Land & Housing Corporation

Planning Unit, Land and Housing Corporation

SENIORS LIVING POLICY: URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR INFILL DEVELOPMENT

Checklist of design principles and better practices

Guide notes:

This checklist is to be used for all Part 5 and Senior Housing Development Applications. It has been prepared to ensure that the subject guidelines are taken into account in accordance with State Environmental Planning Policy (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009 (ARH SEPP) in the site planning and design of residential development carried out by or on behalf of the Land & Housing Corporation under Clause 40 of ARH SEPP as 'development without consent'. Residential development that can be carried out without development consent by the Land and Housing Corporation under ARH SEPP includes dwelling houses, dual occupancies, multi-dwelling housing (townhouse and villa developments), in-fill self-care seniors housing under State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004, residential flat buildings, secondary dwellings, boarding houses, and supportive accommodation that does not result in the construction of a building with a building height of not more than 8.5m and does not result in more than 20 dwellings on a single site. The development type must be permissible with consent either under the council for the areas local planning controls or under ARH SEPP.

The checklist must be completed and submitted, and the declaration at the end of the checklist signed by the consultant architect, as part of the package submission for assessment by the Planning Unit in the Technical Services branch of the Land and Housing Corporation. The declaration will demonstrate that the guidelines have been taken into account in the site planning and design of the development proposal in accordance with Clause 40(4)(c) of ARH SEPP.

The checklist should be completed in conjunction with a review of the guideline document to ensure that a thorough understanding of the design issues, principals and better practices is achieved before attempting to complete the checklist.

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 / DP	**Lot 111, Lot 112, Lot 116 & Lot 117 / DP 253956**
Street Address	**38-40 John T Bell Drive and 31-33 Matfen Close**

Activity Type (tick box ☑):			
Single dwelling	☐	Demolition	☑
Dual Occupancy	☐	Tree removal	☑
Multi dwelling housing (villas/townhouses)	☑	Subdivision – Torrens title	☐
Residential flat building	☑	Subdivision – Strata title	☐
Seniors housing	☐	Other activity (describe below)	☐

Activity Description (please provide detailed description):

The proposal involves the demolition of four existing single storey dwelling houses on four adjoining lots to develop the site to include Option 01 - double storey residential flat buildings containing 10 x 2 bedroom units and 6 x 1 bedroom units or Option 2 –double storey townhouses containing 14 x 2 bedroom dwellings. The intent is to provide for general social housing.

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
1. Responding to Context		
Analysis of neighbourhood character		
The key elements that contribute to neighbourhood character and therefore should be considered in the planning and design of new development are: **1.01 Street layout and hierarchy** – has the surrounding pattern and hierarchy of the existing streets been taken into consideration? (e.g. scale and character of the built form, patterns of street planting, front setbacks, buildings heights)	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The existing street character is of low scale residential development of the mid to late twentieth century. An evolution to low rise higher density residential development is occurring in the area and surrounding suburbs with an increase in housing demand. The local development controls also reflect this future character of the area to allow residential flat buildings with an 8.5mm height limit. The existing streetscape is characterised by single storey lightweight and brick veneer dwellings, gabled roof and located towards the middle of the site with large front setbacks.
1.02 Block and lots – does the analysis of the surrounding block and lot layout take into consideration local compatibility and development suitability? (e.g. lot size, shape, orientation)	Yes ~~/ No~~	The four lots when consolidated allows for double storey townhouses and a potential residential flat building to be arranged to address both Maften Close and John T Bell Drive while achieving amenity and privacy for neighbours.
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 ~~/ No or N/A~~	The predominant built form in the area and surrounding suburbs is evolving from single detached residential dwellings to higher low density residential development including two storey dual occupancies and two storey residential flat buildings. The proposed residential flat building is compatible with the future character of the area with consideration to the amenity and privacy of the existing adjoining neighbours.
1.04 Trees – do trees and planting in the proposed development reflect trees and landscapes in the neighbourhood or street?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The site is relatively clear of significant vegetation. The front and rear setback will include the allowance for increasing trees to enhance the nearby remnant urban bushland.
1.05 Policy environment – has Council's own LEP and DCP been considered to identify key elements that contribute to an areas character? Does the proposed development respond this?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Local planning controls have been considered to ensure the development is in keeping with the future character of the area.
Site analysis		
Does the site analysis include: **1.06** Existing streetscape elements and the existing pattern of development as perceived from the street	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The site analysis has identified the existing setback patterns of the street as well as the surrounding characteristic of the area.
1.07 Patterns of driveways and vehicular crossings	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The existing driveways have been identified in the site analysis. The driveway pattern is to be maintained by the development.
1.08 Existing vegetation and natural features on the site	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The site is relatively clear of any significant vegetation or natural features.

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
1.09 Existing pattern of buildings and open space on adjoining lots	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The existing built form of the adjoining lots have been shown including any changing dwelling types and development.
1.10 Potential impact on privacy for, or overshadowing of, existing adjacent dwellings.	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Setbacks to adjacent boundaries and open spaces of neighbouring properties have been identified.
2. Site Planning and Design		
General		
Does the site planning and design: **2.01** Optimise internal amenity and minimise impacts on neighbours?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The orientation of the townhouses and potential residential flat building prioritises solar access and internal amenity while minimising impacts on neighbouring properties to the south east.
2.02 Provide a mix of dwelling sizes and dwellings both with and without carparking?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The proposed development provides for a mix of 2 bedroom townhouse dwellings with general parking or 1-2 bedroom units with general parking.
2.03 Provide variety in massing and scale of build form within the development?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The planning of the townhouses and/or residential flat building allows for articulation through the use of balconies and entries to break-up the two storey massing. The townhouse option has group dwellings into duplexes to allow landscaped breaks between the building 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 ~~/ No or N/A~~	Street frontage to John T Bell Drive and Maften Close has been prioritised and where dwellings are oriented away from the street, an internal access drive and associated landscaping has been proposed.
2.05 Have developments more modest in scale towards the rear of the site to limit impacts on adjoining neighbours?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The majority of the townhouses have been sited to address the street. Where development is proposed along the side boundary, the required setbacks have been achieved to allow for privacy landscaping and screening.
2.06 Orientate dwellings to maximise solar access to living areas and private open space, and locate dwellings to buffer quiet areas within the development from noise?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The majority of units have living spaces and private open spaces orientated to the north to maximise solar access. Amenities and entries have been located towards circulation spaces to provide acoustic separation between living spaces.
Trees, landscaping and deep soil zones		
Does the site planning and design: **2.07** Retain trees and planning on the street and in front setbacks to minimise the impact of new development on the streetscape?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The scheme allows for the inclusion of trees to enhance the current street tree patterns where it is not possible to retain existing street planting.

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
2.08 Retain trees and planting at the rear of the lot to minimise the impact of new development on neighbours and maintain the pattern of mid block deep-soil planting?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The subject sites do not contain any significant trees or mid-block planting. Deep soil planting and significant areas of landscaping is proposed throughout the site.
2.09 Retain large or otherwise significant trees on other parts of the site through sensitive site planning?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	There are no significant trees on-site to be retained.
2.10 Where not possible to retain existing trees, replace with new mature or semi-mature trees?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The scheme allows for new mature or semi-mature trees within the front setbacks, mid-block and side setback to adjoining properties.
2.11 Increase the width of landscaped areas between driveways and boundary fences and between driveways and new dwellings?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	3m has been allowed for between the south-eastern boundary line and proposed driveway and dwellings/units. RFB have been consolidated with appropriate massing break-up to allow for increased areas of landscaping.
2.12 Provide pedestrian paths?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Pedestrian paths will be allowed for to all residential dwellings, ground floor units and from the car parking to common residential flat building stairs.
2.13 Reduce the width of driveways?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The driveway has been consolidated to a single point off Matfen Close to keep the width to a minimum and reduce visual impact.
2.14 Provide additional private open space above the minimum requirements?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Private open space on the ground floor has been maximise where possible.
2.15 Provide communal open space?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The central area of the lot provides opportunity for communal open space in the RFB option.
2.16 Increase front, rear and/or side setbacks?	~~Yes / No or~~ N/A	Setbacks have been set by the local development controls to match future character of the area.
2.17 Provide small landscaped areas between garages, dwellings entries, pedestrian paths, driveways etc.	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Landscaped areas to improve amenity have been provided adjacent main entry paths, garages, driveways and paths.
2.18 Provide at least 10% of the site area, at the rear of the site, for deep soils zones to create a mid-block corridor of trees within the neighbourhood?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Approximately 25% of the consolidated site is available for deep soil planting. The majority of the landscaping will be within the front and side setbacks.
2.19 Replicate an existing pattern of deep soil planting on the front of the site?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Opportunity for deep soil planting is provided in the front setback.
2.20 Use semi-pervious materials for driveways, paths and other paved areas?	Yes / No or N/A	Opportunity for use of semi-pervious materials to pavement is to be investigated to minimise stormwater overflow off-site.
2.21 Use on-site detention to retain stormwater on site for re-use?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Stormwater will be detained on-site with possible re0use for irrigation

Design Issues / Design Principals 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 ~~/ No or N/A~~	The parking for the development has been located towards the centre of the site to minimise views from the street. Where part of the parking is visible from the street paths and landscaping elements have been incorporated to obscure views to the parking space exposed.
2.23 Maintain, where possible, existing crossings and driveway locations on the street?	Yes / No or N/A	The increased density of the low-rise residential development results in a wider consolidated driveway as opposed to the multi-single driveway crossings currently accessing the site. Where possible, existing driveway crossing will be maintained.
3. Impacts on Streetscape		
General		
Does the site planning and design: **3.01** Sympathise with the building and existing streetscape patterns? (i.e. siting, height, separation, driveways locations, pedestrian entries etc.)	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The proposed massing of the dwellings and residential flat building will be a greater scale than the immediate adjoining buildings however they will be designed to fit within the streetscape character and future evolution of development within the area.
3.02 Provide a front setback that relates to adjoining development?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The front setback has been set to reflect the dominate character of the surrounding area.
Built form		
Does the site planning and design: **3.03** Break up the building massing and articulate building facades?	Yes~~/ No or N/A~~	Varying roof forms, balconies and street entries provide opportunity to articulate the building form and facades.
3.04 Allow breaks in rows of attached dwellings?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Residential flat building has been arranged around the site to allow gaps for landscaping between buildings.
3.05 Use a variation in materials, colours and openings to order building facades with scale and proportions that respond to the desired contextual character?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The material palette is will be a mixture of masonry and lightweight cladding to reflect the predominate character of the area. The building façade of the potential residential flat building, while at a greater scale than the current immediate context is articulated to reflect the current proportions of the surrounding context
3.06 Set back upper levels behind the front building façade?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Upper levels are articulated to reduce the impact on the building massing.
3.07 Where it is common practice in the streetscape, locating second storeys within the roof space and using dormer windows to match the appearance of existing dwelling houses?	~~Yes /~~ No ~~or N/A~~	There is no precedence in the streetscape for locating the second storey within the roof space.

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
3.08 Reduce the apparent bulk and visual impact of the building by breaking down the roof into smaller roof elements?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The roof form will be broken down into smaller roof elements appropriate to the character of the surrounding context.
3.09 Use a roof pitch sympathetic to that of existing buildings in the street?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The roof pitch will be in keeping with the surrounding development and desired future character of the area.
3.10 Avoid uninterrupted building facades including large areas of painted render?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The building planning has provided opportunities to articulate the front façades. Where long facades are proposed to the side boundaries, use of materials to break-up potential large areas will be used.
Trees, landscaping and deep soil zones		
Does the site planning and design: **3.11** Use new planting in the front setback and road reserve where it is not possible or not desirable to retain existing trees/planting?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	New planting will be provided in the front setback.
3.12 Plant in front of front fences to reduce their impact and improve the quality of the public domain?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Where the front setback can be used as private spaces via fencing. This will be set-off from the boundary to allow planting to the public domain.
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 ~~/ No or N/A~~	Where the front setback can be used as private spaces via fencing it will be utilised to increase solar access and amenity to dwellings.
3.14 Define the threshold between public and private space by level change, change in materials, fencing, planting and/or signage?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Public and private spaces will be clearly defined by access pathways, landscaping, and fencing.
3.15 Design dwellings at the front of the site to address the street?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The majority of dwellings address the street.
3.16 Design pedestrian entries, where possible, directly off the street?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Pedestrian entries are situated directly off the street.
3.17 Provide a pedestrian entry for rear residents that is separate from vehicular entries?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Where units are accessed via the rear of the site, clearly defined pathways separate to vehicular entries will allow for safe access.
3.18 Design front fences that provide privacy where necessary, but also allow for surveillance of the street?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Front fencing will delineate private spaces while ensuring passive surveillance is still maintained.
3.19 Ensure that new front fences have a consistent character with front fences in the street?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Front fences will reflect the predominate character of the street.
3.20 Orientate mailboxes obliquely to the street to reduce visual clutter and the perception of multiple dwellings?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Mailboxes will be located perpendicular to the street frontage.

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
3.21 Locate and treat garbage storage areas and switchboards so that their visual impact on the public domain is minimised?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Bin storage will be located in the car park and discreetly screened to reduce visual impact.
Parking, garaging and vehicular circulation		
Does the site planning and design: **3.22** Vary the alignment of driveways to avoid a 'gun barrel' effect?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The driveways has been consolidated to reduce visual impact on the streetscape. Adequate space between driveways has been allowed for landscaping.
3.23 Set back garages behind the predominant building line to reduce their visibility from the street?	~~Yes / No or~~ N/A	No single garages are provided.
3.24 Consider alternative site designs that avoid driveways running the length of the site?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The driveway will only access parking located in the centre of the site.
3.25 Terminate vistas with trees, vegetation, open space or a dwelling rather than garages or parking?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Where possible landscaping has been located at the end of the driveway.
3.26 Use planting to soften driveway edges?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Significant planting is allowed for on the east of the driveway.
3.27 Vary the driveway surface material to break it up into a series of smaller spaces? (e.g. to delineate individual dwellings)	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	There is opportunity to vary the driveway material.
3.28 Limit driveway widths on narrow sites to single carriage with passing points?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The access driveway to the central parking has been minimised to reduce visual impact and allow for additional landscaping.
3.29 Provide gates at the head of driveways to minimise visual 'pull' of the driveway?	Yes / No or N/A	Gates could be provided to secure and limit view of driveway.
3.30 Reduce the width where possible to single width driveways at the entry to basement carparking rather than double?	~~Yes / No or~~ N/A	
3.31 Locate the driveway entry to basement carparking to one side rather than the centre where it is visually prominent?	~~Yes / No or~~ N/A	
3.32 Recess the driveway entry to basement car parking from the main building façade?	~~Yes / No or~~ N/A	
3.33 Where a development has a secondary street frontage, provide vehicular access to basement car parking from the secondary street?	~~Yes / No or~~ N/A	
3.34 Provide security doors to basement carparking to avoid the appearance of a 'black hole' in the streetscape?	~~Yes / No or~~ N/A	

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
3.35 Return façade material into the visible area of the basement car park entry?	~~Yes / No or~~ N/A	
3.36 Locate or screen all parking to minimise visibility from the street?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Parking is located at the centre of the site to reduce visibility.
4. Impacts on Neighbours		
Built form		
Does the site planning and design: **4.01** Where possible, maintain the existing orientation of dwelling 'fronts' and 'backs'?	Yes~~/ No or N/A~~	All units been arranged on-site to address the street or look internally. A formal front address has been provided with private open space to the front or rear depending on the solar orientation. The central dwellings have been orientated with rear private open space with adequate boundary separation.
4.02 Be particularly sensitive to privacy impacts where dwellings must be oriented at 90 degrees to the existing pattern of development?	Yes / No or N/A	Orientation to the side boundaries have been minimised. Where openings are located adequate boundary separation with landscaping and screening will be used.
4.03 Set upper storeys back behind the side or rear building line?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The upper levels will be articulated to reduce scale and bulk where not setback from lower levels.
4.04 Reduce the visual bulk of roof forms by breaking down the roof into smaller elements rather than having a single uninterrupted roof structure?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The roof form will be broken down into smaller roof elements appropriate to the character of the surrounding context.
4.05 Incorporate second stories within the roof space and provide dormer windows?	Yes / No or N/A	The second storey of the townhouses will be designed within the 8.5m height limit and in keeping with the existing and future desired character of the surrounding area.
4.06 Offset openings from existing neighbouring windows or doors?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Orientation to the side boundaries have been minimised. Where openings are located landscaping and screening will be used. Windows will be offset from neighbouring windows.
4.07 Reduce the impact of unrelieved walls on narrow side and rear setbacks by limiting the length of the walls built to these setbacks?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Side walls have been setback 3m to allow significant landscaping.
Trees, landscaping and deep soil zones		
Does the site planning and design: **4.08** Use vegetation and mature planting to provide a buffer between new and existing dwellings?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Landscaping will be used to provide a buffer along the side boundaries and adjoining dwellings.
4.09 Locate deep soil zones where they will provide privacy and shade for adjacent dwellings?	Yes~~/ No or N/A~~	There is ample space throughout the site to provide deep soil planting, privacy and shade to both proposed and adjacent dwellings.

Design Issues / Design Principals 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 ~~/ No or N/A~~	Landscaping will be used to provide privacy and shade to adjoining dwellings along the side boundaries.
4.11 Use species that are characteristic to the local area for new planting?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Species characteristic to the area will be used.
Residential amenity		
Does the site planning and design: **4.12** Protect sun access and ventilation to living areas and private open space of neighbouring dwellings by ensuring adequate building separation?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The side setback to adjoining properties have been maximised to avoid negative impacts on neighbours.
4.13 Design dwellings so that they do not directly overlook neighbours' private open space or look into existing dwellings?	Yes~~/ No or N/A~~	Private open spaces have been oriented where possible to avoid overlooking of neighbouring private open spaces or habitable spaces. Landscaping has also been proposed to assist with privacy.
4.14 Locate private open space in front setbacks where possible to minimise negative impacts on neighbours?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Where possible, private open spaces will be located within the front setbacks to increase solar access.
4.15 Ensure private open space is not adjacent to quiet neighbouring uses, e.g. bedrooms?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Private open spaces have been oriented where possible to avoid overlooking of neighbouring private open spaces or habitable spaces.
4.16 Design dwellings around internal courtyards?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Private open spaces have been maximised to the internal areas of the site.
4.17 Provide adequate screening for private open space areas?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Landscaped buffers will be utilised to provide privacy.
4.18 Use side setbacks which are large enough to provide usable private open space to achieve privacy and soften the visual impact of new development by using screen planting?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Maximised side setbacks to neighbouring properties will be landscaped to provide privacy.
Parking, garaging and vehicular circulation		
Does the site planning and design: **4.19** Provide planting and trees between driveways and side fences to screen noise and reduce visual impacts?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Landscaping is maximised around the car parking where possible.
4.20 Position driveways so as to be a buffer between new and existing adjacent dwellings?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Maximised side setbacks to neighbouring properties will be landscaped to provide privacy.
5. Internal Site Amenity		
Built form		

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
Does the site planning and design: **5.01** Maximise solar access to living areas and private open space areas of the dwelling?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Living and Private areas are mainly located to the north, and west to achieve solar access. Where allowable, private open space will be located within the front setback to increase solar access.
5.02 Provide dwellings with a sense of identity through building articulation, roof form and other architectural elements?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Each entry will be identified through the articulation of the building
5.03 Provide buffer spaces and/or barriers between the dwellings and driveways or between dwellings and communal areas for villa or townhouse style developments?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Landscaped buffers have been provided where possible.
5.04 Use trees, vegetation, fences, or screening devices to establish curtilages for individual dwellings in villa or townhouse style developments?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Entires and private open spaces will be defined by fencing and landscaped buffers.
5.05 Have dwelling entries that are clear and identifiable from the street or driveway?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Common residential flat building entry and lobbies are clearly defined.
5.06 Provide a buffer between public/communal open space and private dwellings?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Landscaping buffers will be used throughout the site to provide privacy.
5.07 Provide a sense of address for each dwelling?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Each unit will address the street where possible
5.08 Orientate dwelling entries to not look directly into other dwellings?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Townhouses and units have been arranged onsite to avoid direct overlooking. Where separation distances are not optimal, landscaping and screening elements will increase privacy.
Parking, garaging and vehicular circulation		
Does the site planning and design: **5.09** Locate habitable rooms, particularly bedrooms, away from driveways, parking areas and pedestrian paths, or where this is not possible use physical separation, planting, screening devices or louvers to achieve adequate privacy?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Bedroom windows have been located towards the front and rear private open spaces and away from driveways, and communal paths.
5.10 Avoid large uninterrupted areas of hard surface?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The driveway and paths will have a varying material with use of permeable and hard stand to break up possible large areas of pavement.
5.11 Screen parking from views and outlooks from dwellings?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Landscaping around the car park will be used to screen its view from units and townhouses.
Reduce the dominance of areas for vehicular circulation and parking by: **5.12** Considering single rather than double width driveways?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	A single access driveway to the centre of the site has been used to minimise the dominance of the driveway.

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
5.13 Use communal car courts rather than individual garages?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Common parking has been provided for both options
Reduce the dominance of areas for vehicular circulation and parking by considering: **5.14** Single rather than double garages?	~~Yes / No or~~ N/A	
5.15 Communal car courts rather than individual garages?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Common parking has been provided for both options
5.16 Tandem parking or a single garage with single car port in tandem?	~~Yes / No or~~ N/A	
5.17 Providing some dwellings without any car parking for residents without cars?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	A total of 8 carparks have been provided for the 16 unit residential flat building option.
Residential amenity		
Does the site planning and design: **5.18** Provide distinct and separate pedestrian and vehicular circulation on the site where possible, where not possible shared access should be wide enough to allow a vehicle and a wheelchair to pass safely?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Pedestrian and vehicular circulation within the site will be clearly separated through pavement type, kerbs, and landscaping. Path widths allow for AS1428.1 compliance.
5.19 Provide pedestrian routes to all public and semi-public areas?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	All public spaces and parking will have dedicated pedestrian routes.
5.20 Avoid ambiguous spaces in building and dwelling entries that are not obviously designated as public or private?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Ambiguous spaces will be kept to a minimum with private spaces clearly defined by fencing and landscaping.
5.21 Minimise opportunities for concealment by avoiding blind or dark spaces between buildings, near lifts and foyers and at the entrance to or within indoor car parks?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Blind corners have been reduced in the communal areas and sight lines maximised between public spaces to reduce areas of concealment.
5.22 Clearly define thresholds between public and private spaces?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Private spaces will be defined by fencing and landscaping, access to private spaces will be minimised to either the front street or rear parking entry.
5.23 Provide private open space that is generous in proportion and adjacent to the main living areas of the dwelling?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Private open space has been maximised where possible and located directly off the main living areas.
5.24 Provide private open space area that are orientated predominantly to the north, east or west to provide solar access?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Living and Private areas are mainly located to the north, or west to achieve solar access. Where front setbacks allow, private open spaces will address the street to increase solar access and amenity.
5.25 Provide private open space areas that comprise multiple spaces for larger dwellings?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	All dwellings and units are provided with private open spaces off primary living areas.
5.26 Provide private open space areas that use screening for privacy but also allow casual	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Fencing types will be utilised to ensure passive surveillance of public spaces from private spaces.

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
surveillance when located adjacent to public or communal areas?		
5.27 Provide private open space areas that are both paved and planted when located at ground level?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	The ground floor private open spaces will utilise a mixture or hard a soft landscaping.
5.28 Provide private open space areas that retain existing vegetation where practical?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	There is no significant vegetation on-site.
5.29 Provide private open space areas that use pervious pavers where private open space is predominantly hard surfaced to allow for water percolation and reduced run-off?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Pervious pavers will be utilised to minimise off-site stormwater drainage.
5.30 Provide communal open space that is clearly and easily accessible to all residents and easy to maintain and includes shared facilities, such as seating and barbeques to permit resident interaction?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Communal open space in the RFB option is centrally located for ease of access and surveillance.
5.31 Site and/or treat common service facilities such as garbage collection areas and switchboards to reduce their visual prominence to the street or to any private or communal open space?	Yes ~~/ No or N/A~~	Bins and services will be located at the rear of the residential flat building and each townhouse and to reduce visual impact.

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:	Ben Rapley
Capacity/Qualifications:	ARBN 8543
Firm:	CKDS Architecture
Signature:	
Date:	22.07.2022

Internal Use Only	
Checked by:	Rajlaxmi Kshirsagar
Land and Housing Corporation:	Portfolio Services
Title:	Planning Officer
Signature:	
Date:	