

## **Appendix 3**

**UDRP minutes  
prepared by  
UDRP**





Our Ref: UDRP18/0009  
Contact: Gavin Cherry  
Telephone: (02) 4732 8125

12 April 2018

Lendlease Retirement Living  
Level 14, Tower Three  
International Towers  
300 Barangaroo Avenue  
BARANGAROO NSW 2000

Email: [murray.robertson@lendlease.com](mailto:murray.robertson@lendlease.com)

Attention: Murray Robertson,

Dear Sir,

**Urban Design Review Panel Meeting**  
**Proposed Development - Retirement Village and Residential Aged Care Facility**  
**Address - Lot 3990 Jordan Springs Boulevard JORDAN SPRINGS NSW 2747**

Thank you for attending Council's Urban Design Review Panel on 28 March 2018

The attached minutes are provided as a summary of the key points raised during the Panel meeting. We hope that you have found participation in the Panel process beneficial and that it will assist both yourself and Council reaching a determination of your proposal.

If you require any further assistance regarding the attached advice please contact me on (02) 4732 8125.

Yours faithfully

Gavin Cherry  
Development Assessment Coordinator

Please note: this advice is to assist you with your development proposal. It is not a full assessment of the proposal. The applicant is responsible to address all relevant requirements.

Penrith City Council  
PO Box 60, Penrith  
NSW 2751 Australia  
T 4732 7777  
F 4732 7958  
[penrithcity.nsw.gov.au](http://penrithcity.nsw.gov.au)

<b>Urban Design Review Panel Advice</b>	
<b>Date of Issue</b>	12 April 2018
<b>Reference</b>	UDRP18/0009
<b>Proposal</b>	Retirement Village and Residential Aged Care Facility
<b>Address</b>	Lot 3990 Jordan Springs Boulevard JORDAN SPRINGS NSW 2747
<b>Key Issues</b>	<p>The following key issues were raised for address in the progression of the development proposal and the lodgement of a development application.</p> <p><b>Retirement Village (Independent Living Units)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The vehicular access arrangements into the site require further consideration. Opportunities exist for an east / west connection from Lakeside Parade through the site terminating with direct views into the lake. This connection should be further explored as the layover and road alignment is unlikely to impact on the delivery of the adjacent approved development.</li> <li>• The provision of a road connection also enable a better 'sense of address' for the site as well as the ability to better connect the proposed future aged care living development with the broader retirement village proposal. Any concerns regarding 'rat runs' can be addressed through the road design, road configuration / alignments and landscape treatments. This should be explored further.</li> <li>• The location of the multi storey units is questionable. If the intention is to locate the buildings to maximise views of the lake and activation around the lake edge, then the transparency of the lake, the relationship of this development to the lake, and the pedestrian connections around the lake are critical. This requires detailed exploration with Lendlease and NPWS (Office of Environment and Heritage). Fencing, landscaping, pedestrian pathways etc will be critical considerations in the support for this location as heights and scale of this nature would be better associated with the main street and the approved multi storey residential flat buildings to the east and north east of the site.</li> <li>• If the multi storey built form was to remain as proposed, greater separation is required to maintain and enhance views between the built form to the lake. The spatial relationship of the built form to the single storey villas is also inadequate. The provision of 6 storey built form has little to no regard to the single storey scale surrounding it. The part four (4) storey height and resulting step to 6 storey's does not sufficiently address this relationship and an overall reduction in building height is necessary if this location and separation was to remain.</li> </ul>



- The descending basement driveway to the multi storey built form requires relocation and amendment (noting this would be addressed through relocation of the built form).
- The drainage channel south of the site does not provide an overly attractive outlook and opportunities exist to relocate the multi storey unit form to this southern boundary, better connected to the development approved to the east and better related to the proposed future aged care built form. The heights would need to transition west towards the lake however opportunities exist for 3 x four storey elements (rather than 2 x 6 storey elements). The location of higher built form, height / built form separation, spatial relationship between developments and views should be further explored.
- The location of the northern six storey building and its access arrangement of a cul-de-sac head is inappropriate and provides a poor sense of address. This also provides a poor interface / relationship to the independent villa opposite.
- The configuration of the road pattern and the resulting unit locations / orientations is creating poor solar access outcomes through the centre of the development. The configuration also provides a potential 'dead space' between villas in the centre of the development. The space east of the cu-de-sac head does not provide sufficient opportunities for activation and does not have identifiable access from a key roadway. The design of this space and the intended use and the configuration requires amendment. Relocation of the multi storey form may assist with the configuration of units, the orientation of the lots to maximise solar access and unit separation.
- The setbacks of the villa housing (in particular adjacent to the aged care) is inadequate. While the DCS may provide minimum 3.0m rear setbacks for residential dwellings, the separation of built form is still dependent on the scale / transition of the built form and a greater setback is required to the future aged care site. Setbacks and separation must also respond to orientation and solar access and will need to increase to ensure sufficient solar access and scale transitions can be provided to each villa / unit within the development.
- The setback to Jordan Springs Boulevard does not provide sufficient landscape treatment to balance the outcomes provided on the northern side of the road. Given recommendations to potentially relocate the multi storey form, alter the central villa configurations and as a consequence, revisit the road alignments, opportunities should be explored to increase this setback. A detailed streetscape treatment is required that integrates fencing, landscaping and the built form to suitably present to the street.



- The driveway separations (south of Jordan Springs Boulevard) and double width areas provide excessive hard stand areas , compromising landscape and street tree outcomes. Split driveways, suitably separated by landscaping must be provided noting on street parking requirements need to be considered (in terms of separation distances between driveways).
- The location of parking bays appears irregular and inaccessible. The location of visitor parking should be carefully considered ensuring that suitable provision is made throughout the development within 'real streets'. This could be in the form of indented parking bays, grouped spaces or kerb side parking. This requires consideration of road hierarchy, waste collection and the landscape design or the development.
- Diversity in villa design is required with specific regard to corner villas that must present to, and activate dual street frontages.

### **Future Aged Care Facility**

- The four (4) x options tabled for the development entertain access from Jordan Springs Boulevard and the options turn their back to the broader retirement village development. This is not suitable and an integrated development should be pursued to encourage shared living and easy transition between the retirement village and the aged care facility. The recommended east / west road connection to Lakeside Parade opens up opportunities for better integration, access and the address of the facility as part of one overall development scheme
- Views towards the main lake should be encouraged such as that indicated in Option 4.
- Option 1, 2 and 3 provides inadequate massing adjacent to single storey villa units without increased separation / setbacks. Option 1 also provide inadequate interface to the south with the driveway / dock and nil landscape treatment.
- Option 2- the arrangement of units is positive with good outlook / views however the built form setbacks and transitions require amendment. Option 2 also provide inadequate interface to the south with the parking area and nil landscape treatment.
- Option 3 – The design loses gravitas on the corner which is not a suitable outcome.
- Option 4 - The café on the corner is positive however the building length is not suitable.



**Jordan Springs Seniors Living – Lot 3991 Jordan Springs Boulevard, Jordan Springs  
Response to PCC UDRP Comments 12 April 2018**

#	UDRP Comments	Response
<b>Seniors Living Development (Villas and Independent Living Units)</b>		
01	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The vehicular access arrangements into the site require further consideration. Opportunities exist for an east / west connection from Lakeside Parade through the site terminating with direct views into the lake. This connection should be further explored as the layover and road alignment is unlikely to impact on the delivery of the adjacent approved development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional access to the future aged care lot and the ILAs will be provided from Lakeside Parade.</li> <li>This will also provide an east-west pedestrian and visual link through the site from Lakeside Parade.</li> </ul>
02	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The provision of a road connection also enables a better 'sense of address' for the site as well as the ability to better connect the proposed future aged care living development with the broader retirement village proposal. Any concerns regarding 'rat runs' can be addressed through the road design, road configuration / alignments and landscape treatments. This should be explored further.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to Comment #01.</li> </ul>
03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The location of the multi storey units is questionable. If the intention is to locate the buildings to maximise views of the lake and activation around the lake edge, then the transparency of the lake, the relationship of this development to the lake, and the pedestrian connections around the lake are critical. This requires detailed exploration with Lendlease and NPWS (Office of Environment and Heritage). Fencing, landscaping, pedestrian pathways etc will be critical considerations in the support for this location as heights and scale of this nature would be better associated with the main street and the approved multi storey residential flat buildings to the east and north east of the site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The multi storey units (ILAs) have been relocated to the southern boundary of the site, resulting in an improved interface with the villas.</li> <li>Building heights will vary from 4 storeys (western building adjacent to Lake), 5 storeys (middle building) and 6 storeys (eastern building).</li> <li>This provides a better built form relationship with the future aged care lot multi-storey</li> </ul>



#	UDRP Comments	Response
04	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the multi storey built form was to remain as proposed, greater separation is required to maintain and enhance views between the built form to the lake. The spatial relationship of the built form to the single storey villas is also inadequate. The provision of 6 storey built form has little to no regard to the single storey scale surrounding it. The part four (4) storey height and resulting step to 6 storeys does not sufficiently address this relationship and an overall reduction in building height is necessary if this location and separation was to remain.</li> </ul>	<p>development, the multi-storey development approved to the east and the village centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The western building will provide an activated edge to the western lake, through community facilities, landscaping and a terrace at ground level.</li> <li>See response to Comment #03.</li> </ul>
05	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The descending basement driveway to the multi storey built form requires relocation and amendment (noting this would be address through relocation of the built form).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to the ILA basement car park has been reconfigured to reflect their changed location.</li> <li>Access is now via the new access road from Lakeside Parade and from an access road off the ring road.</li> <li>See response to Comment #03.</li> </ul>
06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The drainage channel south of the site does not provide an overly attractive outlook and opportunities exist to relocate the multi storey unit form to this southern boundary, better connected to the development approved to the east and better related to the proposed future aged care built form. The heights would need to transition west towards the lake however opportunities exist for 3 x four storey elements (rather than 2 x 6 storey elements). The location of higher built form, height / built form separation, spatial relationship between developments and views should be further explored.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to Comment #03.</li> </ul>
07	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The location of the northern six storey building and its access arrangement of a cul-de-sac head is inappropriate and provides a poor sense of address. This also provides a poor interface / relationship to the independent villa opposite.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to Comment #03.</li> </ul>
08	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The configuration of the road pattern and the resulting unit locations / orientations is creating poor solar access outcomes through the centre of the development. The configuration also provides a potential 'dead space' between villages in the centre of the development. The space east of the cul-de-sac head</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The configuration of the road pattern and unit locations have been amended and improved.</li> <li>Solar access has been improved by relocating the multi storey units south of the villas. The</li> </ul>



#	UDRP Comments	Response
	<p>does not provide sufficient opportunities for activation and does not have identifiable access from a key roadway. The design of this space and the intended use and the configuration requires amendment. Relocation of the multi storey form may assist with the configuration of units, the orientation of the lots to maximise solar access and unit separation.</p>	<p>past configuration had the LLAs west facing, they are now all North/South facing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The communal open space (identified by the UDRP as a 'potential dead space') between the villages has been removed.</li> <li>The proposed roundabout has been removed (access from Jordan Springs Boulevard).</li> </ul>
09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The setbacks of the villa housing (in particular adjacent to the aged care) is inadequate. While the DCS may provide minimum 3.0m rear setbacks for residential dwellings, the separation of built form is still dependent on the scale / transition of the built form and a greater setback is required to the future aged care site. Setbacks and separation must also respond to orientation and solar access and will need to increase to ensure sufficient solar access and scale transitions can be provided to each villa / unit within the development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This has been addressed through the inclusion of a N-S road which provides a separation of approximately 6.5m between the villas and the future aged care site.</li> <li>In addition, the buildings on the future aged care site will be setback from the site boundary.</li> </ul>
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The setback to Jordan Springs Boulevard does not provide sufficient landscape treatment to balance the outcomes provided on the northern side of the road. Given recommendations to potentially relocate the multi storey form, alter the central villa configurations and as a consequence, revisit the road alignment, opportunities should be explored to increase this setback. A detailed streetscape treatment is required that integrates fencing, landscaping and the built form to suitably present to the street.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The streetscape has been improved through the orientation of villas and the provision of sufficient space for landscaping and pedestrian access points at end of the new N-S roads.</li> <li>Street tree planting has also been incorporated throughout the site.</li> <li>Landscaping is proposed along the northern boundary of the site, parallel to Jordan Springs Boulevard, improving the interface between Jordan Springs Boulevard and the villas.</li> </ul>
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The driveway separations (south of Jordan Springs Boulevard) and double width areas provide excessive hard stand areas, compromising landscape and street tree outcomes. Split driveways suitable separated by landscaping must be provided noting on street parking requirements need to be considered (in terms of separation distances between driveways).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The total number of villas have been reduced from 64 to 51, which reduces the overall amount of hard stand areas.</li> <li>Double width driveways have been reduced from 19 to 16.</li> <li>This will achieve a satisfactory streetscape outcome. Please see photos below for indicative streetscape outcomes.</li> </ul>
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The location of parking bays appears irregular and inaccessible. The location of visitor parking should be carefully considered ensuring that suitable provision is</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two visitor parking areas have been proposed.</li> </ul>

#	UDRP Comments	Response
13	<p><i>made throughout the development within 'real streets'. This could be in the form of indented parking bays, grouped spaces or kerb side parking. This requires consideration of road hierarchy, waste collection and the landscape design or the development.</i></p> <p><i>Diversity in villa design is required with specific regard to corner villas that must present to, and activate dual street frontages.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One visitor parking area is located off the access road from Jordan Springs Boulevard comprising 8 visitor parking spaces.</li> <li>• The second visitor parking bay is located on the southern portion of the site, adjacent to the multi-storey buildings comprising 5 parking spaces.</li> <li>• 5 visitor street parking spaces have also been provided along the multi-storey buildings.</li> <li>• The revised plan has addressed corner lots.</li> </ul>



Figure 1: Indicative streetscape outcome (Note kerb and gutter different to proposed Jordan Springs rolled kerb scheme).





Figure 2: Indicative streetscape outcome (Note kerb and gutter different to proposed Jordan Springs rolled kerb scheme).





Figure 3: Indicative streetscape outcome (Note kerb and gutter different to proposed Jordan Springs rolled kerb scheme).





Our Ref: UDRP18/0009  
Contact: Gavin Cherry  
Telephone: (02) 4732 8125

11 May 2018

Lendlease Retirement Living  
Level 14, Tower Three  
International Towers  
300 Barangaroo Avenue  
BARANGAROO NSW 2000

Email: [murray.robertson@lendlease.com](mailto:murray.robertson@lendlease.com)

Attention: Murray Robertson,

Dear Sir,

**2nd Urban Design Review Panel Meeting**

**Proposed Development - Retirement Village & Residential Aged Care Facility**

**Address - Lot 3990 Jordan Springs Boulevard JORDAN SPRINGS NSW 2747**

Thank you for attending the further Urban Design Review Panel meeting on 9 May 2018

The attached minutes are provided as a summary of the key points raised during this further panel meeting and should be considered in conjunction with the previous advice issued.

We hope that you have found participation in the Panel process beneficial and that it will assist both yourself and Council reaching a determination of your proposal.

If you require any further assistance regarding the attached advice please contact me on (02) 4732 8125.

Yours faithfully

**Gavin Cherry**  
**Development Assessment Coordinator**

Penrith City Council  
PO Box 60, Penrith  
NSW 2751 Australia  
T 4732 7777  
F 4732 7958  
[penrithcity.nsw.gov.au](http://penrithcity.nsw.gov.au)

*Please note: this advice is to assist you with your development proposal. It is not a full assessment of the proposal. The applicant is responsible to address all relevant requirements.*



<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Urban Design Review Panel Advice</b>	
<b>Date of Meeting</b>	9 May 2018
<b>Reference</b>	UDRP18/0009.01
<b>Proposal</b>	Retirement Village & Residential Aged Care Facility
<b>Address</b>	Lot 3990 Jordan Springs Boulevard JORDAN SPRINGS NSW 2747
<b>Key Issues</b>	<p><b>Retirement Village (Independent Living Villa Units)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Opportunities to provide a through site connection from Lakeside Parade should continue to be explored as the design of the development and internal private road network could alleviate the potential for 'rat runs'.</li> <li>- It needs to be confirmed if the proposal is for a private road arrangement through a community title scheme (or similar). Where the roadway is intended to be dedicated to Council, compliance with Council's road design and engineering specifications is generally required. This would necessitate a wider road pavement and carriageway width than that currently indicated.</li> <li>- The reconfigured allotment pattern as depicted on the revised plans provides for dead end roads adjacent to Jordan Springs Blvd which are not suitable and restrict waste servicing. The provision of communal collection areas within the streetscape to address this constraint is a poor public domain outcome and compromises landscaping within the streetscape. A circuitous road arrangement is required which would necessitate reconfiguration of the lot / villa arrangement.</li> <li>- The proposed lot / dwelling configuration also provides south facing unit courtyards with minimal rear setbacks which compromises solar access. The subdivision / lot arrangement should provide east west lot configurations (north / south road alignments) that maximise solar penetration and provide for afternoon and morning shade. This configuration would negate the need for dead end roads, increased corner lot housing opportunities and remove the parking area near Jordan Springs Blvd which is not an ideal entry feature into the development.</li> <li>- The resulting intersection location south of Jordan Springs Blvd needs to be verified with a traffic engineer to see how close the intersection can be moved north.</li> <li>- The building designs, colours and finishes throughout the development requires diversity in architectural design with specific emphasis on the corner allotments. Opportunities to maximise landscaping, separation of driveways and minimise front setback hard stand areas should be pursued. The corner dwellings are a positive contribution with more of this offering required throughout the development (which can be achieved as a consequence of the above orientation amendments).</li> </ul>



- The road network and pavement width must ensure that garbage collection can occur which does not compromise the movement of vehicles or parking within the road network. The road requires widening to provide for kerb side parking opportunities unless it can be demonstrated that suitable visitor parking bays can be provided out of the carriageway width, coupled with landscaping preventing kerb side parking that could block the function of the road. Opportunities for visitor parking around the lake edge should also be pursued to maximise access to, and enjoyment of, of this environmental feature.
- Where permitted by the Office of Environment and Heritage (NPWS), circuitous pedestrian access around the lake could provide passive recreational opportunities that benefit the broader community as well as occupants of the proposed development. As a result, fencing around the lake and the resulting separation of the lake (within the regional park) from the development requires further confirmation.

### **Retirement Village (Residential Flat Building Typology)**

- The further Master Plan Principle Drawings (May 2018 Revision 01) tabled during the meeting provide an improved access arrangement to the residential flat building forms as the arrangement on other plans with descending basement ramp adjacent to the western boundary is an unsupportable interface outcome. Basement access should be tucked under the building and not pushed into setback zones.
- The relocation of the flat building form adjacent to the southern boundary is a positive step as it assists to screen the view of the drainage channel, provides spatial separation and views to the regional park between the built form and opens up views to the lake (west).
- The height of the flat building form and architectural design requires refinement having regard to the intended building height at the corner for the future aged care facility. The approved DA to the east provides a 4 x storey form and as such the proposal must ensure that a suitable height transition is proposed between the developments. Opportunities exist to increase the height of the western building with the community facilities as a different offering with the development.
- The front setback of the community facility building is excessive and should be moved north to provide a more integrated setback pattern within the streetscape. The setback can be stepped south of the adjacent buildings to enable expanded views to the lake however the front parking, turning circle and port cochere are not appropriate. Opportunities for set down could be provided within the road design rather than the front setback landscaped area. This would also enable embellished landscaping within the rear setback.
- The basement setback to the rear boundary requires increase to maximum deep root landscaping potential to the southern boundary. Opportunities could be explored to flip the parking arrangements to enable this increase without significant loss of parking. Otherwise section drawings and detailed landscaping plans

	<p>are required which show how suitable landscaping can be accommodated to provide a vegetated green edge to the development and its interface with the rear regional park and address of the drainage channel.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is understood that the flat building form may be a second stage to the development. If this is the case the initial stage should address intended building locations, vehicular access arrangements and conceptual design intentions for the second stage. This could be by way of a concept plan that accompanies the stage 1 proposal.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Electronic Model</b></p>	<p><b>A copy of a 3D electronic model of the development proposal in Autodesk FBX format is required to be submitted in support of any development application lodged.</b></p> <p><b>Please contact Council for assistance regarding alternate file format options if this is required.</b></p>