

Seniors Living Policy: Urban design guidelines for infill development - Checklist

Checklist of design principles and better practices

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)	Lots 43 & 44 in Deposited Plan 36280
Street Address	70-72 Gordon Avenue
Suburb / Postcode	South Granville

PROPOSAL DETAILS:

Activity Type (tick box):

Single dwelling	<input type="checkbox"/>	Seniors housing	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dual occupancy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Demolition	X
Multi dwelling housing (villas/townhouses)	X	Tree removal	<input type="checkbox"/>
Multi dwelling housing (terraces)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Subdivision – Torrens title	<input type="checkbox"/>
Residential flat building	<input type="checkbox"/>	Subdivision – Strata title / Community title	<input type="checkbox"/>
		[Delete whichever is not applicable]	
Manor houses	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Activity Description (please provide summary description):

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	The surrounding pattern of both streets has been analysed. The proposal takes on a contemporary approach in an area that experiences revitalisation. Front setbacks to both streets and building height comply with relevant codes and are sympathetic to and consistent with surrounding build forms. Existing street planting is not impacted by the proposal. Proposed landscaping is considered relevant for the area and will contribute to the revitalisation of the existing surroundings.
1.02 Block and lots – does the analysis of the surrounding block and lot layout take into consideration local compatibility and development suitability? (e.g. lot size, shape, orientation)	Yes	The proposal being a residential building is considered suitable for the area consisting of residential buildings. Building orientation is consistent with surrounding buildings.
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?)	N/A	Refer to Block Analysis Plan – it is determined that the site would support townhouses and has considered the nearby setbacks and scale for similar sites
1.04 Trees – do trees and planting in the proposed development reflect trees and landscapes in the neighbourhood or street?	Yes	Proposed planting is consistent with the existing surrounding trees. Similar to existing species of trees are being 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	The site is classified as accessible therefore LEP and DCP apply. The proposal complies with LEP regarding key controls such as height and floor space ratio. The proposal complies with DCP setbacks

Site analysis

Does the site analysis include:

1.06 Existing streetscape elements and the existing pattern of development as perceived from the street	Yes	Existing streetscape elements and the existing pattern of development have been clearly identified on the Site Analysis, Site Plan and Ground floor drawings
1.07 Patterns of driveways and vehicular crossings	Yes	Driveway and vehicular crossing have been shown on the relevant plans

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
1.08 Existing vegetation and natural features on the site	Yes	The site contours and existing trees have been shown
1.09 Existing pattern of buildings and open space on adjoining lots	Yes	Existing buildings and open spaces on adjoining lots have been shown on relevant drawings. The shadow diagrams have been provided and show no detrimental impact on the adjacent dwellings.
1.10 Potential impact on privacy for, or overshadowing of, existing adjacent dwellings.	Yes	The shadow diagrams have been provided and show no detrimental impact on the adjacent dwellings.

2. Site Planning and Design

General

Does the site planning and design:

2.01 Optimise internal amenity and minimise impacts on neighbours?	Yes	There is no impact on neighbouring dwellings in terms of overshadowing, the privacy of neighbours has not been compromised
2.02 Provide a mix of dwelling sizes and dwellings both with and without carparking?	Yes	The development proposes five parking spaces to be allocated between eight dwellings as required.
2.03 Provide variety in massing and scale of build form within the development?	Yes	The proposal consists of eight dwellings contained in two built forms. Breaking down of the massing helps to lessen the perception of the development scale.

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	As a rectilinear shaped site, 2 of the 8 dwellings are street facing. This is consistent with the existing pattern where 2 dwellings are currently street facing
2.05 Have developments more modest in scale towards the rear of the site to limit impacts on adjoining neighbours?	Yes	Massing has been considered throughout the scheme as well as orientation and privacy. Although the massing does not step down to the rear of the site, the design is compliant with the DCP setback controls. Rear setback is sufficient to ensure no adverse impact on neighbouring buildings.
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	The building forms has been carefully manipulated to maximise northern sunlight into apartments. All dwellings are orientated to maximise solar access to living areas and private open space. 87.5% (7) of dwellings achieve minimum of 3 hours solar access to living areas and public open spaces on 21 June.

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	One tree is being retained (T12) and one tree (T9) is being removed from the front setback. T9 is considered to have low retention value. Suitable and mostly native landscaping is proposed in the redevelopment.
---	-----	--

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
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 trees are being removed at the rear of the lot
2.09 Retain large or otherwise significant trees on other parts of the site through sensitive site planning?	Yes	Ref Arborist report for significant trees to be retained.
2.10 Where not possible to retain existing trees, replace with new mature or semi-mature trees?	Yes	Mature and semi-mature trees to be planted on site. Ref. Arborist report and Landscape design for details
2.11 Increase the width of landscaped areas between driveways and boundary fences and between driveways and new dwellings?	Yes	Sufficient landscaped areas between driveways and boundary fences and between driveways and new dwellings are proposed. Those soft landscaped areas act as buffers between built form and hard surface of the driveway
2.12 Provide pedestrian paths?	Yes	Central shared driveway/pedestrian path crossing the site is proposed to provide access to seven dwellings and enable continuous accessible path of travel within the site.
2.13 Reduce the width of driveways?	Yes	The most efficient, having regard to reduction of the width driveway design has been developed in liaison with traffic engineer
2.14 Provide additional private open space above the minimum requirements?	Yes	Private Open Space is considered acceptable against the yield and has been designed for maximum flexibility and minimal maintenance.
2.15 Provide communal open space?	Yes	The vast communal open space is provided in the centre of development
2.16 Increase front, rear and/or side setbacks?	No	The proposal challenges the front DCP setback control, however is sympathetic to the existing site conditions.
2.17 Provide small landscaped areas between garages, dwellings entries, pedestrian paths, driveways etc.	Yes	Small, landscaped areas provided between dwellings, driveway, fences
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?	No	Landscaping and planting have been provided throughout the development. Deep soil zones at the rear make up approximately 5% of the site area. However, vast deep soil landscaping area is proposed towards the centre of the site.
2.19 Replicate an existing pattern of deep soil planting on the front of the site?	Yes	The existing pattern of deep soil planting have been maintained.
2.20 Use semi-pervious materials for driveways, paths and other paved areas?	No	Access requirements are limiting the materials palette choices, and therefore impervious treatment is considered acceptable.
2.21 Use on-site detention to retain stormwater on site for re-use?	Yes	Rainwater is captured, and OSD tank will slow the rate of excess stormwater into council infrastructure.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
--	--------------------------------------	---------------------------

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	Centralised car parking for six cars has been proposed at the centre of the site.
2.23 Maintain, where possible, existing crossings and driveway locations on the street?	Yes	The new proposal slightly moves the existing vehicle crossing which is a more desirable solution

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	Sitting of the building is sympathetic to and consistent with surrounding build forms. Front setback and pedestrian entry are consistent with existing street pattern. Height of the building is compliant with LEP and is considered appropriate for the area.
3.02 Provide a front setback that relates to adjoining development?	Yes	Front setback pattern observed in the neighbouring sites has been generally maintained.

Built form

Does the site planning and design:

3.03 Break up the building massing and articulate building facades?	Yes	The building massing has been broken into two built forms. Terraces, Balconies, Juliette balconies and awnings contribute to better façade articulation.
3.04 Allow breaks in rows of attached dwellings?	Yes	The building massing has been broken into two built forms containing seven and one dwelling. There is clear delineation between individual townhouses within the row arrangement. This is articulated through a number of material and façade changes.
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	Two shades of face brick have been proposed, proportional openings and awnings contribute to achieving coherent contextual character of the proposal
3.06 Set back upper levels behind the front building façade?	No	Upper floors have been cleverly designed to provide shading and weather protection to Ground level.
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?	N/A	Locating second storeys within the roof space and using dormer windows is not common practice in the streetscape.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
3.08 Reduce the apparent bulk and visual impact of the building by breaking down the roof into smaller roof elements?	Yes	The building massing has been broken into two built forms under separate rooves.
3.09 Use a roof pitch sympathetic to that of existing buildings in the street?	Yes	The built form is characterised by the use of pitched roofs which is similar to both established and newly built developments
3.10 Avoid uninterrupted building facades including large areas of painted render?	Yes	Terraces, Balconies, Juliette balconies and awnings contribute to better façade articulation and ensure large areas of painted render are avoided.

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	The landscape design proposes new planting in the front setback consistent with the existing landscaping pattern
3.12 Plant in front of front fences to reduce their impact and improve the quality of the public domain?	Yes	New planting has been proposed in front of front fences to reduce their impact and soften the perception of the area in the front setback. (Ref. Landscape plan)

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	The 1.5m slat fences separate private from communal spaces in the front setback.
3.14 Define the threshold between public and private space by level change, change in materials, fencing, planting and/or signage?	Yes	The clarity of threshold between public and private space is ensured by coherent and logical design and supporting landscaping. The 1.5m slat fences separate private from communal spaces in the front setback. The change in levels has been limited where possible for accessibility reasons
3.15 Design dwellings at the front of the site to address the street?	Yes	Two dwellings at the front of the site are addressing the street by the articulation of the facades, orientation of entries and awnings
3.16 Design pedestrian entries, where possible, directly off the street?	Yes	Pedestrian entry designed either directly off the street, where possible and practicable, or off shared vehicular and pedestrian accessway
3.17 Provide a pedestrian entry for rear residents that is separate from vehicular entries?	No	Due to site constraints (eg. tree protection measures) access is provided via shared vehicular and pedestrian path
3.18 Design front fences that provide privacy where necessary, but also allow for surveillance of the street?	Yes	The 1.5m fences have been design as having tightly packed slats to provide privacy from pedestrians walking along the footpath and the street and allow for the surveillance of the street at the same time
3.19 Ensure that new front fences have a consistent character with front fences in the street?	Yes	The front fences of the neighbouring buildings vary in heights and materials used. The proposed front fences are considered appropriate and consistent with neighbouring sites.
3.20 Orientate mailboxes obliquely to the street to reduce visual clutter and the perception of multiple dwellings?	Yes	The mailboxes are orientated obliquely at a 90 degrees angle away from the street.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
3.21 Locate and treat garbage storage areas and switchboards so that their visual impact on the public domain is minimised?	Yes	Switchboards are located in the cupboards in discreet location. Garbage areas for each dwelling are located at discrete locations and screened with slat fences and planting

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	Landscape on either side of the driveway is staggered to minimise the gun barrel affect. The view to the end of the driveway is book ended by planting and landscape
3.23 Set back garages behind the predominant building line to reduce their visibility from the street?	Yes	On ground parking for five cars located at the rear of proposed site.
3.24 Consider alternative site designs that avoid driveways running the length of the site?	Yes	After extensive site analysis the most efficient driveway design has been developed in liaison with traffic engineer
3.25 Terminate vistas with trees, vegetation, open space or a dwelling rather than garages or parking?	Yes	Where possible the vistas have been terminated with landscaping. Due to the site constraints the location of the on-ground parking is considered appropriate with proposed landscaping aiming to soften its edges
3.26 Use planting to soften driveway edges?	Yes	Proposed planting along the driveway aims to soften its edges.
3.27 Vary the driveway surface material to break it up into a series of smaller spaces? (e.g. to delineate individual dwellings)	No	This is achieved through the built form with nib walls delineating the individual garages.
3.28 Limit driveway widths on narrow sites to single carriage with passing points?	Yes	Single carriage driveway has been proposed.
3.29 Provide gates at the head of driveways to minimise visual 'pull' of the driveway?	Yes	Visual 'pull' is minimised by the location of the built form in relation to the driveway and by planting along the boundary edge
3.30 Reduce the width where possible to single width driveways at the entry to basement carparking rather than double?	N/A	No basement parking has been proposed
3.31 Locate the driveway entry to basement carparking to one side rather than the centre where it is visually prominent?	N/A	No basement parking has been proposed
3.32 Recess the driveway entry to basement car parking from the main building façade?	N/A	No basement parking has been proposed
3.33 Where a development has a secondary street frontage, provide vehicular access to basement car parking from the secondary street?	N/A	No basement parking has been proposed
3.34 Provide security doors to basement carparking	N/A	No basement parking has been proposed

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
to avoid the appearance of a 'black hole' in the streetscape?		
3.35 Return façade material into the visible area of the basement car park entry?	N/A	No basement parking has been proposed
3.36 Locate or screen all parking to minimise visibility from the street?	Yes	Parking located at the rear of the site where it's not visible 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	The front/back orientation has been retained along the street frontage. The orientation of the remainder of the dwellings are 90 degrees to this to take advantage of the rectilinear shape of the site
4.02 Be particularly sensitive to privacy impacts where dwellings must be oriented at 90 degrees to the existing pattern of development?	Yes	DCP compliant setbacks are maintained to the northern boundary
4.03 Set upper storeys back behind the side or rear building line?	Yes	The upper floor complies with DCP setback for the second floor. The effect of the stepped upper form is achieved through the stepping of the upper roof and upper parts of the common walls
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	Roof forms are broken up by party wall parapets
4.05 Incorporate second stories within the roof space and provide dormer windows?	N/A	Locating second storeys within the roof space and using dormer windows is not common practice in the streetscape.
4.06 Offset openings from existing neighbouring windows or doors?	Yes	Proposed openings are offset from the neighbouring openings and their location comply with relevant codes and NCC standards.
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	The length of the walls built to setbacks has been reduced by introducing openings, balconies and awnings

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	Proposed landscaping provides a buffer between new development and existing buildings to the rear and side. Ref. Landscape drawings
--	-----	--

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
4.09 Locate deep soil zones where they will be provide privacy and shade for adjacent dwellings?	Yes	Majority of deep soil has been located to the southern side of the site to provide privacy and shade.
4.10 Plant in side and rear setbacks for privacy and shade for adjoining dwellings?	Yes	Majority of deep soil has been located to the southern side and towards the centre of the site to provide privacy and shade.
4.11 Use species that are characteristic to the local area for new planting?	Yes	The proposed new species are consistent with the surrounding landscaping. Refer Landscape plan

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	The proposal complies with minimum required side and rear setbacks. There is no detrimental impact of overshadowing of living areas and private open space of neighbouring dwellings. The proposal is set back from the neighbouring boundary to the North by min. 3m and to the West by min. 3m. These separations are sufficient for maintaining sun access and ventilation to the neighbouring buildings.
4.13 Design dwellings so that they do not directly overlook neighbours' private open space or look into existing dwellings?	No	The landscaping buffer zone to north is proposed to ensure adequate screening and no direct overlooking into existing properties.
4.14 Locate private open space in front setbacks where possible to minimise negative impacts on neighbours?	Yes/No	Private open spaces are located at the front and side of two dwellings. The private open spaces of the remaining six dwellings are screened from neighbours on the northern boundary by planting buffer as well as a 1.8m high boundary fence that is densely slatted.
4.15 Ensure private open space is not adjacent to quiet neighbouring uses, e.g. bedrooms?	Yes	Private open space of each dwelling is separated from the other dwellings by planting buffer and fences and is not located in proximity of quiet uses on adjacent sites.
4.16 Design dwellings around internal courtyards?	Yes	
4.17 Provide adequate screening for private open space areas?	Yes	Screening provided in the form of 1.5m slatted metal fences in the front setback and 1.8m boundary fences to the sides.
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	Proposed side setbacks are complying with minimum setbacks required. The planting buffer zone to the south and landscape screening along the northern boundary provide privacy and soften the visual impact of new development

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	Planting buffer proposed along the driveway to reduce noise and visual impact
4.20 Position driveways so as to be a buffer between	No	The driveway has been centrally located to minimise

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
new and existing adjacent dwellings?		the visual impact of the proposal

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	The building form has been carefully manipulated to maximise northern sunlight into apartments. All eight dwellings are orientated to maximise solar access to living areas and private open space. 87.5% (7) of dwellings achieve minimum of 3 hours solar access to living areas and public open spaces on 21 June.
5.02 Provide dwellings with a sense of identity through building articulation, roof form and other architectural elements?	Yes	The proposal consists of eight dwellings contained in two built forms. The site is a rectilinear lot, with 2 dwellings addressing the street directly. The remaining dwellings are accessed via shared pedestrian/vehicular circulation zone. Private open spaces and balconies are logically placed, clearly indicating threshold between common and private areas.
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	Buffer landscaping proposed between driveway and dwellings to the north.
5.04 Use trees, vegetation, fences, or screening devices to establish curtilages for individual dwellings in villa or townhouse style developments?	Yes	Fences and landscaping proposed to create private zones/curtilages for individual dwellings at ground floor.
5.05 Have dwelling entries that are clear and identifiable from the street or driveway?	Yes	The main entries to dwellings are clearly defined. Two front townhouses address Gordon Ave directly, with the remaining dwellings being accessible via clearly defined circulation zones.
5.06 Provide a buffer between public/communal open space and private dwellings?	Yes	Landscaping and slatted fences provide clear division between public and private open spaces.
5.07 Provide a sense of address for each dwelling?	Yes	Each dwelling has its own clearly identifiable entry zone from the main street or pedestrian footpath crossing the site.
5.08 Orientate dwelling entries to not look directly into other dwellings?	Yes	None of the dwelling entry looks directly into other dwelling.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
--	--------------------------------------	---------------------------

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	Northern dwellings (TH2-TH8) living spaces and bedrooms are located away from driveway and separated from parking zone by planting and fencing Eastern single dwelling is separated from the driveway and parking areas by planting buffers and fences. The bedroom and living spaces are not looking directly into driveway.
5.10 Avoid large uninterrupted areas of hard surface?	Yes	Hard surface of the parking area and access driveway is considered necessary and acceptable. The surface parking has been efficiently designed to the relevant standards to reduce its area as much as practicable.
5.11 Screen parking from views and outlooks from dwellings?	Yes	Parking screened from views by planting buffer. Rear parking not visible from the public street.
Reduce the dominance of areas for vehicular circulation and parking by: 5.12 Considering single rather than double width driveways?	Yes	Single width driveway proposed and endorsed by traffic engineer.
5.13 Use communal car courts rather than individual garages?	Yes	Surface parking proposed, no individual garages.
Reduce the dominance of areas for vehicular circulation and parking by considering: 5.14 Single rather than double garages?	N/A	No individual garages proposed.
5.15 Communal car courts rather than individual garages?	Yes	Surface parking proposed, no individual garages.
5.16 Tandem parking or a single garage with single car port in tandem?	N/A	Surface parking proposed with five individual parking spaces
5.17 Providing some dwellings without any car parking for residents without cars?	Yes	Five parking spaces proposed to be distributed between eight units as required.

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?	No	Due to the site constraints- namely necessity to protect existing tree- the hard surfaces must be limited to the bare minimum. Therefore, shared pedestrian and vehicular accessway has been proposed. The shared path is fully wheelchair accessible.
5.19 Provide pedestrian routes to all public and semi-public areas?	Yes	Public, accessible pathway provided to all common areas

Design Issues / Design Principles 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	All spaces are logically and efficiently designed to provide clear distinction between public and private.
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	All spaces within the building and outside have been efficiently designed to not include blind or dark spaces
5.22 Clearly define thresholds between public and private spaces?	Yes	Threshold between public and private is clearly defined by logical design, landscaping buffer zones and fencing
5.23 Provide private open space that is generous in proportion and adjacent to the main living areas of the dwelling?	Yes	Individual large terraces adjacent to the main living areas provide a generosity of space for each dwelling
5.24 Provide private open space area that are orientated predominantly to the north, east or west to provide solar access?	Yes	Private open spaces orientated to the North for seven dwellings, one dwelling has Private open space orientated to the East. 100% of dwellings achieve minimum of 3 hours solar access to public open spaces on 21 June.
5.25 Provide private open space areas that comprise multiple spaces for larger dwellings?	Yes	Ground floor private open spaces comprise smaller spaces such as terraces and landscaped areas for two front dwellings.
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	The 1.5m fences screening the private open spaces of the two front dwellings have been designed as having angled slats to provide privacy and allow for the surveillance of the street and communal areas at the same time. Six other dwellings don't have private open spaces located adjacent to public or communal areas.
5.27 Provide private open space areas that are both paved and planted when located at ground level?	Yes	Private open spaces at the ground floor have been divided into smaller spaces of soft landscaping and paved areas/terraces.
5.28 Provide private open space areas that retain existing vegetation where practical?	No	New landscaping is proposed to provide the opportunity for a breathable space embracing the sunlight and enhancing passive surveillance.
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?	No	Access requirements are limiting the materials palette choices, and therefore impervious treatment is considered acceptable. Stormwater run-off has been carefully considered and designed across the entirety of the site, taking into consideration all private and public spaces
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?	N/A	Communal landscaped area and parking at the rear/centre of the site is easily accessible for all dwellings
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	Yes	Individual bin areas are adequately screened with 1.2m high slat fences and vegetation. Switchboards integrated into building design and discretely located in cupboards along the accessible footpath at the site entry.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
to any private or communal open space?		

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:	Dean Dempsey
Capacity/Qualifications:	Architectural Technician
Firm:	Stanton Dahl Architects
Signature:	
Date:	27/9/23