Planning Unit, Land and Housing Corporation

SENIORS LIVING POLICY: URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR INFILL DEVELOPMENT

Checklist of design principles and better practices

Guide notes:
This form is to be used for all development proposals that are to be assessed under Part 5 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 as amended (EP&A Act) as 'development without consent' carried out by Land and Housing Corporation under *State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021 (Housing SEPP).*

The checklist must be completed and submitted, and the declaration at the end of the checklist signed by the consultant architect, as part of the package submission for assessment by the Planning Unit in the Portfolio Services branch of the Land and Housing Corporation. The declaration will demonstrate that the guidelines have been taken into account in the site planning and design of the development proposal in accordance with Section 43(1)(d) of Housing SEPP.

The checklist should be completed in conjunction with a review of the guideline document to ensure that a thorough understanding of the design issues, principals and better practices is achieved before attempting to complete the checklist.

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 / DP	**Lots 11-15 in DP 243192**
Street Address	**680-688 East St & 165 Alexandra St, East Albury NSW**

Activity Type (tick box ☑):			
Single dwelling	☐	Demolition	☑
Dual Occupancy	☐	Tree removal	☑
Multi dwelling housing (villas/townhouses)	☐	Subdivision – Torrens title	☐
Residential flat building	☑	Subdivision – Strata title	☐
Seniors housing	☐	Other activity (describe below)	☐

Activity Description (please provide detailed description):

Five (5) residential sites have been combined. The scope of the project is the demolition of existing houses & structures and the construction of a new twenty-four (24) unit General Housing Development comprising of 10 x 2-bedroom and 14 x 1-bedroom units in a two-storey walk-up type development with common stair lobbies, with a building comprising 8 units fronting Alexandra Street, and a building comprising 16 units facing East Street. On Ground Floor, three (3) units are adaptable, and all other ground floor units follow Silver Liveable guidelines and have accessibility to the front door. Seventeen (17) car spaces are provided including three (3) accessible/ adaptable spaces associated with the adaptable units. The design is complemented with associated pathways and landscaping.

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	**Addressed in Design (strike through)**	**Design Response / Comment**

Design Issues / Design Principals 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 proposal is complementary to the more recent residential developments in the broader East Albury area, which highlight the future residential trends in the area. There is also a nearby commercial area along Borella Road. The proposal complies with the DCP and ARH SEPP for building height. The set-backs are consistent with the existing neighbouring development, with 8.4m to the primary East Street frontage (matching the neighbour to the south) and 5.4m setback to the secondary Alexandra Street, similar to the existing corner residence at 688 East St. The balconies project forward of this but do not exceed minimum DCP setbacks. The existing Red Gum tree on site is retained, as well as the trees near the boundary on neighbouring properties, and new planting is proposed throughout the site. The scale of the buildings is consistent with the recent residential development observed in broader East Albury. The building massing is expressed as a series of smaller pitched skillion roof and parapet type roof forms, which together with the chosen materials of brick, metal cladding and metal roofing reflect the existing residential nature of the street.  ^ Existing development at Thurgoona & Dight St, East Albury  ^ Existing development at Mate St, East Albury  ^ Existing development at 195 Alexandra St, East Albury
1.02 Block and lots – does the analysis of	Yes /~~No~~	The proposed development combines 5 lots on the corner of a

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
the surrounding block and lot layout take into consideration local compatibility and development suitability? (e.g. lot size, shape, orientation)		block (bounded by East St, Alexandra St and Eastern Ct) of existing single detached residences residential development. However, this area is intended to undergo further RFB development and it is therefore consistent with the intended future trend in this area. The block shape is fairly regular and its orientation has a clear Northerly aspect to Alexandra St, enabling solar access.
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 character of surrounding developments consists of a mixture of single and two storey detached and multi-residential dwellings, along with low rise commercial buildings and the Hospital precinct along Borella Road. The proposal for this two-storey RFB is consistent with the future trends in the area and the proposed design complements the adjoining developments in terms of setbacks, materiality and expressing smaller scale in the massing of building forms.
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~~	The proposal retains the existing significant Red Gum tree #13 on site, as well as the four trees along the rear boundary on neighbouring properties. The existing compromised Claret Ash on Alexandra Street frontage is proposed to be replaced with new street trees to Council standard. The new planting will include screening to the front fences and bin areas, taller privacy planting along the side boundaries and more significant planting in deep soil zones at the rear. The landscaping will be predominantly native planting, compatible with the local area.
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 Council LEP and associated DCP controls, including for 'Residential Flat buildings SEPP 65 does not apply', were considered. The LEP map shows that the adjacent block is zoned R3 medium density residential and there is a B2 local centre with shops nearby within 400m on Borella Rd. The proposed two-storey RFB is therefore consistent with the DCP and the character reflects the future trends in the area and the design elements, roof forms and materiality complement the character of the existing housing in the area.
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~~	Both from aerial views and site inspections the existing streetscape elements have been noted. The newer two-storey developments in the area reflect the future trends and the proposal complements this pattern.
1.07 Patterns of driveways and vehicular crossings	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	The proposed driveways complement the existing pattern of driveways along property boundaries.
1.08 Existing vegetation and natural features on the site	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Existing trees on site and surrounding properties have been assessed with an arborist's report and identification of the significant trees to be retained.
1.09 Existing pattern of buildings and open space on adjoining lots	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Both from aerial views and site inspections the existing adjoining lots have been analysed. Whilst the existing older single storey detached developments do not reflect the new two storey trends, the setbacks are consistent with neighbouring properties along with a deep soil area with larger planting proposed at the rear of

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
		site.
1.10 Potential impact on privacy for, or overshadowing of, existing adjacent dwellings.	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	The main windows to habitable rooms comply with the 6m setback at the rear. Habitable windows closer to the boundary (along South side setback) have higher sill level (highlight) or provided with screening. Non-habitable bathroom windows are obscure glazed. For comparison, if standalone two-storey houses were built on the current single blocks, then the windows could be much closer to the boundaries. Shadow diagrams are provided to indicate extent of overshadowing to adjacent dwellings and generally this is minimal.
2. Site Planning and Design		
General		
Does the site planning and design: **2.01** Optimise internal amenity and minimise impacts on neighbours?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Careful analysis has been undertaken in the Concept and Design Stages to balance these criteria. To ensure efficient planning, the units are compact to reduce bulk. Habitable windows look out to private open space or landscaped areas. Suitable privacy measures are provided between units and neighbouring properties via higher sill heights and screening as appropriate.
2.02 Provide a mix of dwelling sizes and dwellings both with and without carparking?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	14 x 1 Bedroom and 10 x 2 Bedroom units are proposed. 17 parking spaces with 3 of those for the adaptable units. This reflects the current LaHC requirements for this area.
2.03 Provide variety in massing and scale of build form within the development?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	The two-storey development is articulated to complement the more recent trend of two storey multi-dwellings in the area.
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~~	The two buildings are located towards their respective road frontages, with the rear area of the site an open space for car parking and landscaping. Access to the units is clearly established via the common stair lobbies and pathways, with individual access to most of the Ground Floor units off the exterior landings.
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~~	Although the development is all two storeys, this compactness allows for a significant amount of landscaped area to the rear of the site and along the boundaries providing screen planting. Minimum building rear setback is met and privacy screening to rear windows and balconies as appropriate.
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~~	All units have been designed to receive at least some direct sunlight at mid-winter, with 71% receiving a minimum 3 hours of sun between 9am-3pm. The Alexandra St units face north and the East street units in a west-east orientation. The busier of the two streets is East St, and this has a greater set-back to the living areas, and generally living areas are orientated away from the carpark to reduce noise.

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
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~~	The Red Gum tree #13 within the site on the East St frontage will be retained, and there are no existing street trees on East St. There is one existing street tree #15 Claret Ash on Alexandra St, which is compromised by a power line, and which is to be removed for the new driveway and replaced with a new street tree(s) as approved by Council.
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~~	The existing trees positioned on the rear boundary, trees #1, #10, #17, will be retained. New trees will be proposed to complement the existing trees and provide privacy screening.
2.09 Retain large or otherwise significant trees on other parts of the site through sensitive site planning?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	The significant Red Gum tree #13 within the site on East St frontage will be retained.
2.10 Where not possible to retain existing trees, replace with new mature or semi-mature trees?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Due to existing encroachments and new development, addressed in the Arborist's report, trees #3, #4 & #14 will be removed and these will be replaced by new suitable trees within the site in practical locations. Refer to Landscape Plan.
2.11 Increase the width of landscaped areas between driveways and boundary fences and between driveways and new dwellings?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	A 2m min landscaped buffer has been provided between the main driveway and side boundary, and 750mm to the single southern carspace, as well as landscape buffers provided between parking and all buildings.
2.12 Provide pedestrian paths?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Separate pedestrian access is provided to the units directly from the streets and suitable access is provided off the rear driveway/parking for ease of rear access to all units.
2.13 Reduce the width of driveways?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Minimum required driveway widths are provided with the main driveway single lane to minimise visual impact.
2.14 Provide additional private open space above the minimum requirements?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Yes, where practical additional POS provided for ground floor units.
2.15 Provide communal open space?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Communal Open Space is provided via the common pathway at rear of site (near existing tree #10) and also around the Red Gum tree #13 on East St frontage.
2.16 Increase front, rear and/or side setbacks?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	The setback of buildings is increased around the existing retained trees and generally, with the driveways positioned alongside boundaries, the building setbacks then exceed the required DCP setbacks.
2.17 Provide small landscaped areas between garages, dwellings entries, pedestrian paths, driveways etc.	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Landscaping buffers are provided wherever possible. Refer to Landscape Architect's documentation for details.
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~~	The design ensures that 10% of the site area is provided as a deep soil zone at the rear of the site.

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
2.19 Replicate an existing pattern of deep soil planting on the front of the site?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Front setbacks to both streets will include deep soil zones and be planted with trees.
2.20 Use semi-pervious materials for driveways, paths and other paved areas?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Generally LaHC does not prefer to have pavers, but a long term stable and durable surface (i.e coloured concrete).
2.21 Use on-site detention to retain stormwater on site for re-use?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	On site detention is not required by Council, but a GPT will be provided. Refer to the Civil Engineers' documentation.
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~~	Central rear parking consisting of 16 car spaces including 2 adaptable spaces is located at the rear of buildings. A single adaptable 17th car space is located at the southern boundary.
2.23 Maintain, where possible, existing crossings and driveway locations on the street?	~~Yes~~ / No ~~or N/A~~	New crossings to be provided at similar location to existing at South boundary, and new main driveway at Northeast corner near boundary to follow existing pattern in street.
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, separation, driveways locations, pedestrian entries etc.)	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Careful analysis was undertaken through the Concept and Sketch Design to fit the development into each of the two streetscapes in terms of setbacks, driveways, entries as well as in the expression of the building massing and materials. The two-storey development is in keeping with recent redevelopments in the street and will comply with the 8.5m maximum ht.
3.02 Provide a front setback that relates to adjoining development?	~~Yes~~ / No ~~or N/A~~	The front setbacks to both streets meets the DCP requirements, and match existing neighbours at 672 East St, and similar to the existing buildings (being demolished) on the corner of Alexandra St.
Built form		
Does the site planning and design: **3.03** Break up the building massing and articulate building facades?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Careful analysis was undertaken through the Concept and Sketch Design Stages to provide the best balanced development of the building forms on site. Two separate buildings are provided and each has been articulated with varied setbacks, articulation of stair lobbies and balconies in different materials, privacy screens and integrated landscaping features. The other elevations, notably the side elevations reflect a complementary articulation of the main front façade.

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
3.04 Allow breaks in rows of attached dwellings?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	The stair lobbies provide a well-defined break to the buildings from the front and the rear.
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~~	Brick construction with metal cladding and colorbond metal roofs along with screening elements is sympathetic to both the existing and the more recent developments in the area. The stepping of the façade and articulation of stair lobbies and balconies reference the scale of existing development and the desired contextual character.
3.06 Set back upper levels behind the front building façade?	~~Yes / No or~~ N/A	Compliance with setbacks for habitable room windows is achieved without further upper level setback.
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	No dormer windows proposed.
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 elements of the buildings have been broken down to articulate the front façade and entries, defining identity of each unit for the residents with a mix of skillion roofs and parapets. Refer to elevations.
3.09 Use a roof pitch sympathetic to that of existing buildings in the street?	~~Yes /~~ No ~~or N/A~~	The low pitched roofs reflect the future emerging character of the area, and help to reduce the overall height of the two-storey building forms and comply with the building ht limit.
3.10 Avoid uninterrupted building facades including large areas of painted render?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Roof and wall elements have been broken down and recessed to articulate the front façades, balconies and entries. Refer to elevation drawings.
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 landscaping and trees are proposed in the front setbacks, with replacement street tree(s) for the existing compromised street tree on Alexandra St which is being removed. Retention of the existing Red Gum tree #13 on East St. Refer landscape architect's documentation.
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~~	Where front fences are provided near the boundary line, new landscaping and trees are proposed to provide a buffer between the building and the street.
Residential amenity		
Does the site planning and design: **3.13** Clearly design open space in the front setback as either private or communal open space?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Landscaping, fencing and planting is used to clearly define the division between common and private space in the front setbacks. Each ground floor unit has its own clearly defined Private Open Space (POS). The designated pathways and landscaping provide identity for the respective ground floor units facing the street or to the main stair lobby.
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~~	New landscaping provides a buffer between the building and the street, along with screening and different paving to clearly define the threshold between public and private spaces.

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
3.15 Design dwellings at the front of the site to address the street?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Both the Alexandra St and East St buildings directly address the street.
3.16 Design pedestrian entries, where possible, directly off the street?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Generally each group of dwellings has a common access pathway from the street from which there are pathways to each individual Ground Floor P.O.S, giving an access 'from the street' without going into the stair lobby.
3.17 Provide a pedestrian entry for rear residents that is separate from vehicular entries?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	The one bed units facing to rear of the site are accessed from the common walk-through lobbies allowing access from street and carpark, and Ground Floor units have separate access through the P.O.S.
3.18 Design front fences that provide privacy where necessary, but also allow for surveillance of the street?	~~Yes / No or~~ N/A	Front fences are kept low in ht generally 1.2m to define the private spaces while still allowing surveillance, and consideration of sightlines with landscaping to maintain surveillance also.
3.19 Ensure that new front fences have a consistent character with front fences in the street?	~~Yes / No or~~ N/A	Front fences generally of a post and slatted type, consistent with residential fences in the area.
3.20 Orientate mailboxes obliquely to the street to reduce visual clutter and the perception of multiple dwellings?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	The mailboxes are orientated perpendicular to the street, near the boundary. The mail boxes are also integrated with the landscaping and fencing
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~~	Screening and landscaping are provided to the garbage storage areas and gas/ water meters.
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 main driveway is articulated with a passing bay at front to a single width driveway to the parking area and wide landscaping areas along the sides and at end of the parking area reduces the 'gun barrel' effect.
3.23 Set back garages behind the predominant building line to reduce their visibility from the street?	~~Yes / No or~~ N/A	There are no garages provided. All the parking is behind the predominant building line.
3.24 Consider alternative site designs that avoid driveways running the length of the site?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Reviewed at Concept and Sketch Design Stages. Minimum width driveways and landscaping used to mitigate this issue.
3.25 Terminate vistas with trees, vegetation, open space or a dwelling rather than garages or parking?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Appropriate landscaping is proposed where possible especially the substantial landscape strips to the sides of driveway and parking area, and a landscape buffer between the parking and the buildings.
3.26 Use planting to soften driveway edges?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Landscaping is included to both sides along the driveway.
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~~	Not considered for the main driveway as there is a single shared parking area. The driveway colour is differentiated from the pedestrian path colour. Parking is located to suit client requirements.

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
3.28 Limit driveway widths on narrow sites to single carriage with passing points?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	The driveway has been kept to a single carriageway where possible with a passing point at the boundary.
3.29 Provide gates at the head of driveways to minimise visual 'pull' of the driveway?	~~Yes /~~ No or ~~N/A~~	No gates, as required by client.
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 provided.
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 provided.
3.32 Recess the driveway entry to basement car parking from the main building façade?	~~Yes / No or~~ N/A	No basement parking provided.
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 provided.
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 provided.
3.35 Return façade material into the visible area of the basement car park entry?	~~Yes / No or~~ N/A	No basement parking provided.
3.36 Locate or screen all parking to minimise visibility from the street?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	The central parking area is behind the buildings which screens it from the street.
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 front units of the proposed development are orientated towards the streets in the same way as the existing dwellings.
4.02 Be particularly sensitive to privacy impacts where dwellings must be oriented at 90 degrees to the existing pattern of development?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Careful analysis undertaken through the Concept and Sketch Design Stages. Either highlight windows or privacy screens are provided where windows are facing any adjoining development.
4.03 Set upper storeys back behind the side or rear building line?	~~Yes~~ ~~/ No or~~ N/A	Compliance with setbacks for habitable room windows is achieved without further upper level setback.
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~~	Roof and wall elements have been broken down and recessed to articulate the front façades, balconies and entries, with painted elements limited in size. Refer to elevation drawings.

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
4.05 Incorporate second stories within the roof space and provide dormer windows?	~~Yes / No or~~ N/A	No dormer windows proposed.
4.06 Offset openings from existing neighbouring windows or doors?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Where applicable this has been implemented. Also windows with higher sills are provided for privacy.
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~~	The massing from the side is only a single unit to the East and is stepped at the South side boundary, along with articulation of windows, screening and balcony side walls in different materials.
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 along the rear boundaries to be retained and other existing trees where possible along with new landscaping along all boundaries to provide buffers.
4.09 Locate deep soil zones where they will be provide privacy and shade for adjacent dwellings?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	The deep soil zones allow retention of the existing trees at the rear boundary and will allow for new planting along the rear and side setbacks to provide shade and privacy to all dwellings.
4.10 Plant in side and rear setbacks for privacy and shade for adjoining dwellings?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Deep soil zones are allocated behind the building line to provide shade and privacy to all dwellings.
4.11 Use species that are characteristic to the local area for new planting?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	All new planting will be Indigenous species. Refer to landscape architect's documentation
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~~	Some new overshadowing to the existing dwelling to the south, however this is minimal and not over the main rear POS. A minimum 3 hours of sunlight access at mid-winter is maintained to neighbouring dwellings. Refer to shadow diagrams.
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~~	Suitable rear screening will be provided along with setbacks to negate any overlooking.
4.14 Locate private open space in front setbacks where possible to minimise negative impacts on neighbours?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	POS is provided to the front setbacks of both streets.
4.15 Ensure private open space is not adjacent to quiet neighbouring uses, e.g. bedrooms?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Minimum negative impacts on neighbours by facing POS and balconies away from the sides.
4.16 Design dwellings around internal courtyards?	~~Yes / No or~~ N/A	Adequate external private open space (POS) has been provided.
4.17 Provide adequate screening for private open space areas?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Suitable fencing and landscaping is provided.

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
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~~	Side setbacks are used for driveways, and 6m provided to unit 11 for POS with planting to provide screening to neighbours.
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~~	A continuous large landscape zone has been placed along the main driveway boundary and a smaller landscape strip along the single car space driveway.
4.20 Position driveways so as to be a buffer between new and existing adjacent dwellings?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	As noted above, driveways are alongside setbacks and a landscape zone provided as a buffer to 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~~	Alexandra St building living areas are orientated towards the North giving good solar. The East St building is oriented West-East, allowing all units to achieve reasonable solar access to living and POS areas and meeting the required 3hrs mid-winter solar to 70% of dwellings.
5.02 Provide dwellings with a sense of identity through building articulation, roof form and other architectural elements?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	The roof elements of the buildings have been broken down to articulate the front façade and entries, defining the identity of each unit for the residents. Refer to elevations.
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~~	Landscaping buffer zones provided wherever possible.
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~~	Landscaping buffer zones provided wherever possible. Refer landscaping documentation.
5.05 Have dwelling entries that are clear and identifiable from the street or driveway?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	All entries are clearly identifiable with separate external access provided from the street and carpark area where possible, and the first floor units accessed from 2 storey stair lobbies.
5.06 Provide a buffer between public/communal open space and private dwellings?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	New landscaping and fencing provides a buffer between the private and communal spaces, along with screening and different paving to clearly define the threshold between public and private spaces.
5.07 Provide a sense of address for each dwelling?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	The Ground floor units have external access through their P.O.S via common pathways to the street. Roof and wall elements have been broken down and recessed to articulate the entry points.

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
5.08 Orientate dwelling entries to not look directly into other dwellings?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Internal dwelling entries are offset wherever possible – including all external entries do not face other dwellings and have appropriate screening.
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~~	Where habitable rooms are near the parking area and pathways, privacy fencing and landscaping is provided.
5.10 Avoid large uninterrupted areas of hard surface?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	The driveway and parking is the largest hard surface area and the minimum compliance widths have been incorporated to minimise the impact and also landscaping is provided all around.
5.11 Screen parking from views and outlooks from dwellings?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Landscaping buffers are provided all around the driveway and parking to screen dwellings.
Reduce the dominance of areas for vehicular circulation and parking by: **5.12** Considering single rather than double width driveways?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	The main driveway is articulated to single width where possible to minimise impact.
5.13 Use communal car courts rather than individual garages?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	All car parking spaces except one adaptable space are in a communal area.
Reduce the dominance of areas for vehicular circulation and parking by considering: **5.14** Single rather than double garages?	~~Yes / No or~~ N/A	No garages are provided.
5.15 Communal car courts rather than individual garages?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Communal car parking has been provided.
5.16 Tandem parking or a single garage with single car port in tandem?	~~Yes / No or~~ N/A	Communal car parking has been provided.
5.17 Providing some dwellings without any car parking for residents without cars?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Seventeen (17) Parking spaces (including 3 for the adaptable units) are provided for the twenty-four (24) Units.
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~~	Refer documentation – a separate accessible pedestrian pathway is provided from each of the roads to the parking area and front entries. Where rear access is provided from the parking area, sufficient clear standing space is provided.
5.19 Provide pedestrian routes to all public and semi-public areas?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	These are provided with pathways.

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
5.20 Avoid ambiguous spaces in building and dwelling entries that are not obviously designated as public or private?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Roof and wall elements have been broken down and recessed to articulate the entry points with architectural elements. The two storey stair lobbies are well defined.
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~~	Overall planning is open with clear sightlines to building entries and straight walls along sides to avoid blind spots.
5.22 Clearly define thresholds between public and private spaces?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Roof and wall elements have been broken down and recessed to articulate the entry points with architectural elements.
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~~	All POS are adjacent to the main living areas of the dwelling. Refer and drawings and calculations on the cover sheet.
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~~	All POS areas are orientated either north or east / west to receive solar access.
5.25 Provide private open space areas that comprise multiple spaces for larger dwellings?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Where practical, side setbacks have been incorporated into the POS, providing a secondary area to the main front /rear facing POS.
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~~	Refer to overall layout and this has been provided practical slatted vertical screening to achieve this.
5.27 Provide private open space areas that are both paved and planted when located at ground level?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Refer to overall layout. The landscaping and hard surfaces in POS areas are balanced and designed to suit client's needs for low maintenance.
5.28 Provide private open space areas that retain existing vegetation where practical?	Yes / ~~No or N/A~~	Existing trees are retained in the POS areas wherever possible including the tree #13.
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?	~~Yes~~ / No ~~or N/A.~~	Generally, the Client preference is not to have pavers to minimise uneven settlement /trip hazards in the future. The size of hard paved areas is balanced against soft planting areas.
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~~	Communal landscape area is provided in the form of landscaping around the existing large tree at the front of site and along rear of site easily accessible from the common pathways, providing a pleasant outlook while using the common areas.
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~~	Garbage areas are located off the common pathway entries on East Street, screened from the road. Services are screened and electrical boards located within stair lobbies.

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 Geck
Capacity/Qualifications:	Registered Architect No.11083
Firm:	Brewster Murray Pty Ltd
Signature:	
Date:	01/04/22

Internal Use Only	
Checked by:	
Land and Housing Corporation:	
Title:	
Signature:	
Date:	