



Mr Andrew Harvey
Director, Urbis
Level 23, Darling Park Tower 2
201 Sussex Street
SYDNEY NSW 2000

TRIM No: 18/4516
5 February 2018

Dear Mr Harvey

PLANNING PROPOSAL - 4 MITCHELL STREET, ENFIELD

We refer to the meeting on 31 January 2018 between representatives and consultants of Tian An Australia and Council, where you presented a revised design concept for the abovementioned Planning Proposal (PP).

We acknowledge that the revised design concept represents an improvement to the design scheme previously submitted. However, there are still issues of concern, which were discussed at the abovementioned meeting. The key comments raised by Council officers at the meeting are summarised as follow:

Floor Space Ratio (FSR)

The original PP sought an increase in FSR from the existing 0.85:1 to 1.4:1. As already pointed out by Council's consultant, the FSR of 1.85:1, which the revised design concept presented, should be brought down to no greater than what was initially sought, or it would not be recommended for support by Council.

Should you decide to submit the revised PP package based on the increased FSR, Council would require that all PP supporting documents be updated accordingly and new PP fees would be applicable.

Building Height and Building Articulation

Council officers are of the view that the design should be of various building heights with a maximum of four storeys at its frontage to Henley Park and lower towards the properties in Burwood Road.

It was suggested that the façade fronting the park, contained within the six building segments in the revised design concept, be treated to increase building articulation. These six segments should not be all four storeys in height.

Shadow Impact

Council is of the view that absolute minimum compliance with the ADG requirements is not necessarily sufficient, and the design should seek design excellence, particularly where the current maximum FSR of the zone is to be altered and exceeded. The two sunken courtyards in particular, could not be considered to have good solar access. However, lowering the building height next to the eastern boundary would improve solar access.

It was also raised that future development should not cause more shadow impact than the existing development on properties opposite the subject site in Mitchell Street.

Communal Open Space and Roof Top Gardens

Council is of the view that public walkways, such as the one along the eastern boundary of the site, could not be regarded as functional communal open space.

The roofs of the proposed buildings should be treated to enhance the overall design, amenity and performance of the development.

As advised by Council's consultant, and in order to minimise overlooking and maintain privacy, communal access to the roof top should be limited to the areas of roof fronting the park, not adjacent to properties in Burwood Road. Areas on the roof top where communal access is available can be included in the communal open space calculation. Non-accessible areas cannot.

Employment Re-creation and Non Residential Use

It was discussed that the ground floor of the development could include cafes, neighbourhood shops, and spaces for affordable retail and small start-ups, to re-create employment opportunities and activate the frontage to the park. Limited non-residential land uses are currently permitted in the R1 zone under the Burwood Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 2012. However, this issue could be examined further, if the PP progresses to the LEP drafting stage, in consultation with the Department of Planning & Environment.

It was confirmed that Council does not seek community facilities within development on the site.

Building Separations

Again, Council is of the view that mere compliance with the ADG is not necessarily sufficient and that the building separations as shown in the revised design concept appear minimal and raise concerns. However, this matter can be examined further at the Development Application (DA) Stage.

DA Lodgement

It appeared that Tian An Australia intended to lodge a DA during the PP process to further inform the community of what was planned. Council would discourage this approach, which faces uncertainty and a potential waste of the proponent's resources.

Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA)

Council is not interested in negotiating and/or entering into a VPA with Tian An Australia for this site.

In the meantime, if you have any enquiries, please do not hesitate to contact me on 9911 9928.

Yours sincerely



DIWEI LUO

Manager Strategic Planning



Mr Andrew Harvey
Director, Urbis
Level 23, Darling Park Tower 2
201 Sussex Street
SYDNEY NSW 2000

TRIM No: 18/16120
30 April 2018

Dear Mr Harvey

PLANNING PROPOSAL - 4 MITCHELL STREET, ENFIELD

We refer to the meeting on 23 April 2018 between representatives of Tian An Australia and Council staff and its consultant, where you presented the revised design for the abovementioned Planning Proposal (PP).

We appreciate the efforts that your project team has put in this far in addressing issues raised by Council. The further key comments raised by us at this meeting are summarised as follows:

1. **Strategic merit** – Council seeks additional justification for the PP. Such justification should not rely on the published dwelling targets as they can be easily met in the Burwood Local Government Area.
2. **Land use mix** – Council planners are supportive of a small component of non-residential uses on the site along the park edge to activate and create a connection between the development and the park and to provide some additional convenience shopping and café style uses. In this regard, the PP will need to include a request to add food and drink premises (in order to include take-away premises) to the permitted uses in the LEP, potentially as an Additional Local provision under Part 6 of the Burwood LEP or in Schedule 1. Such uses should be limited to a maximum of 400sqm and a minimum of 200sqm. The proponent should also consider whether 'business premises' would offer a greater range of business and make the spaces more viable.
3. **Confirmation of building envelope heights and ground levels** – The design is required to confirm actual feasible RL's and the comparison height sections are to be refined to reflect actual levels in relation to the existing buildings and adjacent streets.
4. **Perspectives and 3D images** – The 3D images are to be corrected to illustrate the correct final ground levels and building forms, particularly at the boundaries of the site interface with the park and adjacent streets. In addition, please provide further perspectives illustrating the experience of the public walking along the park edge pathway and the indicative building forms to the park edge.
5. **LEP height map amendment** – A draft LEP height map amendment is required reflecting the distribution of heights across the site based on the design presented at the meeting. A blanket height limit would not be accepted by Council.
6. **Site specific DCP** – A site specific DCP may be required should the PP progress to a Gateway Determination. The DCP would be expected to cement some of the development's design principles, such as the graduation of heights across the site, the provision of public art and quality public domain and so on.

7. **Deep soil zones** – Confirmation that the indicative development scheme can deliver the required deep soil zones to sustain landscaping of a size to provide adequate screening to adjacent residential properties and comply with the Apartment Design Guide.
8. **Lift overruns** –You may use Clause 4.6 of the Burwood Local Environmental Plan 2012 to seek a variation to the maximum building height development standard at the DA stage. Depending on the circumstances, Council would not object to a minor breach of the building height limit by lift overruns.

In the meantime, if you have any enquiries, please do not hesitate to contact me on 9911 9928.

Yours sincerely



DIWEI LUO
Manager Strategic Planning