

For: Burwood Council Meeting on Project at Mitchell Street, Enfield

Held at: Burwood Council Offices

On: 23rd April 2018

Attendees: Brian Olsen (BO) - Burwood Council Jally Lin (JL) - Tian An

Diwei Luo (DL) - Burwood Council Paul Georgiades (PG) - Tian An

Mariana Kucic (MK) - Burwood Council Andrew Harvey (AH) - Urbis

Deb Sutherland (DS) - Cardno Nik Wheeler (NW) - Urbis

Richard Huxley (RH) - Bureau

Richard Wilkinson (RW) - Bureau

Ross Shepherd (RS) - Site Image

Item	Action	Responsibility
1. BO advised that there had been a public meeting in Enfield over the weekend, following the re-submission of a Planning Proposal on the 'Flower Power' site which is seeking up to 6 storeys in height and an FSR of 1.6:1.	Noted	
2. AH advised that the Strategic Merit described within the PP Planning Report will be updated, given the newly published GSC District and Region Plans, and AH acknowledged that Council is still seeking to deliver much of the future housing in the LGA within Burwood Centre. AH highlighted that strategic merit exists at a local level, due to the existing residential zone, the low density nature of the proposal which will replace the existing bulky commercial/industrial building and the close proximity of the site to public transport.	Noted	Urbis
3. RH introduced the revised scheme and identified that all the previous comments from Council's letter of 5 February 2018 have now been addressed. There were eight items in the letter, of which six were design related items, as follows: 1) Floor Space Ratio (FSR) 2) Building Height and Building Articulation 3) Shadow Impact 4) Communal Open Space and Roof Top Gardens 5) Employment Re-Creation and Non Residential Use 6) Building Separations All of the above items have been addressed by Bureau and are now fully compliant. As requested by Council, the revised scheme illustrates a 100% residential development at 1.4:1. In addition Bureau has prepared	Noted	Bureau

<p>an alternative lower ground floor with an indicative park activation plan offering the potential for additional retail floor space.</p>			
4.	RS presented the new landscape concept report, illustrating the streetscape context, neighbouring properties interface, the proposed benchmarking, the proposed ground level plans, the rooftop amenity and the detailed areas, such as Mitchell St address and southern courtyard, Baker St address and northern courtyard, the central courtyard, the Henley Park edge interface and the sculpture garden indicative artworks.		Site Image
5.	BO agreed that if the development was 100% residential it would not be necessary to allow public access through the site, however if there was retail, there would have to be a separation of public and private access for security and safety reasons.	To be addressed in updated documentation	Bureau
6.	A discussion was had regarding the accessibility of the proposal from Mitchell Street. RH confirmed that the proposal provides full accessibility from Mitchell St.	To be addressed in updated documentation	Bureau
7.	<p>DS indicated that it would be beneficial to have some shops / cafes on the lower ground level of the proposal at the park frontage to activate the park. A discussion was had regarding permissibility of uses, which can be addressed through a Schedule 1 LEP amendment.</p> <p>Council and Cardno are to discuss the potential to accommodate new retail/ commercial premises at this location and will respond to the applicant.</p>	To direct the applicant on preference for small retail units on the park frontage	Council & Cardno
8.	<p>BO requested confirmation of the existing ground levels and proposed levels for the scheme, as well as how the potential lower ground floor space will be treated if a purely residential scheme is progressed. This could be addressed through clear coloured plans and cross-section diagrams.</p> <p>BO also questioned the level of the proposed mound setback from Mitchell St, in particular the levels where the stair is shown. Bureau stated one of the CGI's did not reflect the current scheme and will be updated and submitted with the final package.</p>	To be addressed in updated documentation	Bureau
9.	<p>In relation to the height control, BO suggested that a height map for inclusion in the LEP, clearly describing the varying heights across the site, would be the best way to ensure the heights shown in the proposed design are not exceeded. The proposed 18m height control will allow for additional height on the rooftop of the building, for pergolas and other roof furniture, as well as most of the lift overruns.</p> <p>It was considered that, in addition to the height map, a site specific DCP would ensure the development's character and quality urban outcome is achieved. The DCP could stipulate that the building is four storeys in height, excluding any uses which may be introduced at lower ground level.</p>	This will be evaluated and addressed in updated documentation	Bureau / Urbis

10. BO asked if 3m deep soil buffer zone on the northern and western boundary was sufficient to accommodate new tree planting. RS confirmed it is acceptable and this will be illustrated clearly in the final updated submission.	To be addressed in updated documentation	Site Image
11. DS suggested that an additional perspective view along the park frontage would assist in explaining the proposal further, and could also potentially assist with future community engagement.	To be addressed in updated documentation	Bureau
12. PG informed Council that a comprehensive final package will be submitted following a further review of the comments raised at today's meeting. PG welcomed any feedback on the presentation and he stated that all comments/feedback will be addressed and incorporated into the final updated submission.	To be addressed in updated documentation	Tian An
13. BO thanked the applicant for listening to all the issues raised in Council's Letter of 5 February 2018 and for addressing all the issues. He said he appreciated the ongoing efforts of the project team and he indicated that the Council would respond shortly with any further comments.	Noted	Council