

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 18 & 20 DP 35130 & 35848
Street Address	71-73 Viccliffe Ave
Suburb / Postcode	Campsie 2194

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	X
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 a multi dwelling housing development comprising 8 x 2-bedroom townhouses, 4 parking spaces, associated landscaping works and consolidation of 2 lots into a single lot.

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)	No	This site is dual zoned site with R3 (FSR 0.5:1) & R4 (FRS 0.9:1). Two homes have been removed and replaced with 8 townhouses, the massing is larger than the neighbouring homes, however the design is within the Canterbury DCP requirements.
1.02 Block and lots – does the analysis of the surrounding block and lot layout take into consideration local compatibility and	Yes	A block analysis has been undertaken in order to ensure that this development is suitable as per the surrounding properties.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
development suitability? (e.g. lot size, shape, orientation)		
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?)	No	The development is larger scale & massing to the neighbouring buildings, however, residential flat buildings and townhouses are under construction along the street and surrounding area.
1.04 Trees – do trees and planting in the proposed development reflect trees and landscapes in the neighbourhood or street?	Yes	The proposed landscape plans propose indigenous trees and shrubs reflecting those in the area and in accordance with Canterbury 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	Both the council's LEP & DCP have been considered in regard to setbacks & building heights.

Site analysis

Does the site analysis include:

1.06 Existing streetscape elements and the existing pattern of development as perceived from the street	Yes	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	The proposed driveway crossovers and patterns are consistent with the surrounding area.
1.08 Existing vegetation and natural features on the site	Yes	The selected trees is 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	The street frontage of the proposed development has been designed to provide character to the street, neighbouring homes are old and new residential flat buildings are being constructed within the street and surrounding area.
1.10 Potential impact on privacy for, or overshadowing of, existing adjacent dwellings.	Yes	Impacts on privacy have been minimised as much as possible on this site through internal fencing and providing highlight windows of dwellings. Overshadowing of the southern neighbour has been addressed by providing the driveway along this boundary, thus increasing the side setback of the buildings to minimise the overshadowing

2. Site Planning and Design

General

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
Does the site planning and design:		
2.01 Optimise internal amenity and minimise impacts on neighbours?	Yes	The units in this development are designed with private open spaces. Impacts on neighbour privacy have been minimised as much as possible on this site, with side facing windows have been offset from neighbouring properties along with highlight windows proposed.
2.02 Provide a mix of dwelling sizes and dwellings both with and without carparking?	No	8x2 bed townhouses have been provided to maximise yield for this site. Parking has been designed to Housing SEPP Cl. 42(1)(d) 4 spaces provided for the 8 units.
2.03 Provide variety in massing and scale of build form within the development?	Yes	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	Out of the 8 Townhouses on the site, Block A containing 5 Townhouses address the street each with their own letterbox and entry door.
2.05 Have developments more modest in scale towards the rear of the site to limit impacts on adjoining neighbours?	Yes	Block B containing 3 Townhouse is located towards the rear of the site, overlooking impacts into POS and neighbours windows have been considered by aligning Block B with number 69 Viccliffe Ave garage, this provides privacy to number 69 and the 3 units on site.
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	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	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	Some trees at the rear of this site have been removed, these trees were of low retention or recommended to be removed by the arborist, all high retention trees are remaining.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
		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	Tree T1 has been kept clear to avoid any impact of this tree during construction.
2.10 Where not possible to retain existing trees, replace with new mature or semi-mature trees?	Yes	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	Due to site constraints we have minimum 825mm landscaped area between driveways and boundary fences filled with screening hedges. We have a 950mm planting and 1250 pedestrian path between driveways and new dwellings.
2.12 Provide pedestrian paths?	Yes	Units 1-5 have a private path entry. Units 6-8 have a shared path from the front boundary and from the carpark
2.13 Reduce the width of driveways?	Yes	All driveway and driveway crossover have been design at minimum width as per traffic engineer feedback.
2.14 Provide additional private open space above the minimum requirements?	Yes	Additional private open space above the minimum requirements has been provided where possible.
2.15 Provide communal open space?	Yes	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?	No	Minimum front and side have been proposed in accordance with Canterbury DCP. Due to the odd boundary shape at the rear, the rear setbacks have been encroached to provide better amenity between Block A & B, however this encroachment doesn't impact POS overlooking to the rear neighbours.
2.17 Provide small landscaped areas between garages, dwellings entries, pedestrian paths, driveways etc.	Yes	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	17% of the site area is deep soil, 2/3 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	A deep soil zone has been provided in the front setback to allow for large and mature planting.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
2.20 Use semi-pervious materials for driveways, paths and other paved areas?	Yes	LAHC Design Requirements require concrete for driveways and parking areas. Permeable paving is used in private open space areas.
2.21 Use on-site detention to retain stormwater on site for re-use?	Yes	On-site detention and a communal 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	One shared carpark is provided for the development.
2.23 Maintain, where possible, existing crossings and driveway locations on the street?	No	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.)	No	<p>This site is dual zone site with R3 (FSR 0.5:1) & R4 (FSR 0.9:1).</p> <p>Two homes have been removed and replaced with 8 townhouses, the massing is larger than the neighbouring homes, however the design is within the Canterbury DCP requirements.</p> <p>Furthermore, this street and area is undergoing a lot of construction, the proposed design is aligning with the future development for this area proposed by council. It is predicted the neighbouring homes will eventually be replaced with residential flat buildings and townhouses.</p>
3.02 Provide a front setback that relates to adjoining development?	Yes	Proposed setbacks have been designed in accordance with Canterbury DCP requirements which match 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	The building façade utilises a variety of different materials to allow for variation.
--	-----	---

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
3.04 Allow breaks in rows of attached dwellings?	No	Due to site restraints, Block A contains 5 units, however this block has been designed with 3 steps to follow the existing ground level, the use of materials has been carefully selected to minimise the appearance of a long building.
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	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?	N/A	Not applicable to this development.
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	Not applicable to this development.
3.08 Reduce the apparent bulk and visual impact of the building by breaking down the roof into smaller roof elements?	No	Skillion roofs hidden behind parapet walls have been used to minimise the height of the blocks and simplify for construction stage
3.09 Use a roof pitch sympathetic to that of existing buildings in the street?	No	As noted in 3.01, this development has been designed with the new rezoning of the area, current site is neighboured next to old homes expected to be redeveloped
3.10 Avoid uninterrupted building facades including large areas of painted render?	Yes	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	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	The front fence has been designed as brick and will sit back from the site boundary with low planting provided in front of it.

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 open space in front of the buildings has been designed and can be used as private open space.
--	-----	---

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
3.14 Define the threshold between public and private space by level change, change in materials, fencing, planting and/or signage?	Yes	Private spaces have been distinguished by the use of fencing and screen landscaping elements.
3.15 Design dwellings at the front of the site to address the street?	Yes	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	Units 1 to 5 have their own pathways directly from the street.
3.17 Provide a pedestrian entry for rear residents that is separate from vehicular entries?	Yes	There is a dedicated pathway directly off the street that allow access to Units 6-8.
3.18 Design front fences that provide privacy where necessary, but also allow for surveillance of the street?	Yes	A 1.2m high front fence has been provided. Combined with the planting in front and behind this fence allows for privacy as well as passive surveillance of the street.
3.19 Ensure that new front fences have a consistent character with front fences in the street?	Yes	The front fence of this 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	Units 1 to 5 have their own letterbox along their pathways, for units 6 to 8, their letterbox is located along the pathway leading to the rear of the site and facing the street.
3.21 Locate and treat garbage storage areas and switchboards so that their visual impact on the public domain is minimised?	Yes	<p>The garbage storage area has been designed to Canterbury DCP requirements for collection and storage, this has been screened by designing the enclosure within the building form along the driveway.</p> <p>The switchboard has been located along the pathway between Block A & B and out of public view.</p>

Parking, garaging and vehicular circulation

Does the site planning and design:

3.22 Vary the alignment of driveways to avoid a 'gun barrel' effect?	No	Due to site restraints, changing the alignment in the driveway would impact the clearances to the side boundaries and building, however planting along both sides of the driveway has been implemented to soften the driveway
3.23 Set back garages behind the predominant building line to reduce their visibility from the street?	N/A	Not applicable to this development.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
3.24 Consider alternative site designs that avoid driveways running the length of the site?	No	To located the parking to the rear of the site and achieve a max yield of 8 units, the driveway does run the length of the site, however planting has been provided to minimise the impact of the driveway.
3.25 Terminate vistas with trees, vegetation, open space or a dwelling rather than garages or parking?	No	At the end of the driveway is parking, this is required for vehicle turning to get in and out in a forward approach, however after the parking is landscaped area with existing mature tree and proposed new trees.
3.26 Use planting to soften driveway edges?	Yes	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)	No	Driveway services carpark only and not individual units, the pedestrian path that runs parallel is of a different colour to visually distinguish between the two
3.28 Limit driveway widths on narrow sites to single carriage with passing points?	Yes	Minimum driveway width has been provided. Passing point has been provided at driveway crossover as per traffic engineer feedback.
3.29 Provide gates at the head of driveways to minimise visual 'pull' of the driveway?	No	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?	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?	N/A	Not applicable to this development.
3.32 Recess the driveway entry to basement car parking from the main building façade?	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?	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?	N/A	Not applicable to this development.
3.35 Return façade material into the visible area of the basement car park entry?	N/A	Not applicable to this development.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
3.36 Locate or screen all parking to minimise visibility from the street?	Yes	Parking is located at the rear of the site to minimise view 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 units in this development have been orientated towards the street.
4.02 Be particularly sensitive to privacy impacts where dwellings must be orientated at 90 degrees to the existing pattern of development?	Yes	Private open spaces have been orientated away from looking directly into neighbouring properties.
4.03 Set upper storeys back behind the side or rear building line?	No	There is no room to step the upper floors from side and rear setbacks, however the use of highlight windows and Block B facing 69 Viccliffe Ave garage assists with overlooking privacy
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?	No	Skillion roofs hidden behind parapet walls have been used to minimise the height and bulk appearance.
4.05 Incorporate second stories within the roof space and provide dormer windows?	No	High maintenance and cost issues.
4.06 Offset openings from existing neighbouring windows or doors?	Yes	All 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	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	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	Deep soil zones have been provided in positions that will provide privacy for adjacent dwellings. Refer to landscape plans provided.


Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
4.10 Plant in side and rear setbacks for privacy and shade for adjoining dwellings?	Yes	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	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	Building have sufficient spacing between them thus allowing most units to achieve the minimum 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	Block A units have been designed with "front-back" orientation and fencing are proposed to private open space to avoid overlooking. Block B units have been designed facing the side boundary to provide privacy to Block A POS, furthermore it's been pushed more to the rear to provide overlooking privacy to 69 Viccliffe Ave POS.
4.14 Locate private open space in front setbacks where possible to minimise negative impacts on neighbours?	No	Landscaping and deep soil zones already provide privacy to neighbours. Setback is minimum in front to reduce negative impacts on neighbours.
4.15 Ensure private open space is not adjacent to quiet neighbouring uses, e.g. bedrooms?	Yes	Where possible private open space has been offset from neighbouring properties
4.16 Design dwellings around internal courtyards?	Yes	The dwellings are designed around internal private open spaces.
4.17 Provide adequate screening for private open space areas?	Yes	All private open space areas have been enclosed by 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?	No	Side setbacks for units 6-8 are set at 4m from the boundary to allow sufficient space for retaining wall and planting.
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	Landscaping has been proposed to buffer noise and views along the side boundaries and driveways. Refer to landscape plans provided.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
4.20 Position driveways so as to be a buffer between new and existing adjacent dwellings?	Yes	The driveway have landscape strips that act as buffer zones between proposed development and neighbours.
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 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	Each unit has been designed architecturally to have distinct separated entries and features. Entry portals along front façade added for articulation and wayfinding.
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	Landscaping separation exists between the driveway 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	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	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	Individual private open space for each unit are enclosed within their own privacy screens via fencing and landscaped elements.
5.07 Provide a sense of address for each dwelling?	Yes	Each block has been designed architecturally to have distinct separated entries.
5.08 Orientate dwelling entries to not look directly into other dwellings?	Yes	All units are orientated toward the street. The units in the rear have their living areas orientated into their own private open space facing away from other dwellings.
Parking, garaging and vehicular circulation		
Does the site planning and design:		
5.09 Locate habitable rooms, particularly bedrooms, away from driveways, parking areas and	Yes	All bedrooms are located on the second storey and achieve privacy from pedestrian paths and driveway.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
pedestrian paths, or where this is not possible use physical separation, planting, screening devices or louvers to achieve adequate privacy?		
5.10 Avoid large uninterrupted areas of hard surface?	Yes	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	Shared parking is located at the rear of the site and is screened by fencing and landscaping elements.
Reduce the dominance of areas for vehicular circulation and parking by: 5.12 Considering single rather than double width driveways?	Yes	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	Development has one shared communal car courts.
Reduce the dominance of areas for vehicular circulation and parking by considering: 5.14 Single rather than double garages?	N/A	The units have no individual garages
5.15 Communal car courts rather than individual garages?	Yes	Development has one shared communal car courts.
5.16 Tandem parking or a single garage with single car port in tandem?	N/A	The units have no individual garages
5.17 Providing some dwellings without any car parking for residents without cars?	Yes	4 parking spaces provided for communal use between the 8 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	Separate pedestrian and vehicular circulation has been provided on site.
5.19 Provide pedestrian routes to all public and semi-public areas?	Yes	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 ambiguous space has been left open in this development.
5.21 Minimise opportunities for concealment by avoiding blind or dark spaces between	Yes	All public spaces have been designed as wide and open as possible and all have casual surveillance to

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
buildings, near lifts and foyers and at the entrance to or within indoor car parks?		the street and/or shared parking area. Between Blocks A & B, pedestrian footpath width has been increased with landscaping both sides to open this area up for more passive surveillance.
5.22 Clearly define thresholds between public and private spaces?	Yes	All private open space areas have been enclosed by a 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	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?	No	Block A has been designed to address the street and provide privacy to neighbours, POS have a West orientation. Block B POS have a North orientation.
5.25 Provide private open space areas that comprise multiple spaces for larger dwellings?	N/A	Not applicable to this development.
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	Sections of private open space are concealed within 1.8m high fences but all open areas facing the street of each unit are concealed with a 1200mm high fence allowing for casual surveillance of public areas. POS of units 1-5 are designed with 1.8m high slat fences to provide surveillance to pedestrian footpath.
5.27 Provide private open space areas that are both paved and planted when located at ground level?	Yes	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?	No	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	Private open space have pervious pavers and minimal hard surface areas. Private open space areas is predominantly landscaped and has vegetation.
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?	No	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	The garbage storage area has been designed to Canterbury DCP requirements for collection and storage, this has been screened by designing the

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
		<p>enclosure within the building form along the driveway.</p> <p>The switchboard has been located along the pathway between Block A & B and out of public view.</p>

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:	21 November 2022