Strategic Site Selection and Site Suitability Checklist

NOTE:

If ‘Yes’ is GREEN, this is a favourable aspect of the proposal

If ‘Yes’ is ORANGE, this may make it more difficult to gain an approval for the proposal, though none of these are ‘absolute’ constraints

If ‘Yes’ is RED, this is likely to be a more serious constraint to approval. However, some things are open to interpretation by the Council and the Land and Environment Court (e.g. the ‘character test’), whilst others are more substantive (e.g. whether a site complies with SEPPARH with regard to distance from transport (in Sydney) or from B2 or B4 zones (in regional areas).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Consideration** | **Yes/No** | **Comments /Details** |
| **Relative Need:** |  |  |
| ***Site is in top 20% of LGAs for:*** |  |  |
| Indicator 1 [Tool ?] |  |  |
| Indicator 2 [Tool ?] |  |  |
| Indicator 3 [Tool ?] |  |  |
| Indicator 4 [Tool ?] |  |  |
| Indicator 5 [Tool ?] |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Risk of Council Resistance**  |  |  |
| Council has a supportive Affordable Housing Policy or Strategy |  |  |
| Council has approved similar developments |  |  |
| Council has a history of refusing affordable housing developments  |  |  |
| Council officers appear supportive at pre-DA meeting/s |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Risk of Community Resistance:**  |  |  |
| Above average median age (45+ years) |  |  |
| Predominant urban form is separate houses (>90%) |  |  |
| High SEIFA IRSAD (>score of 1050) |  |  |
| Increase in property prices (>55% over 5 years non-adjusted) |  |  |
| Predominantly owner occupiers (>75%) |  |  |
| Top Quintile in CRRP Index |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Site Constraints:** |  |  |
| Requires a rezoning for proposal  |  |  |
| Requires change in controls for proposal |  |  |
| Requires a change of use for proposal  |  |  |
| In a Heritage Conservation Area |  |  |
| In an Environmental Protection Area |  |  |
| In a flood affected area |  |  |
| In a bush-fire prone area |  |  |
| On prime agricultural land |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Proposal is likely to *have problems achieving compliance* in areas most likely to lead to refusal or significant community opposition:** |  |  |
| ***Physical amenity:*** |  |  |
| Parking standards |  |  |
| Overlooking/privacy standards  |  |  |
| Acoustic standards |  |  |
| Solar Access standards |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| ***Physical Character:*** |  |  |
| Not likely to achieve required set backs  |  |  |
| Not likely to achieve required landscaping  |  |  |
| Achieving compatibility with ‘bulk & scale’ |  |  |
| Site is ***not*** in a ‘transition area’ (e.g. no medium or high density housing has been developed and zoning in is R2 Low Density Residential)  |  |  |
| Not likely to be compatibility with local character in immediate vicinity (e.g. if a problem with several of these factors) |  |  |
| **Other constraints related to compliance with SEPPARH (if using this instrument):** |  |  |
| Site is ***not*** is an ‘accessible’ area (if in Sydney) OR is ***more than*** 400m from B2 or B4 zone (if regional) |  |  |
| Insert other mandatory provision |  |  |
| Insert other mandatory provision |  |  |
| Insert other mandatory provision |  |  |
| Insert other mandatory provision |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Feasibility of development:** |  |  |
| Do you own the site? Or is the site free or at a significantly discounted cost? |  |  |
| Size of site (>1,000 m2) |  |  |
| Is the site large enough to support economic feasibility modelling? |  |  |
| The site is large enough to ensure relevant planning standards (above) can be achieved? |  |  |
| Existing controls allow for development at sufficient scale? |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Other relevant considerations (e.g. raised by council at pre-DA meeting/s):** |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 3. |  |  |
| 4. |  |  |