

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

Checklist of design principles and better practices

Guide notes:

This checklist is to be used for:

- all Part 5 applications, excluding group homes and boarding houses
- Part 4 applications, where required by the Housing SEPP.

It has been prepared to ensure that the Seniors Living Policy: Urban Design Guidelines for Infill Development are taken into account as required by the *State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021* (Housing SEPP).

The checklist must be completed and the declaration at the end of the checklist signed by the consultant architect.

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

Please provide the appropriate response in the 'Addressed in Design' column. A written design response is required where the response is 'Yes' in relation to that design principle / better practice. A written comment justifying departure from the design principle / better practice is required where the response is 'No' or 'NA'.

PROPERTY DETAILS:

Lot(s) / Sec(s) / DP(s)	Lots 21 and 22 in DP 13628
Street Address	25-27 Easton Avenue,
Suburb / Postcode	Sylvania 2224

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	<input type="checkbox"/>
		[Delete whichever is not applicable]	
Manor houses	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Activity Description (please provide summary description):

New multi dwelling housing development and associated landscaping, paths, driveways, etc.

6 Dwellings proposed all with attached single car garages; 4x 3 Bed (two storey) and 2 x 2 Bed (single storey; x1 Adaptable unit). Centralised shared driveway/ pedestrian access.

Demolition of x2 houses on the site, including all associated driveways, paths, sheds, landscaping etc.

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
1. Responding to Context		
Analysis of neighbourhood character		
<p>The key elements that contribute to neighbourhood character and therefore should be considered in the planning and design of new development are:</p> <p>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)</p>	Yes / No or N/A	<p>Refer to streetscape analysis: photomontages & Neighbourhood Block Analysis / Site Analysis Plans.</p> <p>In keeping with front/ side setbacks and building heights of surrounding developments and DCP.</p>
<p>1.02 Block and lots – does the analysis of the surrounding block and lot layout take into consideration local compatibility and</p>	Yes / No	<p>Refer to Block Analysis/ Site Analysis Plans.</p> <p>Consideration has been given, taking into account desired future context. The brief and the proposal is for greater</p>

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
development suitability? (e.g. lot size, shape, orientation)		density than surrounding developments. The rear single storey dwellings are in keeping with surround rear setbacks and bulk (as well as DCP). We are in the support of the increase in density for the area and the desired future context.
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	As above for 1.01 and 1.02
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	Refer to Landscape Plan and Plant Schedules. Appropriate site specific tree and plant selections have been made.
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	As above re site analysis. Consideration has been given, taking into account desired future context. LEP & DCP investigated throughout design development process and integrated where possible. Roof forms, building materiality, etc consistent with areas character.

Site analysis

Does the site analysis include:		Refer to streetscape analysis: photomontages & Neighbourhood Block Analysis / Site Analysis Plans.
1.06 Existing streetscape elements and the existing pattern of development as perceived from the street	Yes / No or N/A	
1.07 Patterns of driveways and vehicular crossings	Yes / No or N/A	As above
1.08 Existing vegetation and natural features on the site	Yes / No or N/A	As above. Arborist report integrated into Site Analysis.
1.09 Existing pattern of buildings and open space on adjoining lots	Yes / No or N/A	As above
1.10 Potential impact on privacy for, or overshadowing of, existing adjacent dwellings.	Yes / No or N/A	No overshadowing impact due to site orientation. Privacy analysed and mitigated with fenestration locations and treatment, fences and landscaping. POS located to side setbacks for rear dwellings as have 4m setback. Refer to Sections, Sun View/ Shadow Analysis Diagrams and REF.

2. Site Planning and Design

General

Design Issues / Design Principals 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 / No or N/A	Solar Access, Privacy, Security, Cross Vent, Overlooking has been considered for Dwellings within and adjacent development. The density and proximity between dwellings on the site is comfortable. The orientation and building separation allows for optimal solar access to all dwellings.
2.02 Provide a mix of dwelling sizes and dwellings both with and without carparking?	Yes / No or N/A	Yes to mix; no to variety of parking. Mix of 2 and 3 Bdrm dwellings provided. 1 garage has been provided per dwelling.
2.03 Provide variety in massing and scale of build form within the development?	Yes / No or N/A	Larger massing & built form address the street. 3Bdrm; 2 storey to the front; then 2 Bdrm single storey to the rear.
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	2 Dwellings have front doors to the street. The remaining 4 dwellings are setback, accessed from a centralised pedestrian/ drive shared accessway. Due to site width and need for parking access, not all dwellings could have frontage to the street without employing a unit-over-unit/ manor house typology. Massing discussed at point 2.03 above.
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	As above. Single storey at rear. Increased side setbacks at the rear from the DCP requirements to provide POS to side rather than rear; to minimise impact to rear neighbours.
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	Meets Solar Access requirements of the ARHSEPP. All dwellings POS and living orientated to North. Bedrooms provided to upper levels only, except for single storey dwellings at rear of site (quieter zone). Garages between dwellings provide building separation and as they are single storey, allow solar access to courtyards. The POS & landscaping provided in the front setback (7.5m) and between dwellings help buffer the dwellings from the street and each other.
Trees, landscaping and deep soil zones		
Does the site planning and design: 2.07 Retain trees and planting on the street and in front setbacks to minimise the impact of new development on the streetscape?	Yes / No or N/A	Increasing planting to the street and in front setbacks. Retaining trees where advised by Arborist, including large established Ironbark in front. Driveway and paths have been designed around the TPZ of established Ironbark to minimise impact as much as possible. Refer to Landscape Plan.

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	Minimal existing planting to the rear within subject site. x1 tree in rear neighbour's yard to be retained. Boring method of Easement at rear designed around tree's TPZ. New trees and planting for the rear POS with careful consideration for the privacy to neighbours at rear. Refer to Landscape Plan.
2.09 Retain large or otherwise significant trees on other parts of the site through sensitive site planning?	Yes / No or N/A	Arborist has advised no other significant trees except the large Ironbark to the front in public domain/ street verge which is being retained.
2.10 Where not possible to retain existing trees, replace with new mature or semi-mature trees?	Yes / No or N/A	Refer to Landscape Plan & Plant Schedules for new mature/ semi- mature trees proposed.
2.11 Increase the width of landscaped areas between driveways and boundary fences and between driveways and new dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	Landscaping provided at sides and termination of driveway. Driveway centralised on site, so does not impact neighbours. Only 6 car spaces so minimal traffic. Refer to Landscape Plan.
2.12 Provide pedestrian paths?	Yes / No or N/A	Individual paths provided from the street to front dwellings directly and common pedestrian access (shared as the driveway) for the rear dwellings. Differentiation in paving surfaces to enable safety of pedestrians/ slow any car traffic. Note: currently no public footpaths at street. We would support these being provided by Council.
2.13 Reduce the width of driveways?	Yes / No or N/A	Currently 2 driveways = 5-6m street frontage utilised for driveways; proposal is for a single directional entry to driveway (reduced to 3.2m at kerb) = less street frontage utilised for driveways than existing. Widens to provide sweep paths and passing bays to garages.
2.14 Provide additional private open space above the minimum requirements?	Yes / No or N/A	DCP = 36sqm/ dwelling; Proposal is for greater than 36sqm for all Dwellings.
2.15 Provide communal open space?	Yes / No or N/A	Not part of brief. Communal driveway can be a place for residents to meet, children to play, etc. Landscape Architects have proposed communal gardens in street verge/ driveway zone –Refer to Landscape Plan.
2.16 Increase front, rear and/or side setbacks?	Yes / No or N/A	DCP Setbacks provided which we find acceptable/ generous. Side setbacks for rear dwellings increased to 4m (DCP = 1.5m) to provide further separation to neighbours.

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
2.17 Provide small landscaped areas between garages, dwellings entries, pedestrian paths, driveways etc.	Yes / No or N/A	Refer to Landscape Plan.
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	Rear setback of 4m provided (meets DCP) = 9.3% of site. Rear Setback predominately planted. New trees and planting for the rear dwellings as a planting strip along rear boundary; careful consideration for privacy and separation to neighbours at rear. Refer to Sections and Landscape Plan.
2.19 Replicate an existing pattern of deep soil planting on the front of the site?	Yes / No or N/A	All front setbacks to the dwellings are provided as deep soil zones. Increased street planting and trees within the setback proposed. Refer to Landscape Plan.
2.20 Use semi-pervious materials for driveways, paths and other paved areas?	Yes / No or N/A	Permeable paving and crushed stone/ gravel/ stepping stones proposed in sections of the driveway and individual courtyards. Refer to Landscape Plan.
2.21 Use on-site detention to retain stormwater on site for re-use?	Yes / No or N/A	Proposed – refer to Civil Engineering.

Parking, garaging and vehicular circulation

Does the site planning and design:		Common driveway to individual garages.
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	
2.23 Maintain, where possible, existing crossings and driveway locations on the street?	Yes / No or N/A	Similar location to existing x2 driveways but narrower as 1 single carriage driveway. Existing would require replacing anyway to correct location and upgrading requirements.

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 proposal will provide a small difference in streetscape built-form, whilst providing a street with 3 times as many dwellings as existing. Height, setbacks in keeping with DCP and surrounding developments. Central driveway and pedestrian access breaks front dwellings to read like two from the street (similar to existing).

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
3.02 Provide a front setback that relates to adjoining development?	Yes / No or N/A	DCP and prevailing setbacks provided.
Built form		
Does the site planning and design:		As above & refer to drawings.
3.03 Break up the building massing and articulate building facades?	Yes / No or N/A	
3.04 Allow breaks in rows of attached dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	As above & refer to drawings.
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	Refer to drawings.
3.06 Set back upper levels behind the front building façade?	Yes / No or N/A	7.5m setbacks.
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	Dwellings are designed for maximum amenity.
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	Variety proposed – Refer to drawings.
3.09 Use a roof pitch sympathetic to that of existing buildings in the street?	Yes / No or N/A	Refer to drawings.
3.10 Avoid uninterrupted building facades including large areas of painted render?	Yes / No or N/A	Refer to drawings. Balconies and covered entries provided to street facades for building articulation.
Trees, landscaping and deep soil zones		
Does the site planning and design:		As above - 2.07 - 2.19
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	
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	As above, refer to Landscaping Plans.
Residential amenity		
Does the site planning and design:		POS provided in all front setbacks of dwellings.
3.13 Clearly design open space in the front setback as either private or communal open space?	Yes / No or N/A	

Design Issues / Design Principals 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 / No or N/A	Front fences, gates and landscaping to front of all dwellings. Paving/ surface treatment, landscaping and fences delineates public and private space within development. Refer to drawings
3.15 Design dwellings at the front of the site to address the street?	Yes / No or N/A	The 2 dwellings at the front of the site address the street
3.16 Design pedestrian entries, where possible, directly off the street?	Yes / No or N/A	Pedestrian entries directly off the street for front 2 dwellings; common pedestrian/ vehicle access from street for rear dwellings in centre of site.
3.17 Provide a pedestrian entry for rear residents that is separate from vehicular entries?	Yes / No or N/A	Not possible with site configuration as loose too much width. Differentiation in driveway surfaces delineates zones for pedestrian access. Careful design has undertaken to mitigate safety, etc.
3.18 Design front fences that provide privacy where necessary, but also allow for surveillance of the street?	Yes / No or N/A	Flat bar palisade fences and landscaping to allow for both privacy and passive surveillance to the street.
3.19 Ensure that new front fences have a consistent character with front fences in the street?	Yes / No or N/A	As above.
3.20 Orientate mailboxes obliquely to the street to reduce visual clutter and the perception of multiple dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	To ensure safety of residents and delivery person while accessing mail boxes, these are located within the wide front verge rather than the common driveway. Refer to drawings.
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	Garbage and recycling in individual garages.
Parking, garaging and vehicular circulation		
Does the site planning and design: 3.22 Vary the alignment of driveways to avoid a 'gun barrel' effect?	Yes / No or N/A	Driveway throat reduced to single carriage. Not a long driveway. Planting to sides of dwellings where sweep paths not required to vary width.
3.23 Set back garages behind the predominant building line to reduce their visibility from the street?	Yes / No or N/A	No garages to street.
3.24 Consider alternative site designs that avoid driveways running the length of the site?	Yes / No or N/A	Driveway stops at front line of rear dwellings.
3.25 Terminate vistas with trees, vegetation, open space or a dwelling rather than garages or parking?	Yes / No or N/A	Deep soil planting proposed to driveway termination. Refer to drawings and Landscape Plans.

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
3.26 Use planting to soften driveway edges?	Yes / No or N/A	Provided, and as above.
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	Mix of permeable paving and hard paving to delineate pedestrian zones and demarcate dwelling entrances. Refer to drawings and Landscape Plans.
3.28 Limit driveway widths on narrow sites to single carriage with passing points?	Yes / No or N/A	Lot is 30.14m wide. Single carriage driveway with passing points provided. Refer to drawings and Traffic Engineering.
3.29 Provide gates at the head of driveways to minimise visual 'pull' of the driveway?	Yes / No or N/A	LAHC advised not desired
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	On grade, no basement.
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	As above, no basement.
3.32 Recess the driveway entry to basement car parking from the main building façade?	Yes / No or N/A	As above, no basement.
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	As above, no basement.
3.34 Provide security doors to basement carparking to avoid the appearance of a 'black hole' in the streetscape?	Yes / No or N/A	As above, no basement.
3.35 Return façade material into the visible area of the basement car park entry?	Yes / No or N/A	As above, no basement.
3.36 Locate or screen all parking to minimise visibility from the street?	Yes / No or N/A	Garaging parallel to street.
4. Impacts on Neighbours		
Built form		
Does the site planning and design:		Existing has 2 stand-alone houses on 2 lots. Proposal is for 6 dwellings.
4.01 Where possible, maintain the existing orientation of dwelling 'fronts' and 'backs'?	Yes / No or N/A	
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	Although main entries to dwellings located at 90 de to the street in some cases, the POS is orientated to the rear where possible/ with a greater side setback than DCP requires where orientated to the side and rear.

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
4.03 Set upper storeys back behind the side or rear building line?	Yes / No or N/A	Provided for side setbacks. No upper storey at the rear.
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	As above 3.08.
4.05 Incorporate second stories within the roof space and provide dormer windows?	Yes / No or N/A	As above 3.07
4.06 Offset openings from existing neighbouring windows or doors?	Yes / No or N/A	Dwellings with front / back orientation. No windows proposed in side setbacks. Very few windows proposed facing other dwellings and are set back significantly from side/ rear setbacks where proposed. Privacy screens can be provided if required.
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	Variation proposed. No long walls on side setbacks.
Trees, landscaping and deep soil zones		
Does the site planning and design:		Provided. Refer to drawings and Landscaping Plans.
4.08 Use vegetation and mature planting to provide a buffer between new and existing dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	
4.09 Locate deep soil zones where they will be provide privacy and shade for adjacent dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	As above
4.10 Plant in side and rear setbacks for privacy and shade for adjoining dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	As above
4.11 Use species that are characteristic to the local area for new planting?	Yes / No or N/A	As above
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	As per DCP side setbacks. Solar access not impacted due to site orientation. Refer to shadow diagrams & planning reports.
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	Landscaping/ privacy screens to edges of POS in rear and side setbacks to mitigate privacy/ impact as mentioned above. Refer to Sections and Landscaping Design. View analysis to be provided in DA stage, privacy screens on upper level windows to be provided if required.

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
4.14 Locate private open space in front setbacks where possible to minimise negative impacts on neighbours?	Yes / No or N/A	Provided for front dwellings. Between dwellings within own development for middle dwellings and to the side and rear for rear dwellings (greater side setbacks than DCP requires for single storey at rear)
4.15 Ensure private open space is not adjacent to quiet neighbouring uses, e.g. bedrooms?	Yes / No or N/A	Refer to drawings.
4.16 Design dwellings around internal courtyards?	Yes / No or N/A	The POS provided for 4 of the dwellings as internal courtyards.
4.17 Provide adequate screening for private open space areas?	Yes / No or N/A	Provided. Refer to drawings and Landscape Plans.
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	Within DCP setbacks. POS provided to rear, except for at rear where 4m setback from side (greater than DCP requires). Planting provided – refer to Landscaping Plans.

Parking, garaging and vehicular circulation

Does the site planning and design:		Driveway not near side fences
4.19 Provide planting and trees between driveways and side fences to screen noise and reduce visual impacts?	Yes / No or N/A	
4.20 Position driveways so as to be a buffer between new and existing adjacent dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	Not suitable with site layout

5. Internal Site Amenity

Built form

Does the site planning and design:		All orientated to the north. Refer to Solar Access Diagrams
5.01 Maximise solar access to living areas and private open space areas of the dwelling?	Yes / No or N/A	
5.02 Provide dwellings with a sense of identity through building articulation, roof form and other architectural elements?	Yes / No or N/A	Provided, refer to drawings.
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	Provided, refer to drawings and Landscape Plans
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	Provided, as mentioned above


Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
5.05 Have dwelling entries that are clear and identifiable from the street or driveway?	Yes / No or N/A	Provided, as mentioned above
5.06 Provide a buffer between public/communal open space and private dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	No communal open space provided. Buffer between public street and private dwellings. Landscaping provided at sides of driveway and pathways to buffer these zones.
5.07 Provide a sense of address for each dwelling?	Yes / No or N/A	Provided, as mentioned above
5.08 Orientate dwelling entries to not look directly into other dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	Mirrored across driveway width which provides adequate separation.
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	Bedrooms on upper levels for front and middle dwellings. Rear dwellings have bedrooms to rear/ private areas.
5.10 Avoid large uninterrupted areas of hard surface?	Yes / No or N/A	Only provided where required. Permeable paving proposed to most of driveway.
5.11 Screen parking from views and outlooks from dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	Garaging provided.
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	Provided in some locations, passing bays and sweep paths dictate width of driveway in other locations.
5.13 Use communal car courts rather than individual garages?	Yes / No or N/A	Site strategy/ design is for individual garages that provide building separation and privacy to Private Open Space.
Reduce the dominance of areas for vehicular circulation and parking by considering:		
5.14 Single rather than double garages?	Yes / No or N/A	Only single provided.
5.15 Communal car courts rather than individual garages?	Yes / No or N/A	As above
5.16 Tandem parking or a single garage with single car port in tandem?	Yes / No or N/A	As above
5.17 Providing some dwellings without any car parking for residents without cars?	Yes / No or N/A	Site is in accessible area for ARH Sepp, however due to reduced number of dwellings it was proposed by LAHC that 1 car park per dwelling be provided.

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
Residential amenity		
Does the site planning and design:		Shared access, however wide enough for vehicle & wheelchair access. Delineation of zones provided. Refer to drawing and Landscaping Plan.
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	
5.19 Provide pedestrian routes to all public and semi-public areas?	Yes / No or N/A	Refer to drawings.
5.20 Avoid ambiguous spaces in building and dwelling entries that are not obviously designated as public or private?	Yes / No or N/A	Refer to drawings.
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	Refer to drawings.
5.22 Clearly define thresholds between public and private spaces?	Yes / No or N/A	As above and refer to drawings.
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	Refer to drawings.
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	As above and refer to drawings.
5.25 Provide private open space areas that comprise multiple spaces for larger dwellings?	Yes / No or N/A	4 out of 6 dwellings have multiple spaces for POS.
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 / No or N/A	Provided where possible. Double garage doors will aid with passive surveillance to common driveway zone.
5.27 Provide private open space areas that are both paved and planted when located at ground level?	Yes / No or N/A	Refer to Landscaping Plans.
5.28 Provide private open space areas that retain existing vegetation where practical?	Yes / No or N/A	Not worthy of retaining within POS. Refer to Landscaping Plans and Arborist report.
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	Mix of landscaping, permeable paving and hard paved areas. Refer to drawings and Landscaping Plans.
5.30 Provide communal open space that is clearly and easily accessible to all residents and easy to maintain and includes shared	Yes / No or N/A	Not provided, as not part of brief.

Design Issues / Design Principals and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
facilities, such as seating and barbeques to permit resident interaction?		
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	To future detail regarding switchboards. Individual garbage storage proposed in garages.

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:	Nuala Collins
Capacity/Qualifications:	Senior Associate
Firm:	Carter Williamson Architects
Signature:	
Date:	31/01/2023