

## **Response to Burwood Design Review Panel (BDRP) 25 November 2022 Meeting Minutes**

Design Review Panel's Comments	Council's Response
The Panel commented on the comprehensive nature of the proposed DCP amendment and that most sections had already been covered.	Noted
The Panel unanimously suggested that Design Excellence provisions already existing in the BDCP be also incorporated into the amendment.	Design excellence heading including objectives and provisions has been inserted into the draft DCP. These are consistent with the provisions already contained within Burwood LEP 2012
Generally, recommend a response only to the <u>contributory</u> elements in the surrounding context.	For the avoidance of the doubt, relevant provisions have been reworded to "characteristic elements that contribute to the character of the local area", rather than contributory elements as this may be confusing as contributory is generally referred to in relation to buildings in heritage conservation areas.
<b>More detailed/specific recommendations include:</b>	
<b>P4:</b> The suggestion that the development application is to be supported by a 'statement' may signal to applicants that this is all that is needed: a statement. Place more emphasis in the process not in providing one more document.	The "statement" needs to demonstrate to the satisfaction of Council how the design of the proposal is compatible with the character of the existing area.  A review of the existing site analysis provisions contained in the Burwood DCP will be rolled out as part of a future review to strengthen the requirements and quality of site analysis to compliment character statement.
<b>P4</b> First Bullet point: should the word 'contributory' be used instead of the word characteristic?	For the avoidance of the doubt, relevant provisions have been reworded to "characteristic elements that contribute to the character of the local area".
<b>P4</b> second bullet, points vi and vii: As per above, insert the word contributory before buildings and make sure to suggest to identify and not emulate detracting parking arrangements such as open ramps and un-'sleeved' surface car parking.	For the avoidance of the doubt, relevant provisions have been reworded to "characteristic elements that contribute to the character of the local area".
<b>P6</b> Side entrances should not be acceptable as they are contrary to the ADG (albeit not applicable to this typology), but their acceptance could lead to inconsistencies along the streetscape. However, entrances can be permitted on primary and secondary frontages.	Agree, this provision is proposed to be amended as follows:  <i>The main entrance of the boarding house or co-living housing development is to be provided within the street elevation to address the street. Side entrances will only be permitted on sites with a secondary frontage and only where they result in a cohesive resolution of the streetscape and do not adversely impact upon neighbouring properties.</i>

<b>P7</b> This provision somehow implies that bonuses will not be considered. Should something be added to the effect that the applicant should demonstrate how (if a bonus is applicable) it is consistent with the aims of the controls?	Agree - The FSR and height are required to be complied with in accordance with the Burwood LEP 2012 and the Housing SEPP.  This provision is deleted accordingly.
<b>P8 item i</b> , should the floor to ceiling height be a minimum like stated in the sketch?	A sketch is already included in the draft and has been relocated to the previous page to avoid confusion.
<b>P8 item ii</b> , should the floor-to-floor height be a minimum?	This is already stated in the control.
<b>P14</b> should the words “within the setback”, be stricken? as this opens the opportunity for them. Require the visual improvements behind the setback. They should be attractive regardless of their location.	Provision is amended as following:  <i>The fire stairs, pump rooms or similar structures must not detract from the overall visual amenity and are generally not supported to be located within the setback area.</i>
<b>P16</b> As we saw in the Gladstone St application, tight sites will count the front setback to meet the minimum open space provision. But, in co-living this could lead to acoustic amenity impacts from gatherings close to the street. Should communal open space only be acceptable behind the front building line?	To respond to DRP’s comment and to complement the proposed draft provision, Communal Open Space (COS) has been added into the provision.
<b>P17</b> should the words “contributory elements of the” be inserted after the word complement? Add roof features to the least and discourage flat unarticulated roof forms	Do not agree with the insertion of roof features as this may result in loophole in argument for the applicant to justify a breach in the overall height of the building.  Agree with the articulation of the roof forms. The following has been added into the provision  <i>– varied roof forms that add to visual interest</i>
<b>P18</b> the suggestion of artwork on blank walls then, in a way, gives a way out to applicants to have them. It is better to encourage well-articulated walls with a ‘solid to void’ ratio as per the design excellence provisions in the DCP?	In centre locations, where buildings may be built boundary to boundary, public art provides a short term design solution as you generally wouldn’t get the same level of articulation along the side facades  Therefore, the existing draft provision is retained.
<b>P22</b> refer to provisions P63 and P64 of the same document.	This provision has been relocated under the heading of the service facilities.
<b>P29</b> is council opening a can of worms by specifying a refrigerator with a storage of 0.13 sqm per person? How can this be enforced or measured for compliance? Also is capacity not measured in cubic metres?	Agree – the numerical requirement of storage within a refrigerator has been removed accordingly.

<b>P32</b> suggest that it should also be well integrated within the landscape plan?	<p>This provision is amended as:</p> <p><i>A least one outdoor clothes drying area shall be provided and located to maximise solar access. The outdoor clothes drying area must be integrated into the landscape design and not be located where visible from the street or public domain.</i></p>
<b>P34</b> include communal or gathering spaces in upper levels. Should everything after the words 'residential uses be stricken? If you suggest that highlight windows or screening can be used, that is exactly what applicants will do. Suggest 'redirection of views to the front or rear' instead.	<p>This provision is amended as:</p> <p><i>The siting of windows and other openings and communal or gathering spaces in upper levels should avoid direct overlooking to adjoining residential uses. Where overlooking cannot be avoided, redirection of views to the front or rear should be incorporated into the design of the development.</i></p>
<b>P40</b> as per the ADG, 7% is for small lots. Why not equate it to the rest of the ADG percentages to cater for larger or any scale of site?	<p>The draft DCP is not proposing to introduce a deep soil requirement that is more onerous than the Apartment Design Guide.</p> <p>However, it is recommended to ensure quality deep soil provision on smaller sites that a minimum dimension of 1.5m be included on sites smaller than 650sqm.</p>
<b>P42</b> should the first bullet point be stricken? Don't give it away so easily. Planting on Structure should then be provided. Good storm water management should be achieved as well as good planting and deep soil, not one or the other.	<p>This provision is amended as:</p> <p><i>Alternative forms of planting should be provided instead such as planting on structures and supported by good stormwater management should be achieved under the following circumstances:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>the location and building typology have limited or no space for deep soil at ground level (e.g. central business district, constrained sites, high density areas, or in centres)</i></li> <li>▪ <i>there is 100% site coverage or non-residential uses at ground floor level</i></li> </ul>
<b>P44</b> , should "a established residential neighbourhood' be added in addition to residential zone?	Agree, amended accordingly
<b>P46 and p47</b> , should the words 'rooms in upper levels' be changed to above ground level?	Agree, amended accordingly to "above ground level"
<b>P50 item ii</b> should the words 'visual and acoustic' be inserted before privacy?	Agree, amended accordingly
<b>P51</b> I believe that the ADG only requires 2 hours of solar access in Metropolitan areas. Is 3 hours excessive?	Provision has been amended to 2 hours of solar access requirement for Communal Open Space to be consistent with the ADG.

<b>P52</b> Should DCP design excellence provisions for the design of roof top areas apply?	Point (g) of Design Excellence provision refers to the roof and public open space areas.
<b>P54</b> should the words “or be incorporated into a roof feature” be inserted after the word recessive?	Agree, amended accordingly.
<b>P55</b> the overall expected quality of the landscape is not spelled out.	<p>This provision is amended as follows:</p> <p><i>Communal open space is to be provided in accordance with the requirements of the Housing SEPP 2021 and must be consolidated into a well-designed, easily identifiable and useable area.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>P62-P64</b> Well done for including these!</li> </ul>	Noted