

For: Burwood Council Meeting on 4 Mitchel Street, Enfield

Held at: Burwood Council Offices

On: 31st January 2018

Attendees: Bruce MacDonnell (BM) - Burwood Council Paul Georgiades (PG) - Tian An

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

Diwei Luo (DL) - Burwood Council Andrew Harvey (AH) - Urbis

Richard Huxley (RH) - Bureau Nik Wheeler (NW) - Urbis

Richard Wilkinson (RW) - Bureau Deb Sutherland (DB) - Cardno

Item	Action	Responsibility
1. Council is generally pleased with the concept presented by Bureau, viewing it as an improvement on previous submission, as long as the FSR is reduced from 1.85:1 to close to 1.4:1 FSR and generally a maximum 4-level height built form with height variations.		
2. BO indicated that the communal open space and access to communal open spaces which only comply with the minimum requirements of the ADG, are not necessarily sufficient for Council.		Bureau
3. BO sought the reduction of height of building to ensure that no front yards of the properties on the south side of Mitchell Street are overshadowed, and BO recommended varying the height of the buildings to avoid a uniform 4 level building.		Bureau
4. BO thought the building separations as shown in the revised design concept (excluding the through site link) appear minimal and are potentially of concern.		Bureau
5. BO & DL recommended to focus roof-top communal open space to the park side of the building and avoid overlooking of the properties to the east. Acoustic treatment and roof-top landscaping would prevent any noise and/or visual impacts.		Bureau
6. Council are open to the potential for retail uses along the park edge and discussing the park interface and redesign. However, at this point they do not wish for council to manage or occupy any community space in the development.		
7. The design should be reviewed to ensure the CPTED is managed properly.		Bureau

Item	Action	Responsibility
8. BM identified that Council do not want to enter into a VPA on the site.		
9. BM queried whether the business incubator units would be viable at this location.		
10. It was discussed that Tian An had conducted early consultation with the local community, with a letter-drop to 600 homes which drew 24 community members to two exhibition sessions. BO & BM indicated that further community interest would be likely during exhibition post Gateway.		
11. DS led discussion about various ways to resolve the height control. It could be dealt with by a 'micro-height' LEP map or it could be through a Stage 1 DA. BO & DS agreed that a site specific DCP may not be a suitable pathway to control heights. PG expressed interest in the Stage 1 DA to expedite the design and approval process.		
12. AH indicated that Tian An wishes to update the Planning Proposal documents for the revised scheme and issue to DS for review and report to Council. Tian An is seeking a response from Council on the FSR and height that would be acceptable.		
13. BO & DL identified that the design changes with a significant increase in FSR could potentially warrant a re-lodgement of the PP, on the basis that it may constitute a substantially different scheme and would require a new assessment. Clarification was sought by PG on whether this could be solved by Council calling for an additional PP fee to cover the time and resources required to assess the revised PP. There is no intention for Council to 'restart the clock' as part of this process. It was suggested that this matter would be discussed internally at the Council and clarified with Tian An.		Council
14. DL indicated that a letter would be forwarded to Tian An confirming comments from the meeting and issues raised. This will need to be agreed with BO & BM before issue.		DL