

Form 10 – Version 2

Survey and Mapping Infrastructure Act 2003

Plan Registration Compliance Checklist

In accordance with Section 20(1)(c) of the *Survey and Mapping Infrastructure Regulation 2004*, this form must be completed and lodged with each cadastral plan that is not endorsed by an accredited surveyor at Item 11 of Form 21 Version 2 under the *Land Act 1994* and the *Land Title Act 1994*. This requirement applies to all plans signed on or after 1 July 2005.

| Plan Number | Surveyor | Assessor | Date Checked |
|-------------|----------|----------|--------------|
| | | | |

| ITEM (Rule through where not applicable) | INIT. | AUDIT COMMENT | REFERENCE |
|--|-------|---------------|---------------------------|
| 1 CERTIFICATION | | | |
| 1.1 Which certificate has been used to certify the plan is accurate? | | | CSR 3.9 |
| 1.2 Is the certificate correct, complete and dated? | | | |
| 1.3 Is the signature current? (NRW Internal Use Only) | | | s.76A SA 77 |
| 1.4 Has the ACN/ABN Number been shown if a Corporation? | | | |
| 1.5 Have any amendments been made to the plan by strikeout? | | | |
| 1.5.1 If so, has an amendment certificate been added to the plan? | | | RDPP 23 |
| 1.6 Has any amendment certificate been completed correctly? | | | RDPP 23 |
| 1.7 If amendment certificate uses s.32 (6) SMI, does it declare that plan is endorsed under that section? | | | CSR 3.7 |
| 1.7.1 Is a certified copy of authorisation lodged? | | | |
| 1.8 Does the plan contain any original information? | | | |
| 1.8.1 If so, is a compilation certificate shown? | | | CSR 9.39 |
| 1.9 If an explanatory plan: | | | |
| 1.9.1 Is the correct certificate used? | | | RDPP 20.10 |
| 1.9.2 Has the format of the plan been modified correctly? | | | RDPP 20.7 |
| 1.9.3 Has the Registrar of Titles approval been provided? | | | RDPP 20.2 |
| 2 DESCRIPTION | | | |
| 2.1 Are all the lots and secondary interests on the face included in the description of the plan? | | | RDPP 4.9 |
| 2.2 Does the cancelling clause contain all lots being cancelled? | | | CSR 3.8 RDPP 4.9, 4.10 |
| 2.3 Are secondary interest descriptors duplicated on the plan or title? | | | RDPP 4.8.2 |
| 2.4 Is the title restricted in depth? | | | |
| 2.4.1 If so, does the description of the lots reflect the restriction as shown in the title and the previous plan? | | | RDPP 8.7 |
| 2.4.2 Is the restriction clearly stated on the face of the plan? | | | RDPP 8.7 |
| 2.5 Does the title and/or subject plan show any exclusion? | | | |
| 2.5.1 If so have they been addressed (eg reservations in title – allocated or purchased)? | | | CSR 2.9 |
| 2.6 Is there a Reservation allocation shown on the plan? | | | |
| 2.6.1 If so, does it agree with the Department's Reservation allocation? | | | CSR 2.9 |
| 2.6.2 Is the allocation certification signed? | | | CSR 2.9 |
| 2.7 Is the title partially cancelled? | | | |
| 2.7.1 Has Registrar of Titles consent been given to continue this status? | | | RDPP 4.17 |
| 2.8 Are new undescribed balances created? | | | |
| 2.8.1 If so – was consent of Registrar provided? | | | RDPP 4.17 |
| 2.9 Do the Parish and County agree with the title and previous plan/s? | | | |

| <i>ITEM (Rule through where not applicable)</i> | <i>INIT.</i> | <i>AUDIT COMMENT</i> | <i>REFERENCE</i> |
|---|--------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 2.10 Does the Orig Grant (eg Portion) agree with the title and are multiple Grants plotted on face? | | | CSR 9.40 |
| 2.11 Does the Local Government and Locality agree with SmartMap? | | | CSR 9.31 |
| 2.12 If cancelling common property, is the common property correctly stated in the cancelling clause – Common Property <scheme name> CTS <number> (plan that created Common Property) ? | | | RDPP 11.3 |
| 3 PLAN PRESENTATION | | | |
| 3.1 Is the correct format of the plan identified? | | | RDPP 4.7 |
| 3.2 Is the plan capable of reproduction at a reduced scale without loss of clarity? | | | RDPP 3.1 |
| 3.2.1 Are the subject parcels correctly identified (line styles & fonts)? | | | CSR 9.30 & 9.55 |
| 3.3 Is an original Barcode label attached to the plan? | | | RDPP 4.2 |
| 3.4 Is the current plan number identified on the reverse of sheet 1 and all additional sheets? | | | RDPP 4.2 |
| 3.5 Is the sheet number identified correctly, on all sheets? | | | RDPP 4.3 |
| 3.6 Have field notes/survey records been provided & plan noted? | | | CSR 3.35 |
| 3.7 Does the scale of the plan comply with the standard scales? | | | RDPP 4.14 CSR 9.48 |
| 3.7.1 Is the scale bar correct? | | | RDPP 4.14 |
| 3.8 Is a north point necessary and if so, shown? | | | RDPP 4.12 |
| 3.9 Does every lot have a total area? | | | RDPP 8.2 CSR 3.6 |
| 3.9.1 If a lot is shown in parts, does each part have a separate area, and is the total area correct? | | | RDPP 8.4.1 |
| 3.9.2 Is a Vinculum used? If so, do severances have no areas? | | | RDPP 8.4.2 |
| 3.10 Is a multiple line area shown? | | | |
| 3.10.1 If so, does the plan show an allocation of the reservation certified by SLAM? | | | CSR 2.9 |
| 3.11 Is public use land created on the plan? | | | |
| 3.11.1 Are all Public Use Land lots identified prominently with an approved term and clearly shown on the first sheet? | | | RDPP 4.8.1 |
| 3.11.2 Is access to the Public Use Land addressed correctly? | | | CSR 3.2.1 |
| 3.12 Are calculated intersections of new lot boundaries with registered secondary interests shown correctly? | | | RDPP 4.21 |
| 3.13 Are any of the new secondary interests restricted? | | | |
| 3.13.1 If so, is the restriction clearly stated on the face of the plan? | | | RDPP 8.5, 8.7 |
| 3.13.2 Has the PM No, Datum and Height been shown on the plan? | | | RDPP 6.5 |
| 3.13.3 Is the information for this PM correct? | | | SCDB |
| 3.13.4 Have sufficient references to the ground RL been shown? | | | RDPP 6.5 |
| 3.14 If part of Common Property is included in lot/s within scheme, is Common Property limits included in each lot identified on face? | | | RDPP 11.8.1 |
| 3.15 Has the meridian box been completed correctly? | | | CSR 3.23 CSR 9.34 |
| 4 ACCURACY | | | |
| 4.1 Does each lot and secondary interest have complete and correct dimensions and area? | | | CSR 3.18 |
| 4.2 Does each lot (and part lot), severance, secondary interest and new road close within acceptable limits? | | | CSR 3.4.2 |
| 4.2.1 Is the area of each parcel correct? | | | CSR 3.6.1 |
| 4.3 Are all the severances fully and correctly dimensioned, including unsurveyed sides of roads? | | | CSR 3.18 |
| 5 ADJOINING INFORMATION | | | |
| 5.1 Does the adjoining description agree with Smart Map? Should be correct at date of certification. | | | CSR 3.5 |

| ITEM (Rule through where not applicable) | INIT. | AUDIT COMMENT | REFERENCE |
|--|--------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| 6 ALLOCATIONS | | | |
| 6.1 Have all previous titles been stated? | | | RDPP 22 |
| 6.2 Has every new lot, new road and secondary interest been correctly allocated against the previous title/s, with a separate line for each previous lot? | | | RDPP 22.4 |
| 6.3 Are there any registered secondary interests (mortgages, easements etc.) or admin advices on the title? | | | |
| 6.3.1 Have they been fully and correctly dealt with, if required, on the plan? | | | RDPP 22.6 |
| 6.3.2 Are the dealing numbers for the registered secondary interests in agreement with those shown on the title/s? | | | RDPP 22.6 |
| 6.4 Has every new lot been correctly allocated against the Original Portion/s, with each new lot mentioned once only? | | | RDPP 22.5 |
| 6.5 Are the Original Portions in agreement with the Title and the previous plan/s? | | | RDPP 22.5 |
| 6.6 If any lot is in more than one Local Government, have Local Govt area allocations been shown? | | | RDPP 22.7 |
| 7 REINSTATEMENT | | | |
| 7.1 Is the reinstatement logical? | | | |
| 7.2 If the reinstatement is complex, or requires explanation, has a report and/or an annotated copy of the plan been lodged as Survey Records? | | | CSR 3.35 |
| 7.3 Have the interests of all adjoining owners including the State been complied with? | | | SMI Reg s11 |
| 8 ENCROACHMENT | | | |
| 8.1 Are there any encroachments shown? | | | SMI Reg 18-19 |
| 8.1.1 Is the size, nature and location shown appropriately? | | | CSR 3.20 |
| 8.1.2 Is there either: (a) a noting on the plan that SMI Reg s.19 has been complied with; or (b) evidence of a letter being forwarded to owner and a copy lodged with NRW as Survey Records? | | | SMI Reg 19 |
| 9 MARKING | | | |
| 9.1 Does the plan show connections to two (2) PMs? | | | CSR 3.26 |
| 9.1.1 If yes, have the sketch plans for new PMs been lodged with the plan? | | | CSR 3.26 SMIA s15(2) |
| 9.1.2 If no, has an explanation been provided? | | | |
| 9.1.3 Are the PM numbers correct? | | | |
| 9.1.4 Is the mark type shown for new marks? | | | |
| 9.2 Have the corners of all new lots and new secondary interests been shown as marked? | | | CSR 3.22.5 |
| 9.3 Have sufficient and suitable reference marks been placed? | | | CSR 3.22.2 |
| 9.4 Is occupation referenced? | | | CSR 3.22.5 |

| <i>ITEM (Rule through where not applicable)</i> | <i>INIT.</i> | <i>AUDIT COMMENT</i> | <i>REFERENCE</i> |
|--|--------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 10 AMBULATORY BOUNDARIES | | | |
| 10.1 Has the ambulatory boundary been compiled? | | | |
| 10.1.1 If so, does the survey plan agree with the previous field survey for this boundary? | | | CSR 3.11 |
| 10.1.2 If so, has this plan number of the most recent survey of the boundary been shown on the face of the plan for this boundary? | | | CSR 3.18 |
| 10.2 Does the survey redetermine the ambulatory boundary, in part or in full? | | | |
| 10.2.1 If so, have Survey Records been lodged clearly explaining the determination, differences etc? | | | CSR 4.0 |
| 10.3 Is the report acceptable? | | | CSR 4.5 |
| 10.4 Does the plan indicate that Survey Records have been lodged, if applicable? | | | CSR 3.35 |
| 10.5 Have correct terms been used for tidal boundaries (eg HWM, not Bay, not Ocean etc)? | | | CSR 4.4 |
| 10.6 Is the presentation of the ambulatory boundary in the correct format (eg River Points Table, direction arrow, curvilinear)? | | | CSR 4.3 |
| 11 STATE LAND PLANS | | | |
| 11.1 Is a letter of offer/approval available? | | | CSR 5.15 |
| 11.2 Does the plan fully comply with the letter of offer from NRW? | | | CSR 5.15 |
| 11.3 Have the parcels been correctly described, lot <alpha>, lot <number>? | | | CSR 3.17 |
| 11.4 Have the correct action statements been shown on the plan? | | | CSR 9.2 |
| 11.5 Is the plan suitable for the action intended? | | | |
| 12 STANDARD FORMAT WITH COMMON PROPERTY (SCHEME - STANDARD FORMAT) | | | |
| 12.1 Does the description of the plan include "common property"? | | | RDPP 11.3 |
| 12.2 Does the plan show the area of common property? | | | RDPP 11.5 |
| 12.3 Is the lot numbering acceptable? | | | RDPP 8.3 |
| 12.3.1 If not, is there a letter of explanation for the numbering pattern adopted? | | | |
| 12.4 Does the plan show CMS Name and/or Number in Item 3? | | | RDPP 4.15 |
| 12.5 Does the plan show the Development Approval Date above item 12? | | | RDPP 4.20 |
| 13 BUILDING FORMAT PLAN (SCHEME - BUILDING FORMAT) | | | |
| 13.1 Is base parcel fully dimensioned? | | | RDPP 9.7 |
| 13.2 Does the plan show the base parcel area? | | | RDPP 9.7 |
| 13.3 If new CTS, does plan have 2 lots (min) and Common Property? | | | RDPP 9.3.1 |
| 13.4 Is the building layout correctly shown and plotted, and "Common Property" not shown within the base parcel? | | | RDPP 9.8 |
| 13.5 Does the plan show two direct or indirect connections to the corners of the base parcel for each building? | | | RDPP 9.8 |
| 13.6 Is there ONLY ONE "remainder" Standard Format Lot? | | | RDPP 9.3.2 |
| 13.6.1 Have the dimensions and area for this lot been shown? | | | RDPP 9.3.2 |
| 13.6.2 Has a statement added to the face of the plan indicating which lot is a Standard Format lot? | | | RDPP 9.3.2 |
| 13.7 Are there multiple buildings? | | | |
| 13.7.1 If so, are they correctly identified by an alpha? | | | RDPP 9.10 |
| 13.7.2 Is this identification also reflected in the level diagrams for each building? | | | RDPP 9.15.2 |
| 13.8 Are there multiple towers? | | | RDPP 9.15 |
| 13.8.1 If so, is the footprint the podium/basement and towers plotted? | | | RDPP 9.15.1 |
| 13.8.2 Are the level diagrams correct? | | | RDPP 9.15.2 |
| 13.8.3 Is a lateral aspect diagram shown? | | | RDPP 9.15.3 |
| 13.9 If consecutive lot numbering is not used, is the lot numbering template acceptable? | | | RDPP 9.4 |
| 13.9.1 Is the lot numbering template applied across the whole of the CTS? | | | RDPP 9.4 |

| <i>ITEM (Rule through where not applicable)</i> | <i>INIT.</i> | <i>AUDIT COMMENT</i> | <i>REFERENCE</i> |
|---|--------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| 13.10 Are all lots and parts of the same lot readily identified by appropriate line weights? | | | RDPP 9.5.2 |
| 13.11 Are all lots bounded by structural elements? | | | RDPP 9.6 |
| 13.11.1 If not and for a boundary within a building, are the corners marked, boundaries dimensioned and referenced to structural elements or base parcel? | | | RDPP 9.6.2 |
| 13.12 Has a standard scale been used for each of the level diagrams and are they all drawn to the same scale and orientation? | | | RDPP 9.12 |
| 13.13 Have the total areas been shown for every lot that is in parts, and is the total area correct? | | | RDPP 9.5.1 |
| 13.14 Have all part lots been described with an approved purpose? | | | RDPP 9.5.4 |
| 13.15 Are all building format lots represented on level diagrams? | | | RDPP 9.12 |
| 13.15.1 If applicable, is the outline of the lower level shown on level diagrams? | | | RDPP 9.13 |
| 13.16 Are the level diagrams correctly identified, eg Level A (and building/tower)? | | | RDPP 9.15.2 |
| 13.17 Is a north point shown for the level diagrams, if necessary? | | | RDPP 9.12 |
| 13.18 Is every closed figure on every level diagram identified with "ownership", eg common property, lot <number>? | | | RDPP 9.12 |
| 13.19 Is adjoining information shown and correct for every lot on every level diagram? | | | CSR 9.3.4 |
| 13.20 Are all encumbrances, eg easements, correctly plotted on every level diagram? | | | RDPP 4.22 |
| 13.21 Are voids shown correctly? | | | RDPP 9.5.5 |
| 13.22 Are there private yards on the plan? | | | |
| 13.22.1 Has the principle of a low-rise building been satisfied? | | | RDPP 9.17 |
| 13.22.2 Does the private yard abut parts of other lots? | | | RDPP 9.17 |
| 13.23 Has the CMS Name or Number been shown in Item 3? | | | RDPP 4.15 |
| 13.24 Has item 12 been fully completed? | | | RDPP 9.20.7 |
| 13.25 Are there any encroachments by the buildings onto adjoining land or road? | | | RDPP 9.20.3 |
| 13.25.1 If so, has the encroachment been addressed correctly? | | | RDPP 9.20.3 |
| 13.26 If an encroachment is shown, is there a statement about "the lots being wholly contained within the base parcel"? | | | RDPP 9.20.7 |
| 13.27 Does the encroachment relate to an "existing building"? | | | RDPP 9.20.7 |
| 13.27.1 If so, is the appropriate noting made? | | | RDPP 9.20.7 |
| 13.28 Does the plan show the Development Approval Date above item 12? | | | RDPP 4.20 |
| 13.29 Are existing volumetric lots or existing volumetric or restricted secondary interests in the base lot affected? | | | |
| 13.29.1 Has a lateral aspect diagram been shown for affected volumetric lots? | | | RDPP 9.16.3 |
| 13.29.2 Have the other special requirements for affected volumetric lots been met, eg. footprints, level diagrams? | | | RDPP 9.16 |
| 13.29.3 Has a lateral aspect diagram been shown for volumetric secondary interest or restricted secondary interest registered against base parcel? | | | RDPP 9.23 |
| 14 VOLUMETRIC PLANS | | | |
| 14.1 Is the lot numbering acceptable? | | | RDPP 10.3 |
| 14.1.1 If not, is there a letter of explanation for the numbering pattern adopted? | | | |
| 14.2 If part lots are used, are they correctly described? | | | RDPP 10.4 |
| 14.3 Has the area of the footprint been shown? | | | RDPP 10.5.3 |
| 14.4 Has the area for the overall footprint been shown? | | | RDPP 10.5.3 |
| 14.5 Have sufficient references to the ground RL been shown? | | | RDPP 10.12.5 |
| 14.6 Has the volume for each lot and secondary interest been shown? (easements may be excluded) | | | RDPP 10.5.4, 10.6 |
| 14.7 Has the PM No, Datum and Height been shown? | | | RTDP 10.10.2 |
| 14.8 Does the plan contain a statement regarding Vertical Planes? | | | RDPP 10.10.5 |
| 14.9 If plan notes that the parcels are bounded by vertical planes, are all the bounding edges on the footprint fully dimensioned? | | | RDPP 10.10.5 |

| <i>ITEM (Rule through where not applicable)</i> | <i>INIT.</i> | <i>AUDIT COMMENT</i> | <i>REFERENCE</i> |
|--|--------------|----------------------|------------------|
| 14.10 If plan does not use vertical planes for bounding surfaces, have the bearings & slope distances for bounding edges been shown? | | | RDPP 10.10.1 |
| 14.11 If co-ordinates are shown, are they in addition to polar dimensions for the bounding edges? | | | RDPP 10.10.1 |
| 14.12 Does the plan contain a definition of bounding surfaces? | | | RDPP 10.10.5 |
| 14.13 Are the corners marked or referenced to physical structures? | | | RDPP 10.11 |
| 14.14 Are the isometric diagrams ISOMETRIC? | | | RDPP 10.12.1 |
| 14.15 Does the plan indicate the direction from which the isometric diagram is viewed? | | | RDPP 10.12.1 |
| 14.16 Have the Isometric Diagrams been drawn to a standard scale? | | | RDPP 10.12.6 |
| 14.17 Do all vertices have an RL? | | | RDPP 10.10.1 |
| 14.17.1 If not, is there a statement for a single horizontal plane? | | | RDPP 10.10.1 |
| 14.18 Is there ONLY ONE remainder Standard Format Lot? | | | RDPP 10.2.4 |
| 14.18.1 If so, has the area for this lot been shown and a statement added to the face of the plan indicating which lot is a Standard Format lot? | | | RDPP 10.2.4 |
| 15 VOLUMETRIC FORMAT WITH COMMON PROPERTY (SCHEME – VOLUMETRIC FORMAT) | | | |
| In addition to 14 VOLUMETRIC PLANS: | | | |
| 15.1 Does the description of the plan include “common property”? | | | RDPP 11.1 |
| 15.2 Does the plan show the area of common property? | | | RDPP 11.6 |
| 15.3 Does the plan show CMS Name and/or Number in Item 3? | | | RDPP 4.15 |
| 15.4 Does the plan show the Development Approval Date above item 12? | | | RDPP 4.20 |

Certification

I, _____ 1

hereby certify that this checklist accurately represents an audit of _____ 2

_____ 3

Date : _____

Cadastral Surveyor

1. Full name of Cadastral Surveyor (Individual) identified on Form 13 or Form 18 on the plan
2. Plan number
3. Signature of Cadastral Surveyor whose name appears at Item 1