# 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) | **Lot 141, 142 DP 35087** |
| Street Address | **47-49 Curry Street** |
| Suburb / Postcode | **Wallsend 2287** |
| PROPOSAL DETAILS: |
| Activity Type (tick box): |
| Single dwelling | □ | **Seniors housing** | □ |
| Dual occupancy | □ | **Demolition** | **✓** |
| Multi dwelling housing (villas/townhouses) | □ | **Tree removal** | □ |
| Multi dwelling housing (terraces) | □ | **Subdivision – Torrens title** | □ |
| Residential flat building | **✓** | **Subdivision – Strata title / Community title** [Delete whichever is not applicable] | □ |
| Manor houses | □ |  |  |
| Activity Description (please provide summary description): |
| Demolition of two detached dwellings and construction of a two storey residential flat building consisting of 9 units over two storeys. |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

| **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. **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 façade is designed to break down the scale of the two-storey development to be more compatible with the local context which is predominately single storey residential detached dwellings. |
| * 1. **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 | Yes. Façade is broken down into smaller components to break down scale of two storey building as the context is predominately single storey. |
| * 1. **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  | Yes, simple roof forms such as skillion and gable roof forms are proposed. |
| * 1. **Trees** – do trees and planting in the proposed development reflect trees and landscapes in the neighbourhood or street?
 | Yes  | Plant species have been selected to provide privacy and amenity to the development and surrounding residents. The trees and landscapes proposed are a mix of natives and exotics to reflect the existing landscape in the locality.  |
| * 1. **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 overall design has been established by understanding the constraints outlined in Newcastle LEP, DCP & Housing SEPP. |
| **Site analysis**Does the site analysis include: |
| * 1. Existing streetscape elements and the existing pattern of development as perceived from the street
 | Yes | The front elevation that addresses Curry Street has been designed to break down the scale of the two-storey development to be more compatible with the local context which is predominately single storey residential detached dwellings. |
| * 1. Patterns of driveways and vehicular crossings
 | Yes | The driveway has been located along the side boundary which is typical of the surrounding context.  |
| * 1. Existing vegetation and natural features on the site
 | N/A | There are no existing trees on site but all attempts have been made to ensure surrounding trees adjacent to the subject development are retained.  |
| * 1. Existing pattern of buildings and open space on adjoining lots
 | Yes | The building form is broken up to maximise amenity, avoid long uninterrupted walls, and provide open space for tenants.  |
| * 1. Potential impact on privacy for, or overshadowing of, existing adjacent dwellings.
 | Yes | Building mass has been designed to minimise overlooking impacts to neighbours, particularly the eastern neighbour. The massing towards the south east quadrant of the site is only single storey.  |
| **2. Site Planning and Design** |
| **General**Does the site planning and design: |
| * 1. Optimise internal amenity and minimise impacts on neighbours?
 | Yes  | Yes, site is accessed centrally with driveway down the side to minimise impact to neighbour on west.  |
| * 1. Provide a mix of dwelling sizes and dwellings both with and without carparking?
 | Yes | There are four 1 beds and five 2 beds proposed. On grade carparking spaces provided as per required parking rates which result in five spaces for 9 dwellings.  |
| * 1. Provide variety in massing and scale of build form within the development?
 | Yes | Yes, the building provides a variety in massing and scale to maximise cross ventilation, solar access, and balancing with privacy impacts to the neighbours. This avoids large bulky forms and unarticulated walls, ensuring that the development is in keeping with the single storey detached dwelling locality.  |
| **Built form**Does the site planning and design: |
| * 1. Locate the bulk of development towards the front of the site to maximise the number of dwellings with frontage the public street?
 | Yes | Yes, bulk of development is located at front of site with carparking at rear. This ensures that out of the 9 dwellings, there are six dwellings addressing the street.  |
| * 1. Have developments more modest in scale towards the rear of the site to limit impacts on adjoining neighbours?
 | Yes | The development steps down in height to the rear of the site to limit impacts on adjoining neighbours, particularly the eastern neighbour.  |
| * 1. 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 | All efforts have been made to maximise solar compliance and 7/9 units achieve solar compliance which is above the minimum requirements.  |
| **Trees, landscaping and deep soil zones**Does the site planning and design: |
| * 1. Retain trees and planting on the street and in front setbacks to minimise the impact of new development on the streetscape?
 | Yes | There were no existing trees on subject sites but street trees have been retained.  |
| * 1. 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 | There were no existing trees on subject sites but street trees have been retained. |
| * 1. Retain large or otherwise significant trees on other parts of the site through sensitive site planning?
 | N/A | No existing trees on subject site. |
| * 1. Where not possible to retain existing trees, replace with new mature or semi-mature trees?
 | N/A | No existing trees on subject site however new canopy trees have been provided along the front elevation to provide privacy for the north facing tenants.  |
| * 1. Increase the width of landscaped areas between driveways and boundary fences and between driveways and new dwellings?
 | Yes  | Yes, planting buffer is located either side of driveway.  |
| * 1. Provide pedestrian paths?
 | Yes | Pedestrian paths are provided including accessible paths of travel. Main pedestrian path is clearly defined with low height walls in red brick that ties into the lobby external wall materiality. |
| * 1. Reduce the width of driveways?
 | Yes  | Driveways are designed to comply with traffic engineer’s requirements with the aim to reduce the width as much as possible.  |
| * 1. Provide additional private open space above the minimum requirements?
 | Yes | Additional POS areas are provided where possible. . |
| * 1. Provide communal open space?
 | Yes  | Communal open space minimum area cannot be achieved due to site constraints and brief. However, there is ample private POS and landscaped areas and all efforts have been made to maximise communal open space.  |
| * 1. Increase front, rear and/or side setbacks?
 | Yes  | Setbacks minimums have been met with slight encroachment to street setback to achieve façade articulation.  |
| * 1. Provide small landscaped areas between garages, dwellings entries, pedestrian paths, driveways etc.
 | Yes  | Small landscaped areas have been provided between dwelling entries, pedestrian paths, and driveways. These areas are in low maintained, not turf, to reduce maintenance requirements for tenants. Each tenant’s POS on the ground floor have a combination of landscape and hardscape.  |
| * 1. 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  | Deep soil area is provided in several locations with 206 sq.m provided in deep soil (184 sq.m is minimum)  |
| * 1. Replicate an existing pattern of deep soil planting on the front of the site?
 | Yes  | Deep soil has been provided at the front of the site where possible.  |
| * 1. Use semi-pervious materials for driveways, paths and other paved areas?
 | No  | Concrete driveways, paved areas and paths have been proposed for maintenance reasons.  |
| * 1. Use on-site detention to retain stormwater on site for re-use?
 | Yes  | Yes, there is an on site detention tank under the driveway with a rainwater tank for rainwater re-use.  |
| **Parking, garaging and vehicular circulation**Does the site planning and design: |
| * 1. Consider centralised parking in car courts to reduce the amount of space occupied by driveways, garages and approaches to garages?
 | Yes | Yes, on grade parking has been located at rear of site and the design ensures that cars are not visible from street.  |
| * 1. Maintain, where possible, existing crossings and driveway locations on the street?
 | Yes | Yes, the existing crossover has been maintained.  |
| **3. Impacts on Streetscape** |
| **General**Does the site planning and design: |
| * 1. Sympathise with the building and existing streetscape patterns? (i.e. siting, height, separation, driveways locations, pedestrian entries etc.)
 | Yes | Yes, building is located towards the front of site with driveway down side to minimise impacts of neighbours.  |
| * 1. Provide a front setback that relates to adjoining development?
 | Yes | Yes, the front setback is largely consistent with the adjoining neighbours. Maximum effort has been made to keep to the prevailing front setback however articulation has been proposed to the 1F balconies that encroaches on the setback.  |
| **Built form**Does the site planning and design: |
| * 1. Break up the building massing and articulate building facades?
 | Yes | The façade is designed to break down the scale of the two-storey development to be more compatible with the local context which is predominately single storey residential detached dwellings. |
| * 1. Allow breaks in rows of attached dwellings?
 | Yes  | The lobby is located centrally to break down the two halves of the buildings.  |
| * 1. Use a variation in materials, colours and openings to order building facades with scale and proportions that respond to the desired contextual character?
 | Yes  | Simple materials have been chosen to reflect the context, such as face brick, corrugated metal roofing, and FC cladding.  |
| * 1. Set back upper levels behind the front building façade?
 | No | Due to the yield and site constraints this was not possible, however, all efforts have been made to reduce the bulk of scale of the front façade, by articulating it with 1F cantilevering balconies and varying materials.  |
| * 1. 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 | The existing streetscape does not have any second storey buildings.  |
| * 1. Reduce the apparent bulk and visual impact of the building by breaking down the roof into smaller roof elements?
 | Yes | The proposed design breaks down the roof into smaller roof elements with a combination of skillion and gable roof forms. The stepped nature of the façade further reduces the visual impact from the street scape.  |
| * 1. Use a roof pitch sympathetic to that of existing buildings in the street?
 | Yes | Yes, gable roofs are proposed to reflect the existing streetscape which is primarily gable roofs with some hip roofs.  |
| * 1. Avoid uninterrupted building facades including large areas of painted render?
 | Yes | No painted render proposed and a mix of materials have been proposed.  |
| **Trees, landscaping and deep soil zones**Does the site planning and design: |
| * 1. Use new planting in the front setback and road reserve where it is not possible or not desirable to retain existing trees/planting?
 | Yes | New planting has been proposed in the front setback including canopy trees.  |
| * 1. Plant in front of front fences to reduce their impact and improve the quality of the public domain?
 | Yes | Planting has been proposed in front of front fences to reduce their impact.  |
| **Residential amenity**Does the site planning and design: |
| * 1. Clearly design open space in the front setback as either private or communal open space?
 | Yes  | Front setback areas are clearly defined as privacy open space for the north facing tenants.  |
| * 1. Define the threshold between public and private space by level change, change in materials, fencing, planting and/or signage?
 | Yes  | The lobby and the entry sequence are proposed to be in a red brick which is clearly different from the private tenants’ entry paths.  |
| * 1. Design dwellings at the front of the site to address the street?
 | Yes | 6 out of 9 dwellings have been designed to address the street.  |
| * 1. Design pedestrian entries, where possible, directly off the street?
 | Yes  | Street facing tenants on the ground floor have direct pedestrian entries.  |
| * 1. Provide a pedestrian entry for rear residents that is separate from vehicular entries?
 | Yes  | Rear residents’ entry are accessed via the lobby which is separate from the vehicular entry.  |
| * 1. Design front fences that provide privacy where necessary, but also allow for surveillance of the street?
 | Yes  | Front fences on the GF are proposed to be in a palisade fence to provide privacy but also allow surveillance of the street. Planting Infront of the fencing further adds to the privacy and improves the street appearance of the proposed development.  |
| * 1. Ensure that new front fences have a consistent character with front fences in the street?
 | Yes  | Open palisade fencing is proposed which is consistent with the streetscape including surrounding streets.  |
| * 1. Orientate mailboxes obliquely to the street to reduce visual clutter and the perception of multiple dwellings?
 | No  | Letterboxes have been integrated into the design of the front fence and is sensitive to the streetscape.  |
| * 1. Locate and treat garbage storage areas and switchboards so that their visual impact on the public domain is minimised?
 | Yes  | Yes, bin store has been discretely located at the rear of site away from public view. Switchboards and metres have been located where possible away from public view.  |
| **Parking, garaging and vehicular circulation**Does the site planning and design: |
| * 1. Vary the alignment of driveways to avoid a ‘gun barrel’ effect?
 | No  | Not possible due to site constraints, however, we have achieved SLUDG intent of not seeing cars down the driveway when standing on the street. Landscaping has been proposed at the rear boundary so that the view down the driveway terminates with landscaping.  |
| * 1. Set back garages behind the predominant building line to reduce their visibility from the street?
 | N/A | Garages not proposed.  |
| * 1. Consider alternative site designs that avoid driveways running the length of the site?
 | Yes  | Not possible due to site constraints, however, we have achieved SLUDG intent of not seeing cars down the driveway when standing on the street. Landscaping has been proposed at the rear boundary so that the view down the driveway terminates with landscaping.  |
| * 1. Terminate vistas with trees, vegetation, open space or a dwelling rather than garages or parking?
 | Yes  | Yes, driveway is designed to terminate with landscaping.  |
| * 1. Use planting to soften driveway edges?
 | Yes  | Yes, strips of landscaping have been proposed either side of the driveway.  |
| * 1. Vary the driveway surface material to break it up into a series of smaller spaces? (e.g. to delineate individual dwellings)
 | No | Concrete driveway proposed for ease of maintenance.  |
| * 1. Limit driveway widths on narrow sites to single carriage with passing points?
 | Yes  | Yes, the proposed driveway is a single carriage. No passing points are required based on the length of the driveway.  |
| * 1. Provide gates at the head of driveways to minimise visual ‘pull’ of the driveway?
 | No | Driveway gate not part of brief and is not consistent with the character of the locality.  |
| * 1. Reduce the width where possible to single width driveways at the entry to basement carparking rather than double?
 | N/A | Basement parking not proposed.  |
| * 1. Locate the driveway entry to basement carparking to one side rather than the centre where it is visually prominent?
 | N/A | Basement parking not proposed.  |
| * 1. Recess the driveway entry to basement car parking from the main building façade?
 | N/A | Basement parking not proposed.  |
| * 1. Where a development has a secondary street frontage, provide vehicular access to basement car parking from the secondary street?
 | N/A | Development does not have a secondary street frontage.  |
| * 1. Provide security doors to basement carparking to avoid the appearance of a ‘black hole’ in the streetscape?
 | N/A | Basement parking not proposed.  |
| * 1. Return façade material into the visible area of the basement car park entry?
 | N/A | Basement parking not proposed.  |
| * 1. Locate or screen all parking to minimise visibility from the street?
 | Yes | Cars are not visible from the street with the proposed arrangement of carparking and driveway.  |
| **4. Impacts on Neighbours** |
| **Built form**Does the site planning and design: |
| * 1. Where possible, maintain the existing orientation of dwelling ‘fronts’ and ‘backs’?
 | Yes  | Yes, balconies and POS to dwellings facing street have been designed to address the street. Six out of nine dwellings address the street.  |
| * 1. Be particularly sensitive to privacy impacts where dwellings must be oriented at 90 degrees to the existing pattern of development?
 | Yes  | Yes, buildings have been set back as much as possible from side boundaries.  |
| * 1. Set upper storeys back behind the side or rear building line?
 | Yes | Yes, upper storeys are set back behind the side or rear building line to mitigate privacy impacts to the adjoining neighbours.  |
| * 1. Reduce the visual bulk of roof forms by breaking down the roof into smaller elements rather than having a single uninterrupted roof structure?
 | Yes  | Yes, the façade is designed to break down the scale of the two-storey development to be more compatible with the local context which is predominately single storey residential detached dwellings. |
| * 1. Incorporate second stories within the roof space and provide dormer windows?
 | No | Dormer windows not compatible with local character.  |
| * 1. Offset openings from existing neighbouring windows or doors?
 | Yes  | Windows have been made smaller in size where adjoining neighbours to reduce privacy impacts. 1F living spaces are orientated to avoid looking to neighbours.  |
| * 1. Reduce the impact of unrelieved walls on narrow side and rear setbacks by limiting the length of the walls built to these setbacks?
 | Yes | Yes, walls are broken up by varying materials or providing articulation.  |
| **Trees, landscaping and deep soil zones**Does the site planning and design: |
| * 1. Use vegetation and mature planting to provide a buffer between new and existing dwellings?
 | Yes  | Yes, landscaping is used along boundaries to provide privacy to the east, west and south adjoining neighbours.  |
| * 1. Locate deep soil zones where they will be provide privacy and shade for adjacent dwellings?
 | Yes | Yes, deep soil zones have been provided to privacy particularly to the south and east adjoining neighbours.  |
| * 1. Plant in side and rear setbacks for privacy and shade for adjoining dwellings?
 | Yes  | Yes, planting has been proposed adjacent to all boundaries.  |
| * 1. Use species that are characteristic to the local area for new planting?
 | Yes | Yes, a mix of native and exotic species have been proposed to both reflect the existing locality and respond to the contemporary nature of the design.  |
| **Residential amenity**Does the site planning and design: |
| * 1. Protect sun access and ventilation to living areas and private open space of neighbouring dwellings by ensuring adequate building separation?
 | Yes | Yes, the massing of the development is such that it is only single storey in height towards the south east quadrant of the site to minimise shadow impacts to the south and east adjoining neighbours. The location of the driveway along the west boundary assists in providing a further setback at the west boundary.  |
| * 1. Design dwellings so that they do not directly overlook neighbours’ private open space or look into existing dwellings?
 | Yes | Yes, the massing of the development is such that it is only single storey in height towards the south east quadrant of the site to minimise privacy impacts to the south and east adjoining neighbours.  |
| * 1. Locate private open space in front setbacks where possible to minimise negative impacts on neighbours?
 | Yes / | POS have been located in front setbacks where possible and where not possible have been designed to minimise privacy impacts to the adjoining neighbours. On the 1F three out four POS face the street, with the remaining one facing the carpark, away from view of neighbours. A privacy screen has been provided to this POS to eliminate any overlooking issues to the south neighbour.  |
| * 1. Ensure private open space is not adjacent to quiet neighbouring uses, e.g. bedrooms?
 | Yes | The main POS of GF units do not directly face quiet neighbouring uses.  |
| * 1. Design dwellings around internal courtyards?
 | N/A | No internal courtyards proposed  |
| * 1. Provide adequate screening for private open space areas?
 | Yes | Yes, a combination of landscaping and privacy screens provide sufficient privacy for POS areas. On the 1F full height privacy screens are proposed to shield views from the clotheslines from street.  |
| * 1. 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 | Yes, POS is located along the east side setback on the GF and screen planting is proposed along that boundary.  |
| **Parking, garaging and vehicular circulation**Does the site planning and design: |
| * 1. Provide planting and trees between driveways and side fences to screen noise and reduce visual impacts?
 | Yes  | Yes, planting has been provided between driveways and side fences with tall planting adjacent to boundary fences to screen noise.  |
| * 1. Position driveways so as to be a buffer between new and existing adjacent dwellings?
 | Yes  | Yes, the driveway is located along the western boundary to further setback the proposed development from the west neighbour.  |
| **5. Internal Site Amenity** |
| **Built form**Does the site planning and design: |
| * 1. Maximise solar access to living areas and private open space areas of the dwelling?
 | Yes | Yes, units are designed to maximise solar access to living areas and POS. Six out of nine units face north and overall, 7/9 units comply with solar requirements which is above the minimum requirements.  |
| * 1. Provide dwellings with a sense of identity through building articulation, roof form and other architectural elements?
 | Yes  | The massing has been designed so that each dwelling is stepped to provide definition and articulation from the street.  |
| * 1. Provide buffer spaces and/or barriers between the dwellings and driveways or between dwellings and communal areas for villa or townhouse style developments?
 | N/A | This is not a villa or townhouse style development.  |
| * 1. Use trees, vegetation, fences, or screening devices to establish curtilages for individual dwellings in villa or townhouse style developments?
 | N/A | This is not a villa or townhouse style development. |
| * 1. Have dwelling entries that are clear and identifiable from the street or driveway?
 | Yes  | The main lobby and the entry sequence is proposed to be in a red brick which is clearly different from the private tenants. Private entries facing the street are defined differently as to not to confuse tenants with the main lobby entry.  |
| * 1. Provide a buffer between public/communal open space and private dwellings?
 | Yes  |  |
| * 1. Provide a sense of address for each dwelling?
 | Yes  | Yes, each GF street facing unit has their own private entry from the street.  |
| * 1. Orientate dwelling entries to not look directly into other dwellings?
 | Yes  | Yes, the massing of the development has been designed to minimise overlooking to adjoining dwellings. The bulk of the mass is located to the front of the site, with the single 1F dwelling at the rear located centrally to avoid privacy impacts to the east and west neighbour.  |
| **Parking, garaging and vehicular circulation**Does the site planning and design: |
| * 1. 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 | Yes, habitable rooms moved away from driveways as much as possible. Where not possible, window sills have been raised to avoid car lights.  |
| * 1. Avoid large uninterrupted areas of hard surface?
 | Yes  | Yes, hard surfaces are designed with landscaping in between to avoid large areas of hard surface. The driveway is bordered by landscaping to soften its edges.  |
| * 1. Screen parking from views and outlooks from dwellings?
 | Yes  | Yes, parking is screened from view as much as possible, or windows are raised to avoid car lights.  |
| Reduce the dominance of areas for vehicular circulation and parking by: * 1. Considering single rather than double width driveways?
 | Yes  | Yes, a single driveway has been provided which terminates with landscaping.  |
| * 1. Use communal car courts rather than individual garages?
 | Yes  | Yes, a communal car park has been provided at the rear of the site.  |
| Reduce the dominance of areas for vehicular circulation and parking by considering:* 1. Single rather than double garages?
 | N/A | No garages proposed  |
| * 1. Communal car courts rather than individual garages?
 | Yes | Yes, a communal car park has been provided at the rear of the site. |
| * 1. Tandem parking or a single garage with single car port in tandem?
 | N/A | No garages or carports proposed  |
| * 1. Providing some dwellings without any car parking for residents without cars?
 | Yes | A parking mix has been used so that there is a total of 5 car spaces for 9 dwellings.  |
| **Residential amenity**Does the site planning and design: |
| * 1. 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 | The driveway is located at the side boundary to the west and the main pedestrian entry to the lobby is located centrally. The lobby and the entry sequence is proposed to be in a red brick which is clearly different from the private tenants. |
| * 1. Provide pedestrian routes to all public and semi-public areas?
 | Yes | Yes, there are pedestrian routes to all pedestrian areas such as the lobby, bin store, and communal open areas.  |
| * 1. Avoid ambiguous spaces in building and dwelling entries that are not obviously designated as public or private?
 | Yes | Yes, the lobby and the entry sequence for the main pedestrian entry from the street is proposed to be in a red brick which is clearly different from the private tenants’ entry.  |
| * 1. 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 | Yes, all efforts have been made to maximise passive surveillance and reduce opportunities for concealment. The lobby has been designed to ensure there are as little blind corners as possible.  |
| * 1. Clearly define thresholds between public and private spaces?
 | Yes | Fences are provided around each tenant’s POS on the GF to clearly define thresholds between public and private.  |
| * 1. Provide private open space that is generous in proportion and adjacent to the main living areas of the dwelling?
 | Yes | Yes, all POS are accessed off living spaces and all efforts have been made to maximise their generosity.  |
| * 1. Provide private open space area that are orientated predominantly to the north, east or west to provide solar access?
 | Yes | Yes, six out of nine dwellings have their POS directly facing north. Unit 4 on the GF has their POS facing north and east, and unit 9 on the 1F facing west.  |
| * 1. Provide private open space areas that comprise multiple spaces for larger dwellings?
 | Yes | Yes, each unit has paved hardscape and softscape in their POS.  |
| * 1. Provide private open space areas that use screening for privacy but also allow casual surveillance when located adjacent to public or communal areas?
 | Yes | Yes, POS facing the street have open style fencing and planting to provide casual surveillance of the street (public) and also maintain privacy.  |
| * 1. Provide private open space areas that are both paved and planted when located at ground level?
 | Yes | Yes, POS for tenants on the GF have a combination of hardscape and softscape surfaces.  |
| * 1. Provide private open space areas that retain existing vegetation where practical?
 | N/A | Minimal existing vegetation on site.  |
| * 1. 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  | Concrete pavers have been specified for maintenance reasons and allow for ease of surface run off.  |
| * 1. 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 | Communal open space is easily accessibility to all residents. Shared facilities not part of brief.  |
| * 1. 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  | Yes, garage room is located to the rear of the site to reduce visual prominence to 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: | Sam Crawford |
| Capacity/Qualifications: | Director |
| Firm: | Sam Crawford Architects |
| Signature: |  |
| Date: | 11 July 2022  |