



Project Title		4 Mitchell St, Enfield – Planning Proposal Independent Assessment	
Date	12 December 2017	Meeting No.	3
Project No.	80217011		
Recorded By	Shaun Grevler		
Purpose of Meeting	Presentation of updated concept designs for 4 Mitchell St, Enfield		
Attendance		Distribution	
Deborah Sutherland Shaun Grevler Paul Georgiades Richard Huxley Richard Wilkinson Nik Wheeler Andrew Harvey	Cardno Cardno Tian An Australia Bureau of Urban Architecture Bureau of Urban Architecture Urbis Urbis		
Apologies			
Item	Description		
1.0	Intention to submit DA in parallel with the Planning Proposal		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paul indicated that Tian An were intending to prepare and lodge a DA for the construction of the development during the PP gateway process to further inform the community of what was planned. Deborah indicated that this was the Proponents risk. Many of the matters discussed at the workshop will be DA matters. However the Proponent has sought to refine and undertake detailed design of the proposed building envelopes in order to more fully demonstrate how they could work 		
2.0	Presentation of new design		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Richard Huxley presented the new design responding to issues raised in the previous discussion with Cardno. Design based on the preferred development option discussed at the previous workshop with Cardno for two separate buildings with ground floor commercial and community uses and residences above and maximum height of 4 storeys. 		
2.0	New Design – Communal Areas / Open Space		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Richard presented the new sunken courtyard spaces containing retail, commercial, recreational and community uses off a central courtyard Richard stated that these courtyard spaces would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> be directly accessible from the perimeter public walkway; enjoy good solar access; being below the level of adjacent residences minimise any acoustic intrusion; present the opportunity to provide active ground floor courtyards, potentially including community facilities, swimming pool, theatre, gallery spaces, library etc; and 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ provide significant deep soil / open space for residents and the general public. • The revised design presented the possibility of roof top gardens. Deborah advised that the areas for public access on the roof top should be limited to the areas of roof fronting the park not adjacent residences to minimise overlooking. 	
3.0	Urban Form	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The building form presented is comprised of repeating 'L' shapes – the design provides significant solar access to public and circulation areas. ▪ The presentation looked also at the possibility of changing the massing to include 5 storey elements on the park front and stepping down to 3 storeys at the rear. Concern was raised as to the potential impact that could have on communal open space on the roof top. ▪ Shadow diagrams illustrated only minimal additional overshadowing as compared to the existing buildings. ▪ Development has far better ADG compliance than previous iteration ▪ Proponent flagged the option for working collaboratively with Council / Cardno throughout Gateway process and subsequent design stage to ensure desired outcome is reached for all parties. 	
4.0	Employment Creation	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ground floor design includes significant commercial space – proposed to be designated as home offices. Deborah asked that the number of the live work apartments be reduced and be replaced by more convenience retailing and community facilities and the like. • Proponent raised question regarding commercial FSR – not certain what is the most appropriate amount to provide. Agreed that only small scale retailing would be feasible but would add amenity to the development and surrounding locality. • Paul indicated that Tian An were keen to explore opportunities to provide spaces for affordable retail and incubation spaces for small start-ups. They want to be able to give support to young entrepreneurial businesses. • Deborah pointed out that too much commercial space would increase the car parking requirements. • Paul stated he wished to seek guidance from Council with regard to the building's façade fronting the park, the Proponent requires guidance from Council to work out how to best address the park – e.g. community facilities, food/drink, art spaces / gallery etc, landscaping 	
5.0	Floor Space Ratio	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The latest building envelopes presented would result in a FSR of 1.85:1 (incl. residential, commercial and community), over 0.4:1 higher than the original Planning Proposal submitted. Deborah advised that this figure should be lower to reflect no more than the originally proposed FSR. She also stated that such elements as community facilities could potentially be considered outside the 1.4:1 if Council was agreeable that there was genuine community benefit from their provision. In that case the DA would have to rely on a Clause 4.6 amendment to vary the FSR. 	
6.0	Subsequent design iterations	

Minutes of Meeting

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Paul stated that they would like to continue engaging with Cardno and Council to achieve the best outcome for the site and particularly seek council's views on the interface with the park and Planning Agreement.• Deborah advised that the design should consider better addressing the Henley Park edge in terms of uses and final uses (activating) connections to the park.	
7.0	Next meeting	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Paul flagged the possibility of organising a meeting with Council prior to Christmas – Deborah advised that it was very unlikely but she would mention to Council.• Deborah advised that she would brief Council about the current design iteration for the development by the end of the week.	