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 5 -8 in DP 35087**
Street Address	**6-12 Peters Avenue**
Suburb / Postcode	**Wallsend 2287**

PROPOSAL DETAILS:			
Activity Type (tick box):			
Single dwelling	☐	**Seniors housing**	☐
Dual occupancy	☐	**Demolition**	✓
Multi dwelling housing (villas/townhouses)	☐	**Tree removal**	✓
Multi dwelling housing (terraces)	☐	**Subdivision – Torrens title**	☐
Residential flat building	✓	**Subdivision – Strata title / Community title** [Delete whichever is not applicable]	☐
Manor houses	☐		
Activity Description (please provide summary description):			

Demolition of four detached dwellings and construction of a two-storey residential flat building consisting of 20 units over two storeys.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
1. Responding to Context		
Analysis of neighbourhood character The key elements that contribute to neighbourhood character and therefore should be considered in the planning and design of new development are:		
1.01 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	The façade is designed to break down the scale of the two-storey development to be more compatible with the local context which is predominately single storey residential detached dwellings. Given the proximity to the corner of Peters Avenue and Stapleton Street, as well as the long elevation, a more contemporary approach has been undertaken, whilst balancing the compatibility with existing streetscape.
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	Yes. Façade is broken down into smaller components to break down scale of two storey building as the context is predominately single storey.
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	Yes, simple roof forms such as skillion roof forms are proposed.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
1.04 Trees – do trees and planting in the proposed development reflect trees and landscapes in the neighbourhood or street?	Yes	Plant species have been selected to provide privacy and amenity to the development and surrounding residents. The trees and landscapes proposed are a mix of natives and exotics to reflect the existing landscape in the locality.
1.05 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	The overall design has been established by understanding the constraints outlined in Newcastle LEP, DCP & Housing SEPP.
Site analysis Does the site analysis include:		
1.06 Existing streetscape elements and the existing pattern of development as perceived from the street	Yes	The front elevation that addresses Peters Avenue has been designed to break down the scale of the two-storey development to be more compatible with the local context which is predominately single storey residential detached dwellings. Light weight cantilevering balconies on the 1F are designed so they reduce the overall mass of the 1F volume.
1.07 Patterns of driveways and vehicular crossings	Yes	The driveway has been located between two separate proposed buildings to help break down the mass of the proposed development.
1.08 Existing vegetation and natural features on the site	N/A	All attempts have been made to ensure trees marked as important by the arborist are retained.
1.09 Existing pattern of buildings and open space on adjoining lots	Yes	The building form is broken up to maximise amenity, avoid long uninterrupted walls, and provide open space for tenants.
1.10 Potential impact on privacy for, or overshadowing of, existing adjacent dwellings.	Yes	Building mass has been designed to minimise overlooking impacts to neighbours, particularly the northern and southern neighbour. All efforts have been made to locate privacy open spaces of GF and 1F away from the northern and southern neighbours, and where not possible, the use of privacy screens have been adopted. Overshadowing impacts to the southern neighbour has been demonstrated as not being significant.

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	The development is broken up into three separate buildings to break down the mass of the development. Vehicular and pedestrian pathways and located between the separate buildings. This ensures that the carpark is towards the rear and an internal courtyard is created amongst the group of existing trees.
2.02 Provide a mix of dwelling sizes and dwellings both with and without carparking?	Yes	There are 12 x 1 beds and 8 x 2 beds proposed. On grade carparking spaces provided as per required parking rates which result in 9 spaces for 20 dwellings.
2.03 Provide variety in massing and scale of build form within the development?	Yes	Yes, the building provides a variety in massing and scale to maximise cross ventilation, solar access, and balancing with privacy impacts to the neighbours. This avoids large bulky forms and unarticulated walls, ensuring that the development is in keeping with the single storey detached dwelling locality.
Built form Does the site planning and design:		
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	Yes, bulk of development is located at front of site with carparking at rear. This ensures that out of the 20 dwellings, there are 12 dwellings addressing the street.
2.05 Have developments more modest in scale towards the rear of the site to limit impacts on adjoining neighbours?	Yes	The development steps down in height to the rear of the site to limit impacts on adjoining neighbours, particularly the southern neighbour.
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	All efforts have been made to maximise solar compliance and 15/20 units achieve solar compliance which is above the minimum requirements.
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	All significant trees noted by the arborist have been retained.

Design Issues / Design Principles 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	All significant trees noted by the arborist have been retained.
2.09 Retain large or otherwise significant trees on other parts of the site through sensitive site planning?	Yes	All significant trees noted by the arborist have been retained.
2.10 Where not possible to retain existing trees, replace with new mature or semi-mature trees?	Yes	All significant trees noted by the arborist have been retained.
2.11 Increase the width of landscaped areas between driveways and boundary fences and between driveways and new dwellings?	Yes	Yes, planting buffer is located either side of driveway.
2.12 Provide pedestrian paths?	Yes	Pedestrian paths are provided including accessible paths of travel. Main pedestrian path is clearly defined via low height walls with letterboxes.
2.13 Reduce the width of driveways?	Yes	Driveways are designed to comply with traffic engineer's requirements with the aim to reduce the width as much as possible.
2.14 Provide additional private open space above the minimum requirements?	Yes	Additional POS areas are provided where possible. .
2.15 Provide communal open space?	Yes	Communal open space has been provided at the rear of the site, providing a pleasant outlook for the majority of units.
2.16 Increase front, rear and/or side setbacks?	Yes	Setbacks minimums have been met. A slight encroachment to the front setback is proposed to articulate the 1F balconies.
2.17 Provide small landscaped areas between garages, dwellings entries, pedestrian paths, driveways etc.	Yes	Small landscaped areas have been provided between dwelling entries, pedestrian paths, and driveways. These areas are in low maintained, not turf, to reduce maintenance requirements for tenants. Each tenant's POS on the ground floor have a combination of landscape and hardscape.
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	Deep soil area is provided in several locations with 512 sq.m provided in deep soil (387 sq.m is minimum)
2.19 Replicate an existing pattern of deep soil planting on the front of the site?	Yes	Deep soil has been provided at the front of the site where possible.
2.20 Use semi-pervious materials for driveways, paths and other paved areas?	No	Concrete driveways, paved areas and paths have been proposed for maintenance reasons.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
2.21 Use on-site detention to retain stormwater on site for re-use?	Yes	Yes, there is an on site detention tank under the driveway with a rainwater tank for rainwater re-use.
Parking, garaging and vehicular circulation Does the site planning and design:		
2.22 Consider centralised parking in car courts to reduce the amount of space occupied by driveways, garages and approaches to garages?	Yes	Yes, on grade parking has been located at rear of site and the design ensures that cars are not visible from street.
2.23 Maintain, where possible, existing crossings and driveway locations on the street?	Yes	Yes, the existing crossover has been maintained.
3. Impacts on Streetscape		
General Does the site planning and design:		
3.01 Sympathise with the building and existing streetscape patterns? (i.e. siting, height, separation, driveways locations, pedestrian entries etc.)	Yes	Yes, building is located towards the front of site with driveway down near the side to minimise impacts of neighbours and to break down the scale of the development.
3.02 Provide a front setback that relates to adjoining development?	Yes	Yes, the front setback is largely consistent with the adjoining neighbours. Maximum effort has been made to keep to the prevailing front setback however articulation has been proposed to the 1F balconies that encroaches on the setback.
Built form Does the site planning and design:		
3.03 Break up the building massing and articulate building facades?	Yes	The façade is designed to break down the scale of the two-storey development to be more compatible with the local context which is predominately single storey residential detached dwellings.
3.04 Allow breaks in rows of attached dwellings?	Yes	The development is broken up into three separate buildings to break down the mass of the overall development.
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	Simple materials have been chosen to reflect the context, such as face brick and corrugated metal roofing.
3.06 Set back upper levels behind the front building façade?	No	Due to the yield and site constraints this was not possible, however, all efforts have been made to reduce the bulk of scale of the front façade, by

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
		articulating it with 1F cantilevering balconies and varying materials.
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	The existing streetscape does not have any second storey buildings that are located within the roof space.
3.08 Reduce the apparent bulk and visual impact of the building by breaking down the roof into smaller roof elements?	Yes	The proposed design breaks down the roof into smaller roof elements with a combination of skillion and gable roof forms. The stepped nature of the façade further reduces the visual impact from the street scape.
3.09 Use a roof pitch sympathetic to that of existing buildings in the street?	Yes	Simple skillion roofs are proposed to create a contemporary design. Along with the LAHC two storey development at Curry Street and Douglas Street, it is anticipated that these three developments, totalling 49 units, will play a significant part in establishing a new character for Wallsend. Looking to nearby suburbs that are currently undergoing similar urban renewal, such as Shortland and Adamstown, it can be seen that new two storey development exhibit contemporary materials such as face brick, skillion roofs, metal roof sheeting, metal window hoods, and metal batten screening and blustering. The proposed development takes cues from these recent developments.
3.10 Avoid uninterrupted building facades including large areas of painted render?	Yes	No painted render proposed and a mix of materials have been proposed.
Trees, landscaping and deep soil zones Does the site planning and design:		
3.11 Use new planting in the front setback and road reserve where it is not possible or not desirable to retain existing trees/planting?	Yes	New planting has been proposed in the front setback including canopy trees.
3.12 Plant in front of front fences to reduce their impact and improve the quality of the public domain?	Yes	Planting has been proposed in front of front fences to reduce their impact.
Residential amenity Does the site planning and design:		
3.13 Clearly design open space in the front setback as either private or communal open space?	Yes	Front setback areas are clearly defined as privacy open space for the street facing tenants.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
3.14 Define the threshold between public and private space by level change, change in materials, fencing, planting and/or signage?	Yes	The main pedestrian and vehicular entries are clearly defined and separate from individual paths to individual units. The main pedestrian paths have a low brick wall with letterboxes at the site boundary.
3.15 Design dwellings at the front of the site to address the street?	Yes	12 out of 20 dwellings have been designed to address the street.
3.16 Design pedestrian entries, where possible, directly off the street?	Yes	Street facing tenants on the ground floor have direct pedestrian entries without having to access a lobby.
3.17 Provide a pedestrian entry for rear residents that is separate from vehicular entries?	Yes	Rear residents' entry are accessed via the lobby which is separate from the vehicular entry.
3.18 Design front fences that provide privacy where necessary, but also allow for surveillance of the street?	Yes	Front fences on the GF are proposed to be in a palisade fence to provide privacy but also allow surveillance of the street. Planting Infront of the fencing further adds to the privacy and improves the street appearance of the proposed development.
3.19 Ensure that new front fences have a consistent character with front fences in the street?	Yes	Open palisade fencing is proposed which is consistent with the streetscape including surrounding streets.
3.20 Orientate mailboxes obliquely to the street to reduce visual clutter and the perception of multiple dwellings?	No	Letterboxes have been integrated into the design of the front fence and is sensitive to the streetscape.
3.21 Locate and treat garbage storage areas and switchboards so that their visual impact on the public domain is minimised?	Yes	Yes, bin store has been discretely located at the rear of site away from public view. Switchboards and metres have been located where possible away from public view.
Parking, garaging and vehicular circulation Does the site planning and design:		
3.22 Vary the alignment of driveways to avoid a 'gun barrel' effect?	No	Not possible due to site constraints, however, we have achieved SLUDG intent of not seeing cars down the driveway when standing on the street. Landscaping has been proposed at the end of the driveway so that the view down the driveway terminates with landscaping.
3.23 Set back garages behind the predominant building line to reduce their visibility from the street?	N/A	Garages not proposed.
3.24 Consider alternative site designs that avoid driveways running the length of the site?	Yes	Not possible due to site constraints, however, we have achieved SLUDG intent of not seeing cars down the driveway when standing on the street. Landscaping has been proposed at the end of the

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
		driveway so that the view down the driveway terminates with landscaping.
3.25 Terminate vistas with trees, vegetation, open space or a dwelling rather than garages or parking?	Yes	Yes, driveway is designed to terminate with landscaping.
3.26 Use planting to soften driveway edges?	Yes	Yes, strips of landscaping have been proposed either side 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)	No	Concrete driveway proposed for ease of maintenance.
3.28 Limit driveway widths on narrow sites to single carriage with passing points?	Yes	Yes, the proposed driveway is a single carriage. No passing points are required based on the length of the driveway.
3.29 Provide gates at the head of driveways to minimise visual 'pull' of the driveway?	No	Driveway gate not part of brief and is not consistent with the character of the locality.
3.30 Reduce the width where possible to single width driveways at the entry to basement carparking rather than double?	N/A	Basement parking not proposed.
3.31 Locate the driveway entry to basement carparking to one side rather than the centre where it is visually prominent?	N/A	Basement parking not proposed.
3.32 Recess the driveway entry to basement car parking from the main building façade?	N/A	Basement parking not proposed.
3.33 Where a development has a secondary street frontage, provide vehicular access to basement car parking from the secondary street?	N/A	Development does not have a secondary street frontage.
3.34 Provide security doors to basement carparking to avoid the appearance of a 'black hole' in the streetscape?	N/A	Basement parking not proposed.
3.35 Return façade material into the visible area of the basement car park entry?	N/A	Basement parking not proposed.
3.36 Locate or screen all parking to minimise visibility from the street?	Yes	Cars are not visible from the street with the proposed arrangement of carparking and driveway.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
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	Yes, balconies and POS to dwellings facing street have been designed to address the street. 12 out of 20 dwellings address the street.
4.02 Be particularly sensitive to privacy impacts where dwellings must be oriented at 90 degrees to the existing pattern of development?	Yes	Yes, buildings have been set back as much as possible from side boundaries.
4.03 Set upper storeys back behind the side or rear building line?	Yes	All efforts have been made to set back upper storeys from the side setbacks, and where not possible, the use of privacy screens and / or translucent windows provide necessary privacy measures.
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	Yes, the façade is designed to break down the scale of the two-storey development to be more compatible with the local context which is predominately single storey residential detached dwellings. The use of 1F cantilevering balconies and simple forms achieve this.
4.05 Incorporate second stories within the roof space and provide dormer windows?	No	Dormer windows not compatible with local character.
4.06 Offset openings from existing neighbouring windows or doors?	Yes	Windows have been made smaller in size where adjoining neighbours to reduce privacy impacts. 1F living spaces are orientated to avoid looking to neighbours.
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	Yes, walls are broken up by varying materials or providing articulation.
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	Yes, landscaping is used along boundaries to provide privacy to the east, west and south adjoining neighbours.
4.09 Locate deep soil zones where they will be provide privacy and shade for adjacent dwellings?	Yes	Yes, deep soil zones have been provided to privacy particularly to the north and south adjoining neighbours where possible.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
4.10 Plant in side and rear setbacks for privacy and shade for adjoining dwellings?	Yes	Yes, planting has been proposed adjacent to all boundaries.
4.11 Use species that are characteristic to the local area for new planting?	Yes	Yes, a mix of native and exotic species have been proposed to both reflect the existing locality and respond to the contemporary nature of the design.
Residential amenity Does the site planning and design:		
4.12 Protect sun access and ventilation to living areas and private open space of neighbouring dwellings by ensuring adequate building separation?	Yes	All efforts have been made to reduce impacts to adjoining neighbours, particularly the southern neighbour. Shadow diagrams have been provided to demonstrate that there are no adverse impacts to the private open spaces to the southern neighbour.
4.13 Design dwellings so that they do not directly overlook neighbours' private open space or look into existing dwellings?	Yes	All efforts have been made to avoid overlooking to adjoining neighbours. Where not possible, translucent windows and privacy screen provide the privacy measures required.
4.14 Locate private open space in front setbacks where possible to minimise negative impacts on neighbours?	Yes /	POS have been located in front setbacks where possible and where not possible have been designed to minimise privacy impacts to the adjoining neighbours. Due to the yield there are some POS that face adjoining neighbours however the use of privacy screens mitigate impacts.
4.15 Ensure private open space is not adjacent to quiet neighbouring uses, e.g. bedrooms?	Yes	The main POS of GF units do not directly face quiet neighbouring uses.
4.16 Design dwellings around internal courtyards?	N/A	No internal courtyards proposed
4.17 Provide adequate screening for private open space areas?	Yes	Yes, a combination of landscaping and privacy screens provide sufficient privacy for POS areas. On the 1F full height privacy screens are proposed to shield views from the clotheslines from street.
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	Yes, POS is located along the north and south side setback on the GF and screen planting is proposed along the north / south boundaries for privacy.

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:		
4.19 Provide planting and trees between driveways and side fences to screen noise and reduce visual impacts?	Yes	Yes, planting has been provided between driveways and side fences with tall planting adjacent to boundary fences to screen noise.
4.20 Position driveways so as to be a buffer between new and existing adjacent dwellings?	No	Due to the long elevation the driveway has been positioned between two separate buildings to break down the mass of the development.
5. Internal Site Amenity		
Built form Does the site planning and design:		
5.01 Maximise solar access to living areas and private open space areas of the dwelling?	Yes	Yes, units are designed to maximise solar access to living areas and POS. 15/20 units comply with solar requirements which is above the minimum requirements.
5.02 Provide dwellings with a sense of identity through building articulation, roof form and other architectural elements?	Yes	The massing has been designed so that each dwelling is stepped to provide definition and articulation from the street.
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?	N/A	This is not a villa or townhouse style development.
5.04 Use trees, vegetation, fences, or screening devices to establish curtilages for individual dwellings in villa or townhouse style developments?	N/A	This is not a villa or townhouse style development.
5.05 Have dwelling entries that are clear and identifiable from the street or driveway?	Yes	The main pedestrian entries are clearly defined as they are placed between the separate buildings. The main pedestrian entries also have a letterbox on a low brick wall which clearly mark them as main entries.
5.06 Provide a buffer between public/communal open space and private dwellings?	Yes	Tthe communal open space has landscape buffers to the dwellings.
5.07 Provide a sense of address for each dwelling?	Yes	Yes, each GF street facing unit has their own private entry from the street.
5.08 Orientate dwelling entries to not look directly into other dwellings?	Yes	Yes, the massing of the development has been designed to minimise overlooking to adjoining

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
		dwellings wherever possible. Where not possible, the use of privacy screens and translucent windows have been used.
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	Yes, habitable rooms moved away from driveways as much as possible. Where not possible, window sills have been raised to avoid car lights.
5.10 Avoid large uninterrupted areas of hard surface?	Yes	Yes, hard surfaces are designed with landscaping in between to avoid large areas of hard surface. The driveway is bordered by landscaping to soften its edges.
5.11 Screen parking from views and outlooks from dwellings?	Yes	Yes, parking is screened from view as much as possible, or windows are raised to avoid car lights.
Reduce the dominance of areas for vehicular circulation and parking by: **5.12** Considering single rather than double width driveways?	Yes	Yes, a single driveway has been provided which terminates with landscaping.
5.13 Use communal car courts rather than individual garages?	Yes	Yes, a communal car park has been provided at the rear of the site.
Reduce the dominance of areas for vehicular circulation and parking by considering: **5.14** Single rather than double garages?	N/A	No garages proposed
5.15 Communal car courts rather than individual garages?	Yes	Yes, a communal car park has been provided at the rear of the site.
5.16 Tandem parking or a single garage with single car port in tandem?	N/A	No garages or carports proposed
5.17 Providing some dwellings without any car parking for residents without cars?	Yes	A parking mix has been used so that there is a total of 9 car spaces for 20 dwellings.
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	The driveway and pedestrian path is separated by landscaping to clearly define the two.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
5.19 Provide pedestrian routes to all public and semi-public areas?	Yes	Yes, there are pedestrian routes to all pedestrian areas such as the lobbies, bin store, and communal open areas.
5.20 Avoid ambiguous spaces in building and dwelling entries that are not obviously designated as public or private?	Yes	Yes, the main pedestrian paths are located between the separate buildings and clearly defined with a brick wall and letter boxes.
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	Yes, all efforts have been made to maximise passive surveillance and reduce opportunities for concealment. The communal lobbies have a clear line of sight from front to back.
5.22 Clearly define thresholds between public and private spaces?	Yes	Fences are provided around each tenant's POS on the GF to clearly define thresholds between public and private.
5.23 Provide private open space that is generous in proportion and adjacent to the main living areas of the dwelling?	Yes	Yes, all POS are accessed off living spaces and all efforts have been made to maximise their generosity.
5.24 Provide private open space area that are orientated predominantly to the north, east or west to provide solar access?	Yes	Yes, all efforts have been made to maximise north facing private open spaces.
5.25 Provide private open space areas that comprise multiple spaces for larger dwellings?	Yes	Yes, each unit has paved hardscape and softscape in their 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	Yes, POS facing the street have open style fencing and planting to provide casual surveillance of the street (public) and also maintain privacy.
5.27 Provide private open space areas that are both paved and planted when located at ground level?	Yes	Yes, POS for tenants on the GF have a combination of hardscape and softscape surfaces.
5.28 Provide private open space areas that retain existing vegetation where practical?	Yes	The existing trees are located in the communal space that is in view with most private open spaces.
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	Concrete pavers have been specified for maintenance reasons and allow for ease of surface run off.
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 is easily accessibility to all residents. Shared facilities not part of brief.

Design Issues / Design Principles and Better Practices	Addressed in Design (strike through)	Design Response / Comment
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	Yes, garbage room is located to the rear of the site to reduce visual prominence to the street.

Declaration by consultant architect	
I/we declare to the best of my/our knowledge and belief, that the details and information provided on this checklist are correct in every respect.	
Name:	Sam Crawford
Capacity/Qualifications:	Director
Firm:	Sam Crawford Architects
Signature:	
Date:	26 July 2022