

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 1, LOT 2 in DP 121500, and LOT 2, LOT 25 in DP 38118
Street Address	1,3 Walker Street and 2,4 Caldwell Avenue
Suburb / Postcode	Lismore 2480

PROPOSAL DETAILS:

Activity Type (tick box):

Single dwelling	<input type="checkbox"/>	Seniors housing	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dual occupancy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Demolition	<input checked="" 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 [Delete whichever is not applicable]	<input type="checkbox"/>
Manor houses	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Activity Description (please provide summary description):

Demolition of existing structures, tree removal and construction of 16 unit residential flat building, at-grade parking for 12 car parking spaces inclusive of 3 accessible spaces, and associated landscaping, fencing and civil works.

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 existing character is largely freestanding single storey dwellings with hipped roofs. There are some two storey dwellings. While the proposed design is larger than the surrounding buildings the two-storey volume is broken down, has an appropriate building alignments and roofs.
1.02 Block and lots – does the analysis of the surrounding block and lot layout take into consideration local compatibility and	Yes / No	The proposed lot while being larger than the surrounding lots has two buildings each one oriented towards either

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
development suitability? (e.g. lot size, shape, orientation)		Caldwell Avenue or Walker Street continuing a logical development pattern in this location.
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	The proposed character is directly taken from the surrounding context. The proposal has a masonry ground floor and weatherboard clad first floor. The roof is visible from the street and forms part of an appropriately scaled composition in three parts being a base, middle and roof like the vast majority of surrounding buildings.
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	With the help of a consulting Arborist significant trees have been identified and maintained. New trees are also proposed.
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	The proposed building responds to setbacks in the DCP

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	The low scaled horizontal character is maintained in the proposal as are the setbacks and landscaped setting.
1.07 Patterns of driveways and vehicular crossings	Yes / No or N/A	One single driveway is proposed off Dibbs Street
1.08 Existing vegetation and natural features on the site	Yes / No or N/A	Due to slope of land the buildings are stepped down the site. Some excavation and fill required.
1.09 Existing pattern of buildings and open space on adjoining lots	Yes / No or N/A	The surrounding properties have private open spaces and gardens to the rear of the property. The proposal has an open parking area behind maintaining the open quality in the mid section of the block.
1.10 Potential impact on privacy for, or overshadowing of, existing adjacent dwellings.	Yes / No or N/A	Very little privacy and overshadowing impact is caused by the proposal. Openings facing the neighbour are minimised and private open spaces away from the shared boundaries.

2. Site Planning and Design

General

Does the site planning and design:

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
2.01 Optimise internal amenity and minimise impacts on neighbours?	Yes / No or N/A	All apartments have good internal amenity and minimise overlooking and potential noise nuisance to neighbours.
2.02 Provide a mix of dwelling sizes and dwellings both with and without carparking?	Yes / No or N/A	A mix of 1 and 2 bedroom apartments are proposed with a mixture of accessible and shared parking spaces.
2.03 Provide variety in massing and scale of build form within the development?	Yes / No or N/A	The building form is well articulated through the use of pitched roof elements and a stepped footprint

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	Most apartments face the street.
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	No apartments have been proposed in the centre of the site between Caldwell Avenue and Walker Street. This is consistent with the development on the neighbouring properties.
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	Solar access to living areas and private open space has been maximised.

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	Tree number 6 a Bottlebrush Callistemon viminalis is retained on site.
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	Substantial planting is proposed
2.09 Retain large or otherwise significant trees on other parts of the site through sensitive site planning?	Yes / No or N/A	Significant existing trees have been considered in the planning of the site and new trees proposed.
2.10 Where not possible to retain existing trees, replace with new mature or semi-mature trees?	Yes / No or N/A	Significant existing trees have been considered in the planning of the site and new trees proposed.
2.11 Increase the width of landscaped areas between driveways and boundary fences and between driveways and new dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	Landscaping is provided between the driveway and dwellings and adjacent to boundary fences.
2.12 Provide pedestrian paths?	Yes / No or N/A	Pedestrian paths are provided

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
2.13 Reduce the width of driveways?	Yes / No or N/A	The driveway is sized in accordance with the traffic engineers recommendation. The shape of the driveway limits the visual impact on the site.
2.14 Provide additional private open space above the minimum requirements?	Yes / No or N/A	The area of private open space per apartment exceeds the minimum LAHC requirement.
2.15 Provide communal open space?	Yes / No or N/A	LAHC have requested that only minimal communal open space be provided
2.16 Increase front, rear and/or side setbacks?	Yes / No or N/A	The proposed setbacks are suitable for the context
2.17 Provide small landscaped areas between garages, dwellings entries, pedestrian paths, driveways etc.	Yes / No or N/A	All pathways, residential entries and driveways are bounded by landscaped areas
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	Deep soil zones provided on the site suitable for trees.
2.19 Replicate an existing pattern of deep soil planting on the front of the site?	Yes / No or N/A	Deep soil is provided on the front of the site.
2.20 Use semi-pervious materials for driveways, paths and other paved areas?	Yes / No or N/A	A semi-pervious driveway and paved areas is not suitable for wheelchair access and is thus not proposed.
2.21 Use on-site detention to retain stormwater on site for re-use?	Yes / No or N/A	On site detention and rainwater reuse is proposed.

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	A centralised parking area is proposed.
2.23 Maintain, where possible, existing crossings and driveway locations on the street?	Yes / No or N/A	A new driveway crossing is proposed as the existing crossings do not comply with the requirements of the Australian Standards and the location is not appropriate.

3. Impacts on Streetscape

General

Does the site planning and design:

3.01 Sympathise with the building and existing streetscape patterns? (i.e. siting, height,	Yes / No or N/A	The proposal is modulated and sited to fit comfortably in the existing street pattern while providing logical and appropriate entries for vehicles and pedestrians.
---	----------------------------	---

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
separation, driveways locations, pedestrian entries etc.)		
3.02 Provide a front setback that relates to adjoining development?	Yes / No or N/A	The front setbacks are consistent with surroundings.

Built form

Does the site planning and design:

3.03 Break up the building massing and articulate building facades?	Yes / No or N/A	The façade is well articulated.
3.04 Allow breaks in rows of attached dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	The entry and building modulation breaks up the building
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	The faced is modulated with various materials and colours providing a rich contextual response.
3.06 Set back upper levels behind the front building façade?	Yes / No or N/A	Balconies provide articulation but as the building is only two storeys setting back the first floor would serve not real benefit.
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	Second storeys in the roof with dormers are not common in the area.
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 roof plane is broken up.
3.09 Use a roof pitch sympathetic to that of existing buildings in the street?	Yes / No or N/A	A roof sympathetic roof pitch is proposed.
3.10 Avoid uninterrupted building facades including large areas of painted render?	Yes / No or N/A	No large uninterrupted building facades are proposed.

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	New planting is proposed.
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	Planting proposed to reduce impact of fences and add quality.

Residential amenity

Does the site planning and design:

--	--	--

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
3.13 Clearly design open space in the front setback as either private or communal open space?	Yes / No or N/A	Open spaces are clearly defined as either private or communal
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	A change in material is proposed for pedestrians as they enter the site.
3.15 Design dwellings at the front of the site to address the street?	Yes / No or N/A	The level changes within the site didn't facilitate the provision of multiple entrances noting that each entrance needs to be access compliant in accordance with the BCA.
3.16 Design pedestrian entries, where possible, directly off the street?	Yes / No or N/A	The majority of dwellings address the street by way of windows and private open space that front the street.
3.17 Provide a pedestrian entry for rear residents that is separate from vehicular entries?	Yes / No or N/A	There are no rear residents. Pedestrian paths are provided 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	Fences in the proposal provide privacy but allow surveillance.
3.19 Ensure that new front fences have a consistent character with front fences in the street?	Yes / No or N/A	Front fences are compatible with the surrounding front fences.
3.20 Orientate mailboxes obliquely to the street to reduce visual clutter and the perception of multiple dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	Letterboxes are perpendicular to the street.
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	Garbage areas are located to ensure they are accessible, close to the street but not visually dominant.

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	The proposed drive is not a long straight line.
3.23 Set back garages behind the predominant building line to reduce their visibility from the street?	Yes / No or N/A	No garages proposed. The parking area is setback from the building line.
3.24 Consider alternative site designs that avoid driveways running the length of the site?	Yes / No or N/A	Various site designs were considered.
3.25 Terminate vistas with trees, vegetation, open space or a dwelling rather than garages or parking?	Yes / No or N/A	Deep soil landscaping is provided around the parking areas.
3.26 Use planting to soften driveway edges?	Yes / No or N/A	Extensive planting is proposed around the driveway.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
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	Paving finish has been varied between driveway and the pathways across the site. There is limited view of the driveway extents from the public domain. The driveways have been softened with extensive landscape edges.
3.28 Limit driveway widths on narrow sites to single carriage with passing points?	Yes / No or N/A	The site is not narrow
3.29 Provide gates at the head of driveways to minimise visual 'pull' of the driveway?	Yes / No or N/A	LAHC do not provide gates to driveways due to maintenance and management issues. Gates to driveways are not typical in the locale.
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	No basement parking
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	No basement parking
3.32 Recess the driveway entry to basement car parking from the main building façade?	Yes / No or N/A	No basement parking
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 basement parking
3.34 Provide security doors to basement carparking to avoid the appearance of a 'black hole' in the streetscape?	Yes / No or N/A	No basement parking
3.35 Return façade material into the visible area of the basement car park entry?	Yes / No or N/A	No basement parking
3.36 Locate or screen all parking to minimise visibility from the street?	Yes / No or N/A	Planting is provided to screen parking

4. Impacts on Neighbours

Built form

Does the site planning and design:

4.01 Where possible, maintain the existing orientation of dwelling 'fronts' and 'backs'?	Yes / No or N/A	The proposal maintains the existing orientation
4.02 Be particularly sensitive to privacy impacts where dwellings must be oriented at 90	Yes / No or N/A	Apartment orientation not facing neighbours

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
degrees to the existing pattern of development?		
4.03 Set upper storeys back behind the side or rear building line?	Yes / No or N/A	Side setback sufficient to not require further setback of first floor.
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	The roof form is broken down.
4.05 Incorporate second stories within the roof space and provide dormer windows?	Yes / No or N/A	Second stories within the roof and dormers are not common in the area.
4.06 Offset openings from existing neighbouring windows or doors?	Yes / No or N/A	The proposed windows do not face directly into neighbours windows.
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	Length of walls to neighbour limited.
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	Existing trees are protected in and on neighbouring property.
4.09 Locate deep soil zones where they will be provide privacy and shade for adjacent dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	Deep soil provided between building and neighbouring properties.
4.10 Plant in side and rear setbacks for privacy and shade for adjoining dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	Planting provided in side and rear setbacks
4.11 Use species that are characteristic to the local area for new planting?	Yes / No or N/A	Appropriate species have been proposed.
Residential amenity		
Does the site planning and design:		
4.12 Protect sun access and ventilation to living areas and private open space of neighbouring dwellings by ensuring adequate building separation?	Yes / No or N/A	Adequate building separation provided
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	Overlooking is minimised by the proposal

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
4.14 Locate private open space in front setbacks where possible to minimise negative impacts on neighbours?	Yes / No or N/A	Most of the private open spaces are located facing the street. A few however are not but they face toward the central area and not towards the neighbours.
4.15 Ensure private open space is not adjacent to quiet neighbouring uses, e.g. bedrooms?	Yes / No or N/A	The private open spaces proposed are not directly adjacent to neighbouring bedrooms
4.16 Design dwellings around internal courtyards?	Yes / No or N/A	A central area is provided in the design
4.17 Provide adequate screening for private open space areas?	Yes / No or N/A	Screening is provided to private open spaces
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	Private open space is not located on side boundary. The boundary is softened by the proposed landscaping.

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	Driveway not adjacent to side fence
4.20 Position driveways so as to be a buffer between new and existing adjacent dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	Driveway not adjacent to existing dwellings

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	Good solar access provided to living areas and private open space
5.02 Provide dwellings with a sense of identity through building articulation, roof form and other architectural elements?	Yes / No or N/A	The proposal provides elements of architectural interest, such as roof form, balconies and roof shapes to create visual interest.
5.03 Provide buffer spaces and/or barriers between the dwellings and driveways or between dwellings and communal areas for villa or townhouse style developments?	Yes / No or N/A	Buffer spaces provided
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	

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
5.05 Have dwelling entries that are clear and identifiable from the street or driveway?	Yes / No or N/A	The common entry points are clear and identifiable from the street.
5.06 Provide a buffer between public/communal open space and private dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	Planting acting as a buffer are proposed
5.07 Provide a sense of address for each dwelling?	Yes / No or N/A	Each apartment building has a sense of address but not each dwelling. That said each dwelling is discernible in the facade
5.08 Orientate dwelling entries to not look directly into other dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	Apartment entries don't directly overlook each other.
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	Habitable rooms are located as far as practicable from the driveways, parking and pedestrian paths.
5.10 Avoid large uninterrupted areas of hard surface?	Yes / No or N/A	No unnecessarily large areas of hard surfaces are provided.
5.11 Screen parking from views and outlooks from dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	Parking is screened by planting
Reduce the dominance of areas for vehicular circulation and parking by:		A single driveway is not appropriate in this instance due to parking numbers and the required turning circles.
5.12 Considering single rather than double width driveways?	Yes / No or N/A	
5.13 Use communal car courts rather than individual garages?	Yes / No or N/A	A common car court is proposed
Reduce the dominance of areas for vehicular circulation and parking by considering:		A single driveway is not appropriate in this instance due to parking numbers and the required turning circles.
5.14 Single rather than double garages?	Yes / No or N/A	
5.15 Communal car courts rather than individual garages?	Yes / No or N/A	A common car court is proposed
5.16 Tandem parking or a single garage with single car port in tandem?	Yes / No or N/A	

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
5.17 Providing some dwellings without any car parking for residents without cars?	Yes / No or N/A	A common car court is proposed
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	12 parking spaces are provided for 16 dwellings.
5.19 Provide pedestrian routes to all public and semi-public areas?	Yes / No or N/A	Paths for pedestrians provided
5.20 Avoid ambiguous spaces in building and dwelling entries that are not obviously designated as public or private?	Yes / No or N/A	Dwelling entries are connected to one of the two main entries and are obvious
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	Opportunities for concealment are minimised.
5.22 Clearly define thresholds between public and private spaces?	Yes / No or N/A	Spaces are clearly defined.
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	Private opens spaces are larger than LAHC minimum requirements and adjacent to the living room
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	Most private opens spaces have good solar access
5.25 Provide private open space areas that comprise multiple spaces for larger dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	No larger dwellings provided.
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	Private opens spaces have both screened areas and areas allowing casual surveillance.
5.27 Provide private open space areas that are both paved and planted when located at ground level?	Yes / No or N/A	Paved and planted areas proposed to ground floor apartments.
5.28 Provide private open space areas that retain existing vegetation where practical?	Yes / No or N/A	No existing vegetation is retained in proposed private open spaces as its not practical to do so and construct the new buidling
5.29 Provide private open space areas that use pervious pavers where private open space is	Yes / No or N/A	Three of the ground floor apartments are accessible apartments and pervious paving is not suitable for

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
predominantly hard surfaced to allow for water percolation and reduced run-off?		wheelchair users. All paving in the ground floor private opens spaces is the same.
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	LAHC discourages common and shared facilities due to maintenance issues.
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	Common service facilities have been included in the design to ensure they are not too dominant.

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:	Anthony Nolan
Capacity/Qualifications:	Registered Architect NSW # 6773
Firm:	Kennedy Associates Architects
Signature:	
Date:	22 /5/2023