



## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES

No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
1	Community 29/1/2008 Objection	<i>Volume of additional traffic due to 685 parking spaces, commercial vehicles and trucks passing their property will cause problems for their tenants and access to their property difficult.</i>	<p>Car parking for the development has been carefully considered by the proponent. 230 commercial spaces have been approved in the original proposal along with 205 public parking spaces which are currently in operation and 8 Council parking spaces at the ground floor level. Additional traffic relates to the parking spaces required to make up the minimum 232 residential parking spaces under Burwood Council's DCP for the residential component.</p> <p>URaP-TTW have prepared a TMAP and addressed the parking needs of the amended development. (Copy attached as Appendix H)</p> <p>The additional parking spaces have been assessed by Thompson Stanbury in terms of traffic impact as satisfactory in their Revised Traffic Impact Statement dated August 2008 (Copy attached as Appendix I). Access into and from the site has been assessed as complying the Australian Standard.</p>
2	Community 31/1/2008 Objection	<p><i>MP of this magnitude (the multiple high rise towers) isn't in keeping with current natural and commercial environment of this part of Burwood.</i></p> <p><i>Project of this scale will materially adversely alter the existing character of this part of Burwood.</i></p>	<p>The December 2008 design for the proposed residential buildings are in keeping with the desired future character for the Burwood Town Centre (ie. Draft LEP 2008) and surrounding area. The existing character of Burwood is a mix of low rise and high rise development. Future intentions for the Burwood Town Centre include buildings within in this location up to 60m in height and the proposal complies with the objectives of the draft LEP.</p>
		<i>The low rise retail and commercial part of the project is beneficial.</i>	Noted

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
3	EDS Pty Ltd & CBA 20/2/2008 Objection	<i>Consider the CBA Computer Centre (48-60 George St) - one of the Banks "critical infrastructure sites". Any new development in the vicinity should be aware that the purpose and usage of the site won't change.</i>	Noted. Three new electrical substations have been provided on site to provide electricity for the site, the proposed development and other properties in the immediate vicinity. It is unknown if these also service the EDS buildings. It is noted that the substations were installed and construction has occurred at the subject site, for which EDS did not make any complaints to the developer about any interruptions to power. The substations have been installed as per the requirements of Energy Australia.
		<i>Continuity of operations is of significant importance to the Bank's daily worldwide business and as such relies on the electrical infrastructure provided. Data generators are regularly run and tested within and outside normal business hours for extended periods of time.</i>	
		<i>Any interruption to the building's energy supply will implement the automatic start of their emergency diesel generator system - prevailing winds may result in the exhaust fumes wafting across to the site in the (potential for these fumes are minimal).</i>	Noted
		<i>Concerned about the traffic impacts - reviewed the Statement and Plan (Oct 07). Panel appointed to assess the DLEP convened a public hearing in Nov 07 - traffic issues raised. The traffic reports pre-date that public hearing. Seeking DOP's assurance that concerns raised at that and other public consultations re. the DLEP will be considered in the assessment of the application. Particularly as it appears the proponent seeks to have the application assessed with regards to the DLEP.</i>	<p>Car parking for the development has been carefully considered by the proponent. 230 commercial spaces have been approved in the original proposal along with 205 public parking spaces which are currently in operation and 8 Council parking spaces at the ground floor level. Additional traffic relates to the parking spaces required to make up the minimum 232 residential parking spaces under Burwood Council's DCP for the residential component.</p> <p>URaP-TTW have prepared a TMAP and addressed the parking needs of the amended development. (Copy attached as Appendix H)</p> <p>The additional parking spaces have been assessed by Thompson Stanbury in terms of traffic impact as satisfactory in their Revised Traffic Impact Statement dated August 2008 (Copy attached as Appendix I). Access into and from the site has been assessed as complying the Australian Standard.</p>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
4	Community 20/2/2008 Objection	<p><i>Traffic around corner of Park Rd and Gladstone St makes it increasingly hard to access properties. Proposed exit route from the site will worsen the situation in that area.</i></p> <p><i>Any early assessment of resultant problems will be but theoretical and any worsening for local residents will be too late for solution. Any effect on the surrounding properties cannot be but deleterious.</i></p> <p><i>Any claim that traffic resultant from 685 parking spaces will have anything but catastrophic effect on an area already enclosed by Burwood Rd, Park Ave, Park Rd and railway line is wishful thinking.</i></p>	<p>This is an existing exit as it has already been constructed and is currently operating and being used by cars accessing the Council Car park.</p> <p>Car parking for the development has been carefully considered by the proponent. 230 commercial spaces have been approved in the original proposal along with 205 public parking spaces which are currently in operation and 8 Council parking spaces at the ground floor level. Additional traffic relates to the parking spaces required to make up the minimum 232 residential parking spaces under Burwood Council's DCP for the residential component.</p> <p>URaP-TTW have prepared a TMAP and addressed the parking needs of the amended development. (Copy attached as Appendix H)</p> <p>The additional parking spaces have been assessed by Thompson Stanbury in terms of traffic impact as satisfactory in their Revised Traffic Impact Statement dated August 2008 (Copy attached as Appendix I). Access into and from the site has been assessed as complying the Australian Standard.</p>
		<p><i>Results flowing from the multi-storey building already under construction almost next door which completed and occupied have yet to be felt</i></p>	<p>The proposed development has not constructed the residential component.</p>
5.	Community (business) Feb 2008 Objection	<p><i>Concerns re. the adequacy of car parking facilities to accommodate all of the residents and visitors of the proposed towers, employees and clients of the commercial building, and the council parking facilities.</i></p>	<p>Car parking for the development has been carefully considered by the proponent. 230 commercial spaces have been approved in the original proposal along with 205 public parking spaces which are currently in operation and 8 Council parking spaces at the ground floor level. Additional traffic relates to the parking spaces required to make up the minimum 232 residential parking spaces under Burwood Council's DCP for the residential component.</p> <p>URaP-TTW have prepared a TMAP and addressed the parking</p>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			<p>needs of the amended development. (Copy attached as Appendix H)</p> <p>The additional parking spaces have been assessed by Thompson Stanbury in terms of traffic impact as satisfactory in their Revised Traffic Impact Statement dated August 2008 (Copy attached as Appendix I). Access into and from the site has been assessed as complying the Australian Standard.</p>
		<p><i>Current parking situation is horrendous along Elsie and George Sts despite the Council car park being open. They police parking on their property in visitor's parking spots. Large towers will increase the demand for the parking available in this complex thus forcing more to try to find parking in the streets.</i></p>	<p>Future residents of the buildings will have their own parking allocated and the public car park will provide parking for visitors. The commercial parking is already approved and the public car park is in operation offering 205 spaces. A Council Media Release dated 31 March 2008 quotes that the George Street Car park (included as Appendix A within the URaP-TTW report):</p> <p><i>"is currently filling to up to a third of its capacity – a good indication of level of demand being met."</i> The site is also in close proximity to the railway station which encourages the use of public transport.</p>
		<p><i>Flow of traffic stemming from one way Victoria Street (soon to be 2 way) into Park Rd, traffic from Elsie St heading to Park Ave via Dunns Lane - all narrow streets that barely cope with the minimal traffic at the moment let alone the extra traffic brought on by the new development.</i></p>	<p>Refer to Revised Thompson Stanbury report at Appendix I.</p>
		<p><i>Traffic exiting the complex will cause major traffic congestion for traffic turning right into Park Ave. Wait for the lights on Park Ave/Burwood Road to relieve the traffic lines before they can turn – causing problems. It'll increase anyway when Victoria St becomes 2 way.</i></p>	<p>Refer to Revised Thompson Stanbury report at Appendix I.</p>
		<p><i>Eg Gloucester Ave, Gladstone St - are also narrow residential roads which are not suited for the traffic that these towers will bring.</i></p>	<p>Refer to Revised Thompson Stanbury report at Appendix I.</p>



## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES

No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
		<p><i>Road system is inadequate to cope with future inhabitants, their visitors and clients of the massive proposed edifice.</i></p> <p><i>Parking problems will escalate if more cars are concentrated in this area.</i></p>	Refer to Revised Thompson Stanbury report at Appendix I.
		<p><i>Why was the design changed to include the towers half way through building the commercial development?</i></p>	The proposed residential development creates a mix of uses considered to be in keeping with the proposed intentions for the Burwood Town Centre (BTC) under the Draft LEP 2008.
		<p><i>Why has this plan by-passed Council and gone directly to DOP?</i></p>	<p>The Concept Plan has a value in excess of \$50 million.</p> <p>The Concept Plan has been accepted under Part 3A of the EP&amp;A Act and will therefore be assessed under Part 3A.</p>
6.	Community 19/4/06 Objection	<p><i>21/11/05 BC approved additional car spaces in line with a condition of consent for the minimum requirement of 553 car spaces of which 205 were for public parking. Lead up to approval for the S96. Supported by an independent planner. Now the applicant is requesting for another level of parking for 162 car spaces.</i></p>	<p>This objection appears to relate to a previous application not the current Part 3A Application.</p> <p>The proposal relates to parking for the proposed Concept Plan being the residential component of the mixed use development for the site. Parking which formed part of previous approvals for the approved and built public car park and commercial floor space are not proposed to be altered.</p>
		<p><i>Concerns traffic increase will cause further congestion in the area.</i></p>	<p>Car parking for the development has been carefully considered by the proponent. 230 commercial spaces have been approved in the original proposal along with 205 public parking spaces which are currently in operation and 8 Council parking spaces at the ground floor level. Additional traffic relates to the parking spaces required to make up the minimum 232 residential parking spaces under Burwood Council's DCP for the residential component.</p> <p>URaP-TTW have prepared a TMAP and addressed the parking needs of the amended development. (Copy attached as Appendix H)</p> <p>The additional parking spaces have been assessed by Thompson Stanbury in terms of traffic impact as satisfactory in their Revised</p>



## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES

No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			Traffic Impact Statement dated August 2008 (Copy attached as Appendix I). Access into and from the site has been assessed as complying the Australian Standard.
		<i>Concern that the increase in car spaces is a stepping stone for the developer to apply for height increases to both buildings once additional spaces are approved. (e.g. approval at 3 Railway Pde)</i>	The amended Concept Plan as detailed in the Preferred Project Report is the application for which approval is being sought.
		<i>Few minutes walk to Burwood Station from Elsie St and bus services are available in Burwood Road and Railway Pde offering convenient public transport – why the need for additional car spaces?</i>	<p>Car parking for the development has been carefully considered by the proponent. 230 commercial spaces have been approved in the original proposal along with 205 public parking spaces which are currently in operation and 8 Council parking spaces at the ground floor level. Additional traffic relates to the parking spaces required to make up the minimum 232 residential parking spaces under Burwood Council's DCP for the residential component.</p> <p>URaP-TTW have prepared a TMAP and addressed the parking needs of the amended development. (Copy attached as Appendix H)</p> <p>The additional parking spaces have been assessed by Thompson Stanbury in terms of traffic impact as satisfactory in their Revised Traffic Impact Statement dated August 2008 (Copy attached as Appendix I). Access into and from the site has been assessed as complying the Australian Standard.</p>
7.	Community 1/12/2007 Objection	<i>Public forum held by the Burwood Town Centre Planning Panel (BTCPP) on 9/10/07 – no discussion on 1-17 Elsie St as DOP is now the consent authority. Confusing when BC is trying to finalise the LEP 2007 with the BTCPP to be told that development over \$40 million is with DOP.</i>	<p>The Concept Plan has a value in excess of \$50 million.</p> <p>The Concept Plan has been accepted under Part 3A of the EP&amp;A Act and will therefore be assessed under Part 3A.</p> <p>The Burwood Planning Panel members were appointed by the Minister for Planning as an Independent Hearing and Assessment</p>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			Panel (IHAP) in May 2008. The IHAP conducted a hearing in May 2008. The IHAP prepared a report in September 2008 on the Concept Plan. As a result, the proponent has amended the Concept Plan and submitted a Preferred Project Report for determination.
		<i>Concerns raised with BC with amended plans to no avail. New proposal for the 3 towers to be increased to 17, 16 and 15 storeys is unacceptable and sets a further undesirable precedence in which developers negotiate outcomes to their benefit in stages.</i>	<p>The amended design of the buildings is in response to the draft LEP 2008, issues raised by the IHAP and matters raised in submissions.</p> <p>The amended design of the residential buildings by Turner and Associates (TAA) to reduce the overall floor space, increase building separation, increase solar access and amenity within the development, while at the same time reducing impacts on immediately adjoining residential properties to the west.</p>
		<i>No consideration has been given to the detrimental impact this development will have on adjoining heritage listed terraces, overshadowing to properties in Gloucester Ave, inadequate setback in Victoria St West and increased traffic in the narrow streets.</i>	<p>A further Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared by Design 5 which has included an assessment against each of the items of heritage nominated within the Draft BTC LEP 2008, existing items of heritage within the Burwood Planning Scheme ordinance and the State Heritage Registered items nearby in Burwood. Design 5 has assessed the amended TAA design also in relation to its visual environment. The assessment has concluded that the amended design will not adversely impact on the heritage significance of any item in the vicinity of the site.</p> <p>While the amended proposal involves tall buildings, the location and design are such that these have been assessed as acceptable and will not impact the heritage significance of draft heritage items in the vicinity of the development.</p> <p>Shadow diagrams have been prepared by Turner and Associates (TAA) which include a comparison with the approved commercial development on the site. Based on this comparison for intervals</p>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			<p>on 22 June, while the shadows will be cast longer in the morning at 9am over the front yard of the property located at the corner of Gloucester Avenue and George Street, and there is a minor increase in shadowing on the rear yards of the properties immediately to the west being 2 and 4 Gloucester Avenue at the 10am interval, overall the impact is similar to the original approved development in terms of solar access to the residential properties to the immediate west. It should be noted that this shadowing is clear of the rear yards by 10.12am, which is a marginal improvement when compared to the original approved commercial building which is not clear until 10.18am. It is also noted that the terraces at number 53 and 65 George Street are used for residential purposes and will have no greater shadow impact as a result of the amended design. The duration of shadowing to the residential properties to the west is similar to the approved development and well less than 3 hours, as shadowing is clear by 10.12am.</p> <p>The Victoria Street frontage of the property is proposed to be widened to improve the Victoria Street public domain.</p>
		<i>The DA should be rejected in its current form. Alternate options such as having the buildings stepped and height reduced to compensate for the aggressive footprint and lack of open space.</i>	<p>Amended design has modified the facades of the building to modulate the buildings and create a better design outcome. The buildings have been designed to be stepped to reduce height towards the existing residential flat buildings to the north.</p> <p>Open space has been provided in accordance with NSW Residential Flat Design Code (RFDC) on the podium level.</p>
8.	Community Objection	<i>Objects as the project adds 209 apartments and 685 cars.</i>	The Concept Plan seeks approval for 210 apartments and 115 car spaces. Commercial floor space, commercial car parking and public parking spaces are approved.



## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
		<p><i>Traffic analysis? People on the west side of Burwood Rd can spend more than 5 minutes and wait 3 green traffic lights to make a right turn from Park Ave to south bound on Burwood Rd during the day. No convenient alternative route.</i></p> <p><i>No extra time should be required to travel to /from the surrounding area for the people living in the area or the project should be stopped.</i></p>	<p>Car parking for the development has been carefully considered by the proponent. 230 commercial spaces have been approved in the original proposal along with 205 public parking spaces which are currently in operation and 8 Council parking spaces at the ground floor level. Additional traffic relates to the parking spaces required to make up the minimum 232 residential parking spaces under Burwood Council's DCP for the residential component.</p> <p>URaP-TTW have prepared a TMAP and addressed the parking needs of the amended development. (Copy attached as Appendix H)</p> <p>The additional parking spaces have been assessed by Thompson Stanbury in terms of traffic impact as satisfactory in their Revised Traffic Impact Statement dated August 2008 (Copy attached as Appendix I). Access into and from the site has been assessed as complying the Australian Standard.</p>
		<p><i>In addition it will result in loss of sunlight and form a shield to block air ventilation for nearby residents.</i></p>	<p>Shadow diagrams have been prepared by Turner and Associates (TAA) which include a comparison with the approved commercial development on the site. Based on this comparison for intervals on 22 June, while the shadows will be cast longer in the morning at 9am over the front yard of the property located at the corner of Gloucester Avenue and George Street, and there is a minor increase in shadowing on the rear yards of the properties immediately to the west being 2 and 4 Gloucester Avenue at the 10am interval, overall the impact is similar to the original approved development in terms of solar access to the residential properties to the immediate west. It should be noted that this shadowing is clear of the rear yards by 10.12am, which is a marginal improvement when compared to the original approved commercial building which is not clear until 10.18am. It is also noted that the</p>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			terraces at number 53 and 65 George Street are used for residential purposes and will have no greater shadow impact as a result of the amended design. The duration of shadowing to the residential properties to the west is similar to the approved development and well less than 3 hours, as shadowing is clear by 10.12am.  Wind tunnel testing has been undertaken by Windtech which indicates that the proposal is satisfactory subject to conditions which have been included in the Revised Statement of Commitments.
		<i>Air, water and noise pollution during the construction?</i>	A Construction Management Program and Plan was included in Appendix X of the EA.
9.	Community 18/2/2008 Objection	<i>Roads surrounding the proposal are at maximum capacity, especially when traffic is bottlenecking into Burwood Rd. Morning peak hour traffic, Thursday night shopping and all weekend.  Current road infrastructure surrounding this development is not capable of supporting such a huge influx of occupants. Very frustrating to travel by car in this area without adding any pressure to the existing capacity.</i>	Car parking for the development has been carefully considered by the proponent. 230 commercial spaces have been approved in the original proposal along with 205 public parking spaces which are currently in operation and 8 Council parking spaces at the ground floor level. Additional traffic relates to the parking spaces required to make up the minimum 232 residential parking spaces under Burwood Council's DCP for the residential component.  URaP-TTW have prepared a TMAP and addressed the parking needs of the amended development. (Copy attached as Appendix H)  The additional parking spaces have been assessed by Thompson Stanbury in terms of traffic impact as satisfactory in their Revised Traffic Impact Statement dated August 2008 (Copy attached as Appendix I). Access into and from the site has been assessed as complying the Australian Standard.

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
		<i>Burwood Station is also over capacity. Development will add pressure to an already a rundown station.</i>	Burwood Station is to be upgraded as part of an upgrade being undertaken as detailed on Council's Website Media Release 17 April 2008 – <i>Railway Station Upgrade</i> .
		<i>Trains are congested and overcrowded (more a State Rail issue) a DA that increases the volume of people using Burwood Station doesn't help.</i>	The vision for Burwood encourages use of public transport.
		<i>EIS may have been done but detailed consideration must be sought as with any studies results may be skewed depending on the methodology used and the audience of the ultimate results.</i>	Comment noted. All reports have been prepared by professionals with appropriate level of experience to consider relevant technical and assessment issues.
10.	Community 18/2/2008 Objection	<i>Object to the proposal concept plan for the construction of 3 residential towers of 8, 12 and 13 storeys.</i>	The amended Concept Plan is for 3 residential buildings which comply with the maximum height permitted under Draft LEP 2008.
		<i>Wouldn't improve their living environment and will create more havoc/traffic around the area in addition to existing.</i>	<p>Car parking for the development has been carefully considered by the proponent. 230 commercial spaces have been approved in the original proposal along with 205 public parking spaces which are currently in operation and 8 Council parking spaces at the ground floor level. Additional traffic relates to the parking spaces required to make up the minimum 232 residential parking spaces under Burwood Council's DCP for the residential component.</p> <p>URaP-TTW have prepared a TMAP and addressed the parking needs of the amended development. (Copy attached as Appendix H)</p> <p>The additional parking spaces have been assessed by Thompson Stanbury in terms of traffic impact as satisfactory in their Revised Traffic Impact Statement dated August 2008 (Copy attached as Appendix I). Access into and from the site has been assessed as complying the Australian Standard.</p>
11	Community 17/2/2008	<i>Proposal to alter the current construction is vastly different to the original submitted to BC and subsequently approved.</i>	The Preferred Project Report for this amended Concept Plan seeks approval for:

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
	Objection		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of three (3) residential apartment buildings;</li> <li>• Alteration to the ground floor and associated footpath area;</li> <li>• Lift entries and lobbies from residential parking levels through to each residential tower; and</li> <li>• 210 residential apartments and an additional 115 car parking spaces.</li> </ul>
		<i>The 3 (16, 15 &amp; 11) storey towers proposed are exceedingly higher than any other buildings in the region and will overshadow a large area.</i>	<p>The amended Concept Plan design has reduced the total floor space of the buildings, increased the building separation and sought to use the space of the plant located at the upper level of each building.</p> <p>The amended Concept Plan is for 3 residential buildings which comply with the maximum height permitted under Draft LEP 2008.</p> <p>Shadowing from the tallest building generally affects the land to the southern side of George Street which has been developed for commercial buildings currently occupies by EDS. The immediate surrounds of the site have been considered in Section 2.1.5 of the original EA. It is considered that existing development consists of a broad range of building types and heights with the tallest being some 8 storeys with a lift overrun at Park Parade.</p>
		<i>Increased traffic flow in the area will have a detrimental effect on the surrounding inhabitants both through increased noise and pollution. The existing roads in the area are inadequate to handle the increase in traffic flow that would occur from the 685 car parking spaces.</i>	<p>Car parking for the development has been carefully considered by the proponent. 230 commercial spaces have been approved in the original proposal along with 205 public parking spaces which are currently in operation and 8 Council parking spaces at the ground floor level. Additional traffic relates to the parking spaces required to make up the minimum 232 residential parking spaces under Burwood Council's DCP for the residential component.</p> <p>URaP-TTW have prepared a TMAP and addressed the parking needs of the amended development. (Copy attached as Appendix</p>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			<p>H)</p> <p>The additional parking spaces have been assessed by Thompson Stanbury in terms of traffic impact as satisfactory in their Revised Traffic Impact Statement dated August 2008 (Copy attached as Appendix I). Access into and from the site has been assessed as complying the Australian Standard.</p>
12	Community 19/2/2008 Support	<p><i>Whilst the development will be a boost to Burwood, it's important to consider it as one part of a whole. There needs to be a bigger and better vision of the streetscape and environment of the Burwood Municipality in its entirety. This project should be one element of an acceptable and forward looking town plan. A planning vision should have uniform and coherent pre-determined building heights not ones as a result of developer and council negotiations on a case by case basis.</i></p>	<p>The proposal has provided improvements to the public domain including wide pavements and colonnade along Elsie Street. The public domain improvements have been discussed with the Panel and improvements have been constructed as part of the previous approval.</p> <p>As part of the commercial approved development for the site the following public domain improvements have been completed by the proponent:</p> <p>George Street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of vehicular crossings (site).</li> <li>• Paving of footpath.</li> </ul> <p>Elsie Street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Widening of footpath, kerb and guttering.</li> <li>• Paving, street trees, tree guards, and smart poles.</li> </ul> <p>Victoria Street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Widening of street, kerb and guttering, sealing of road.</li> <li>• Reinstating of vehicular crossings.</li> <li>• Construction of vehicular crossings (site).</li> <li>• Paving of footpath.</li> </ul>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			<p>The proponent obtained approval from Council previously for these works. A copy of the approved drawings can be found at <i>Appendix Y</i> of the original EA.</p> <p>The proponent also seeks improvements to the Victoria Street frontage with the widening of the footpath area to 1.8m adjacent to the subject site, as shown in the amended ground floor design prepared by Architex refer to Appendix B of the Preferred Project Report.</p>
		<i>Generally support the nature of this development believes that the building itself should be setback further from the street. This will allow for wider and greener footpaths now interrupted by parking metres.</i>	The amended Concept Plan proposes increased setbacks from the western boundary to each proposed building on the podium level of the existing building. The basement and podium levels are existing and therefore cannot be setback further from the street.
		<i>In addition more consideration needs to be given to making the streets wider. There should be 4 lanes – to allow for car parking on either side and for 2 vehicles to be able drive comfortably on each side without having to pull over to let the other pass. Now have an opportunity to improve what we have should take it and not just ignore problems by accepting existing limitations.</i>	<p>As part of the commercial approved development for the site the following public domain improvements have been completed by the proponent:</p> <p>George Street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of vehicular crossings (site).</li> <li>• Paving of footpath.</li> </ul> <p>Elsie Street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Widening of footpath, kerb and guttering.</li> <li>• Paving, street trees, tree guards, and smart poles.</li> </ul> <p>Victoria Street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Widening of street, kerb and guttering, sealing of road.</li> <li>• Reinstating of vehicular crossings.</li> <li>• Construction of vehicular crossings (site).</li> </ul>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paving of footpath.</li> </ul> <p>The proponent obtained approval from Council previously for these works. A copy of the approved drawings can be found at <i>Appendix Y</i> of the original EA.</p> <p>The proponent also seeks improvements to the Victoria Street frontage with the widening of the footpath area to 1.8m adjacent to the subject site, as shown in the amended ground floor design prepared by Architex refer to Appendix B of the Preferred Project Report.</p>
		<p><i>Needs to be a more open and transparent town planning and approval process. Funds should not be wasted on consultants and reports that provide no measurable benefit to the community.</i></p>	<p>The Minister for Planning has appointed an Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel to assess the Concept Plan. The IHAP held a public hearing on 30 May 2008 to consider issues raised by persons who made a submission.</p> <p>As part of the commercial approved development for the site the following public domain improvements have been completed by the proponent:</p> <p>George Street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction of vehicular crossings (site).</li> <li>Paving of footpath.</li> </ul> <p>Elsie Street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Widening of footpath, kerb and guttering.</li> <li>Paving, street trees, tree guards, and smart poles.</li> </ul> <p>Victoria Street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Widening of street, kerb and guttering, sealing of road.</li> <li>Reinstating of vehicular crossings.</li> <li>Construction of vehicular crossings (site).</li> </ul>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paving of footpath.</li> </ul> <p>The proponent also seeks improvements to the Victoria Street frontage with the widening of the footpath area to 1.8m adjacent to the subject site, as shown in the amended ground floor design prepared by Architex refer to Appendix B of the Preferred Project Report.</p>
13.	Ministry of Transport Feb 2008	<i>Ministry provided comments for DGRs and that this was provided to the proponent. DGRs didn't contain the Ministry's concern or as an agency for further consultation.</i>	Comments noted.
		<i>Ministry's previous advice has not been adequately addressed in the EA. Recommended that future DGRs specify where a TMAP is required it is prepared by a suitable experienced consultant.</i>	URaP-TTW have prepared a TMAP and addressed parking needs of the amended development. (Copy attached as Appendix H)
		<p><i>Ministry requests that conditions of consent relating to the following matters are imposed:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Identification of the minimum car parking requirement for the proposal having regard to the accessibility of the subject site to public transport and local employment and reallocate excess parking for public use.</i></li> <li><i>Demonstrated compliance with the relevant standards for pedestrian and cycle access. (Planning Guidelines for Walking and Cycling NSW Govt 2004 is a useful toolkit).</i></li> <li><i>Provision of showers for employees if they ride bicycles.</i></li> <li><i>Identification of an appropriate package of traffic demand management measures to reduce private vehicle use by residents, employees and future customers to the subject site.</i></li> </ul>	<p>A Revised Statement of Commitments has been prepared to accompany the Preferred Project Report.</p> <p>This identifies the car parking required for the proposed development.</p> <p>The Concept Plan does not propose showers for employees as the application is for the residential buildings.</p> <p>URaP-TTW have prepared a TMAP and addressed parking needs of the amended development. (Copy attached as Appendix H)</p>
14.	Heritage Branch	<i>The scheme has not changed significantly from a heritage point of view since our last letter of advice to the Department and so we believe that</i>	A further Statement of Heritage Impact has been prepared by Design 5 which has included an assessment against each of the



## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
	(DOP) 28/2/2008	<i>our previous letter dated 7/8/07 is still relevant to your consideration.</i>	<p>items of heritage nominated within the Draft BTC LEP 2008. The design has been assessed as to its impact in its visual environment as well. While the proposal involves tall buildings, the location and design are such that these have been assessed as acceptable and will not impact the heritage significance of draft heritage items in the vicinity of the development.</p> <p>The matters raised in Heritage Branch correspondence have been considered by Design 5 in their Statement of Heritage Impact.</p>
15.	Community 21/2/2008 Objection	<i>Proposed 3 towers (one 18 storeys) is not suitable for the area. This is not the Gold Coast it is mainly houses and units (some 9 storeys high).</i>	<p>The December 2008 design for the proposed residential buildings are in keeping with the desired future character for the Burwood Town Centre (ie. Draft LEP 2008) and surrounding area. The existing character of Burwood is a mix of low rise and high rise development. Future intentions for the Burwood Town Centre include buildings within in this location up to 60m in height and the proposal complies with the objectives of the draft LEP.</p> <p>The amended Concept Plan is for 3 residential buildings which comply with the maximum height permitted under Draft LEP 2008.</p>
		<i>Proposed 685 parking spaces are more than these roads can take. Victoria St West is one way with 2 ways at either end. Council owns land to widen the street but hasn't done so.</i>	<p>Car parking for the development has been carefully considered by the proponent. 230 commercial spaces have been approved in the original proposal along with 205 public parking spaces which are currently in operation and 8 Council parking spaces at the ground floor level. Additional traffic relates to the parking spaces required to make up the minimum 232 residential parking spaces under Burwood Council's DCP for the residential component.</p> <p>URaP-TTW have prepared a TMAP and addressed the parking needs of the amended development. (Copy attached as Appendix H)</p>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			The additional parking spaces have been assessed by Thompson Stanbury in terms of traffic impact as satisfactory in their Revised Traffic Impact Statement dated August 2008 (Copy attached as Appendix I). Access into and from the site has been assessed as complying the Australian Standard.
		<i>Burwood Station has not been updated with lifts. There are 39 steep steps to No 3 platform into the city. These are things to be remedied before they put another 219 units in the area.</i>	209 apartments are proposed not 219. Other modes of public transport available in the area as well as the train station eg. Bus services. Burwood Station is to be upgraded as part of an upgrade being undertaken as detailed on Council's Website Media Release 17 April 2008 – <i>Railway Station Upgrade</i> . This media release is included as Appendix A of the URaP-TTW report which can be found at Appendix H of this PPR.
16.	Resident 19/2/2008 Objection	<i>High rise will be a scar on the local area. It will cause overshadowing and loss of privacy for my and other houses in the area.</i>	<p>The December 2008 design for the proposed residential buildings are in keeping with the desired future character for the Burwood Town Centre (ie. Draft LEP 2008) and surrounding area. The existing character of Burwood is a mix of low rise and high rise development. Future intentions for the Burwood Town Centre include buildings within in this location up to 60m in height and the proposal complies with the objectives of the draft LEP.</p> <p>The amended Concept Plan is for 3 residential buildings which comply with the maximum height permitted under Draft LEP 2008.</p> <p>Shadow diagrams have been prepared by Turner and Associates (TAA) which include a comparison with the approved commercial development on the site. Based on this comparison for intervals on 22 June, while the shadows will be cast longer in the morning at 9am over the front yard of the property located at the corner of Gloucester Avenue and George Street, and there is a minor increase in shadowing on the rear yards of the properties immediately to the west being 2 and 4 Gloucester Avenue at the</p>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			<p>10am interval, overall the impact is similar to the original approved development in terms of solar access to the residential properties to the immediate west. It should be noted that this shadowing is clear of the rear yards by 10.12am, which is a marginal improvement when compared to the original approved commercial building which is not clear until 10.18am. It is also noted that the terraces at number 53 and 65 George Street are used for residential purposes and will have no greater shadow impact as a result of the amended design. The duration of shadowing to the residential properties to the west is similar to the approved development and well less than 3 hours, as shadowing is clear by 10.12am.</p> <p>The shadow diagrams prepared to illustrate the shadows associated with the Concept Plan. These show that there will be less than 3 hours of shadow impact on the residential properties to the immediate west.</p> <p>Privacy has previously been discussed in the EA. Further the design changes undertaken by TAA sought to address the privacy and amenity between residential properties to the immediate west and the subject site, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building A set further back from the western boundary.</li> <li>• Building B setback some 18.3m from the western boundary.</li> <li>• Building C setback increased to at least 12m from western boundary.</li> <li>• Screens both fixed and vertical have been added to some of the apartments (as annotated on the elevations).</li> <li>• Balcony balustrades have been designed at the lower levels of each building to include solid elements to prevent</li> </ul>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			<p>downward viewing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A pergola structure which will have climbers, is proposed on the podium level along the western boundary to provide for a visual break from the rear yards of the properties to the immediate west when looking upwards.</li> <li>The landscape design seeks to mitigate overlooking with the use of planter boxes along the western edge of the podium.</li> </ul>
		<i>Too much traffic added to roads which are already choked.</i>	<p>Car parking for the development has been carefully considered by the proponent. 230 commercial spaces have been approved in the original proposal along with 205 public parking spaces which are currently in operation and 8 Council parking spaces at the ground floor level. Additional traffic relates to the parking spaces required to make up the minimum 232 residential parking spaces under Burwood Council's DCP for the residential component.</p> <p>URaP-TTW have prepared a TMAP and addressed the parking needs of the amended development. (Copy attached as Appendix H)</p> <p>The additional parking spaces have been assessed by Thompson Stanbury in terms of traffic impact as satisfactory in their Revised Traffic Impact Statement dated August 2008 (Copy attached as Appendix I). Access into and from the site has been assessed as complying the Australian Standard.</p>
		<i>The height, bulk and scale of the building are too great and are not necessary. There is already a 5 and 7 storey building approved and under construction on the site and this is as much as should be allowed.</i>	<p>The December 2008 design for the proposed residential buildings are in keeping with the desired future character for the Burwood Town Centre (ie. Draft LEP 2008) and surrounding area. The existing character of Burwood is a mix of low rise and high rise development. Future intentions for the Burwood Town Centre</p>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			<p>include buildings within in this location up to 60m in height and the proposal complies with the objectives of the draft LEP.</p> <p>The amended Concept Plan is for 3 residential buildings which comply with the maximum height permitted under Draft LEP 2008.</p> <p>The bulk and scale of the buildings have been considered in the PPR Concept Design prepared by TAA with the inclusion of a horizontal band between levels 3 and 7 with variations in the balcony setbacks rather than uniformity. The upper levels of each building then provide for uniformity and symmetry with regular sizing of balconies which create vertical eye lines. With the last top levels of each building being finished with solid boarders and infill glass balconies. In this way, the bulk and scale of the development has been broken into three distinct elements with materials and finishes to complement each element, a base, a middle and an upper for each building. In redesigning the development TAA have consciously sought to shift the bulk and scale of the buildings away from the residential properties located to the west and create building designs with articulation and variation both horizontally and vertically. The amended design acts as a backdrop to the lower scale development in its surrounds and has been assessed as reasonable in its current location where other tall buildings may occur in the future.</p>
17.	Community 18/2/2008 Objection	<i>3 high rise towers over a podium is a gross overdevelopment for this area. The proposal seeks approval for 3 towers of 13,12 and 8 storeys the actual development includes a podium of retail / commercial that constitutes a total height of 17,16 and 12 storeys (just under 60m high).</i>	<p>The December 2008 design for the proposed residential buildings are in keeping with the desired future character for the Burwood Town Centre (ie. Draft LEP 2008) and surrounding area. The existing character of Burwood is a mix of low rise and high rise development. Future intentions for the Burwood Town Centre include buildings within in this location up to 60m in height and the proposal complies with the objectives of the draft LEP.</p> <p>The amended Concept Plan is for 3 residential buildings which comply with the maximum height permitted under Draft LEP 2008.</p>



## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES

No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
		<i>Context of prior approvals for the site. Late 1990s a 2 x 11 storey proposal was rejected. Proposal for a mixed commercial / residential development with a max height of 2, 5 and 7 storeys was approved and under this approval basement parking and commercial levels have been constructed. This development was deemed after appropriate processes of consultation to be acceptable for the site.</i>	The PPR includes an overview of the historical approvals for the site and details of what has been approved.
		<i>1. Unreasonable presumptions relating to Draft LEP and the sub-regional strategy for the Inner-West (not completed). In particular undermine the panel in providing sound decision of the LEP. To decide this proposal prior to the finalisation of the LEP and Inner West Strategy jeopardises due process and establishes dangerous precedent.</i>	<p>The Draft Inner West Subregional Strategy states:</p> <p><i>Burwood and Olympic Park – Rhodes have been identified as Strategic Centres for the Inner West Subregion. Over the next 25 years, Burwood will strengthen its role as a Major Centre providing a mix of higher skilled office jobs, retailing and homes. (p.8)</i></p> <p>...</p> <p><i>Encouraging new housing to be located in centres with good accessibility to public transport will contribute to more sustainable development. (p.9)</i></p> <p>...</p> <p><i>The Metropolitan Strategy aims to concentrate development to strengthen Major/Strategic Centres, Towns, Villages and Neighbourhoods and establish a balanced approach to accommodating more residential growth in new release areas and existing urban areas over the next 25 years (30-40 and 60-70 percent respectively). The strategy sets draft housing targets for the ten subregions. (p.62).</i></p> <p>The Draft Inner West Subregional Strategy has now been released. The Draft Inner West Subregional Strategy indicates a dwelling target of 1,111 additional dwelling per year to 2031. Burwood is identified as a Major Centre (as per the SMS which identified a total of 10). An additional 3,500 employees are sought</p>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			<p>to be accommodated in Burwood Major Centre, along with an additional 7,700 extra dwellings in the Burwood LGA of which 80% are to be located in centres. Specifically, the Draft Strategy advises "Housing will be strategically placed within close proximity of future employment centres, such as Burwood Major Centre".</p> <p>The Concept Plan seeks to provide affordable housing within close proximity to existing transport services and employment opportunities which is consistent with the Draft Strategy.</p> <p>The Draft Burwood Town Centre Local Environmental Plan 2008 (as recently exhibited) includes a number of objectives and controls, for which the proposed development has been assessed as consistent. Refer to Appendix N of the PPR.</p>
		<p>2. The proposal is put forward as a "concept plan" but the cover letter (to Anthony Witherdin 21/1/08) asks that there be no further environmental assessment. If this is a CP then requesting that there be no further EA is unreasonable. If detail in the documents is beyond a CP stage then this compromises the notion of CP – to consider in principle the core elements that represents a further undermining of due process.</p>	<p>The information submitted with the original EA, Addendum Report, Additional Information and the Preferred Project Report are to a level of detail which would ordinarily be submitted with a Project Application under Part 3A.</p> <p>Provision is made under Section 75P of the Act as follows:</p> <p><b>75P Determinations with respect to project for which concept plan approved</b></p> <p>(1) When giving an approval for the concept plan for a project, the Minister may make any (or any combination) of the following determinations:</p> <p>(a) the Minister may determine the further environmental assessment requirements for approval to carry out the project or any particular stage of the project under this Part (in which case those requirements have effect for the purposes of Division 2),</p> <p>(b) the Minister may determine that approval to carry out the</p>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			<p><i>project or any particular stage of the project is to be subject to the other provisions of this Act (in which case the project or that stage of the project ceases to be a project to which this Part applies),</i></p> <p><i>(c) the Minister may determine that no further environmental assessment is required for the project or any particular stage of the project (in which case the Minister may, under section 75J, approve or disapprove of the carrying out of the project or that stage of the project without further application, environmental assessment or report under Division 2).</i></p> <p>The proponent has requested that the Minister for Planning grant approval to the Concept Plan under Section 75P(1)(c) of the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i> (as amended) given the level of detail which has been included within the documentation, including: the original Environmental Assessment, its appendices and subsequent Addendum Report and its appendices and design drawings, additional information, and Preferred Project Report and its appendices and detailed design drawings. This is substantially more detail and information than what would ordinarily be submitted for a Concept Plan and is to a level as that which is required for a Project Application (particularly in light of the Director-General's Requirements specifying a Project Application is to be prepared. The proposal includes sufficient details in the drawings and associated documentation to enable the Minister for Planning to determine the concept plan without the need for a further environmental assessment.</p>
		<p><i>3. Revitalisation of Burwood, if deemed necessary and accommodation of a reasonable proportion of future population growth from the Metro Strategy does not require high rise residential towers.</i></p> <p><i>The existing 2, 5 and 7 storey development contributes a major increase</i></p>	<p>The proposed development is consistent with the strategic intent of the SMS, Draft Strategy and Draft BTCLEP 2008. The Draft BTCLEP 2008 seeks to enable buildings up to 60m in height at the subject site.</p>





## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES

No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
		<i>in dwellings in Burwood and will aesthetically enhance the environment in a way that does not impose the triple towers externalities of overshadowing, wind tunnelling and visual pollution, nor establish dangerous high rise precedent.</i>	<p>The proponent has redesigned the buildings to a comparable level of overshadowing as that attributed to the approved commercial development. A wind tunnel assessment (refer to Appendix L) has concluded that the development is acceptable subject to inclusion of conditions which form part of the proponent's Revised Statement of Commitments (refer to Appendix G).</p> <p>The existing development was for commercial development only. The proposal introduces the residential component onto the site.</p> <p>The amended design has included additional assessment with respect to visual analysis and heritage assessment (refer to Appendix P), which have concluded the design is acceptable in its location.</p>
		<i>4. To assert that the 3 storey podium has already been approved and can simply be deployed as the basis of this proposal appears deceptive and dangerous. Surely the 5/7 storey approval cannot just be stopped part way built and then used for a different purpose to what was originally proposed – as a foundation for a high-rise complex – without specific approval for the 3 level structure per se.</i>	<p>The proponent has completed all works associated with the existing building which stands on the site in accordance with the existing approvals issued by Burwood Council.</p> <p>The proponent cannot and does not seek approval for development which has already been approved and constructed.</p> <p>The proponent seeks approval for the residential development, changes to the ground floor plan and accommodation of residential car parking spaces within the basement car parking levels.</p> <p>The Concept Plan has been lodged specifically for the residential component. The residential component is proposed to be located on the existing approved and constructed building (podium and car parking levels).</p>
		<i>5. In depicting the surrounding neighbourhood (Report Chapters 2 &amp; 3) makes it appear that the area as all medium –high rise so that the triple tower construction will simply sit amongst like companions.</i>	<p>Design 5 in their report Assessment of Heritage Impact of Development surrounding heritage items and streetscape (which can be found at Appendix P) describes at page 7 "The site and context" as follows:</p>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
		<p><i>It discusses land use on the east through to Burwood Rd – 2 blocks but only for ½ block on west side i.e. to the eastern side of Gloucester Ave. Within 2 blocks of the development to the west (i.e. all of Gloucester Ave west and Park Rd) are single dwelling houses forming a buffer from the town centre.</i></p> <p><i>It ignores that this was designated for further investigation in the Vision Document (not carried out) – even though it reproduces exactly that from the Vision Document itself. Inappropriate to juxtaposition 17 storey high rise and mostly single dwellings. The assertion at pg 23 that a tower development is justified because of the “existing context of the site is urban” fails to acknowledge the single residential uses in the area.</i></p>	<p><i>The site at 1-17 Elsie Street is located within the Burwood Town Centre. The site is bounded by George Street to the south, Elsie Street to the east, Victoria Street to the north and on the western side by a driveway which separates the site from residential dwellings including a row of two storey Victorian terraces on the south end fronting George Street. The site itself has no heritage value.</i></p> <p><i>The development surrounding the site comprises a mixture of commercial and residential buildings.</i></p> <p><i>The residential development comprises a mixture of single or two storey detached dwellings or multi storey units along Victoria Street and Park Avenue. Commercial buildings are located mainly to the Elsie Street, east of the site and George Street which is south of the site. These buildings range in height from two stories up to seven stories.</i></p> <p><i>The site is located two blocks west of Burwood Road which is characterised by mainly two and three storey retail buildings. The site is also located close to Burwood Rail station.</i></p> <p><i>Prior to construction of the podium, the site was used as a public car park.</i></p> <p>This is considered to be a reasonable evaluation of the site and its surrounding context.</p>
		<p><i>6. The graphics in the document are deceptive. The front cover (reproduced pg 22) show the current George St/Elsie St landscape with the structure superimposed. Amendment of the foundation photo is not complete – the George St terraces are incorrectly shown as having sun on them after the towers are constructed. From the shadow diagrams</i></p>	<p>A visual analysis of the proposed development from 10 view locations surrounding the site in the Burwood Town Centre has been prepared by TAA. This information has been used by Design 5 in the assessment of the proposed development in relation to existing heritage items and nominated heritage items.</p>



## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES

No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
		<i>those terraces will almost never see the direct sunlight again once the towers are built.</i>	Refer to revised shadow diagrams and illustrations provided by TAA.
		<i>7. The shadow diagrams understate the shadow effect by only showing 9am-3pm. Pre 9am and post 3pm will cast much greater shadows – extending probably to Park Rd in the west in the mornings. Whilst there may be planning custom and practice that deems 9am and 3pm as acceptable yardsticks for shadowing, the real effect of residents, particularly west where there are single residences, is understated and will be unacceptable.</i>	<p>Shadow diagrams have been prepared by Turner and Associates (TAA) which include a comparison with the approved commercial development on the site. Based on this comparison for intervals on 22 June, while the shadows will be cast longer in the morning at 9am over the front yard of the property located at the corner of Gloucester Avenue and George Street, and there is a minor increase in shadowing on the rear yards of the properties immediately to the west being 2 and 4 Gloucester Avenue at the 10am interval, overall the impact is similar to the original approved development in terms of solar access to the residential properties to the immediate west. It should be noted that this shadowing is clear of the rear yards by 10.12am, which is a marginal improvement when compared to the original approved commercial building which is not clear until 10.18am. It is also noted that the terraces at number 53 and 65 George Street are used for residential purposes and will have no greater shadow impact as a result of the amended design. The duration of shadowing to the residential properties to the west is similar to the approved development and well less than 3 hours, as shadowing is clear by 10.12am.</p> <p>New shadow diagrams prepared to illustrate the shadows associated with the modified design. These show that there will be less than 3 hours of shadow impact on the residential properties to the immediate west.</p> <p>Additional diagrams for hours outside the 9am-3pm time period have been completed by TAA for the amended design to illustrate the effects of residences. The diagrams show that the angle of the sun being close to the horizon means little solar access is available and shadows are longer as a result.</p>



## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES

No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
		<i>8. The proposal is silent about Tullona Estate, a significant Heritage Listed building at 48-50 Park Rd, in the next block to the proposal. The character surrounding this heritage listed building will be irrevocably changed by the triple tower development and will become unsuitable for the preservation of this important part of Sydney's Heritage.</i>	Design 5 has prepared a Heritage Impact Assessment Report which has specifically included consideration of Tullona Estate – refer to Appendix P.
		<i>9. The 'view points' pgs 87-102 are deceptive. These use a perspective which makes the latter look very small and the limitation of trying to fit them and a sketch on to an A4 page only show part of the artist's impression. They don't illustrate the true extent of the visual damage – they are not visually innocuous as claimed. The crane on the site is only at the equivalent of 6-7 storeys (much lower than the towers will be). Pictorial material has such a direct impact and the representation in the EA is unacceptable.</i>	<p>TAA have prepared revised views as part of a view analysis of the subject site.</p> <p>The comment that the existing crane is equivalent to the height of a 6-7 storey building is inaccurate. The existing RL to the underside (haulage point) of the crane has been provided within Appendix T and indicates RL 62.45 whereas the maximum height of Building B is proposed to be RL 66.35. As such, the height of the top-side of the crane is equivalent to that of the Building B in the middle of the site being a 15 storey building.</p> <p>The height of the buildings complies with the maximum height indicated in the Draft BTCLEP map at 60m for the subject site. The bulk and scale of the buildings have been reconsidered in the modified design by TAA by the inclusion of a horizontal band between levels 3 and 7 with variations in the balcony setbacks rather than uniformity. The upper levels of each building then provide for uniformity and symmetry with regular sizing of balconies which create vertical eye lines. With the last three levels of each building being finished with solid boarders and infill glass balconies. In this way, the bulk and scale of the development has been broken into three distinct elements with materials and finishes to complement each element, a base, a middle and an upper for each building. In redesigning the development TAA have consciously sought to shift the bulk and scale of the buildings away from the residential precinct to the west and create building designs with articulation and variation both horizontally and vertically. The amended design acts as a</p>



## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES

No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			backdrop to the lower scale development in its surrounds and has been assessed as reasonable in its setting where no other taller buildings are currently located but may occur in the future.
		<i>10. Major omission from the 'view points' as none are from Tullona Estate against the backdrop of the 'triple towers'. The visual impact on this low level residential neighbourhood will be vast and undesirable.</i>	The potential views / impacts from Tullona Estate have been discussed in the Heritage Impact Assessment included in Appendix P.
		<p><i>11. There are inconsistencies in the parking tally: pg 1 - 685, next page - 654 and on pg 23 - 672 spaces. Highest of these taken as the parking provision.</i></p> <p><i>More serious is the process whereby this number of car spaces has been achieved. After approval of the 2/5/7 storey DA and commencement of excavation of the site, the proponent gained approval for an additional level of basement parking on the grounds that these were needed to meet the requirements for the 2/5/7 storey developments and Council's car parking requirements. If this is the case the how is the same parking space now touted as sufficient for 209 residences?</i></p>	<p>Refer to Section 2.3.3 and 2.3.4 of the revised Preferred Project Report.</p> <p>The original approval required a minimum number of parking spaces 553 of which 205 were required to be provided as public car parking, based on an approved total floor space under the Burwood Planning Scheme Ordinance of 18,916.93 square metres. This allowed for 348 parking spaces for the commercial component.</p> <p>The current built form has a total floor space under the BPSO of some 11,518.93 for which a minimum of 230 commercial spaces have been approved in the original proposal along with 205 public parking spaces which are currently in operation.</p> <p>Car parking for the development has been carefully considered by the proponent. 230 commercial spaces have been approved in the original proposal along with 205 public parking spaces which are currently in operation and 8 Council parking spaces at the ground floor level. Additional traffic relates to the parking spaces required to make up the minimum 232 residential parking spaces under Burwood Council's DCP for the residential component.</p> <p>URaP-TTW have prepared a TMAP and addressed the parking needs of the amended development. (Copy attached as Appendix H)</p>



## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES

No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			The additional parking spaces have been assessed by Thompson Stanbury in terms of traffic impact as satisfactory in their Revised Traffic Impact Statement dated August 2008 (Copy attached as Appendix I). Access into and from the site has been assessed as complying the Australian Standard.
		<p>12. Wind Effects Statement assessed the podium will be a desolate, windswept terrain on which people will be able to walk only if protective screening is erected. Pg 44 claims podium level communal open space will be unsuitable for standing, sitting and marginal for walking according to the threshold gust velocities set out on P13 of the Wind Statement. Westerly winds will create high wind problems “on the neighbouring residential area to the western side of the proposed development” (pg 12). Effects aren’t detailed and constitute a significant adversity imposed on the environment and amenity of surrounding properties.</p> <p>Report recommends wind tunnel model testing should be undertaken.</p>	Wind tunnel model testing has been completed refer to report by Windtech at Appendix L. The recommendations of this report have been included in the Revised Statement of Commitments (refer to Appendix G).
		<p>13. Significant public benefits of the proposal will be the revitalisation of the western side of BTC (Pg i). There is already a high degree of vitality in the neighbourhood to the west of BTC. Constructing triple towers 10-12 storeys higher than what has already been approved for this site will not necessarily constitute revitalisation but is guaranteed to intensify already documented and unacceptable levels of congestion in Burwood and undermines community vitality.</p>	<p>It is considered that the redevelopment of the land has delivered a number of public benefits. In terms of facts, the proponent has undertaken the following:</p> <p>George Street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of vehicular crossings (site).</li> <li>• Paving of footpath.</li> </ul> <p>Elsie Street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Widening of footpath, kerb and guttering.</li> <li>• Paving, street trees, tree guards, and smart poles.</li> </ul> <p>Victoria Street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Widening of street, kerb and guttering, sealing of road.</li> </ul>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reinstating of vehicular crossings.</li> <li>• Construction of vehicular crossings (site).</li> <li>• Paving of footpath.</li> </ul> <p>The proponent obtained approval from Council previously for these works. A copy of the approved drawings can be found at <i>Appendix Y</i> of the original EA.</p> <p>The proponent also seeks improvements to the Victoria Street frontage with the widening of the footpath area to 1.8m adjacent to the subject site, to cater for pedestrians who will use the northern entry and pedestrian users beyond the site. This is shown in the amended ground floor design prepared by Architex refer to Appendix D of the PPR.</p>
		14. Pg.38 it claims “the proposed height and bulk of the development will be consistent with the scale identified in the desired future character of the area.” Extensive public opposition to the height, bulk and scale underpinning the DLEP when exhibited in 2007 and public hearing by the Panel on 28/11/07. Such an assertion is unjustified and untenable given it is based on an assumption that the DLEP is acceptable.	The proposal was designed in line with the Draft BTCLEP 2007 prepared for Burwood. Since the initial exhibition the Draft BTCLEP 2007 has been redrafted and as a result the proposal has been considered in relation to the current Draft BTCLEP 2008. Refer to the compliance table provided in Appendix N of the PPR.
		15. The “comments” in Table 7 (Pg. 59) are often vague. An objective assessment of such assertions is urged, one that takes account of the plurality of views about the appropriate use, intensity, scale and bulk of what should come to occupy this site.	An assessment of the amended changes incorporated into the proposal in relation to bulk and scale has been included in the Addendum Report.
		16. Significant local resident concern and objection as documented in the Consultation Report (Appendix F) citing construction noise, height, bulk, scale, overshadowing and adverse traffic impacts. Loss of privacy for residents to the west and north when overlooked by 17 storeys does not appear to be documented.	<p>Privacy has previously been discussed in the EA. Further design changes have been undertaken by TAA so as to improve amenity between residential properties to the immediate west and the subject site, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building A set further back from the western boundary.</li> <li>• Building B setback some 18.3m from the western</li> </ul>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			<p>boundary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Screens both fixed and vertical have been added to some of the apartments.</li> <li>• Balcony balustrades have been designed at the lower levels of each building to include solid elements to prevent downward viewing.</li> <li>• A pergola structure which will have climbers, is proposed on the podium level along the western boundary to provide for a visual break from the rear yards of the properties to the immediate west when looking upwards.</li> </ul> <p>The landscape design seeks to mitigate overlooking with the use of planter boxes along the western edge of the podium.</p>
		17. Sect 4.4 (Site Facilities) of the Report is incomplete (website).	Comment in submission stops in mid-sentence.
		18. Reflectivity Report fails to report on impact on occupants of existing residences and businesses. e.g. will the westerly sun reflect off the towers to the residences to the west?	<p>A revised Reflectivity Report has been prepared by Vipac based on the current design.</p> <p>The materials, finishes and design of the amended development will remain consistent with the Reflectivity Report as submitted. The report considered impacts in relation to the public domain and demonstrates that the development will not cause hazard to users of the public domain.</p>
		<p>19. Traffic Report is out of date and understates current and future traffic volumes.</p> <p>a) Narrowing of any street (inc. Elsie St) (pg.11-12) is adverse. Unreasonable extent of development from kerb to kerb.</p> <p>b) 205 public car spaces fails to account for the loss of 26 on street kerbside spaces (pg 11-12 Traffic Report) and the 'discount' of 35 visitor car spaces (1 per 6 units – pg 11 Traffic Report) that are not provided.</p>	<p>Car parking for the development has been carefully considered by the proponent. 230 commercial spaces have been approved in the original proposal along with 205 public parking spaces which are currently in operation and 8 Council parking spaces at the ground floor level. Additional traffic relates to the parking spaces required to make up the minimum 232 residential parking spaces under Burwood Council's DCP for the residential component.</p> <p>URaP-TTW have prepared a TMAP and addressed the parking</p>



## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
		<p>The NET provision isn't 205 public spaces but 144 which are below the minimum of 200 required by Council as a replacement for the Council owned car park previously existing on site.</p>	<p>needs of the amended development. (Copy attached as Appendix H)</p> <p>The additional parking spaces have been assessed by Thompson Stanbury in terms of traffic impact as satisfactory in their Revised Traffic Impact Statement dated August 2008 (Copy attached as Appendix I). Access into and from the site has been assessed as complying the Australian Standard.</p> <p>Previous approvals by Burwood Council required the changes to Elsie Street which have now been completed.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The public parking spaces have already been approved and are operational.</p>
		<p>c) Traffic Volumes and forecasts are based on out of date figures from 2003, evolved upwards by 2% to 2006.</p> <p>Traffic volumes from 2001 are cited for vehicles using when it was a public car park. At that time parking in Westfield was unmetered commonly used for long stay parking and the council car park was underutilised (now metered and alternative areas used). 2001 data are so out of date as to be irrelevant in the calculations.</p> <p>2003 figures (and 2006 which are based on them) are also underestimated.</p>	<p>Refer to Sections 1(h) and (i), 2.3.3 and 2.3.4 of the revised Prefer Project Report.</p> <p>Car parking for the development has been carefully considered by the proponent. 230 commercial spaces have been approved in the original proposal along with 205 public parking spaces which are currently in operation and 8 Council parking spaces at the ground floor level. Additional traffic relates to the parking spaces required to make up the minimum 232 residential parking spaces under Burwood Council's DCP for the residential component.</p> <p>URaP-TTW have prepared a TMAP and addressed the parking needs of the amended development. (Copy attached as Appendix H)</p> <p>The additional parking spaces have been assessed by Thompson Stanbury in terms of traffic impact as satisfactory in their Revised Traffic Impact Statement dated August 2008 (Copy attached as Appendix I). Access into and from the site has been assessed as complying the Australian Standard.</p>



## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES

No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
		d) Traffic Report essentially ignores the DLEP data, instead using out of date data. The DLEP Data are substantially higher than the base data used in the Traffic Report clearly showing there are irregularities and that the 2%/1% incremental factor applied to the proponent's 2003 data are insufficient.	Modelling undertaken by Thompson Stanbury in their revised report (Appendix I) indicates that the proposed development will not adversely impact on traffic.
		e) Table 2 assessments are damning "the 2016 base case outcome...just satisfactory with all intersection levels of service reaching 'C' and 'D' (pg 38 Traffic Report).  Traffic Report specifies that accident studies will be required for some intersections and urge approval not to be granted without follow through on these recommendations = using current data.	Modelling undertaken by Thompson Stanbury in their revised report (Appendix I) indicates that the proposed development will not adversely impact on traffic.
		f) Diagrams in the Traffic Report omit Victoria St East. In the DLEP this is designated to be linked up with Victoria St West to become a major through-route from Park Rd to Croydon Rd carrying 550-600 cars/hr in peak periods instead of the few dozen at present. Thus the INTANAL output calculations of Intersection Efficiency (Table 2 pg 22 are underestimated. Level of service is likely to become for worse than projected potentially nearing category 'F' at many intersections.	Modelling undertaken by Thompson Stanbury in their revised report (Appendix I) indicates that the proposed development will not adversely impact on traffic. Amended report takes into account Council's traffic studies.
18.	Community Feb 2008 Objection	Attaches documents submitted to BC in 2007 in respect of the DLEP opposing in principle the construction of high rise buildings on the Elsie St site. (Did not receive a copy of the petition, letters of submission or news articles). On behalf of residents to give high priority to concerns and disallow any construction over 5/7 storeys currently approved.	The construction of the building is in consideration with the future direction identified in the draft LEP which allows buildings of this height in the proposed zoning identified for the site. Also provides a mix of uses on the site introducing residential component to the existing commercial/retail on site and in close proximity to the railway station.
19.	Burwood Community Voice	<i>Metro Strategy:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Believes an approval of this DA will compromise Inner West Metro Strategy (IWMS).</li></ul>	Table 7 of the draft 'Inner-west' sub-regional strategy states that characteristics of a major centre include "...taller office and residential buildings...". The proposal provides a development with an existing commercial podium with residential buildings



## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES

No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
	22/2/2008 Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sub Regional IWMS is not finalised / on public exhibition and thus there is no understanding of the pressure on the BTC and surrounding area by population increases in neighbouring Councils. No reference point to judge the DA.</li> <li>Burwood identified as a Major Centre according to the State's Metro Strategy – DOP still guidelines and strategic directions for them.</li> </ul> <p>Outcomes of this process need to be examined before approvals are made for specific sites.</p>	above in close proximity to both public transport and services and a Westfield mall within the Burwood Town Centre (BTC) area. This is consistent with the desired future character of a Major Centre as envisaged at Burwood.
		<p><i>DLEP 2007 Burwood Town Centre:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An approval could compromise the review process of the DLEP.</li> <li>Approval of this DA using the DLEP will create precedent.</li> <li>New densities proposed and there impacts were not calculated into the DLEP. Note Burwood residents are already well below open space provisions for LGAs.</li> </ul>	<p>Proposal has been assessed in relation to Draft BTCLEP 2008 refer to Appendix N.</p> <p>The proposal includes the required open space on the podium level for the future residents of the development.</p>
		<p><i>3A Determination:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear as to why a Part 3A determination was granted. Believe DA does not warrant determination by the Minister according to Guidelines for State Significant Sites under Major Project SEPP.....</li> <li>If 1-17 Elsie St is seen as state significant then all other large developments in the BTC would meet this criteria. This rationale undermines the relevance of the BTCPP.</li> <li>Current DA proposes a 300% increase from the original approval. This increase should not be seen as "the rest" (refers to Minister's response quoted) or that the development was "basically complete".</li> <li>Haste for an approval is not part of the 3A determination criteria. Proper planning process must be followed for orderly development to</li> </ul>	SEPP (Major Projects) 2007 includes a threshold for residential developments over \$50 million. QS provided with proposed development indicate residential development exceeds \$50 million. The Minister for Planning has accepted the proposed development under Part 3A as per advice dated 24 December 2007 from the Department of Planning..

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
		<p>occur.</p> <p><i>Desired Future Character</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report inadequately describes the surrounding commercial buildings of 5 &amp; 8 storeys and 2 &amp; 3 storey residential flats and townhouses.</li> <li>• This site is the only developable site in the area in the near future.</li> <li>• Towers will therefore not sit comfortably within the site but remain anomalous and out of context with surrounding development.</li> <li>• Height and bulk of the towers and its poor relationship with surrounding area is shown in the applicant's height plan diagram.</li> </ul>	<p>Design 5 in their report Assessment of Heritage Impact of Development surrounding heritage items and streetscape (which can be found at Appendix P) describes at page 7 "The site and context" as follows:</p> <p><i>The site at 1-17 Elsie Street is located within the Burwood Town Centre. The site is bounded by George Street to the south, Elsie Street to the east, Victoria Street to the north and on the western side by a driveway which separates the site from residential dwellings including a row of two storey Victorian terraces on the south end fronting George Street. The site itself has no heritage value.</i></p> <p><i>The development surrounding the site comprises a mixture of commercial and residential buildings.</i></p> <p><i>The residential development comprises a mixture of single or two storey detached dwellings or multi storey units along Victoria Street and Park Avenue. Commercial buildings are located mainly to the Elsie Street, east of the site and George Street which is south of the site. These buildings range in height from two stories up to seven stories.</i></p> <p><i>The site is located two blocks west of Burwood Road which is characterised by mainly two and three storey retail buildings. The site is also located close to Burwood Rail station.</i></p> <p><i>Prior to construction of the podium, the site was used as a public car park.</i></p> <p>This is considered to be a reasonable evaluation of the site and its surrounding context.</p>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			<p>The proposed development has been prepared with the Burwood Council Vision document in mind, Draft BTCLEP 2007 and Draft BTCLEP 2008, as each outline the desired future character of the Burwood Town Centre as adopted by Burwood Council.</p> <p>A further Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared by Design 5 which has included an assessment against each of the items of heritage nominated within the Draft BTC LEP 2008, existing items of heritage within the Burwood Planning Scheme ordinance and the State Heritage Registered items nearby in Burwood. Design 5 has assessed the amended TAA design also in relation to its visual environment. The assessment has concluded that the amended design will not adversely impact on the heritage significance of any item in the vicinity of the site.</p> <p>While the proposal involves taller buildings, the location and design are such that these have been assessed as acceptable and will not impact the heritage significance of draft heritage items in the vicinity of the development.</p> <p>The height of the buildings complies with the maximum height indicated in the Draft BTCLEP map at 60m for the subject site. The bulk and scale of the buildings have been reconsidered in the modified design by TAA by the reduction in floor area and inclusion of a horizontal band between levels 3 and 7 with variations in the balcony setbacks rather than uniformity. The upper levels of each building then provide for uniformity and symmetry with regular sizing of balconies which create vertical eye lines. With the last three levels of each building being finished with solid boarders and infill glass balconies. In this way, the bulk and scale of the development has been broken into three distinct elements with materials and finishes to complement each element, a base, a middle and an upper for each building. In redesigning the development TAA have consciously sought to</p>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			<p>shift the bulk and scale of the buildings away from the residential precinct to the west and create building designs with articulation and variation both horizontally and vertically. The amended design acts as a backdrop to the lower scale development in its surrounds and has been assessed as reasonable in its setting where no other taller buildings are currently located but may occur in the future.</p> <p>The height of the tallest building is 60m Building A, is within the maximum height noted in the Draft BTC LEP 2008, which allows for 60m.</p>
		<p><i>Heritage</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal overpowers many neighbouring heritage buildings e.g. Lochiel Terraces.</li> <li>• Draft Burwood Development Control requires that “any development located near or adjacent to a heritage item respects the heritage significance and does not overwhelm the scale of the heritage item”. 15 storeys next to 2 is a significant departure.</li> <li>• Applicant asserts that a visually prominent feature in foreground of the towers will “distract attention” from the bulk and scale and thus mitigate the negative impacts on the heritage listed terraces. Believe this assertion has no basis.</li> <li>• Planting of shrubs on the podium (Level 3) will not soften the impact of the further 12 storeys on the 2 storey terraces.</li> <li>• Fails to mention the towers will create significant overshadowing on the terraces in both summer and winter.</li> <li>• Heritage report silent on potential impacts on Tullona Estate and heritage listed buildings on Burwood Rd.</li> </ul>	<p>A further Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared by Design 5 which has included an assessment against each of the items of heritage nominated within the Draft BTC LEP 2008, existing items of heritage within the Burwood Planning Scheme ordinance and the State Heritage Registered items nearby in Burwood. Design 5 has assessed the amended TAA design also in relation to its visual environment. The assessment has concluded that the amended design will not adversely impact on the heritage significance of any item in the vicinity of the site.</p> <p>Refer to comments above.</p> <p>A pergola structure has been included in the amended design to help visually screen the towers when looking up from the ground level.</p> <p>Overshadowing has been considered in detail, discussed in this submissions report and illustrated in TAA’s drawings submitted with the Addendum Report.</p> <p>The Heritage Report (as Appendix P) includes an assessment of the potential impacts on Tullona Estate.</p>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage Office expressed concerns regarding the DA and DLEPs proposed densities and heights on heritage listed properties in BTC.</li> </ul>	
		<p><i>Amenity:</i></p> <p>Significant impact on neighbouring residents in terms of overshadowing and traffic generation and on the community with increased pressure on traffic in surrounding streets, strain on open space and infrastructure.</p>	<p>Shadow diagrams for the amended design have been produced by TAA and are included in Appendix B. The impact has been discussed previously in this submissions report as being similar to that of the original approved development.</p> <p>Car parking for the development has been carefully considered by the proponent. 230 commercial spaces have been approved in the original proposal along with 205 public parking spaces which are currently in operation and 8 Council parking spaces at the ground floor level. Additional traffic relates to the parking spaces required to make up the minimum 232 residential parking spaces under Burwood Council's DCP for the residential component.</p> <p>URaP-TTW have prepared a TMAP and addressed the parking needs of the amended development. (Copy attached as Appendix H)</p> <p>The additional parking spaces have been assessed by Thompson Stanbury in terms of traffic impact as satisfactory in their Revised Traffic Impact Statement dated August 2008 (Copy attached as Appendix I). Access into and from the site has been assessed as complying with the Australian Standard.</p> <p>The open space component of the proposal is included on the podium level and is in line with what is required in the RFDC a proposal to upgrade the railway station upgrade has also been discussed previously in this table.</p>
		<p><i>Open Space Provision:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No increase in communal open space provisions from previous DA.</li> <li>Inclusion of building entrances in open space calculations seems</li> </ul>	<p>Open space for the future residents of the development is accommodated at the podium level.</p> <p>Open Space provided complies with RFDC requirements for the proposal.</p>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
		<p>inappropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Podium level will provide 30% of open space for residents however this is unsustainable given the problems with areas wind effects.</li> <li>Burwood LGA one of the lowest providers of open space per head.</li> <li>Acceptable benchmark is 2.83ha/1000 people, Burwood is 1.20ha.</li> </ul>	
		<p><i>Wind effects.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analysis was taken for wind effects on ground level public areas and access ways but no wind tunnel effects were undertaken.</li> <li>Report indicates significant increase in wind velocities for balconies on the northern side of Block C.</li> <li>Report indicates down wash over adjacent residential areas.</li> <li>Report indicates significant wind conditions over the podium even with the recommended wind barriers.</li> <li>Authors of the report repeatedly recommend a wind tunnel study to be conducted.</li> </ul>	<p>Wind tunnel model testing has been completed refer to report by Windtech at Appendix L. The recommendations of this report have been included in the Revised Statement of Commitments (refer to Appendix G).</p>
		<p><i>Overshadowing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report indicates significant overshadowing in summer and winter on the Lochiel Terraces and the 2/3 storey townhouses behind the site.</li> <li>Winter shadow diagrams show long shadows cast on shops, footpaths and the roadway along Burwood Rd.</li> <li>Part of the BTC plan sees "outdoor" cafes as part of revitalisation which will be compromised by the shadows cast by the proposal.</li> </ul>	<p>Shadow diagrams have been prepared by Turner and Associates (TAA) which include a comparison with the approved commercial development on the site. Based on this comparison for intervals on 22 June, while the shadows will be cast longer in the morning at 9am over the front yard of the property located at the corner of Gloucester Avenue and George Street, and there is a minor increase in shadowing on the rear yards of the properties immediately to the west being 2 and 4 Gloucester Avenue at the 10am interval, overall the impact is similar to the original approved development in terms of solar access to the residential properties to the immediate west. It should be noted that this shadowing is clear of the rear yards by 10.12am, which is a marginal</p>



## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			<p>improvement when compared to the original approved commercial building which is not clear until 10.18am. It is also noted that the terraces at number 53 and 65 George Street are used for residential purposes and will have no greater shadow impact as a result of the amended design. The duration of shadowing to the residential properties to the west is similar to the approved development and well less than 3 hours, as shadowing is clear by 10.12am.</p> <p>New shadow diagrams prepared to illustrate the shadows associated with the modified design. These show that there will be less than 3 hours of shadow impact on the residential properties to the immediate west.</p> <p>Additional diagrams for hours outside the 9am-3pm time period have been completed by TAA for the amended design to illustrate the effects of residences. The diagrams show that the angle of the sun being close to the horizon means little solar access is available and shadows are longer as a result.</p>
		<p><i>Traffic:</i></p> <p>With the loss of on-street kerb side spaces and concession of 35 visitor spaces the public car space provision falls to 144 and therefore below the mandated minimum of 200 required by the council as a replacement.</p> <p>Predicted increase on Burwood Rd (7900 vehicles /hr, Park Rd, Victoria West (550 vph) from the DLEP have not been calculated into the report.</p>	<p>Council approved the previous DA which included the basement and podium levels which have been constructed on site. The public parking was approved and is currently operating.</p> <p>Car parking for the development has been carefully considered by the proponent. 230 commercial spaces have been approved in the original proposal along with 205 public parking spaces which are currently in operation and 8 Council parking spaces at the ground floor level. Additional traffic relates to the parking spaces required to make up the minimum 232 residential parking spaces under Burwood Council's DCP for the residential component.</p> <p>URaP-TTW have prepared a TMAP and addressed the parking needs of the amended development. (Copy attached as Appendix</p>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			<p>H)</p> <p>The additional parking spaces have been assessed by Thompson Stanbury in terms of traffic impact as satisfactory in their Revised Traffic Impact Statement dated August 2008 (Copy attached as Appendix I). Access into and from the site has been assessed as complying the Australian Standard.</p>
20	Community 21/2/2008 Objection	<p>1) <i>Traffic</i>: Proposal increase congestion on current traffic conditions. Burwood main roads are all one lane, currently takes up to 15mins by car to leave the town centre due to dense population already approved and developed main road which houses Westfield and shops.</p> <p>No way Burwood Rd could cope with hundreds more residential cars.</p>	<p>Car parking for the development has been carefully considered by the proponent. 230 commercial spaces have been approved in the original proposal along with 205 public parking spaces which are currently in operation and 8 Council parking spaces at the ground floor level. Additional traffic relates to the parking spaces required to make up the minimum 232 residential parking spaces under Burwood Council's DCP for the residential component.</p> <p>URaP-TTW have prepared a TMAP and addressed the parking needs of the amended development. (Copy attached as Appendix H)</p> <p>The additional parking spaces have been assessed by Thompson Stanbury in terms of traffic impact as satisfactory in their Revised Traffic Impact Statement dated August 2008 (Copy attached as Appendix I). Access into and from the site has been assessed as complying the Australian Standard.</p>
		<p>2. <i>Noise</i>: More residents and their vehicles in the area creates more noise for current residents. Noise created by constant stream of cars.</p>	<p>Appendices N and O of the original Environmental Assessment considered noise related aspects of the proposed development. These reports advsd that the development is acceptable.</p>
		<p>3. <i>Character</i>: Proposed height of buildings is an eyesore for the area. 8, 12 and 13 storeys are out of character to the current town centre.</p>	<p>The height of the buildings comply with the maximum height indicated in the Draft BTCLEP map at 60m for the subject site. The bulk and scale of the buildings have been reconsidered in the</p>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			<p>modified design by TAA by the inclusion of a horizontal band between levels 3 and 7 with variations in the balcony setbacks rather than uniformity. The upper levels of each building then provide for uniformity and symmetry with regular sizing of balconies which create vertical eye lines. With the last three levels of each building being finished with solid boarders and infill glass balconies. In this way, the bulk and scale of the development has been broken into three distinct elements with materials and finishes to complement each element, a base, a middle and an upper for each building. In redesigning the development TAA have consciously sought to shift the bulk and scale of the buildings away from the residential precinct to the west and create building designs with articulation and variation both horizontally and vertically. The amended design acts as a backdrop to the lower scale development in its surrounds and has been assessed as reasonable in its setting where no other taller buildings are currently located but may occur in the future.</p> <p>The height of the tallest building 60m Building A, is within the maximum height noted in the Draft BTC LEP 2008, which allows for 60m.</p> <p>Proposal includes 3 towers of 15, 12 and 9 storeys. The proposed design responds to the desired future character of the Burwood Town Centre as indicated in the Draft BTC LEP 2008.</p>
21.	Community (No date) Objection	<p>No mention that the proposal would also impact on Gloucester and Victoria Sts. Many people would be affected by the overshadowing.</p> <p>2. On completion the buildings will rest atop the already approved commercial site and thus the ultimate height will be equivalent of 12, 16 and 17 storeys (or 55.9m, 67.9m and 71.9m).</p> <p>Overcrowding in what used to be a pleasant area.</p> <p>Concerned how the proposal will affect future generations. Will Burwood</p>	<p>Shadow diagrams for the amended design have been produced by TAA and are included a Appendix B. The impact has been discussed previously in this submissions report as being similar to that of the original approved development.</p> <p>The height of the tallest building 60m Building A, is within the maximum height noted in the Draft BTC LEP 2008, which allows for 60m.</p>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
		Park be swallowed up by developers leaving kids nowhere to play...	Proposal includes 3 towers of 15, 12 and 9 storeys. The proposed design responds to the desired future character of the Burwood Town Centre as indicated in the Draft BTC LEP 2008.
22.	Community 15/2/2008 Objection	<p>Loss of morning sun for surrounding homes and units.</p> <p>Lack of privacy for neighbouring homes and units.</p> <p>Create further traffic congestion in the narrow streets surrounding them.</p> <p>Burwood already has too much traffic in all areas and will be much worse if there is an increase in workers and residents in the area.</p> <p>Will Burwood Railway Station still not upgraded cope with the added pressure of more passengers?</p> <p>More than their fair share of high rise development in this area already..</p>	<p>Shadow diagrams have been prepared by Turner and Associates (TAA) which include a comparison with the approved commercial development on the site. Based on this comparison for intervals on 22 June, while the shadows will be cast longer in the morning at 9am over the front yard of the property located at the corner of Gloucester Avenue and George Street, and there is a minor increase in shadowing on the rear yards of the properties immediately to the west being 2 and 4 Gloucester Avenue at the 10am interval, overall the impact is similar to the original approved development in terms of solar access to the residential properties to the immediate west. It should be noted that this shadowing is clear of the rear yards by 10.12am, which is a marginal improvement when compared to the original approved commercial building which is not clear until 10.18am. It is also noted that the terraces at number 53 and 65 George Street are used for residential purposes and will have no greater shadow impact as a result of the amended design. The duration of shadowing to the residential properties to the west is similar to the approved development and well less than 3 hours, as shadowing is clear by 10.12am.</p> <p>New shadow diagrams prepared to illustrate the shadows associated with the modified design. These show that there will be less than 3 hours of shadow impact on the residential properties to the immediate west.</p> <p>Additional diagrams for hours outside the 9am-3pm time period have been completed by TAA for the amended design to illustrate the effects of residences. The diagrams show that the angle of the sun being close to the horizon means little solar access is</p>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			<p>available and shadows are longer as a result.</p> <p>Car parking for the development has been carefully considered by the proponent. 230 commercial spaces have been approved in the original proposal along with 205 public parking spaces which are currently in operation and 8 Council parking spaces at the ground floor level. Additional traffic relates to the parking spaces required to make up the minimum 232 residential parking spaces under Burwood Council's DCP for the residential component.</p> <p>URaP-TTW have prepared a TMAP and addressed the parking needs of the amended development. (Copy attached as Appendix H)</p> <p>The additional parking spaces have been assessed by Thompson Stanbury in terms of traffic impact as satisfactory in their Revised Traffic Impact Statement dated August 2008 (Copy attached as Appendix I). Access into and from the site has been assessed as complying the Australian Standard.</p> <p>Burwood Railway Station is being upgraded as discussed previously.</p>
23.	Burwood Council 27/2/2008	1) <i>Proposal</i> : Council considering against BPSO 1979, exhibited draft Burwood Town Centre LEP, draft Burwood Town Centre DCP Pt.36, draft Infrastructure demand and Funding Plan, draft Section 94 Contributions Plan, draft Public Domain Plans, draft Consolidated DCP and SEPP No.65.	The proposed development seeks an outcome consistent with the desired future character of the Burwood Town Centre as indicated within the Draft BTCLEP 2008.
		2) <i>Current construction</i> : 5 basement car parking levels and the 3 storey retail and commercial podium have been constructed and external finishes are being applied. Council's public car park at basement levels 1 and 2 is in operation.	Comment noted.
		Compliance Table:	Revised compliance tables have been submitted with this revised

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			PPR.
		<p>3) <i>BPSO 1979</i>: Site zoned Business Special 3(c2) which permits a max FSR of 2:1. An FSR of 3.35:1 has been given consent on the site for a Part 5 and 7 storey commercial development with 5 levels of basement car parking. Council notes a SEPP 1 Objection is attached to the EA objecting to the current development standard to allow total FSR of 5:1.</p>	<p>The Minister for Planning under the provisions of Part 3A need not have to vary a development standard using SEPP 1. The inclusion of the revised SEPP 1 objection demonstrates that despite not strictly complying with the development standard contained within the BPSO, the variation of the standard is acceptable in this circumstance as the underlying objectives of the control will be met.</p>
		<p>4) <i>Draft BTC LEP</i>: Site located in the proposed B4 Mixed Use Zone and within the "Core" Area. Area of the site is 5,633m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>Proposal is consistent with the standards of the exhibited draft LEP in regard to the proposed height (17 storeys, 11-16 proposed), max FSR (5:1; 5:1 proposed), max residential FSR (3.5:1; 3.2:1 proposed, and the minimum non-residential % of the development (20%; 36% proposed).</p>	<p>The comments are noted.</p>
		<p>5) <i>Heritage</i>: Additional matters that require further heritage consideration (further to Development Consent D379/01) include the proposed corner element to the podium structure and the additional height of the proposal.</p> <p>The new corner element does not create additional heritage concern, and creates an architectural distinction between the developed and adjacent heritage item. The additional height does not create specific heritage concerns as well.</p>	<p>A further Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared by Design 5 which has included an assessment against each of the items of heritage nominated within the Draft BTC LEP 2008, existing items of heritage within the Burwood Planning Scheme ordinance and the State Heritage Registered items nearby in Burwood. Design 5 have assessed the amended TAA design also in relation to its visual environment. The assessment has concluded that the amended design will not adversely impact on the heritage significance of any item in the vicinity of the site.</p> <p>While the proposal involves taller buildings, the location and design are such that these have been assessed as acceptable and will not impact the heritage significance of draft heritage items in the vicinity of the development.</p>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
		<p>6) <i>Draft BTC DCP Pt. 36.</i></p> <p>Proposal is generally consistent with the proposed development controls with exception to Part 3 – Building Form and Character.</p>	Comment noted.
		<p>(a) Side Rear Setback – Western boundary.</p> <p>Secondary setback is consistent along 3 street frontages, setback to western boundary isn't consistent with Draft DCP Pt.36, for all 3 towers.</p> <p>Towers are setback 6m from the western boundary and don't have any secondary setbacks (noted in Compliance Table). This inconsistency increases the bulk of the development and results in loss of morning solar access to residents adjacent to the western boundary.</p> <p>Urban design of 3 rectangular towers doesn't address concerns raised and may need to be re-considered in regard to the objectives of draft DCP Pt.36.</p>	The redesign of the buildings by TAA have vastly overcome the deficiencies with the original design related to privacy both within the development and to surrounding properties, with the bulk and scale having been moderated with the design approach as discussed previously in this submissions report responses.
		<p>(b) <i>Separation of buildings</i></p> <p>Draft DCP Pt 36 recommends a building separation of 24m for developments above 24m in height. (Also identified in the RFDC.) Proposed separation between the buildings is 18m and is inconsistent with the objectives of both documents. Matter exacerbated with the north/south orientation of the proposed towers.</p>	<p>Details of building setbacks to the boundaries of the site and internally to buildings within the development are shown on the drawings. Building separation (within the site and external) complies between Building A and external adjoining properties, Building B and external adjoining properties and Building C and external adjoining properties. Building separation between Building A and Building B does not comply with the guide within the RDFC. The proposal does however seek to mitigate the proposed variation based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building B has been "pushed" towards the Elsie Street frontage so as to provide for a marked improvement in privacy and amenity for the adjoining properties to the west;</li> <li>• The southern elevation of Building B has been designed to avoid placement of any windows for living areas as the main orientation;</li> <li>• Windows on the southern elevation of Building B has been reduced in size;</li> </ul>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The windows and angles in the wall of Building B have been off-set from those located on the façade of Building A;</li> <li>No balconies are proposed in the southern elevation of Building B;</li> <li>Fixed privacy screens are proposed to the southern elevation of building B.</li> </ul> <p>It is considered that the mitigation measures proposed and the designed location of Building B are reasonable, and it was considered vastly more reasonable to locate the building in its proposed location so as to mitigate privacy issues of properties to the west, while maintaining minimum apartment sizes to Building B.</p> <p>The siting and internal layouts of each dwelling have been carefully planned to ensure that direct overlooking of primary living areas of other dwellings in the development is avoided. With most living spaces oriented away from the southern street frontage, balconies are located on the northern, eastern and western façades to optimise solar access. Living areas are oriented towards the corners of the buildings rather than directly towards each other. Careful consideration has been given to where overlooking may occur and appropriate fixed and operable screening devices have been included in the amended design (refer to TAA drawings included as Appendix B).</p>
		<p><i>7) Traffic and Parking:</i></p> <p><i>(a) Pedestrian access</i> – 3 pedestrian crossings proposed for Elsie St which is only 12m wide and 131m long. RTA criteria would not be met and would also remove on street parking. Council doesn't support installation of these crossings.</p>	<p>TMAP Report by URaP-TTW recommends inclusion of pedestrian crossings. If Council does not want these then the proponent will not include them, thus the revised Statement of Commitments has not included a condition.</p>
		<p><i>(b) Parking Provision</i> – 683 parking spaces are provided, 205 of which are public - parking requirements have been met.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
		<p><i>(c) Traffic Volumes</i> – Consultant applied a conservative 1% per annum</p>	<p>URaP-TTW have prepared a TMAP and addressed parking needs</p>





## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES

No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
		growth rate to the 2006 traffic volumes. More realistic growth rate of 4% per annum should be applied to the traffic count data. This may alter the results of Table 2 – Intanal Output Intersection Efficiency.	of the amended development – refer to Appendix F of this addendum. The 119 additional parking spaces have been assessed by Thompson Stanbury in their Traffic Report contained at Appendix R of the original EA.
		8) <i>Exhibited Documents</i> : Consider the proposal with draft plans noted in 1) previously. Recommended conditions forwarded to DoP asap.	Comment noted.
		9) <i>Engineering</i> : Previous consent conditions apply to the proposal however additional bond or bank guarantee is required for streetscape improvements, in accordance with Burwood Consolidated DCP Pt 35, which didn't exist when D379/01 was granted consent. Matter will be addressed in the recommended consent conditions sent to DoP.	Refer to revised Statement of Commitments, which have essentially included the same conditions as that imposed in the original Development Consent.
24	Burwood Council 12/3/2008	Additional Comment – Traffic and Parking 7) <i>Traffic and Parking</i> : Proposed car parking layout on basement levels 1 and 2 are not consistent with the previous approvals granted by Council. (Refer to details in letter).	Stratum subdivision has already occurred for the council car park. This is considered to be a separate matter which could be resolved between Council and the Applicant. Refer to Appendix S.
25.	Community 20/4/2006 Objection	Objection to DA No.2001.379 (modification) 1) Oppose any subsequent applications to increase height of the development.	This objection is dated 20/4/2006. This objection does not relate to the current Concept Plan application but rather a previous modification considered by Burwood Council.
		2) With Westfield, significant townhouse and commercial developments the local roads in the vicinity of Elsie St, the DA assessment said the traffic increase would be moderate. With the S.96 Modification for additional parking lodged on 5/9/05 and now this application for further parking the traffic impact can no longer be considered 'moderate'. This will generate unacceptable traffic volumes on local roads.	Car parking for the development has been carefully considered by the proponent. 230 commercial spaces have been approved in the original proposal along with 205 public parking spaces which are currently in operation and 8 Council parking spaces at the ground floor level. Additional traffic relates to the parking spaces required to make up the minimum 232 residential parking spaces under Burwood Council's DCP for the residential component.  URaP-TTW have prepared a TMAP and addressed the parking needs of the amended development. (Copy attached as Appendix

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			<p>H)</p> <p>The additional parking spaces have been assessed by Thompson Stanbury in terms of traffic impact as satisfactory in their Revised Traffic Impact Statement dated August 2008 (Copy attached as Appendix I). Access into and from the site has been assessed as complying the Australian Standard.</p>
		<p>3) Council promoted Burwood as a public transport hub and has recent State approval for work to be done on the railway station to improve access. Protest to increase parking as it will undermine the strategy of local and state governments to promote reliance on public transport.</p>	<p>The increase in parking relates to the residential car parking only – the commercial parking is approved and the public parking is operational.</p> <p>Car parking for the development has been carefully considered by the proponent. 230 commercial spaces have been approved in the original proposal along with 205 public parking spaces which are currently in operation and 8 Council parking spaces at the ground floor level. Additional traffic relates to the parking spaces required to make up the minimum 232 residential parking spaces under Burwood Council's DCP for the residential component.</p> <p>URaP-TTW have prepared a TMAP and addressed the parking needs of the amended development. (Copy attached as Appendix H)</p> <p>The additional parking spaces have been assessed by Thompson Stanbury in terms of traffic impact as satisfactory in their Revised Traffic Impact Statement dated August 2008 (Copy attached as Appendix I). Access into and from the site has been assessed as complying the Australian Standard.</p> <p>Parking is in accordance with Council's current DCP minimum requirements.</p>



## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES

No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
26.		<p>Petition: Opposes any development over what is already approved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Constitutes overdevelopment</li> <li>• Overshadow substantial parts of the adjoining residential areas</li> <li>• Diminish heritage significance of properties on George St &amp; Park Rd</li> <li>• Compromise privacy of neighbouring houses, yards and flats.</li> <li>• Create unmanageable traffic and congestion in an overcrowded Town Centre</li> <li>• Unnecessary for Council to fulfil the DOP Metropolitan Strategy.</li> </ul>	<p>Comments are noted.</p> <p>Each of the points raised have been previously addressed with responses within this submissions report.</p>
27.	RTA 9/7/2008	<p>1. Development to contribute to the achievement of transport objectives in the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy and other high-level NSW Government strategies. These policies share aims of increasing the use of walking, cycling and public transport; appropriately co-locating new urban development with existing and improved transport services; and improving the efficiency of the road network.</p> <p>RTA recommends that the development should provide shower facilities as part of the development to encourage walking and cycling to and from the development.</p>	<p>The Draft Inner West Subregional Strategy has been released as a flow-on from the SMS, which states in part:</p> <p><i>Burwood and Olympic Park – Rhodes have been identified as Strategic Centres for the Inner West Subregion. Over the next 25 years, Burwood will strengthen its role as a Major Centre providing a mix of higher skilled office jobs, retailing and homes. (p.8)</i></p> <p>...</p> <p><i>Encouraging new housing to be located in centres with good accessibility to public transport will contribute to more sustainable development. (p.9)</i></p> <p>...</p> <p><i>The Metropolitan Strategy aims to concentrate development to strengthen Major/Strategic Centres, Towns, Villages and Neighbourhoods and establish a balanced approach to accommodating more residential growth in new release areas and existing urban areas over the next 25 years (30-40 and 60-70 percent respectively). The strategy sets draft housing targets for the ten subregions. (p.62).</i></p> <p>The Draft Inner West Subregional Strategy has now been released. The Draft Inner West Subregional Strategy indicates a dwelling target of 1,111 additional dwelling per year to 2031.</p>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			<p>Burwood is identified as a Major Centre (as per the SMS which identified a total of 10). An additional 3,500 employees are sought to be accommodated in Burwood Major Centre, along with an additional 7,700 extra dwellings in the Burwood LGA of which 80% are to be located in centres. Specifically, the Draft Strategy advises "Housing will be strategically placed within close proximity of future employment centres, such as Burwood Major Centre".</p> <p>The Concept Plan seeks to provide affordable housing within close proximity to existing transport services and employment opportunities which is consistent with the Draft Strategy.</p> <p>The development contributes to achieving the aims and objectives of the State Plan – refer to p. 13 of the EA. The development contributes to achieving the aims and objectives of the SMS refer to p. 14 of the EA. The development contributes to achieving the aims and objectives of the Draft Inner West Subregional Strategy.</p> <p>The Draft Burwood Town Centre Local Environmental Plan 2008 (as recently exhibited) includes a number of objectives and controls, for which the proposed development has been assessed as consistent. Refer to Appendix N of the PPR.</p>
		2. Additional traffic volumes generated as a result of this development will exacerbate congestion and delays that are already experienced at the intersections of the local roads with Parramatta Road and Liverpool Road, both State Roads. Congestion is also to increase along Burwood Road.	<p>The increase in parking relates to the residential car parking only – the commercial parking is approved and the public parking is operational.</p> <p>Car parking for the development has been carefully considered by the proponent. 230 commercial spaces have been approved in the original proposal along with 205 public parking spaces which are currently in operation and 8 Council parking spaces at the ground floor level. Additional traffic relates to the parking spaces required to make up the minimum 232 residential parking spaces under Burwood Council's DCP for the residential component.</p>

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
			<p>URaP-TTW have prepared a TMAP and addressed the parking needs of the amended development. (Copy attached as Appendix H)</p> <p>The additional parking spaces have been assessed by Thompson Stanbury in terms of traffic impact as satisfactory in their Revised Traffic Impact Statement dated August 2008 (Copy attached as Appendix I). Access into and from the site has been assessed as complying the Australian Standard.</p> <p>Parking is in accordance with Council's current DCP minimum requirements.</p>
		3. The RTA expects that the likely scope of any planning agreement and/or development contributions that may be entered into between the developer, Burwood Council, and the Department of Planning for road-based transport improvements, including pedestrian and cycle facilities etc would be satisfactorily resolved prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate.	No planning agreement is proposed. The revised Statement of Commitments includes at conditions 22, 23a, 23b, and 23c contributions as can be levied under existing Section 94 Contributions Plans.
		4. The proposed layout of the car parking areas including loading bays, sight distance requirements, aisle widths, ramp grades, turn paths, driveway widths and parking bay dimensions are to be in accordance with AS 2890.1 – 2004 and AS 2890.2 – 2002 for heavy vehicle usage.	The amended Thompson Stanbury report advises at pages 11, 13 and 42 compliance with the AS provisions as are relevant to the proposal.
		5. In the event that a boom gate or other form of vehicle control point is to be provided the queuing area is to comply with Table 3.3 of AS 2890.1 – 2004.	The amended Thompson Stanbury report advises at pages 11, 13 and 42 compliance with the AS provisions as are relevant to the proposal.

## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES



No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
		6. Should Council propose to introduce a fee for parking within the public car park, Council is reminded of Section 65 of the Local Government (General) Regulation 2005, requiring concurrence of the RTA for the operation of a public car park: The RTA provide concurrence to pay parking subject to the following conditions: a. A minimum of 3 hours free parking to be implemented. B. The proposed fee structure should be reviewed and agree to by Council.	The proponent does not seek to operate a public car park. This matter does not relate to the proposed development and the RTA should raise this issue directly with Council.
		7. A parking management plan is to be submitted to the satisfaction of Burwood Council.	This item has been included as a condition of the revised Statement of Commitments.
		8. The car parking areas and entry/exit points need to be clearly delineated through line marking and signage to ensure smooth, safe traffic flow.	This item has been included as a condition of the revised Statement of Commitments.
		9. Council is to consider bicycle parking at a safe and convenient location and cycle facilities such as change rooms with lockers located in close proximity to bicycle parking.	Bicycle rails have been included as part of the design in the basement parking levels.
		10. The RTA's NSW Bicycle Guidelines and the NSW Planning Guidelines for Walking and Cycling are useful technical documents for designing bicycle and pedestrian routes and should be referred to in the design of bicycle and pedestrian facilities for the site as a whole.	Bicycle rails have been included as part of the design in the basement parking levels.
		11. All works/regulatory signage associated with the proposed development are to be at no cost to the RTA.	This item has been included as a condition of the revised Statement of Commitments.
		12. All vehicles should be wholly contained within the site before being required to stop.	This has been achieved in the existing approved design.



## SUBMISSIONS REPORT - SUMMARY AND RESPONSES

No.	Submission by:	Issues	Comment
		13. All vehicles are to enter and leave the site in a forward direction.	This has been achieved in the existing approved design.
		14. A demolition/construction traffic management plan detailing construction vehicle routes, number of trucks, hours of operation, access arrangements and traffic control should be submitted to Council for approval prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate.	This item has been included as a condition of the revised Statement of Commitments.

### Summary of the Main Issues from Submissions:

1. Traffic
2. Bulk/Scale/height
3. Overshadowing
4. Use of DLEP to justify
5. Number of parking spaces
6. Use of existing podium
7. Impacts on residential properties