

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 4 / DP 35006
Street Address	13 Latty Street
Suburb / Postcode	Fairfield NSW 2165

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 type="checkbox"/>	Tree removal	<input type="checkbox"/>
Multi dwelling housing (terraces)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Subdivision – Torrens title	<input type="checkbox"/>

Residential flat building	<input type="checkbox"/>	Subdivision – Strata title / Community title [Delete whichever is not applicable]	<input type="checkbox"/>
Manor houses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

Activity Description (please provide summary description):

Demolition of the existing structures and dwelling, relocation of the existing driveway and construction of a multi-dwelling housing of four (4) dwellings with parking for two (2) cars including one (1) accessible space, associated landscaping, fencing and required bins holding area for eight (8) bins.

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	<p>The surrounding pattern of the existing street has been analysed and determined as slightly chaotic. The proposal takes on a contemporary approach in an area that experiences revitalisation. Front setback and building height comply with relevant codes and are sympathetic to and consistent with surrounding build forms.</p> <p>Existing street planting is not impacted by the proposal. Proposed landscaping is considered</p>
---	-----	--

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
		relevant for the area and will contribute to the revitalisation of the existing surroundings.
1.02 Block and lots – does the analysis of the surrounding block and lot layout take into consideration local compatibility and development suitability? (e.g. lot size, shape, orientation)	Yes	The proposal being a residential building is considered suitable for the area consisting of residential buildings. Lot size and shape is typical for the area. Building orientation is consistent with surrounding buildings.
1.03 Built environment – has a compatibility check been undertaken to determine if the proposed development is consistent with the neighbourhoods built form? (e.g. scale, massing, should particular streetscapes or building types be further developed or discouraged?)	Yes	Proposed residential building is considered suitable for the area consisting of residential buildings. The scale and massing are considered appropriate and aim to contribute to the revitalisation of the existing surroundings.
1.04 Trees – do trees and planting in the proposed development reflect trees and landscapes in the neighbourhood or street?	Yes	Proposed planting is consistent with the existing surrounding trees.
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	Council's own LEP and DCP has been considered and responded. Proposed residential building is considered suitable for the area consisting of residential buildings. The scale and massing are considered appropriate and aim to contribute to the revitalisation of the existing surroundings.

Site analysis

Does the site analysis include:

1.06 Existing streetscape elements and the existing pattern of development as perceived from the street	Yes	Existing streetscape elements and the existing pattern of development have been clearly identified on the Site Analysis, Site Plan and Ground floor drawings
1.07 Patterns of driveways and vehicular crossings	Yes	Driveway and vehicular crossing have been shown on the relevant plans
1.08 Existing vegetation and natural features on the site	Yes	The site contours have been shown. There are no existing trees on site.
1.09 Existing pattern of buildings and open space on adjoining lots	Yes	Existing buildings and open spaces on adjoining lots have been shown on relevant drawings.
1.10 Potential impact on privacy for, or overshadowing of, existing adjacent dwellings.	Yes	The shadow diagrams have been provided and show no detrimental impact on the adjacent dwellings.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
2. Site Planning and Design		
General		
Does the site planning and design:		
2.01 Optimise internal amenity and minimise impacts on neighbours?	Yes	There is no impact on neighbouring dwellings in terms of overshadowing, the privacy of neighbours has not been compromised
2.02 Provide a mix of dwelling sizes and dwellings both with and without carparking?	Yes	The development proposes two parking spaces, one to be allocated for the Accessible Unit 01
2.03 Provide variety in massing and scale of build form within the development?	Yes	The proposal consists of four dwellings contained in two built forms. This breaking down of the massing helps to lessen the perception of the building scale. The common lobby sitting in-between two primary built forms provides further variety in massing.
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	The proposal consists of four dwellings each of them fronting the public street
2.05 Have developments more modest in scale towards the rear of the site to limit impacts on adjoining neighbours?	Yes	Sufficient rear setback ensures no adverse impact on neighbouring buildings and allowing for a landscaped Communal Open Space
2.06 Orientate dwellings to maximise solar access to living areas and private open space, and locate dwellings to buffer quiet areas within the development from noise?	Yes	The building form has been carefully manipulated to maximise northern sunlight into apartments. All four dwellings are orientated to maximise solar access to living areas and private open space. 100% of dwellings achieve minimum of 3 hours solar access to public open spaces and living rooms on 21 June.
Trees, landscaping and deep soil zones		
Does the site planning and design:		
2.07 Retain trees and planting on the street and in front setbacks to minimise the impact of new development on the streetscape?	Yes	No tree removal is proposed on site (there are no trees on site) or on neighbouring sites.
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 tree removal is proposed on site (there are no trees on site). Proposed new landscape design will ensure the sufficient area of deep-soil planting.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
2.09 Retain large or otherwise significant trees on other parts of the site through sensitive site planning?	Yes	No tree removal is proposed on site (no trees on site) Communal Open Space is proposed along the TPZ of neighbouring trees
2.10 Where not possible to retain existing trees, replace with new mature or semi-mature trees?	N/A	
2.11 Increase the width of landscaped areas between driveways and boundary fences and between driveways and new dwellings?	Yes	Sufficient landscaped areas between driveways and boundary fences and between driveways and new dwellings are proposed. Those soft landscaped areas act as buffers between built form and hard surface of the driveway
2.12 Provide pedestrian paths?	Yes	The existing pedestrian path remains
2.13 Reduce the width of driveways?	Yes	The most efficient, having regard to reduction of the width driveway design has been developed in liaison with traffic engineer
2.14 Provide additional private open space above the minimum requirements?	Yes	All four units have the Private Open Spaces exceeding the minimum required areas with Ground floor dwellings benefiting from private open spaces as generous as 46.4m ² (Unit01) and 63.9m ² (Unit02)
2.15 Provide communal open space?	Yes	The communal open space is provided at the rear of the building.
2.16 Increase front, rear and/or side setbacks?	Yes	Increased rear and side setbacks are proposed
2.17 Provide small landscaped areas between garages, dwellings entries, pedestrian paths, driveways etc.	Yes	Small, landscaped areas provided between two built forms driveway, fences, pedestrian path
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	41% (322.03m ²) of the site area has been provided as deep soil zone at the rear and northern side of the site to create a mid-block corridor of planting
2.19 Replicate an existing pattern of deep soil planting on the front of the site?	Yes	The existing pattern of deep soil planting have been maintained. Above ground OSD has been proposed to further increase deep soil area at the front
2.20 Use semi-pervious materials for driveways, paths and other paved areas?	No	Access requirements are limiting the materials palette choices, and therefore impervious treatment is considered acceptable.
2.21 Use on-site detention to retain stormwater on site for re-use?	Yes	On -ground OSD will retain stormwater on site and slow the rate of excess stormwater into council infrastructure

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

Parking, garaging and vehicular circulation

Does the site planning and design:

2.22 Consider centralised parking in car courts to reduce the amount of space occupied by driveways, garages and approaches to garages?	Yes	Two separate car parks are proposed for ease of access from the Accessible Unit and from the Lobby.
2.23 Maintain, where possible, existing crossings and driveway locations on the street?	Yes	The driveway crossing has been maintained and increased to accommodate an accessible car. Another driveway is proposed for easy access from the lobby.

3. Impacts on Streetscape**General**

Does the site planning and design:

3.01 Sympathise with the building and existing streetscape patterns? (i.e. siting, height, separation, driveways locations, pedestrian entries etc.)	Yes	Sitting of the building is sympathetic to and consistent with surrounding build forms. Front setback, driveway location and pedestrian entry are consistent with existing street pattern. Height of the building is compliant with LEP and is considered appropriate for the area.
3.02 Provide a front setback that relates to adjoining development?	Yes	Front setback pattern observed in the neighbouring sites has been maintained.

Built form

Does the site planning and design:

3.03 Break up the building massing and articulate building facades?	Yes	The building massing has been separated by a party wall connected via the lobby. Terraces, balconies, windows and awnings contribute to better façade articulation.
3.04 Allow breaks in rows of attached dwellings?	Yes	The building massing has been separated by a party wall connected via the lobby. The common lobby sitting in-between those forms provides visual and spatial break in massing.
3.05 Use a variation in materials, colours and openings to order building facades with scale and proportions that respond to the desired contextual character?	Yes	Two shades of face brick have been proposed, proportional openings with FC cladded hoods and awnings contribute to achieving coherent contextual character of the proposal
3.06 Set back upper levels behind the front building façade?	No	Upper floor has been designed to provide shading and weather protection to Ground level.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
3.07 Where it is common practice in the streetscape, locating second storeys within the roof space and using dormer windows to match the appearance of existing dwelling houses?	N/A	Locating second storeys within the roof space and using dormer windows is not common practice in the streetscape.
3.08 Reduce the apparent bulk and visual impact of the building by breaking down the roof into smaller roof elements?	No	The building massing has been separated by a party wall connected via the lobby. The common lobby sitting in-between those forms provides additional visual and spatial break in massing.
3.09 Use a roof pitch sympathetic to that of existing buildings in the street?	Yes	Roof pitch is generally sympathetic to the existing buildings. Well-balanced design of the proposed rooves takes on a contemporary approach, in an area that experiences revitalisation to existing dwellings.
3.10 Avoid uninterrupted building facades including large areas of painted render?	Yes	Terraces, balconies, windows and awnings contribute to better façade articulation and ensure large areas of painted render are avoided.

Trees, landscaping and deep soil zones

Does the site planning and design:

3.11 Use new planting in the front setback and road reserve where it is not possible or not desirable to retain existing trees/planting?	Yes	The landscape design proposes new planting in the front setback consistent with the existing landscaping pattern
3.12 Plant in front of front fences to reduce their impact and improve the quality of the public domain?	Yes	New planting has been proposed in front of front fences to reduce their impact and soften the perception of the area in the front setback. (Ref. Landscape plan)

Residential amenity

Does the site planning and design:

3.13 Clearly design open space in the front setback as either private or communal open space?	Yes	The 1.5m slat fences separate private from communal spaces in the front setback
3.14 Define the threshold between public and private space by level change, change in materials, fencing, planting and/or signage?	Yes	The clarity of threshold between public and private space is ensured by coherent and logical design and supporting landscaping. The 1.5m slat fences separate private from communal spaces. The change in levels has been limited for accessibility reasons.
3.15 Design dwellings at the front of the site to address the street?	Yes	Two dwellings address the street.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
3.16 Design pedestrian entries, where possible, directly off the street?	Yes	Pedestrian entry designed directly off the street
3.17 Provide a pedestrian entry for rear residents that is separate from vehicular entries?	No	Entry via main lobby except for Unit 01 where access is also provided through terrace via accessible carpark.
3.18 Design front fences that provide privacy where necessary, but also allow for surveillance of the street?	Yes	The 1.5m fences can be designed as having angled slats to provide privacy and allow for the surveillance of the street at the same time.
3.19 Ensure that new front fences have a consistent character with front fences in the street?	Yes	The front fences of the neighbouring buildings vary in heights and materials used. The proposed front fences are considered appropriate and consistent with neighbouring sites.
3.20 Orientate mailboxes obliquely to the street to reduce visual clutter and the perception of multiple dwellings?	Yes	The mailboxes orientated obliquely to the street.
3.21 Locate and treat garbage storage areas and switchboards so that their visual impact on the public domain is minimised?	Yes	Screened garbage holding area located after 6m front setback to minimise visual impact. Switchboards are located adjacent to side lobby entry.
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	The most efficient driveway design has been developed in liaison with traffic engineer.
3.23 Set back garages behind the predominant building line to reduce their visibility from the street?	No	On ground & open space carparking provided on each side of the building.
3.24 Consider alternative site designs that avoid driveways running the length of the site?	Yes	After extensive site analysis the most efficient driveway design has been developed in liaison with traffic engineer
3.25 Terminate vistas with trees, vegetation, open space or a dwelling rather than garages or parking?	Yes	Where possible the vistas have been terminated with landscaping. Due to the site area limits the location of the on-ground parking is considered appropriate with proposed landscaping aiming to soften its edges.
3.26 Use planting to soften driveway edges?	Yes	Planting are proposed along the driveway to soften its edges.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
3.27 Vary the driveway surface material to break it up into a series of smaller spaces? (e.g. to delineate individual dwellings)	No	The driveway is designed to be discrete and efficiently uses the site area, delineation of individual dwellings is ensured by the breaking down of the built form.
3.28 Limit driveway widths on narrow sites to single carriage with passing points?	No	Two driveways proposed for 2 carparks, one for ease of access to Accessible Unit 01 and the other to access the Communal Lobby.
3.29 Provide gates at the head of driveways to minimise visual 'pull' of the driveway?	Yes	Visual 'pull' is minimised by the location of the built form in relation to the driveway and by planting along the boundary edge.
3.30 Reduce the width where possible to single width driveways at the entry to basement carparking rather than double?	N/A	No basement parking has been proposed.
3.31 Locate the driveway entry to basement carparking to one side rather than the centre where it is visually prominent?	N/A	No basement parking has been proposed.
3.32 Recess the driveway entry to basement car parking from the main building façade?	N/A	No basement parking has been proposed.
3.33 Where a development has a secondary street frontage, provide vehicular access to basement car parking from the secondary street?	N/A	No secondary street frontage on site.
3.34 Provide security doors to basement carparking to avoid the appearance of a 'black hole' in the streetscape?	N/A	No basement parking has been proposed.
3.35 Return façade material into the visible area of the basement car park entry?	N/A	No basement parking has been proposed.
3.36 Locate or screen all parking to minimise visibility from the street?	No	Parking are located after 6m front setback. Planting are proposed along the driveway to soften its edges.

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 existing orientation of dwellings has been maintained
4.02 Be particularly sensitive to privacy impacts where dwellings must be oriented at 90 degrees to the existing pattern of development?	Yes	Dwellings orientated at 90 degrees are provided with privacy screens to reduce privacy impacts and overlooking into neighbouring buildings.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
4.03 Set upper storeys back behind the side or rear building line?	No	The upper floor complies with DCP setback for the second floor and has been designed to provide shading and weather protection to Ground level
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	The building massing has been separated by a party wall connected via the lobby. The common lobby sitting in-between those forms provides additional visual and spatial break in massing.
4.05 Incorporate second stories within the roof space and provide dormer windows?	No	Locating second storeys within the roof space and using dormer windows is not common practice in the streetscape.
4.06 Offset openings from existing neighbouring windows or doors?	Yes	Proposed openings are offset from the neighbouring openings and their location comply with relevant codes and NCC standards. Privacy screens are proposed to reduce privacy impacts and overlooking into neighbouring buildings.
4.07 Reduce the impact of unrelieved walls on narrow side and rear setbacks by limiting the length of the walls built to these setbacks?	Yes	The length of the walls built to setbacks has been reduced by introducing balconies, awnings and window hoods

Trees, landscaping and deep soil zones

Does the site planning and design:

4.08 Use vegetation and mature planting to provide a buffer between new and existing dwellings?	Yes	Proposed landscaping provides a buffer between new development and existing buildings to the rear and sides. Refer Landscape Plan
4.09 Locate deep soil zones where they will be provide privacy and shade for adjacent dwellings?	Yes	Majority of deep soil has been located to the rear and sides of the site to provide privacy and shade.
4.10 Plant in side and rear setbacks for privacy and shade for adjoining dwellings?	Yes	41% (322.03m ²) of the site area to the rear and sides has been nominated as deep soil which exceeds requirement
4.11 Use species that are characteristic to the local area for new planting?	Yes	The proposed new species are consistent with the surrounding landscaping. Refer Landscape plan

Residential amenity

Does the site planning and design:

4.12 Protect sun access and ventilation to living areas and private open space of neighbouring	Yes	The proposal exceeds minimum required side and rear setbacks. There is no detrimental impact of
---	-----	---

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
dwelling by ensuring adequate building separation?		overshadowing of living areas and private open space of neighbouring dwellings. The proposal is set back from the neighbour to the North by 5.05 m and to the South by 3.86m. These separations are sufficient for maintaining sun access and ventilation to the neighbouring buildings.
4.13 Design dwellings so that they do not directly overlook neighbours' private open space or look into existing dwellings?	No	Unit 04 is provided with privacy screens to reduce privacy impacts and overlooking into existing properties. The deep soil planting also creates buffer zone to ensure no direct overlooking into existing properties.
4.14 Locate private open space in front setbacks where possible to minimise negative impacts on neighbours?	Yes	Private open spaces are located at the front and back of the building and are screened from neighbours by planting buffer as well as 1.5m high angled slat fences.
4.15 Ensure private open space is not adjacent to quiet neighbouring uses, e.g. bedrooms?	Yes	Private open space of each dwelling is separated from the other dwellings by common lobby/pathway and is not located in proximity of quiet uses on adjacent sites.
4.16 Design dwellings around internal courtyards?	Yes	Dwelling designed around and linked by internal lobby
4.17 Provide adequate screening for private open space areas?	Yes	Screening provided in form of 1.5m angled slat metal fences.
4.18 Use side setbacks which are large enough to provide usable private open space to achieve privacy and soften the visual impact of new development by using screen planting?	Yes	Proposed side setbacks are exceeding minimum setbacks required on site. The deep soil planting buffer zone to the north and landscaping along the driveway to the south provide privacy and soften the visual impact of new development

Parking, garaging and vehicular circulation

Does the site planning and design:

4.19 Provide planting and trees between driveways and side fences to screen noise and reduce visual impacts?	Yes	Planting buffer proposed along the driveway; between the driveway and side fences to reduce noise and visual impact
4.20 Position driveways so as to be a buffer between new and existing adjacent dwellings?	Yes	Driveway positioned between proposed building and neighbour to the north and south

5. Internal Site Amenity

Built form

Does the site planning and design:

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
5.01 Maximise solar access to living areas and private open space areas of the dwelling?	Yes	The building form has been carefully manipulated to maximise northern sunlight into apartments. All four dwellings are orientated to maximise solar access to living areas and private open space. 100% of dwellings achieve minimum of 3 hours solar access to private open spaces and living rooms on 21 June.
5.02 Provide dwellings with a sense of identity through building articulation, roof form and other architectural elements?	Yes	The proposal consists of four dwellings with the common lobby connecting all four dwellings defining the communal entry zone. Private open spaces and balconies are logically placed, clearly indicating threshold between common and private areas.
5.03 Provide buffer spaces and/or barriers between the dwellings and driveways or between dwellings and communal areas for villa or townhouse style developments?	Yes	Buffer landscaping and angled slat fences proposed between driveway and dwellings.
5.04 Use trees, vegetation, fences, or screening devices to establish curtilages for individual dwellings in villa or townhouse style developments?	Yes	1.5m angled slat fences and landscaping proposed to create private zones/curtilages for individual dwellings at ground floor.
5.05 Have dwelling entries that are clear and identifiable from the street or driveway?	Yes	The main entry to common lobby is clearly defined from street, side entry directly faces the driveway. Dwelling entries are accessible directly from the main lobby.
5.06 Provide a buffer between public/communal open space and private dwellings?	Yes	Landscaping and 1.5m angled slat fences provide clear division between public and private open spaces.
5.07 Provide a sense of address for each dwelling?	Yes	Each dwelling is directly accessed from the centrally located main lobby.
5.08 Orientate dwelling entries to not look directly into other dwellings?	Yes	None of the dwelling entry looks directly into other dwelling.

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	<p>Northern dwelling living spaces and bedrooms are located away from driveway and separated from parking zone by planting</p> <p>Southern dwellings are separated from the driveway by planting zone. The bedroom and living spaces are not looking directly into driveway.</p>
--	-----	--

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
5.10 Avoid large uninterrupted areas of hard surface?	Yes	Hard surface of the parking area and access driveway is considered necessary and acceptable. The surface parking has been efficiently designed to the relevant standards to reduce its area as much as practicable.
5.11 Screen parking from views and outlooks from dwellings?	Yes	Parking screened from views by planting buffer
Reduce the dominance of areas for vehicular circulation and parking by: 5.12 Considering single rather than double width driveways?	Yes	Two single width driveway proposed and endorsed by traffic engineer.
5.13 Use communal car courts rather than individual garages?	N/A	No individual garages proposed.
Reduce the dominance of areas for vehicular circulation and parking by considering: 5.14 Single rather than double garages?	N/A	No individual garages proposed.
5.15 Communal car courts rather than individual garages?	N/A	No individual garages proposed.
5.16 Tandem parking or a single garage with single car port in tandem?	N/A	No individual garages proposed.
5.17 Providing some dwellings without any car parking for residents without cars?	Yes	Two parking spaces provided, one for Accessible Unit 01 and another to be shared.

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	Pedestrian access separated from the vehicular access.
5.19 Provide pedestrian routes to all public and semi-public areas?	Yes	Public, accessible pathway provided to all common areas.
5.20 Avoid ambiguous spaces in building and dwelling entries that are not obviously designated as public or private?	Yes	All spaces are logically and efficiently designed to provide clear distinction between public and private.
5.21 Minimise opportunities for concealment by avoiding blind or dark spaces between buildings, near lifts and foyers and at the entrance to or within indoor car parks?	Yes	All spaces within the building and outside have been efficiently designed to not include blind or dark spaces

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
5.22 Clearly define thresholds between public and private spaces?	Yes	Threshold between public and private is clearly defined by logical design, landscaping buffer zones and fencing
5.23 Provide private open space that is generous in proportion and adjacent to the main living areas of the dwelling?	Yes	Individual large terraces adjacent to the main living areas provide a generosity of space for each dwelling. POS extended out to include landscaping at Ground level dwellings.
5.24 Provide private open space area that are orientated predominantly to the north, east or west to provide solar access?	Yes	Private open spaces orientated to the North, East and West. 100% of dwellings achieve minimum of 3 hours solar access to public open spaces on 21 June.
5.25 Provide private open space areas that comprise multiple spaces for larger dwellings?	Yes	Ground floor private open spaces comprise terraces and landscaped areas.
5.26 Provide private open space areas that use screening for privacy but also allow casual surveillance when located adjacent to public or communal areas?	Yes	The 1.5m fences screening the private open spaces have been designed as having angled slats to provide privacy and allow for the surveillance of the street and communal areas at the same time.
5.27 Provide private open space areas that are both paved and planted when located at ground level?	Yes	Private open spaces at the ground floor consists of paved terrace and landscaping
5.28 Provide private open space areas that retain existing vegetation where practical?	No	New landscaping is proposed to provide the opportunity for a breathable space embracing the sunlight and enhancing passive surveillance.
5.29 Provide private open space areas that use pervious pavers where private open space is predominantly hard surfaced to allow for water percolation and reduced run-off?	No	Access requirements are limiting the materials palette choices, and therefore impervious treatment is considered acceptable.
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	Communal open space at the rear of the site is easily accessible for all dwellings.
5.31 Site and/or treat common service facilities such as garbage collection areas and switchboards to reduce their visual prominence to the street or to any private or communal open space?	Yes	Screened garbage holding area located after 6m front setback to minimise visual impact. Switchboards are located adjacent to side lobby entry. Water and gas meters contained in one neat enclosure incorporated into landscaping.

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:	Conrad Johnston
Capacity/Qualifications:	Director
Firm:	Studio Johnston
Signature:	
Date:	13.05.2022