**SEPP 65 – Apartment Design Guide Table of Compliance – DA/619/2023 – PPSHCC-193**

| **No.** | **Control** | **Proposed** | **Complies** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Part 1 – Identifying the context*** | | | |
| *1A: Apartment building types* | *Towers apartments are suited to central business districts, major centres and urban renewal areas. Tower apartments are typically more than nine storeys and best used when:*  *- located in dense urban areas*  - *other towers exist in the surrounding context*  *- an area requires greater density than can be delivered by perimeter block buildings*  *- a strong vertical form or landmark is desired* | The proposed development is predominantly defined as shop top housing. | Yes |
| *1B: Local character & context* | *Good design responds and contributes to its context. Context is everything that has a bearing on an area and comprises the key natural and built features. Context also includes social, economic and environmental factors.* | The subject sites are located within a local centre in a coastal setting with several items of heritage significance both within the site or near the site. The mixed-use development is compatible with the local centre, however the design could do more to respond to its coastal setting and items of heritage significance.  Council questions the large areas of commercial floor area provided as there are currently many vacant tenancies within the local centre, in addition to the subject sites being on the periphery of this centre. | **No** |
| *1C: Precincts & individual sites* | *Residential apartment developments are generally developed on individual sites or within precincts* | The design rationale is unclear for Site 1, which is a relatively large site and should be considered as a precinct. This is a missed opportunity to provide either an identifiable precinct or unique public area fronting The Entrance Road.  The design rationale is somewhat clearer for Site 2 however the proposed building form and articulation needs to consider its coastal setting and adjoining heritage items. | **No** |
| ***Part 2 – Developing the Controls*** | | | |
| *2E: Building depth* | *Use a range of appropriate maximum apartment depths of 12-18m from glass line to glass line.* | The developments across both Sites 1 and 2 have been designed to have separate building form with nearly all apartments having a maximum depth of between 12-18m. The exception to this is some larger apartments with three aspects and so building depth is acceptable. | Yes |
| *2F: Building separation* | *Building separation up to 4 storeys* | Site 1 – western boundary of Building A has a setback of 8.2m on the ground floor and 8.6m on the next three storey levels and so complies with minimum separation distances.  Building A has an awning above the ground level that is setback 5.6m from the boundary and so fails to comply with this control.  Building F has a setback of over 6m to the boundary on the first two storeys with the third and fourth storeys encroaching upon the 6m setback in the south eastern corner (5.8m) and so fails to comply with this control.  Site 1 – southern boundary  Buildings D, E and F have a minimum setback of 8.5m to the southern boundary for the first 4 storeys and so complies with the minimum separation distances. | **No** |
|  |  | Site 2 – eastern boundary:  The development proposes setbacks between 5.2m and 5.8m along this boundary for the first 4 storeys and so does not comply with minimum separation distances. | **No** |
| *Building separation 5-8 storeys* | Site 1 – western boundary  Building A has a setback of approximately 8.6m on the fifth to eighth storeys and does not comply with the minimum separation distances.  Building F has a setback of 5.8-7.2m on the fifth to eighth storeys, and so does not comply with the minimum separation distances.  Site 1 – southern boundary  Buildings D, E and F have a minimum setback of 8.5m-8.7m to the southern boundary for the fifth to eighth storeys and so does not comply with the minimum separation distances. | **No** |
| Site 2 – eastern boundary  The development has setbacks from 5.2m-5.6m along this boundary for the fifth to eighth storeys and so does not comply with the minimum separation distances. | **No** |
| *Building separation 9 storeys and above* | Site 1 – western boundary  Building A has a setback of approximately 12m on the ninth storey, and complies with the minimum separation distance.  Building F has a setback of 5.9-7.2m on the ninth storey, and so does not comply with the minimum separation distance.  Site 1 – southern boundary  Buildings D, E and F have a minimum setback of 8.8m-9.6m to the southern boundary on the ninth storey and so does not comply with the minimum separation distances. | **No** |
|  |  | Site 2 – eastern boundary  The development has a setback of 5.5m from this boundary for the ninth storey and so does not comply with the minimum separation distance. | **No** |
| *2G: Street Setbacks* | *Under the CCDCP, street setbacks are specified in Ch.2.3 Residential Flat Buildings and Shop Top Housing Part 2.3.4.1 covers setbacks for RFBs of 3 or more storeys. Front setbacks of 6 metres applies to all aspects of the development, with the exception of a portico, or an approved structure required for a waste collection area.*  *Note: these setback requirements do not apply to any commercial portion of the proposal.* | Site 1 Building A has a 4.6m setback to the boundary with The Entrance Rd for levels 1-7 and so does not comply with this control.  Site 1 Building B has a 15m setback to the boundary with The Entrance Rd and complies with this control.  Site 1 Building C has a 17.9m setback to the boundary with The Entrance Rd and complies with this control in this area. Site 1 Building C has a varying setback to the boundary with Oakland Ave of between 2.3m to 4.6m for levels 1-7 and so does not comply with this control.  Site 1 Building D has a varying setback to the boundary with Oakland Ave of between 2.4m and 9.6m for levels 1-8 and so does not comply with this control for approximately 50% of the length of the eastern façade of the building.  Site 1 Building F has a varying setback to the boundary with Clifford St of between 5.9m to 7.2m for levels 1-8 and so does not comply with this control for approximately 20% of the length of the western façade of the building. | **No** |
|  |  | The development on Site 2 has a minimum setback of 6m to the boundary with The Entrance Rd on levels 1-6 and complies with this control.  The development on Site 2 has a varying setback to the boundary with Oakland Ave with a minimum setback of 0m and does not comply with this control.  The development on Site 2 has a varying setback to the boundary with Bent St with a minimum setback of 5.5m and does not comply with this control. | **No** |
| *2H: Side and rear setbacks* | *Under the CCDCP, there are side and rear setbacks for residential flat buildings (RFBs) in Ch.2.3 Residential Flat Buildings and Shop Top Housing.*  *Part 2.3.4.1 requires side and rear setbacks of 6m or the first four storeys, 9m for the 5th-8th storeys, and 12m for the 9th storey and above.*  *Note: no more than 4 consecutive storeys of the building shall be at the same setback.* | Site 1 Building A has setbacks to the side boundary of 8.5m for the first four storeys and so complies with this control. Site 1 Building A has setbacks of 8.5m for the 5th-8th storeys which is less than the required 9m and so does not comply with this control. Site 1 Building A has a setback to the side boundary of 12m on the 9th storey and so complies with this control.  Site 1 Building D has setbacks to the rear boundary of a minimum of 8.5m for the first four storeys and so complies with this control. Site 1 Building D has setbacks of 8.5m for the 5th-8th storeys which is less than the required 9m and so does not comply with this control. Site 1 Building D has setbacks of 8.5m for the 9th storey which is less than the required 12m and so does not comply with this control.  Site 1 Building E has setbacks to the rear boundary of 8.5m for the first four storeys and so complies with this control. Site 1 Building E has setbacks of 8.5m for the 5th-8th storeys which is less than the required 9m and so does not comply with this control. Site 1 Building E has a minimum setback of 9.6m for the 9th storey which is less than the required 12m and so does not comply with this control.  Site 1 Building F has a minimum setback to the rear boundary of 8.8m for the first four storeys and so complies with this control. Site 1 Building F has a minimum setback of 8.8m for the 5th-8th storeys which is less than the required 9m and so does not comply with this control. Site 1 Building F has a minimum setback of 8.8m for the 9th storey which is less than the required 12m and so does not comply with this control. | **No** |
|  |  | The development on Site 2 has setbacks to the rear boundary of between 5.1m and 5.5m for all residential storeys and does not comply with these controls. | No |
| ***Part 3 – Siting the Development*** | | | |
| *3A: Site Analysis* | *Site analysis illustrates that design decisions have been based on opportunities and constraints of the site conditions and their relationship to the surrounding context.*  *Each element in the Site Analysis Checklist should be addressed (see Appendix 1)* | Site 1 has minimal information provided, which is unacceptable for a site of this size. Site 1 needs to be considered as a precinct in the wider and local context and in the site context.  Evidence of site analysis and design decisions based on understanding of the context is very limited. The proposal does not acknowledge coastal setting on the lake foreshore. The proposal does not adequately respond to or respect heritage items on the site or in the vicinity, apart from proposing to retain them. Neighbourhood character has not been analysed graphically and is not evident in the architectural response. *Site context and survey plan* and an *Analysis* plan as per the ADG checklist have not been provided. Many elements in the Site Analysis Checklist (App1 of ADG) need to be addressed, including but not limited to surrounding existing vegetation (street trees and substantial palms in front of site), existing heritage items on the site and in close proximity, solar access and potential overshadowing, location of POS or communal areas on adjoining land, location of utilities and easements (future carriageway) etc. These elements then need to be analysed and should inform the design. | **No** |
|  |  | Site 2 has minimal information provided. Evidence of site analysis and design decisions based on understanding of the context is limited. Proposal does not acknowledge coastal setting on the lake foreshore. Proposal does not adequately respond to or respect heritage items in the vicinity. Neighbourhood character has not been analysed graphically and is not evident in the architectural response. *Site context and survey plan* and an *Analysis* plan as per the ADG checklist have not been provided. Many elements in the Site Analysis Checklist (App1 of ADG) need to be addressed, including but not limited to surrounding existing vegetation (street trees and substantial palms in front of site), existing heritage items in close proximity to the site, location of POS or communal areas on adjoining land, location of utilities and easements (future carriageway) etc. These elements then need to be analysed and should inform the design, e.g. how will building forms respond to or respect heritage items in the vicinity? Which locations are appropriate for active street frontages built to boundary with awnings, and which locations should planting be provided? What materials are appropriate to the coastal setting, and to respond to the heritage items and local character. | **No** |
| *3B: Orientation* | *Building types and layouts respond to the streetscape and site while optimising solar access within the development* | Site 1 building type and layout is a mixed use development with a ground level of retail and back of house services, 1 podium level of residential and communal open space, then 5-8 additional levels of residential in 6 building forms spaced around the site. The development on Site 1 does not respond to the streetscape while optimising solar access within the development. The layouts of the buildings are the same whether or not they face the street, and the building forms are the same on each level and do not allow for greater setbacks at upper levels to optimise solar access within the development. | **No** |
| Site 2 building type and layout is a mixed use development with a ground level of retail and back of house services, 2 podium levels of residential, then 4-5 additional levels of residential in 2 building forms facing north and south. The development on Site 2 responds to the streetscape while optimising solar access and satisfies the requirements of the control. | Yes |
|  | *Overshadowing of neighbouring properties is minimised during mid-winter* | The development on Site 1 has not made an attempt to minimise overshadowing of properties to the south. A 9 storey building height is maintained for the 3 buildings along this boundary, and setbacks have not been increased accordingly. In addition, development on Site 1 will overshadow development on Site 2, and the sites to the south of Site 2. | **No** |
| Development on Site 2 will overshadow sites to the east and south. A minimal setback to the boundaries has been provided of less than 6m, and setbacks have not been increased on upper levels in accordance with the ADG, so overshadowing of neighbouring properties has not been minimised. | **No** |
| *3C Public Domain Interface* | *Transition between private and public domain is achieved without compromising safety and security* | The development on Site 1 has a poor differentiation between public and private areas. Ground floor retail faces streets as well as communal open space areas. More private areas within the site like the stand of trees near Clifford Street are accessible to the public and there are concerns about safety and security in this area. | **No** |
| The development on Site 2 has a good differentiation between the public and private domain and satisfies the control. | Yes |
|  | *Amenity of the public domain is retained and enhanced* | The development on Site 1 proposes to retain the paperbark trees along The Entrance Rd and the pine trees near Clifford St. The heritage building on the corner is also proposed to be retained. These areas could be enhanced by the creation of a public precinct near the heritage building and the paperbark trees, with smaller retail outlets that would encourage food and beverage premises and outdoor seating. The area near the pine trees near Clifford St could form part of an open space area with access from Clifford St providing a public park and play area where Building F is located. This would improve the amenity for the residents in Clifford St and surrounding areas, as well as for the residents of the development. | **No** |
| The development on Site 2 provides a landscaped setback and street trees on 3 sides but there is a conflict with the awning proposed above the trees and it is not clear how they are to grow in this location. This conflict will need to be resolved before this control can be satisfied. | **No** |
| *3D-1: Communal & Public Open Space* | *Communal open space has a minimum area equal to 25% (1,208m²) of the site area and min. dimension of 3m* | Site 1 has an area of 15,025m² meaning a minimum area of approximately 3,756m² with a minimum dimension of 3m must be provided as communal open space.  The COS provided on the Ground Level around the two groups of trees and the COS provided Level 1 with a minimum dimension of 3m has a total area of approximately 4,494m² which complies with the control. | Yes |
|  | Site 2 has an area of 4,269m² meaning an area of approximately 1,067m² with a minimum dimension of 3m must be provided as communal open space (COS).  The COS provided on Level 2 and Level 9 with a minimum dimension of 3m has a total area of approximately 1,128m² which complies with the control. | Yes |
| *Developments achieve a minimum of 50% direct sunlight to the principal usable part of the communal open space for a minimum of 2 hours between 9am and 3pm on 21 June (mid winter)* | From the shadow diagrams for Site 1, the COS area on the podium between buildings B & E, and buildings C& D, have solar access generally between 9am and 12 noon. The COS area out the front near the paperbark trees gets solar access most of the day. The COS area out the back near the pine trees gets solar access generally between 12 noon and 3pm. The requirement is satisfied. | Yes |
|  | From the shadow diagrams for Site 2, the COS area on the podium between the two buildings is overshadowed by the development or by the development on Site 1, for all of the day in mid-winter. The COS area on the roof gets solar access all day. The roof area is more than half of the required total COS area therefore this requirement is satisfied. | Yes |
| *3E-1: Deep Soil* | *Minimum 7% (338.17m²) of the site is to comprise deep soil, with a minimum dimension of 6m for a site area greater than 1,500m²* | Site 1 has an area of 15,025m² meaning a minimum area of approximately 1,052m² with a minimum dimension of 6m must be provided as deep soil zones. The deep soil zones provided with a minimum dimension of 6m total approximately 2,772m², which well exceeds the minimum. | Yes |
|  |  | Site 2 has an area of 4,269m² meaning an area of approximately 299m² with a minimum dimension of 6m must be provided as deep soil zones. The deep soil zones provided have a width varying between 5.2m – 5.6m, not 6m as required, and so do not qualify for inclusion in the calculation. Site 2 has 0m² provided as deep soil zones. | **No** |
| *3F-1: Visual Privacy* | *Minimum separation distances from buildings to the side and rear boundary are as follows:*  *Up to 12m (4 storeys)*   * *6m between habitable rooms and balconies* * *3m between non-habitable rooms.*   *Up to 25m (5-8 storeys)*   * *9m between habitable rooms and balconies* * *4.5m between non-habitable rooms.*   *Building height over 25m (9+ storeys)*   * *12m between habitable rooms and balconies* * *6m between non-habitable rooms.* | Note: the development on Site 1 has the first 3 storeys at a height of 10.5m, then storeys 4-7 are 22.9m then storeys 8 and 9 are over 25m.  Also note: it is difficult to determine where window openings are on some of the buildings (particularly Buildings B and F) so measurements are taken to the walls of habitable rooms or balustrades of balconies.  Site 1 Building A has a minimum separation of 12m to Buildings B and E for the 2nd and 3rd storeys and so complies with this control for these levels. Building A has a minimum separation distance of 12m from other buildings on storeys 4-7 which is less than the 18m required and so does not comply with this control for these levels. Building A has a minimum separation distance of 12m from Building E on storeys 8-9 which is less than the 24m required and so does not comply with this control for these levels.  Site 1 Building B has a minimum separation of 12m to other buildings for the 2nd and 3rd storeys and so complies with this control for these levels.  Building B has a separation distance of less than 18m from other buildings on storeys 4-6 and so does not comply with this control for these levels.  Site 1 Building C has a minimum separation of greater than 12m to Buildings B for the 2nd and 3rd storeys and so complies with this control for these levels. Building C has a 6m separation to the blank wall of Building D for the 2nd and 3rd storeys and complies with this control for these levels in this area. Building C has a minimum separation distance of less than 18m with Building B between habitable rooms or balconies on storeys 4-6 and so does not comply with this control for these levels. Building C has a minimum separation distance of less than 9m with the blank wall of Building D on storeys 4-7 and so does not comply with this control for these levels. Building A has a minimum separation distance of less than 12m with the blank wall of Building D on storeys 8-9 so does not comply with this control for these levels.  Site 1 Building D has the required separation distance with Building C for the 2nd and 3rd storeys only. The separation distances between Buildings D and C on storeys 4-9 are less than the required minimums.  Site 1 Building D has a minimum separation distance with Building E greater than required for storeys 2-7 and so complies with this control for these levels. Building D has a minimum separation distance with Building E of less than the required 24m on the 8th and 9th storeys and do does not comply with this control for these levels in this area.  Site 1 Building E has a minimum separation distance with Building F greater than required for the 2nd and 3rd storeys and so complies with this control for these levels. Building E has separation distance with Building F less than the minimum required for storeys 4-9 and so does not comply with the controls. Refer to Trapeze docs for building dimensions. | **No** |
|  |  | The development on Site 2 has a ground level of retail, then 2 levels of residential in a U shape with a courtyard on a podium in between. There are two separate buildings on the 4th – 6th storeys with a minimum separation distance of approximately 19m, which complies with this control. There is only one building on the 9th storey so this control is not applicable. | Yes |
| *3G: Pedestrian Access* | *Building entries and pedestrian access connects to and addresses the public domain* | The development on Site 1 has residential building entries that are accessible from the public domain but do not have a clear address to the street for 5 of the 6 residential buildings. The only façade that signifies a residential address is for Building D where there is a change of material around the first two storeys of the building. The other entry ways and lobbies to the other buildings are visible as doorways to glazing or do not face the street and internal elevations have not been provided so it is not clear what level of articulation has been provided. | **No** |
|  |  | The development on Site 2 has entry ways fronting the street but these are not differentiated in the building form. More could be done to highlight the entry ways and lobbies to the residential units. | **No** |
|  | *Access, entries and pathways are accessible and easy to identify* | The pathways on Site 1 are ambiguous and the level of detail provided in the landscape plan is very poor. For a site of this size, a detailed design plan is required for the public domain and common open space areas to show the different functions of the spaces and different design qualities. Having the same informal treatment for all spaces is confusing. | **No** |
| The pathways on Site 2 are ambiguous and the level of detail provided in the landscape plan is very poor. | **No** |
| *3H-1: Vehicle Access* | *Vehicle access points are designed and located to achieve safety, minimise conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles and create high quality streetscapes* | Vehicle access to each site is well considered and located in a discreet location away from the major street frontages. Vehicle access to the sites is satisfactory. | Yes |
| ***Part 4 – Designing the Building*** | | | |
| *4A-1: Solar and Daylight Access* | *Living rooms and private open spaces of at least 70% of apartments in a building receive a minimum of 3 hours direct sunlight between 9am and 3pm at mid winter* | Site 1 could not verify solar and daylight access as window openings not clear on plans for some buildings (refer to Building B and F Level 05 plan) and no internal elevations have been provided for the development. | **No** |
|  | Site 2 64/105 units receive at least 3 hours of sunlight as specified under the control. This represents 62% of the units on Site 2 and is less than the minimum required. | **No** |
| *A maximum of 15% of apartments in a building receive no direct sunlight between 9am and 3pm mid winter* | Site 1 could not verify solar and direct sunlight access as window openings are not clear on plans for some buildings (refer to Building B and F Level 05 plan) and no internal elevations have been provided for the development. | **No** |
|  | Site 2 18/105 units do not receive any direct sunlight. This represents 17% of total units and exceeds the maximum required under the control. | **No** |
| *4B-3: Natural Ventilation* | *Minimum of 60% of apartments are naturally cross ventilated in the first nine storeys of the building* | Site 1 could not verify cross ventilation as window openings not clear on plans for some buildings (refer to Building B and F Level 05 plan) and no internal elevations provided for the development.  Based on the information provided, an assessment of Building A indicated that only 41% of units achieving cross ventilation, which is less than the minimum required. | **No** |
| Site 2 has 47 of 105 units with a single aspect, or 45% of units that do not achieve cross ventilation. 55% of units are naturally cross ventilated which is less than the minimum requirements. | **No** |
| *4C: Ceiling Heights* | *Minimum ceiling heights for habitable rooms are 2.7m and non-habitable rooms are 2.4m* | Site 1 Elevations indicate residential floor to floor heights of 3.1m so a ceiling height of 2.7m should be achievable. | Yes |
| Site 2 Sections indicate residential floor to floor heights of 3.1m so a ceiling height of 2.7m should be achievable. | Yes |
| *4D-1: Apartment Size* | *Apartments have the following minimum internal areas:*   * *Studio – 35m²* * *1 bedroom – 50m²* * *2 bedroom – 70m²* * *3 bedroom – 90m²*   *Add 5m² for each additional bathroom* | All units comply for both Sites 1 and 2. | Yes |
| *4D-2: Room Depths*  And *4D-3: Apartment Layout* | *Master bedrooms have a minimum area of 10m² and other bedrooms 9m² (excluding wardrobe space)* | Unable to assess as unit labels are concealing floor plans for 77% of units. | **No** |
| *Bedrooms have a minimum dimension of 3m (excluding wardrobe space)* | Unable to assess as unit labels are concealing floor plans for 77% of units. | **No** |
| *Apartment layouts are designed to accommodate a variety of household activities and needs* | Unable to assess as unit labels are concealing floor plans for 77% of units. | **No** |
| *Living rooms or combined living/dining rooms have a minimum width of:*  *3.6m for studio and 1 bedroom apartments*  *4m for 2 and 3 bedroom apartments* | Unable to assess as unit labels are concealing floor plans for 77% of units. | **No** |
| *4E: Private Open Space & Balconies* | *All apartments are required to have primary balconies as follows:*   * *Studio – 4m²* * *1 bedroom – 8m² with min. 2m depth* * *2 bedroom – 10m² with min. 2m depth* * *3+ bedroom – 12m² and min. 2.4m depth* | Site 1 has a total of 274/354 of units with a POS that does not comply with this control. This is 77% of units on Site 1 with insufficient POS.  Site 1 Buildings A and C have a narrow area of communal open space (COS) in front of every balcony on level 1. This is not good in terms of privacy and usability. This COS should be redesigned so that it is POS and combined with the balconies will make this comply with the POS size for a podium level.  Site 1 Building A has 60/77 units with POS that does not comply with this control. This is 78% of the units of Building A with insufficient POS.  Site 1 Building B has 4/25 units with POS that does not comply with this control. This is 16% of the units of Building B with insufficient POS.  Site 1 Building C has 73/77 units with POS that does not comply with this control. This is 95% of the units of Building C with insufficient POS.  Site 1 Building D has 44/52 units with POS that does not comply with this control. This is 85% of the units of Building D with insufficient POS.  Site 1 Building E has 74/77 units with POS that does not comply with this control. This is 96% of the units of Building E with insufficient POS.  Site 1 Building F has 19/46 units with POS that does not comply with this control. This is 41% of the units of Building F with insufficient POS.  Refer to Trapeze docs and Compliance tables for unit nos., POS areas and dimensions. | **No** |
|  | Site 2 has 42/105 units with POS that does not comply with this control. This is 40% of the units on Site 2 with insufficient POS.  Refer to Trapeze docs and Compliance tables for unit nos., POS areas and dimensions. | **No** |
| *4F-1: Common Circulation* | *The maximum number of apartments off a circulation core on a single level is 8* | Site 1 Buildings D, E and F comply. Buildings A, C and E have 10 apartments off each circulation core on levels 1-6, and 9 apartments off each circulation core on level 8. On level 7, buildings A, C and E have 8 apartments off a circulation core and this is the only level where these buildings comply with the control. | **No** |
| Site 2 complies | Yes |
|  | *Longer corridors greater than 12m in length from the lift core should be articulated. Design solutions may include:*  *- a series of foyer areas with windows and spaces for seating*  *- wider areas at apartment entry doors and varied ceiling heights.* | Site 1 Buildings A, C and E have long corridors approximately 27m in length but the buildings have a break in the north end to allow for daylight and an individual foyer to the northern apartments and the south end has a window which assists in breaking up the length of the corridors. | Yes |
| Site 2 has corridors approximately 21m in length in both the north and south parts of the development. There is no break or articulation in these corridors. The only daylight is from windows located near the lifts. This design issue is worse on level 1 where both corridors have no daylight and one of them is approximately 42m in length when measured from the lift core. This is unsatisfactory and potentially unsafe and breaks in the building should be provided to permit articulation and daylight into the corridors. | No |
| *4G: Storage* | *In addition to storage in kitchens, bathrooms and bedrooms, the following storage is provided:*   * *Studio – 4m³* * *1 bedroom – 6m³* * *2 bedroom – 8m³* * *3+ bedroom – 10m³*   *At least 50% of required storage to be located within the apartment* | Site 1 could not assess storage within units as apartment labels obscure the detail in the floor plans. | No |
|  |  | Site 2 has 41/105 units without sufficient storage provided within the apartment. This is 39% of units on Site 2 that do not comply with this control. | **No** |
| *Storage not located in apartments is secure and clearly allocated to specific apartments* | Site 1 has a total of 124 individual storage cages in the basement which is not enough to supply adequate storage for 354 units. Storage cages are provided for only 35% of units on Site 1. | **No** |
| Site 2 has a total of 74 individual storage cages in the basement which is not enough to supply adequate storage for 105 units. Storage cages are provided for 70% of units on Site 2. | **No** |
| *4H: Acoustic Privacy* | *Adequate building separation is provided within the development and from neighbouring buildings/ adjacent uses* | The development on Site 1 does not have adequate building separation in many instances as discussed in parts 2F, 2H and 3F. | **No** |
| The development on Site 2 does not have adequate building separation from the side boundary as discussed in part 2H. | **No** |
| *Noise sources such as garage doors, driveways, service areas, plant rooms, building services, mechanical equipment, active communal open spaces and circulation areas should be located at least 3m away from bedrooms* | The development on Site 1 has communal open space in the form of a podium level on the 2nd storey which wraps around many of the residential blocks. Many bedroom windows face these areas and will be directly impacted by noise as well as impacts on visual privacy**.** | **No** |
| The development on Site 2 satisfies the control. | Yes |
| *4J: Noise and Pollution* |  | The sites are located in a lakeside location with good quality air and limited impacts from potential noise sources like transport corridors. | Yes |
| *4K: Apartment Mix* | *A range of apartment types and sizes is provided to cater for different household types now and into the future* | The units are a good mix of 1, 2 and 3 bedrooms which can cater for different household types. | Yes |
| *4M: Facades* | *Building facades provide visual interest along the street while respecting the character of the local area* | The development on Site 1 has a very poor quality design approach to the facades. The proposed façade treatment is the same on all levels except for the ground floor on most of the buildings. The character of the local area has not been respected in the facades and visual interest is limited because the site is so big and the buildings appear to have little differentiation between them. The façade treatment in the vicinity of the heritage item does not respect or respond appropriately to this unique feature on the site. | **No** |
| The development on Site 2 has a better design resolution than Site 1. The building form of 3 podium levels runs for the length of the street but there is little attempt to break up the length along Oakland Ave, especially around the lobby entry areas. There is an opportunity to provide a different street address to The Entrance Road which is more compatible with the heritage when viewed in the streetscape. | **No** |
| *Building functions are expressed by the facade* | It is difficult to assess the facades in Site 1 as internal elevations have not been provided. The boundary elevations do not show an expression of building functions in the façade. | **No** |
| It would be preferable for the entry ways to the residential components to be expressed in the façade for Site 2. This would also help to alleviate the length of the podium levels along Oakland Ave. | **No** |
| *4N: Roof design* | *Roof treatments are integrated into the building design and positively respond to the street* | Roof treatments for both sites are simple flat roof forms that do not negatively impact on the street. | Yes |
| *Opportunities to use roof space for residential accommodation and open space are maximised* | The roofs on the buildings on Site 1 have not made use of these opportunities. | **No** |
| The roof of the southern building on Site 2 has photovoltaics to contribute towards energy supply in the development. | Yes |
| *4O: Landscape Design* | *Landscape design is viable and sustainable.* | Landscape design drawings have been provided with limited detail and this component can’t be assessed. | **No** |
| *Landscape design contributes to the streetscape and amenity* | Landscape design drawings have been provided with limited detail and this component can’t be assessed. | **No** |
| *4P: Planting on Structures* | *Planting on structures contributes to the quality and amenity of communal and public open spaces* | Landscape design drawings have been provided with limited detail and this component can’t be assessed. | **No** |
| *4Q: Universal Design* | *Developments achieve a benchmark of 20% of the total apartments incorporating the Liveable Housing Guideline’s silver level universal design features* | The development on Site 1 identifies 6 unit plans as being accessible and suitable for adaption but has not indicated universal design features and has not indicated the number of units and where they are located so this requirement can’t be assessed. | **No** |
| The development on Site 2 identifies 11/105 units as having silver level design features. This is only 10% of units and does not comply with the control. | **No** |
|  | Silver level design features  *1. A safe continuous and step free path of travel from the street entrance and/or parking area to a dwelling entrance that is one level* | Site 1 has ground floor plans with limited detail so this requirement can’t be assessed. | **No** |
| Site 2 has step free paths of travel from street entrances and accessible parking in basement to lifts that can access dwelling entries. | Yes |
|  | *2. At least one, level (step-free) entrance into the dwelling* | Entrances to all dwellings from the corridor on Site 1 appear to be step-free | Yes |
| Entrances to all dwellings from the corridor on Site 2 are step-free | Yes |
|  | *Adaptable housing should be provided in accordance with the relevant council policy*  *Ch2.3 of CCDCP requires 10% of units in RFBs to be designed as suitable for adaptation for occupation by disabled/ aged persons, as outlined in AS 4299: Adaptable Housing. A higher rate of adaptable housing of 15% is encouraged.* | The development on Site 1 has floor plans for 6 units that are accessible and could be adapted, but it is not clear where these units are located, and if they occur on multiple floors so this requirement could not be assessed. | **No** |
| The development on Site 2 has not identified any units as suitable for adaption for occupation by disabled or aged persons. | **No** |
| *4R: Adaptive Reuse* | *Adaptive Reuse* | There is a heritage building on Site 1 but there is no use proposed in the floor plans, so it is unclear what reuse is proposed. | **No** |
| Adaptive reuse is not applicable to Site 2. | N/A |
| *4S: Mixed Use* | *Mixed use developments are provided in appropriate locations and provide active street frontages that encourage pedestrian movement. Mixed use development should be concentrated around public transport and centres* | The location is in a town centre with existing mixed use buildings. | Yes |
| Site 1 has a random location of active frontages with some retail spaces facing internal areas within the site. As there are a lot of vacant shop fronts in The Entrance, active frontages/ retail spaces should be more concentrated towards street frontages. Back of house, communal open space for residential and sleeved parking could be provided at ground level in place of an over supply of retail areas. | **No** |
|  | Site 2 has active frontages provided addressing the streets. As there are a lot of street boundaries in Site 2, there may be the opportunity to selectively concentrate active frontages in specific locations, and keep more room at ground level for entry lobby areas to residential uses, amenities, etc. There is also the opportunity to provide more indentations in the building and landscaping to break up the length of the podium. | Yes |
| *4U: Energy Efficiency* | *Development incorporates passive environmental design. Well located, screened outdoor areas should be provided for clothes drying* | No outdoor screened clothes drying areas have been provided for either of the developments on Site 1 and Site 2. | **No** |
| *4W: Waste Management* | *Waste storage facilities are designed to minimise impacts on the streetscape, building entry and amenity of residents* | Complies. Separate waste facilities are provided for commercial and residential areas and waste is stored and serviced in a back of house area in both the sites. The service areas are behind a garage door and not visible from the street. | Yes |
| *4X: Building maintenance* |  | Site 1 there are some concerns about the proposed render and paint finishes, which will weather in this coastal location. Render at the ground floor can be easily damaged. If appropriate balcony drainage is provided via a floor waste or similar, and a high quality render is applied, this may not be an issue. | **No** |
|  |  | Site 2 proposes textured masonry and metal cladding which may be more durable in this coastal location than the paint and render selections on Site 1. | Yes |