

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

Checklist of design principles and better practices

Guide notes:

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 395-397, DP 702896
Street Address	25-29 Prospero Street
Suburb / Postcode	Maryland, 2287

PROPOSAL DETAILS:

Activity Type (tick box):

Single dwelling	<input type="checkbox"/>	Seniors housing	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dual occupancy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Demolition	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Multi dwelling housing (villas/townhouses)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tree removal	<input checked="" 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 [Delete whichever is not applicable]	<input type="checkbox"/>
Manor houses	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Activity Description (please provide summary description):

- Construction of General Housing Development – 9 Townhouses; 3x 3 Bed, 5x 2 Bed, 1x 1 Bed

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 / No or N/A	All setbacks, building height and massing have been designed in accordance with Newcastle DCP.
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 / No	A block analysis has been undertaken in order to ensure that this development is suitable as per the surrounding properties.
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	Yes / No or N/A	The development is consistent with the surrounding dwellings. Heights of the two storey townhouses were staggered to follow the slope of the site and retain a visual height consistency along the streetscape.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
building types be further developed or discouraged?		
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 proposed landscape plans propose indigenous trees and shrubs reflecting those in the area and in accordance with Newcastle DCP.
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	Both the council's LEP & DCP have been considered regarding setbacks & building heights. This particular development is designed in accordance with SEPP requirements.

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	The site analysis depicts this development alongside its neighbouring properties as well as showing all existing streetscape elements.
1.07 Patterns of driveways and vehicular crossings	Yes / No or N/A	The proposed driveway crossovers and patterns are consistent with the surrounding area.
1.08 Existing vegetation and natural features on the site	Yes / No or N/A	The selected trees are depicted on the plan and will be retained. Other existing vegetation will be replaced as per the landscape plans provided.
1.09 Existing pattern of buildings and open space on adjoining lots	Yes / No or N/A	The street frontage of the proposed development has been designed to limit massing thus keeping it consistent with the surrounding streetscape.
1.10 Potential impact on privacy for, or overshadowing of, existing adjacent dwellings.	Yes / No or N/A	Impacts on privacy have been minimised as much as possible on this site through internal and boundary fencing. Overshadowing is not an issue as blocks are oriented, so shadows cast over neighbours are marginal.

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	The units in this development are designed with private open spaces. Impacts on privacy have been minimised as much as possible on this site, with the use of internal and boundary fencing.
2.02 Provide a mix of dwelling sizes and dwellings both with and without carparking?	Yes / No or N/A	1, 2, & 3 bed units have been provided. Parking spots are not specifically allocated to a unit.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
2.03 Provide variety in massing and scale of build form within the development?	Yes / No or N/A	Material design and architectural articulation ensure a variety in massing on site.
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	Two storey massing has been proposed along the street frontage.
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	Buildings are located to the front part of the site. The rear of the site is allocated for parking and deep soil landscaping.
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	Where possible, all units have been orientated to gain maximum solar access in the living areas and private open spaces.
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	Existing street trees will be retained in this development. New trees will also be planted to minimise impact of proposed development.
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	Some trees at the middle of this site have been removed, however we will be proposing new trees at the rear of the site to minimise the impact of the development on the neighbouring property.
2.09 Retain large or otherwise significant trees on other parts of the site through sensitive site planning?	Yes / No or N/A	Existing street trees will be retained in this development.
2.10 Where not possible to retain existing trees, replace with new mature or semi-mature trees?	Yes / No or N/A	Semi-mature trees and new planting is proposed as per the landscape plan provided.
2.11 Increase the width of landscaped areas between driveways and boundary fences and between driveways and new dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	Due to site constraints we have minimum 600mm landscaped area between driveways and new dwellings.
2.12 Provide pedestrian paths?	Yes / No or N/A	All units have a private path entry.
2.13 Reduce the width of driveways?	Yes / No or N/A	All driveways have been design at minimum width.
2.14 Provide additional private open space above the minimum requirements?	Yes / No or N/A	Additional private open space above the minimum requirements has been provided where possible.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
2.15 Provide communal open space?	Yes / No or N/A	Communal open space has not been provided as each unit has been designed with their own private courtyard.
2.16 Increase front, rear and/or side setbacks?	Yes / No or N/A	The proposed front setback is lower than the existing street frontage average. Council has permitted to use the proposed shorter front setback dimension. The proposed side and rear setbacks are higher than the minimum required by Newcastle DCP.
2.17 Provide small landscaped areas between garages, dwellings entries, pedestrian paths, driveways etc.	Yes / No or N/A	Landscape strips have been provided adjacent to driveways and pedestrian pathways.
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	22% of the site area is deep soil, most of which has been provided to the rear of site.
2.19 Replicate an existing pattern of deep soil planting on the front of the site?	Yes / No or N/A	A deep soil zone has been provided in the front setback to allow for large and mature planting.
2.20 Use semi-pervious materials for driveways, paths and other paved areas?	Yes / No or N/A	LAHC Design Requirements entail the use concrete for driveways and parking areas.
2.21 Use on-site detention to retain stormwater on site for re-use?	Yes / No or N/A	On-site detention and central rainwater tank has been proposed within the development.

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	Common parking area is located to the rear of the site.
2.23 Maintain, where possible, existing crossings and driveway locations on the street?	Yes / No or N/A	All existing driveways will be demolished, and new driveways will be proposed.

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	The proposed building's position, height and separation are adjusted to be consistent with those in the surrounding area.
---	----------------------------	---

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
3.02 Provide a front setback that relates to adjoining development?	Yes / No or N/A	Proposed setbacks are closer to the front boundary than those of the existing adjoining properties.

Built form

Does the site planning and design:

3.03 Break up the building massing and articulate building facades?	Yes / No or N/A	The building façade utilises a variety of different materials to allow for variation.
3.04 Allow breaks in rows of attached dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	The buildings are broken into modules to allow a less linear appearance.
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	The building facade proposes a mix of face brickwork, and metal wall cladding allowing scale and proportions to respond to the desired contextual character.
3.06 Set back upper levels behind the front building façade?	Yes / No or N/A	Upper levels have articulations to break the façade.
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	Second storeys are not within the roof space.
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	Each block has their own roof to break up the massing and reduce apparent bulk and visual impact.
3.09 Use a roof pitch sympathetic to that of existing buildings in the street?	Yes / No or N/A	Roof pitches match or are shallower than the surrounding roofs creating sympathy.
3.10 Avoid uninterrupted building facades including large areas of painted render?	Yes / No or N/A	The building facade proposes a mix of face brickwork, and metal wall cladding, with architectural elements to provide variation in the building facades.

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 planting will be provided in the front setback as per the landscape plan provided.
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	Front fencing have been offset from the site boundary to allow for low planting in front of it.

Residential amenity

Does the site planning and design:

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
3.13 Clearly design open space in the front setback as either private or communal open space?	Yes / No or N/A	The open space in the front setback is allocated for landscaping and deep soil.
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	Private spaces have been distinguished using fencing and screen landscaping elements.
3.15 Design dwellings at the front of the site to address the street?	Yes / No or N/A	Dwellings with frontage to the street have been designed to address the street with entries and individual pathways.
3.16 Design pedestrian entries, where possible, directly off the street?	Yes / No or N/A	Unit 8 & 9 have direct pedestrian entry off the street. Other units entries are coming from common pathways.
3.17 Provide a pedestrian entry for rear residents that is separate from vehicular entries?	Yes / No or N/A	All units have entries coming off the street either directly or from common pathways.
3.18 Design front fences that provide privacy where necessary, but also allow for surveillance of the street?	Yes / No or N/A	A 1.2m average height front fence with planting in front has been provided. Buildings are higher from the street level due to existing site conditions.
3.19 Ensure that new front fences have a consistent character with front fences in the street?	Yes / No or N/A	The front fencing of the development has been designed to match those similar to this area to fit in well in the streetscape.
3.20 Orientate mailboxes obliquely to the street to reduce visual clutter and the perception of multiple dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	This is not necessary as the letterboxes for this development have been split into 2 sets thereby reducing visual impact.
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	Bin storages have been incorporated onto the front fence to minimise visual impact.

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	Driveway is designed with minimum length and slope required to access the rear common parking area.
3.23 Set back garages behind the predominant building line to reduce their visibility from the street?	Yes / No or N/A	Not applicable to this development.
3.24 Consider alternative site designs that avoid driveways running the length of the site?	Yes / No or N/A	Driveways is just at the minimum required length and slope. Landscaped areas assist in breaking up the massing of the driveway visually.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
3.25 Terminate vistas with trees, vegetation, open space or a dwelling rather than garages or parking?	Yes / No or N/A	Not applicable to this development.
3.26 Use planting to soften driveway edges?	Yes / No or N/A	Landscape strips are provided along the sides of driveways to soften driveway edges. Refer to landscape plans provided.
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	Driveways are short and does not warrant a change in driveway material.
3.28 Limit driveway widths on narrow sites to single carriage with passing points?	Yes / No or N/A	Minimum driveway width has been provided.
3.29 Provide gates at the head of driveways to minimise visual 'pull' of the driveway?	Yes / No or N/A	Providing gates at driveway entrances is not supported by LAHC Design Requirements as they pose maintenance issues.
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	Not applicable to this development.
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	Not applicable to this development.
3.32 Recess the driveway entry to basement car parking from the main building façade?	Yes / No or N/A	Not applicable to this development.
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	Not applicable to this development.
3.34 Provide security doors to basement carparking to avoid the appearance of a 'black hole' in the streetscape?	Yes / No or N/A	Not applicable to this development.
3.35 Return façade material into the visible area of the basement car park entry?	Yes / No or N/A	Not applicable to this development.
3.36 Locate or screen all parking to minimise visibility from the street?	Yes / No or N/A	Parking is located at the rear of the site and 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 / No or N/A	The middle block is oriented toward the street. The side blocks entry are not facing the street.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
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	Private open spaces of the side blocks are facing neighbouring properties. Additional internal fencing added to prevent overlooking onto neighbours.
4.03 Set upper storeys back behind the side or rear building line?	Yes / No or N/A	Buildings are located to the front part of the site.
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	Each block have their own roof to break up the massing and reduce apparent bulk and visual impact.
4.05 Incorporate second stories within the roof space and provide dormer windows?	Yes / No or N/A	High maintenance and cost issues.
4.06 Offset openings from existing neighbouring windows or doors?	Yes / No or N/A	Openings on this development that are orientated to adjoining properties are offset from the existing neighbouring windows and doors.
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	All walls have been designed with architectural articulation and elements to reduce the appearance of unrelieved walls.
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	New planting has been proposed to provide a buffer between new and existing dwellings as per the landscape plans provided.
4.09 Locate deep soil zones where they will be provide privacy and shade for adjacent dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	Deep soil zones have been provided in positions that will provide privacy for adjacent dwellings. Refer to landscape plans provided.
4.10 Plant in side and rear setbacks for privacy and shade for adjoining dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	New planting will be provided in positions that will provide privacy for adjacent dwellings. Refer to landscape plans provided.
4.11 Use species that are characteristic to the local area for new planting?	Yes / No or N/A	Indigenous and local planting has been proposed. Refer to landscape plans provided.
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	Buildings have sufficient spacing between them thus allowing most units to achieve the minimum

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
		requirements for solar access to both living areas and private open spaces.
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	The rear part of the side blocks are facing neighbouring properties. Additional internal fencing added to prevent overlooking onto neighbours.
4.14 Locate private open space in front setbacks where possible to minimise negative impacts on neighbours?	Yes / No or N/A	The open space in the front setback is allocated for landscaping and deep soil.
4.15 Ensure private open space is not adjacent to quiet neighbouring uses, e.g. bedrooms?	Yes / No or N/A	The private open spaces of the side blocks are facing the adjoining properties.
4.16 Design dwellings around internal courtyards?	Yes / No or N/A	The dwellings are designed around internal private open spaces.
4.17 Provide adequate screening for private open space areas?	Yes / No or N/A	All private open space areas have been enclosed by minimum 1.8m high fences and landscaped elements.
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 for private open space are used.

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	Landscaping has been proposed to buffer noise and views along the side boundaries and driveways. Refer to landscape plans provided.
4.20 Position driveways so as to be a buffer between new and existing adjacent dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	Driveway is located along the middle of the site.

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	The development achieves the minimum requirements for solar access. Refer to solar access table on shadow diagrams.
5.02 Provide dwellings with a sense of identity through building articulation, roof form and other architectural elements?	Yes / No or N/A	Each unit has been designed architecturally to have distinct separated entries and features.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
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 separation exists between driveways and private open spaces. Communal space is not provided as part of this development.
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	New landscaped areas define the curtilage of each unit as per landscape plans provided.
5.05 Have dwelling entries that are clear and identifiable from the street or driveway?	Yes / No or N/A	The entries have been designed to be clear and identifiable from the street or driveway.
5.06 Provide a buffer between public/communal open space and private dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	Individual private open space for each unit is enclosed within their own privacy screens via fencing and landscaped elements.
5.07 Provide a sense of address for each dwelling?	Yes / No or N/A	Each block has been designed architecturally to have distinct separated entries.
5.08 Orientate dwelling entries to not look directly into other dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	The side blocks entries are facing sides of the middle block.


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	Common parking area is located to the rear of the site.
5.10 Avoid large uninterrupted areas of hard surface?	Yes / No or N/A	All driveway and hard-stand surfaces have been designed to minimum allowable size restrictions. Landscape strips and vegetation provided along the sides of driveways.
5.11 Screen parking from views and outlooks from dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	Screen fencing facing the common parking is introduced to the rear POS of the middle block.
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 driveway width has been minimised where possible and landscaping is used to further break up the dominance of the driveway.
5.13 Use communal car courts rather than individual garages?	Yes / No or N/A	Common parking area is introduced to the development.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
Reduce the dominance of areas for vehicular circulation and parking by considering: 5.14 Single rather than double garages?	Yes / No or N/A	Not applicable to this development.
5.15 Communal car courts rather than individual garages?	Yes / No or N/A	Common parking area is introduced to the development.
5.16 Tandem parking or a single garage with single car port in tandem?	Yes / No or N/A	Not applicable to this development.
5.17 Providing some dwellings without any car parking for residents without cars?	Yes / No or N/A	No permanently allocated parking spots to the 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	Separate pedestrian and vehicular circulation has been provided on site.
5.19 Provide pedestrian routes to all public and semi-public areas?	Yes / No or N/A	Concrete paths have been provided for pedestrian circulation.
5.20 Avoid ambiguous spaces in building and dwelling entries that are not obviously designated as public or private?	Yes / No or N/A	No ambiguous space has been left open in this development.
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	All public spaces have been designed as wide and open as possible and all have casual surveillance to the street.
5.22 Clearly define thresholds between public and private spaces?	Yes / No or N/A	All private open space areas have been enclosed by a minimum 1.8m high fences and landscaped 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 private courtyard areas open directly from either the living room or dining room.
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	The side blocks and Unit 8 have and east/west private open space orientation. Unit 9 has a south facing private open space.
5.25 Provide private open space areas that comprise multiple spaces for larger dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	Not applicable to this development.
5.26 Provide private open space areas that use screening for privacy but also allow casual	Yes / No or N/A	Slatted fences with minimum 1.8m height are introduced to private open spaces to allow for casual surveillance.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
surveillance when 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 / No or N/A	All units have an area of hard-stand surface for clothes lines etc, as well as landscape areas.
5.28 Provide private open space areas that retain existing vegetation where practical?	Yes / No or N/A	This is not possible due to site constraints so we will be replacing trees with new ones as per the landscape plan provided.
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	No pervious pavers used on private open 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?	Yes / No or N/A	Communal space is not provided as per LAHC brief for maintenance issues.
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	The garbage storage areas have been located behind the front fencing in order to reduce visual impact from the street.

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:	Michael Padre
Capacity/Qualifications:	Graduate of Architecture
Firm:	Stanton Dahl Architects
Signature:	
Date:	19 May 2023