympathise with the building and existing streetscape patterns? (i.e. siting, height, separation, driveways locations, pedestrian entries etc.)	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES, LOOKING AT FUTURE PLANNING CONCEPTS AND TAKING CUES FROM THE EXISTING ROOF PLANE TYPOLOGY
<b>3.02</b> Provide a front setback that relates to adjoining development?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
		REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b> & SK-002

#### Built form

Does the site planning and design:

<b>3.03</b> Break up the building massing and articulate building facades?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES. REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b> & ELEVATIONS SK-115, SK-116 & <b>SK-131 &amp; SK-132</b>
<b>3.04</b> Allow breaks in rows of attached dwellings?	<del>Yes / No</del> or N/A	N/A
<b>3.05</b> Use a variation in materials, colours and openings to order building facades with scale and proportions that respond to the desired contextual character?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES. REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b> & ELEVATIONS SK-115, SK-116 & <b>SK-131 &amp; SK-132</b>
<b>3.06</b> Set back upper levels behind the front building façade?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES. REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-113 & <b>SK-129</b> & ELEVATIONS SK-115, SK-116 & <b>SK-131 &amp; SK-132</b>
<b>3.07</b> 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?	<del>Yes / No</del> or N/A	N/A
<b>3.08</b> Reduce the apparent bulk and visual impact of the building by breaking down the roof into smaller roof elements?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES. REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-114 & <b>SK-130</b> & ELEVATIONS SK-115, SK-116 & <b>SK-131 &amp; SK-132</b>
<b>3.09</b> Use a roof pitch sympathetic to that of existing buildings in the street?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES. REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-114 & <b>SK-130</b> & ELEVATIONS SK-115, SK-116 & <b>SK-131 &amp; SK-132</b> & SK-003
<b>3.10</b> Avoid uninterrupted building facades including large areas of painted render?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES. ELEVATIONS SK-115, SK-116 & <b>SK-131 &amp; SK-132</b> & STREETSAPES SK-117 & <b>SK-133</b>

#### Trees, landscaping and deep soil zones

Does the site planning and design:

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
<b>3.11</b> Use new planting in the front setback and road reserve where it is not possible or not desirable to retain existing trees/planting?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES  REFER TO LANDSCAPE DESIGN PACKAGE
<b>3.12</b> Plant in front of front fences to reduce their impact and improve the quality of the public domain?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES  REFER TO LANDSCAPE DESIGN PACKAGE
<b>Residential amenity</b>		
Does the site planning and design:		
<b>3.13</b> Clearly design open space in the front setback as either private or communal open space?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES  REFER TO LANDSCAPE DESIGN PACKAGE
<b>3.14</b> Define the threshold between public and private space by level change, change in materials, fencing, planting and/or signage?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES  REFER TO LANDSCAPE DESIGN PACKAGE
<b>3.15</b> Design dwellings at the front of the site to address the street?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES, SPRING STREET COMPRISES OF TWO UNIT BLOCK REFER TO AS "Block 1 & Block 2" WITH A CENTRALISED CARPARK. MAXIMUM SETBACK FROM THE ADJOINING BOUNDARYS HELP REDUCE THE IMPACT ONTO THE NEIGHBORING PROPERTIES  <b>YES, NORTH PARADE'S BULK IS TO THE STREET FRONTAGE AND MAXIMUM SETBACKS FROM THE ADJOINING BOUNDARIES TO REDUCE IMPACT ONTO NEIGHBORING PROPERTIES. THE ADJOINING BLOCK TO THE EAST IS CURRENTLY VACANT</b>
<b>3.16</b> Design pedestrian entries, where possible, directly off the street?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES.  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>3.17</b> Provide a pedestrian entry for rear residents that is separate from vehicular entries?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES.  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>3.18</b> Design front fences that provide privacy where necessary, but also allow for surveillance of the street?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES.  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>3.19</b> Ensure that new front fences have a consistent character with front fences in the street?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES.  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>  & ELEVATIONS SK-115, SK-116 & <b>SK-131 &amp; SK-132</b>



Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
<b>3.20</b> Orientate mailboxes obliquely to the street to reduce visual clutter and the perception of multiple dwellings?	Yes / <del>No</del> or N/A	YES.  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>  & ELEVATIONS SK-115, SK-116 & <b>SK-131 &amp; SK-132</b>
<b>3.21</b> Locate and treat garbage storage areas and switchboards so that their visual impact on the public domain is minimised?	Yes / <del>No</del> or N/A	YES.  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>Parking, garaging and vehicular circulation</b>		
Does the site planning and design:		
<b>3.22</b> Vary the alignment of driveways to avoid a 'gun barrel' effect?	Yes / <del>No</del> or N/A	YES.  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>3.23</b> Set back garages behind the predominant building line to reduce their visibility from the street?	Yes / <del>No</del> or N/A	YES.  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>3.24</b> Consider alternative site designs that avoid driveways running the length of the site?	Yes / <del>No</del> or N/A	YES.  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>3.25</b> Terminate vistas with trees, vegetation, open space or a dwelling rather than garages or parking?	Yes / <del>No</del> or N/A	YES.  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>3.26</b> Use planting to soften driveway edges?	Yes / <del>No</del> or N/A	YES.  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>3.27</b> Vary the driveway surface material to break it up into a series of smaller spaces? (e.g. to delineate individual dwellings)	<del>Yes</del> / <del>No</del> or N/A	N/A
<b>3.28</b> Limit driveway widths on narrow sites to single carriage with passing points?	Yes / <del>No</del> or N/A	YES WHERE POSSIBLE BOTH SITES USE MINIMUM DRIVEWAY WIDTHS
<b>3.29</b> Provide gates at the head of driveways to minimise visual 'pull' of the driveway?	<del>Yes</del> / <del>No</del> or N/A	NO – NOT FITTING WITH EXISTING STREETSCAPE CHARACTER
<b>3.30</b> Reduce the width where possible to single width driveways at the entry to basement carparking rather than double?	<del>Yes</del> / <del>No</del> or N/A	NO – NOT VIABLE
<b>3.31</b> Locate the driveway entry to basement carparking to one side rather than the centre where it is visually prominent?	<del>Yes</del> / <del>No</del> or N/A	N/A
<b>3.32</b> Recess the driveway entry to basement car parking from the main building façade?	<del>Yes</del> / <del>No</del> or N/A	N/A

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
<b>3.33</b> Where a development has a secondary street frontage, provide vehicular access to basement car parking from the secondary street?	<del>Yes / No</del> or N/A	N/A
<b>3.34</b> Provide security doors to basement carparking to avoid the appearance of a 'black hole' in the streetscape?	<del>Yes / No</del> or N/A	N/A
<b>3.35</b> Return façade material into the visible area of the basement car park entry?	<del>Yes / No</del> or N/A	N/A
<b>3.36</b> Locate or screen all parking to minimise visibility from the street?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES BOTH SITES SHIELD THE BULKS OF THE CARPARKING BEHIND THE BUILT FORMS.

#### 4. Impacts on Neighbours

##### Built form

Does the site planning and design:

<b>4.01</b> Where possible, maintain the existing orientation of dwelling 'fronts' and 'backs'?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES. REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>4.02</b> Be particularly sensitive to privacy impacts where dwellings must be oriented at 90 degrees to the existing pattern of development?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES. REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>4.03</b> Set upper storeys back behind the side or rear building line?	<del>Yes / No</del> or N/A	NO, INSTEAD THE SIDE SETBACKS HAVE REMAINED GENEROUS AND WHERE POSSIBLE BALCONY RECESS FURTHER PULL BACK THE MAIN BUILDING LINE.
<b>4.04</b> Reduce the visual bulk of roof forms by breaking down the roof into smaller elements rather than having a single uninterrupted roof structure?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES, REFER TO DRAWINGS : SK-114 & <b>SK-130</b>
<b>4.05</b> Incorporate second stories within the roof space and provide dormer windows?	<del>Yes / No</del> or N/A	N/A
<b>4.06</b> Offset openings from existing neighbouring windows or doors?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES. REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b> & ELEVATIONS SK-115, SK-116 & <b>SK-131 &amp; SK-132</b>
<b>4.07</b> Reduce the impact of unrelieved walls on narrow side and rear setbacks by limiting the length of the walls built to these setbacks?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES. REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b> & ELEVATIONS SK-115, SK-116 & <b>SK-131 &amp; SK-132</b>

##### Trees, landscaping and deep soil zones

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
Does the site planning and design:		
<b>4.08</b> Use vegetation and mature planting to provide a buffer between new and existing dwellings?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES. REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b> & LANDSCAPE DESIGN PACKAGE
<b>4.09</b> Locate deep soil zones where they will be provide privacy and shade for adjacent dwellings?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES. REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b> & LANDSCAPE DESIGN PACKAGE
<b>4.10</b> Plant in side and rear setbacks for privacy and shade for adjoining dwellings?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES. REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b> & LANDSCAPE DESIGN PACKAGE
<b>4.11</b> Use species that are characteristic to the local area for new planting?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES. REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b> & LANDSCAPE DESIGN PACKAGE
<b>Residential amenity</b>		
Does the site planning and design:		
<b>4.12</b> Protect sun access and ventilation to living areas and private open space of neighbouring dwellings by ensuring adequate building separation?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES, REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-140,141,150,151,152,153 / <b>SK-142,143,154,155,156,157</b>
<b>4.13</b> Design dwellings so that they do not directly overlook neighbours' private open space or look into existing dwellings?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES, REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-140,141,150,151,152,153 / <b>SK-142,143,154,155,156,157</b> & REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>4.14</b> Locate private open space in front setbacks where possible to minimise negative impacts on neighbours?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES. REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>4.15</b> Ensure private open space is not adjacent to quiet neighbouring uses, e.g. bedrooms?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES. REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>4.16</b> Design dwellings around internal courtyards?	<del>Yes</del> / <del>No or N/A</del>	NO, REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>4.17</b> Provide adequate screening for private open space areas?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES. REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
<b>4.18</b> 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 / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES.  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>

#### Parking, garaging and vehicular circulation

Does the site planning and design:

<b>4.19</b> Provide planting and trees between driveways and side fences to screen noise and reduce visual impacts?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES.  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b> & LANDSCAPE DESIGN PACKAGE
<b>4.20</b> Position driveways so as to be a buffer between new and existing adjacent dwellings?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES.  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>

#### 5. Internal Site Amenity

##### Built form

Does the site planning and design:

<b>5.01</b> Maximise solar access to living areas and private open space areas of the dwelling?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES,  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-119,120,121,122,123,124 / <b>SK-135,136,137,138,139,140</b>
<b>5.02</b> Provide dwellings with a sense of identity through building articulation, roof form and other architectural elements?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES.  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-119,120,121,122,123,124 / <b>SK-135,136,137,138,139,140</b>
<b>5.03</b> Provide buffer spaces and/or barriers between the dwellings and driveways or between dwellings and communal areas for villa or townhouse style developments?	<del>Yes / No</del> or N/A	N/A
<b>5.04</b> Use trees, vegetation, fences, or screening devices to establish curtilages for individual dwellings in villa or townhouse style developments?	<del>Yes / No</del> or N/A	N/A
<b>5.05</b> Have dwelling entries that are clear and identifiable from the street or driveway?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES.  ELEVATIONS SK-115, SK-116 & <b>SK-131 &amp; SK-132&amp;</b> STREETSCAPES SK-117 & <b>SK-133</b>
<b>5.06</b> Provide a buffer between public/communal open space and private dwellings?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES.  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
<b>5.07</b> Provide a sense of address for each dwelling?	Yes / <del>No</del> or <del>N/A</del>	YES. AS BEST POSSIBLE WHILST STILL MAINTAINING A COMMUNAL FOYER  ELEVATIONS SK-115, SK-116 & <b>SK-131 &amp; SK-132</b> & STREETSAPES SK-117 & <b>SK-133</b>
<b>5.08</b> Orientate dwelling entries to not look directly into other dwellings?	Yes / <del>No</del> or <del>N/A</del>	YES. THIS IS ACHIEVED THROUGH THE DIRECT NORTH SOUTH ORIENTAITON OF THE BLOCKS  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>Parking, garaging and vehicular circulation</b>		
Does the site planning and design:		
<b>5.09</b> 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 / <del>No</del> or <del>N/A</del>	YES, WHERE NOT POSSIBLE SCREENIGN ELEMENTS AND GREEN BUFFERS HAVE BEEN PROVIDED.
<b>5.10</b> Avoid large uninterrupted areas of hard surface?	Yes / <del>No</del> or <del>N/A</del>	YES,  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>5.11</b> Screen parking from views and outlooks from dwellings?	Yes / <del>No</del> or <del>N/A</del>	YES  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-120, SK-121 & <b>SK-122 &amp; SK-123</b> & STREETSAPES SK-121 & <b>SK-124</b>
Reduce the dominance of areas for vehicular circulation and parking by:		YES. WHERE APPLICABLE BOTH SITES HAVE AIMED TO ACHIEVE MINIMUM DRIVEWAY WIDTHS WHILST STILL REMAINING FUNCTIONAL TO CAPACITY
<b>5.12</b> Considering single rather than double width driveways?	Yes / <del>No</del> or <del>N/A</del>	REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>5.13</b> Use communal car courts rather than individual garages?	Yes / <del>No</del> or <del>N/A</del>	YES,  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
Reduce the dominance of areas for vehicular circulation and parking by considering:		N/A
<b>5.14</b> Single rather than double garages?	<del>Yes</del> / <del>No</del> or <del>N/A</del>	
<b>5.15</b> Communal car courts rather than individual garages?	Yes / <del>No</del> or <del>N/A</del>	YES,  REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>5.16</b> Tandem parking or a single garage with single car port in tandem?	<del>Yes</del> / <del>No</del> or <del>N/A</del>	N/A
<b>5.17</b> Providing some dwellings without any car parking for residents without cars?	Yes / <del>No</del> or <del>N/A</del>	YES,



Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
		REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>Residential amenity</b>		
Does the site planning and design:		
<b>5.18</b> 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 / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES, REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>5.19</b> Provide pedestrian routes to all public and semi-public areas?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES, REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>5.20</b> Avoid ambiguous spaces in building and dwelling entries that are not obviously designated as public or private?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES, REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>5.21</b> 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 / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES, REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>5.22</b> Clearly define thresholds between public and private spaces?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES, THIS IS ACHIEVED THROUGH THE USE OF COURTYARD WALLS AND PLANTER BUFFERS REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>5.23</b> Provide private open space that is generous in proportion and adjacent to the main living areas of the dwelling?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES, REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>5.24</b> Provide private open space area that are orientated predominantly to the north, east or west to provide solar access?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES, REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>5.25</b> Provide private open space areas that comprise multiple spaces for larger dwellings?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES, WHERE POSSIBLE UNITS USE FRONT AND REAR P.O.S REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>5.26</b> Provide private open space areas that use screening for privacy but also allow casual surveillance when located adjacent to public or communal areas?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES, REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>5.27</b> Provide private open space areas that are both paved and planted when located at ground level?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES, REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>
<b>5.28</b> Provide private open space areas that retain existing vegetation where practical?	Yes / <del>No or N/A</del>	YES, REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & <b>SK128 &amp; SK-129</b>

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



Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
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?	<del>Yes / No or N/A</del>	YES, REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & SK128 & SK-129
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?	<del>Yes / No or N/A</del>	N/A
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?	<del>Yes / No or N/A</del>	YES, REFER TO DRAWINGS: SK-111,SK-112 & SK128 & SK-129

## 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:	David. W. PFAFF
Capacity/Qualifications:	SENIOR ARCHITECT / ASSOCIATE NSW Reg N°: 11709
Firm:	CK ARCHITECT (AUST) P/L.
Signature:	
Date:	15/9/2022.