Public Exhibition for the Explanation of Intended Effect New State Environmental Planning Policy (Design and Place)

Your Name	
Your Organisation	System Architects
Postcode	2010
Phone	
Email	
Stakeholder group	oximes Industry $oximes$ Council $oximes$ Aboriginal Community $oximes$ Community $oximes$ State Agency
Age demographic	□ 18-25 □ 26-45 ⊠ 46-65 □ 65+
Your feedback How to make a formal submission	We welcome your feedback on the Explanation of Intended Effect for a New Design and Place State Environmental Planning Policy. Submissions close on 31 March 2021. Feedback is sought on all parts of the document. Please consider if the proposal: Reflects contemporary understanding and practices Clearly articulates the intentions of the policy Should consider other opportunities.

Explanation of intended effect (EIE)

PART 1

Introduction

PART 2

Proposed new State Environmental Planning Policy (Design and Place)

Part 3.2.2 Table 1 Item 4 Local Living

To fit in with other inclusive aspects of the Policy, 20 mins walk for an older person or person with a disability (generally regarded as 3km/hr – 50m /min) is very different to an 'average person' (5km/hr – 80m/min). Most data (can provide if required) seem to suggest 400-500m (10 mins) to local shops and services and 800-1000m (20 mins) to larger parks is good.

I know this is supposed to be a performance based Policy but still think this needs a bit more definition.

PART 3

Key components of the new State Environmental Planning Policy The 5 min to a local open space is good but may need to define what a local public open space? Is this provided as part of the precinct planning process? What min/ max size? 'Public' means it is not in private hands? Who is responsible for it?

More generally and in the same vein, it might not be the place for it but it would nice to see other inclusive, engagement and attraction pedestrian friendly initiatives including infrastructure, public toilets, street lighting, seating areas etc. I have sent this before but this is a good guide for improving streets and places for older people. http://universaldesignaustralia.net.au/wp-

content/uploads/2016/09/Age-Dementia-friendly-spaces-MVCC-Report-final.pdf

PART 4

Proposed amendments to existing State Environmental Planning Policies

PART 5

Relationship with other planning instruments and policies

PART 6

Planning pathways

APPENDIX A

Proposed Amendments to the Apartment Design Guide and SEPP 65

A2.4 Table A6 / 3

The Livable Housing Australia guidelines was a Federal initiative bringing together most of the housing stakeholders, I would think a minimum standard is Silver for all Apartments and Gold for at least 10% should be included in the Policy.

A2.4 Table A7 /4

As above, the LHA Silver level lobby requirements don't have anything about lifts. All lifts should be wheelchair accessible. The Silver lobby access requirements are less than the requirement for a wheel chair to turn so almost irrelevant. Public Spaces are more a DDA thing.

A5 Housing Diversity SEPP

Agree that the Seniors SEPP should align with and be included in this policy, but given that the Seniors SEPP is an incentive to developers to develop more housing for seniors exclusively, it goes against the inclusive aspects of the Design and Place Policy. My view is that there need to be incentives but that they shouldn't be exclusive but on a pro rata basis much like the Affordable Housing SEPP.

APPENDIX B

Proposed New Public Spaces and Urban Design Guide

APPENDIX C

Sustainability in Residential Buildings

B3.5 Intended Effects Table B1

Footpath widths should 2m wide clear of all obstructions. If signage, bollards, trees are in the footpath zone then the mi with could be 1.5m.

The Age'n'dem toolkit link (above in part 3 comments) has more information about footpaths, crosiings etc.

Additional comments

I really like how this has all been brought together in one comprehensive design guide. Well done!

Thank you for your time in preparing this submission.