

## ☐ RECORD OF MEETING

**Meeting :** 4 Mitchell Street, Enfield: Independent Urban Design and Traffic Assessment

**Venue:** Cardno Offices, The Forum, 203 Pacific Highway, St. Leonards

**Date :** 22 August 2017

**Prepared by:** Tracy Davey & Deborah Sutherland

### Attendees:

Tian An Australia – Paul Georgiades, Senior Development Manager

Dem Architects – Jon Pizey, Group Design Partner

Urbis - Nik Wheeler, Senior Consultant

Urbis - Lucy Band, Senior Consultant, Social Planning

Bitzios – A. Giyaji, Traffic Consultant

Cardno – Deborah Sutherland, Principal Planner

Cardno – Tracy Davey, Senior Specialist Planner

Cardno – Ivo Pais, Traffic Modelling Team Leader

The meeting was to discuss the Planning Proposal submitted by Tian An Australia to Burwood Council. The Proposal seeks to amend the Burwood Local Environmental Plan (BLEP) 2012 to amend the increase the maximum building height and FSR development standards applying to the Vision Australia site to facilitate development of housing on the site. The Urban Design and Traffic reports were presented by the applicants Consultants, issues clarified and discussed.

Cardno posed a number of questions to the Proponent team. Responses and additional information required of the Proponents were as follows:

Comments & issues raised by Cardno	Comments/ request for additional information
<b>Strategic Justification</b> There is no Strategic imperative for the proposal. Notwithstanding the site has merit for development for residential purposes.	Additional justification is required for the use of the site for residential purposes, noting that the Burwood LGA is already on track to meeting its housing targets.
<b>Land Use</b> Retail Use – it was commented that as the site is not close to shops, some convenience retail/café uses and possibly some form of community facility could be provided on the site, for example childcare. This is considered important as 129 jobs will be lost from the site.	The Concept Plan to be revised to include some convenience retail/ café and community uses.

<p><b>Concept Layout</b></p> <p>The site has a North-South Orientation and excellent views west over Henley Park. It is surrounded by low density residential to the North, South and West.</p> <p>Given the unique elements of the site it is recommended that the massing and height of the proposed buildings be revised to better integrate with the bulk and mass of the surrounding low density residential dwellings.</p> <p>Granted the existing buildings are out of character in terms of use and building form with the surrounding low density residential area and parklands. In addition the design would benefit from greater through-site visual connections to the park and open up more /orient towards the park.</p>	<p>Revised Concept Plan is required to address issues raised.</p>
<p><b>Height of Building</b></p> <p>The proposed height along the southern and portion of north and eastern boundaries should relate to the adjoining low density residential development which has a typical height of 8.5m, or two storeys.</p> <p>The existing Vision Australia buildings exceed the height of the residential dwellings surrounding the site and it is agreed that this provides some justification for the future development to be 'bulked up' in the area of the existing building. The building heights in this area should approximate the height of the existing main building roof lines which equate to an average of approximately 3.5 storeys, not the minor building services elements that protrude above the main roof line of the existing building as suggested in the PP. Smaller elements could potentially be considered setback from the building edge in the central part of the site.</p> <p>Accordingly, the form and height of new development adjoining Henley Park in the area of the existing building footprint is suited to height that generally reflects the extent of the current built form. This would be a three storey building with a forth setback from the main building edge.</p>	<p>Revised Building envelopes to better relate to context.</p>

<p><b>Floor Space Ratio</b></p> <p>The floor space ratio should be reduced to ensure that all buildings are able to achieve the SEPP 65 orientation, solar access, building separation and communal open space design criteria, and are complementary to the character of the area.</p>	<p>Revise max FSR sought to reflect revised concept plan and Building envelopes.</p>
<p><b>SEPP 65, particularly solar access</b></p> <p>Cardno questioned whether the concept plan could meet the Apartment Design Code under SEPP 65 and particularly the proposed dwellings almost underground which would get basically no direct sunlight.</p> <p>Cardno raised concern regarding the useability of the central open space proposed in the concept layout due to its linear form and significant overshadowing.</p>	<p>Require indicative assessment of the Concept Plan against the Apartment Design Guide and review of the central open space and/or demonstration as to how it could be used as a meaningful communal space.</p>
<p><b>Traffic – Access</b></p>	<p>The Traffic impact Report needs to be updated to acknowledge that vehicular access is currently and will continue to be from both Baker Street and Mitchell Street and the associated volumes analysed/impacts on intersections provided.</p>
<p><b>Traffic – Traffic Generation</b></p> <p>The Traffic Report states that the traffic generation is anticipated to be reduced (from the existing land use), based on RMS rates for the current use (office) and proposed development (residential).</p> <p>While there is merit in establishing this comparison, this should be supplemented by an assessment of the actual number of private vehicle trips currently generated (based on counts).</p> <p>The traffic engineer advised that a staff survey was undertaken to obtain current mode share and other journey to work data. It would be valuable to add these results to the traffic report but it must be noted that this should also include actual private vehicle traffic surveys to document current traffic generation (as explained above).</p>	<p>An assessment of the actual number of private vehicle trips currently generated (based on counts) is required.</p> <p>Add staff survey travel habits results to Traffic Impact Assessment.</p> <p>With regards the capacity of the Roads to absorb the additional traffic it is recommended that a SIDRA analysis be undertaken and include this data in the Traffic Report.</p> <p>It was discussed how the weekend operation should also be assessed, even if only on a high level, due to the traffic generated by Henley Park. It is likely that increased traffic volumes in the vicinity of the site (compared to weekday peak hour) will be balanced out by a lower trip generation by the site.</p>
<p><b>Traffic – Retail Use</b></p> <p>The traffic and parking generated by the proposed retail space (even if marginal) was not considered in the Traffic impact Report.</p>	<p>Assessment of retail and /or community spaces included in revised Traffic Impact Assessment Report</p>

<p><b>Retention of Trees</b></p> <p>The site is surrounded by significant Eucalypts and other established trees. Further investigation is required to establish trees to be retained, for example the SUEL (Safe Useful Life Expectancy) method may be appropriate.</p>	<p>A detailed Ecological &amp; Arborist assessment is required to identify trees on and surrounding the site that need to be retained together with required building setbacks to ensure their continued survival.</p>
<p><b>Loss of Employment</b></p> <p>It is noted that it was stated at the meeting that Vision Australia would remain in the LGA. It would be useful to have more specific information.</p> <p>Noting the loss of employment on the site it is recommended that other non-residential uses be investigated which maintain some of the local employment.</p>	<p>Details of where Vision Australia is moving the jobs to be lost.</p>
<p><b>Affordable Housing &amp; community facilities</b></p> <p>Proponent is negotiating with Council regarding provision of affordable housing and community facilities on the site as part of a VPA.</p>	<p>Paul indicated that they were offering 5% affordable housing and are in discussions with Council to provide community facility off site possible in Henley Park.</p>
<p><b>Key DCP Controls</b></p> <p>P5 Rooftop Gardens  P32 Amenities Room for RFB greater than 15 units  P36 Adaptable Housing 10%  P36 Car Podium – not to exceed more than 0.75metres, otherwise counted as floor area.</p>	<p>Revised Concept Plan to reflect key Burwood Development Control Plan controls.</p>
<p><b>Community Consultation</b></p> <p>Proponent advised that they had undertaken extensive community engagement and that they had prepared a report of the outcomes.</p>	<p>Copy of community participation report be provided to Cardno and Council.</p>
<p><b>PP Urban Design Report 'corrupted'</b></p> <p>The Urban Design Report link is currently corrupted, and Cardno requested that an additional PDF copy be forwarded</p>	<p>New digital copy of the Urban Design Report be provided to Cardno &amp; Council.</p>