



Your Reference SSD-77260958
Michelle Niles
Department of Planning, Industry and Environment
Via Major Projects Planning Portal

29 September 2025

**Response to Submission to SSDA
20-24 Railway Parade and No.2-4 Burleigh Street, Burwood
Mixed Use Development**

Thank you for your correspondence inviting Burwood Council to comment on the State Significant Development Application (SSDA) and Response to Submission documentation relating to the Mixed Use Development at 20-24 Railway parade and No. 2-4 Burleigh Street, Burwood.

On 23 May 2025, Council provided a written response to the original documentation provided as part this SSDA development, in which a number of issues had been raised. The key issues raised by Council included the following:

- Heritage.
- Traffic, Access and Parking.
- Livability and Environmental Impacts
- Building Separation.
- Site Planning.
- Urban Design
- Streetscape presentation.
- Residential Amenity,
- Engineering.
- Building - Fire Separation
- Unit Sizes and Amenity

The applicant has since provided a Response to Submission. The applicants' Response to Submission has largely retained the original SSDA proposal, with the exceptions of refinements to the layout of the development. Key amendments to the proposal include the following:

- Reduction in the basement driveway width to 6m.
- Reduction of the Port Cochere entry and exit width to 3m.
- Reduction in the service bay entry/exit width to 6m.
- Elimination of the concealment opportunities.
- Redesign of the winter gardens.
- Reconfiguration of the communal open space areas.

No other changes have been proposed to the original design submitted. As such, the physical design of the development remains largely unchanged in the Response to Submission.

This submission is not conclusive or able to cover all potential issues given the tight timeframe.

Council supports the provision of significant development at 20-24 Railway Parade and 2-4 Burleigh Street and acknowledges the increasing need to provide more affordable housing within the Burwood Local Government Area to keep up with population growth and the current Sydney Housing crisis. Notwithstanding this, Council cannot support the proposal in the current form.

The following issues remain outstanding:

Heritage

The response to submission report does not indicate how the findings of the revised HIS and Historical Archaeological Report have been addressed in the revised design or how the issues included in Appendix 23, Table of Mitigation Measures have been dealt with.

The setbacks proposed are not appropriate to the partially demolished terrace house form, as these had front yards. While a franchised themed AC/DC Hard Rock Café may be one way to acknowledge the former occupants of the site, a more detailed heritage interpretation to recognise the cultural contribution is required.

In addition, the design of the vehicular entrances to suit the building use does not reflect the subdivision pattern of rear lanes (night soil lanes) and small front gardens. The Porte-Cochere form is not considered to be appropriate within the context of surrounding heritage items.

Furthermore, the applicant's response indicates that heritage details will be provided at construction certificate stage. However, the detail is needed now to assess the developments impacts on surrounding heritage items, the rail infrastructure, the terraces and the Greek church. Heritage impacts are currently not able to be fully assessed due to insufficient detail currently provided.

The development has not provided an adequate setback from the north-west corner to provide curtilage to the church to the west that is listed as a local heritage item.

It is recommended that conditions of consent be included in the SSDA approval in relation to the findings of the HIS and Historical Archaeological Report, including:

- The requirement for the submission of a more detailed design demonstrating materials, finishes, detailing and landscaping at the Construction Certificate stage.
- Conditions relating to the treatment of potential historical archaeology (as set out in the historical archaeology report) and Aboriginal archaeology.
- A condition requiring interpretation of the past uses, occupiers and buildings on the site including the preparation and implementation of a Heritage Interpretation Plan and a detailed acknowledgement of the association with the Rock band AC/DC.

Traffic

- The proliferation of driveways associated with the proposed development is not supported. It is acknowledged driveway widths have been reduced; however, the extent of driveways remains unchanged to that of the original SSDA proposal.
- Consideration should be given to investigating the consolidation of driveways along Railway Parade, to have a combined single basement car park/porte-cochere. Consolidation of these driveways would improve pedestrian amenity and remove the need to have a driveway located so close to the intersection with Burleigh Street.
- The modification to the Porte-cochere exit shows a reduced driveway width, which pushes exiting vehicles closer to Railway Parade. If the driveway is narrowed it should be required to provide a greater distance from Railway Parade to address the concerns previously raised.
- The modification to the basement driveway which now includes an offset between the vehicle crossover at the kerb and the internal aisle is not supported as it will lead to conflict between entering and exiting traffic.
- No evidence in the way of swept path analysis has been provided for the design of the Porte Cochere to show how two vehicles can use this space simultaneously, or how one vehicle entering can enter if another vehicle is already parked in this space.

- The motorised gate at the entry to the loading dock is to be set back so as to allow the largest sized vehicle to be able to pull into the site fully without blocking the footpath while waiting for the gate to open.
- The motorised gate on the ramp on level B2 which leads down to level B3 will restrict access to resident visitor parking spaces. All resident visitor parking spaces are therefore required to be placed on level B1 and accessible at all times, or alternately able to be accessed via an intercom to all residential units. A turning space would be required to be provided on level B2 if visitor spaces are to be located on level B3 in the event that a visitor cannot get access to B3.
- For the purpose of parking calculations, the two-bedroom units have been classified as 2 x one-bedroom as advised. This therefore equates to 36 affordable one-bedroom units, and 60 non-affordable one-bedroom units. Under the DCP 96 resident and 19 visitor parking spaces are required. Under the SEPP 44 resident and 0 visitor parking spaces are required. The plans show 82 resident and 2 visitor parking spaces. Clarification therefore is sought as to what calculations have been used.
- Confirmation of what parking is required to be removed within Burleigh Street opposite the site to allow for service vehicles and vehicles exiting the porte-cochere are to be provided.

Livability

- The proposal has retained the entire glass façade which is not supported due to heat load and the requirement for continuous artificial cooling and heating as indicated within the previous submission response.
- The revised architectural plans and the accompanying additional information rely predominantly on the BASIX certificate as the principal measure of the tower's energy efficiency and thermal performance. However, under Schedule 7 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2021, hotels, commercial offices, and restaurants are not classified as BASIX developments. As these uses constitute approximately half of the tower, it remains unclear how the submitted BASIX certificate sufficiently demonstrates the environmental sustainability of the development in its entirety.
- Furthermore, given the scale and complexity of the proposed tower, additional passive cooling strategies are necessary to address the potential greenhouse effect associated with the glass curtain wall façade.

Building Separation/Setbacks

- The building envelope for No. 18 Railway Parade, as depicted in Drawing No. 25, Revision C, does not clearly demonstrate compliance with the required separation between the proposed apartment building at No. 18 and the existing residential flat building at No. 16 Railway Parade. Further information, including details of a feasibility study, is required to allow Council to assess how the site can be developed in accordance with the building separation requirements set out in the Apartment Design Guide (ADG).
- Site isolation remains a concern. More specifically, the submission does not clarify any efforts to acquire adjacent properties. Properties at No. 6, 8, and 10 Burleigh Street and No. 18, 18A, and 18B Railway Parade may be isolated due to the proposed development's non-compliant ADG building separation distances. The applicant's submitted lot amalgamation patterns are unclear and difficult to interpret.
- As indicated in the previous submission response provided by Council. Privacy' glazing is an inappropriate treatment to a constrained site and would limit development potential of adjoining sites.
- The revised architectural plans have not provided any additional setback from the neighbouring building, and the previously raised concerns regarding the non-compliance with the building separation requirements of the Apartment Design Guide (ADG) remain unaddressed. Council seeks to see an increased building separation from the adjoining site

to facilitate a clear view corridor and ensure a balanced relationship between built form and open space.

- The assertion that the rounded corners provide an optimum outlook for the corner apartments, as stated in the submitted response, is inaccurate and misleading. The revised drawings do not address the loss of outlook resulting from the use of opaque glazing on the façade of the bedrooms and lounge in Unit 03B – repeated over 14 levels of the building. Overall, Council has not identified any meaningful design modifications in response to the concerns previously raised.
- The current building separation proposed is 12m to No.18A Burleigh Street, thus failing to comply with the ADG requirements of 24m for 9 storeys and above.

Site Planning

- The submitted additional information and revised architectural plans reference Drawings No. 45 Revision C, No. 46 Revision C, and No. 47 Revision C to illustrate how the proposed development would support connectivity and pedestrian wayfinding with the adjoining site and Burwood Town Centre. However, these drawings only present feasibility studies for the neighbouring lots at No. 18, 18A, 18B Railway Parade and No. 6, 8, and 10 Burleigh Street. The documents do not sufficiently address the public domain issues previously identified by Council, particularly regarding future connectivity between the subject site and the adjoining properties.
- Placemaking, public art, and wayfinding are key elements of the public domain and urban design outcomes of the proposed development and should be considered as part of the preliminary assessment of this SSDA. The submitted additional information does not provide new or adequate detail on the public domain strategy or urban design resolution, and the concerns previously raised by Council remain unresolved.
- A conceptual design is required to demonstrate how the proposal will facilitate well-considered placemaking, the integration of public art, and effective pedestrian wayfinding.
- The proposed hydrant booster represents a critical element of the building's streetscape presentation along Railway Parade, particularly when viewed from the ground plane. The submitted architectural elevation does not illustrate the proposed hydrant booster. A detailed design response is required to demonstrate how its visual impact can be mitigated through a well-integrated and articulated design treatment.
- Council's preference is to utilise landscaping or architectural elements to screen the hydrant booster where practical. Alternatively, the booster could be rotated 90 degrees so that its shorter elevation faces Railway Parade.

Communal Open Space

- It is acknowledged that communal open space areas have been provided on Level 2 and Level 38 of the revised architectural floor plans. However, the communal open space areas lack sufficient detail, in terms of plantings and landscaping treatments, balustrades and useability.
- In addition, the Section drawing (Drawing No.27, Revision C) indicates that a large scale air ventilation system is located above the residential communal open space area, whereby their function is unknown. Concerns are raised that these vents may compromise the amenity of the communal open space areas.

Urban Design

- The SSDA proposal is pre-emptive of a Council-led precinct master-planning process which has commenced. Early stakeholder engagement with adjoining landowners is currently underway with a view to a collaborative approach to an integrated precinct outcome, inclusive of the site, that is the subject of this SSDA.
- The proposed development is considered inconsistent with the desired future character of

the area due to its excessive bulk and scale. Specifically, the proposal incorporates extensive driveway areas and basement ramps, which impede opportunities for active street-level engagement and diminish pedestrian amenity.

- The design should be revised to prioritise pedestrian movement and accessibility over vehicle circulation. The active part of façade particularly on the ground level is less than 50% of the façade which does not meet the requirements of the BDCP Part 3.2.1 P15 for the purpose of maximising the facade activation by 90%. This aims to prioritise a pedestrian environment over vehicle.
- Furthermore, the brown sandstone podium façade demonstrates a lack of well-articulated architectural response to the existing streetscape along Burleigh Street and Railway Parade, resulting in a design that fails to integrate with its surrounding context.
- As indicated in the previous response to submission, opacified glasses which limit the view of the internal spaces are not supported as a solution to compensate for insufficient separation distances.
- In light of the above, setbacks, separation distance and the developments presentation to the street remain unresolved and not supported.

Environmental Impact

- The proposed development retains a full glass façade which wraps around the building.
- The revised architectural plans and accompanying information do not adequately address how future occupants will be protected from discomfort associated with western sun glare.
- In addition, given the height of the proposed development, further information is required to demonstrate how the glass curtain wall will withstand wind loads at elevated altitudes.
- It must also be confirmed whether the glass façade system can ensure water tightness and prevent leakage under conditions of intense wind-driven rain.

Unit Sizes and Amenity

Balcony Area (1 Bedroom and Studio Apartments)

Section 4E of the Apartment Design Guide (ADG) stipulates that studio apartments must have a minimum balcony area of 4m², with a minimum depth of 1 metre contributing to that area. Additionally, one-bedroom apartments must have a minimum balcony area of 8m², with a minimum depth of 2 metres contributing to that area.

- A preliminary review of the amended plans undertaken by Council has identified that the balcony areas meeting the minimum required depths for Units 01A, 02B, 03A, and 30B do not comply with the minimum balcony area requirements outlined in the ADG.
- In addition, the revised architectural plans have not excluded the portions of the balconies that do not meet the minimum depth requirement, and the total balcony areas indicated on the plans are therefore inaccurate.
- A revised balcony design is required to ensure that sufficient compliant private open space is provided, and that balcony areas with non-compliant depths are minimised or excluded in accordance with the requirements from ADG.
- Additionally, the rounded corners of the tower have significantly reduced the portions of balconies that can achieve compliant depths. The current building form undermines both the amenity and functionality of the apartment balconies.

Internal Area (1 Bedroom and Studio Apartments)

Section 4D of the Apartment Design Guide (ADG) stipulates that a studio apartment must have a minimum internal area of 35m², and a one-bedroom apartment must have a minimum internal area of 50m².

- Units 01A, 01B, 02A, 02B, 03A, and 03B do not meet the minimum internal area requirements set out in the ADG. Council has excluded internal risers from the internal area calculations, as these spaces are not considered as habitable areas and therefore cannot be included.
- The apartment design must be revised to increase the internal areas of the affected apartments, ensuring that the internal area calculations exclude all internal risers in accordance with the ADG.
- It is also important to highlight that the building's rounded corners have resulted in awkwardly shaped bedrooms and living areas. This design decision has significantly compromised the amenity of the corner apartments by creating irregularly shaped spaces.

Waste

- There is no dedicated waste plan to how the building will work on an ongoing basis Nil, this is small renovation of existing building.
- The architectural plans show no recycling option on each floor of the basement.
- There are no FOGO options.
- There is a lack of information to understand how daily waste will be removed, or how often bins are going to be removed from the storage areas.
- There is nothing in the waste plan in relation to ongoing waste collection.
- A waste management plan needs to be submitted to address daily operation of the building both for the residential component and the commercial component of the building.

Building

- Dual key apartments do not satisfy the definition of sole-occupancy units as the shared "lobby" functions as a public corridor, requiring fire and acoustic separation along the walls separating the units. Manner of / pattern to usage for those apartments are secondary consideration to building compliance specific to fire risk.
- In addition, the entry doors to each unit must be fire-rated, travel distances to exits are to be measured from the SOU doors rather than the corridor door, and any obstruction of SOU entry doors is not permitted.
- Any public corridor exceeding 40m in length for a Class 2 building must also satisfy Part C3D15 specific to provision of smoke proof walls.
- Many of the building concerns have remained – as the applicant response to submissions mentioned that those issues will be addressed by the Principal Certifier at the construction certificate stage. On that basis, it is up to the DA issuing authority to consider necessary conditions of consent for the SSDA, to those building compliance concerns Council has.

Environmental Health

- A Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Report prepared by Acoustic logic, dated 8 August 2025 has been received by Council.
- A Preliminary Site Investigation Report has been prepared by NSW Housing Corporation, dated 19 February 2025.

Stormwater Management

- In accordance with Section 4.7 of Burwood Council Stormwater Management Code, the proposed On-Site Detention (OSD) must restrict out flow from the development site during 100 year ARI storms to a Permissible Site Discharge (PSD) determined from, $PSD (L/s) = \text{Site Area (ha)} \times 150$. The volume of OSD storage shall be determined from, $\text{Vol. (m}^3\text{)} = \text{Site Area (ha)} \times 300$

Public Domain

- A detailed public domain plan shall be prepared prior to CC that encompasses the two frontages of the building on Burleigh Street and Railway Parade including road pavement re-sheeting (resurfacing) to Council's satisfaction. The works shall be carried out at the expense of the applicant.

EV Charging and EV related storage/uses

- EV vehicles including electrical bicycles, scooters and other appliances may occupy spaces within the proposed development. Any proposal should comply with NCC 2022 Volume 1 E1D17 and E2D21.
- There is no documented details on managing EV including but not limited to charging of EV batteries, mitigating fire hazards from EV charging and managing fires resulting from EV.
- This would include end-of-trip EV charging for hotel clients. Majority of hotels in Sydney are installing EV charge stations.
- No charging of e-bicycles or e scooters inside apartments, or bicycle storage space at ground level. Fire suppression mitigation infrastructure in the bicycle storage space is required prior to any use of space to charge e-bicycles.
- Reference to the practice note by Fire and Rescue NSW on EVs as special hazards in a building.

Conclusion

Burwood Council has completed its preliminary assessment of the proposed State Significant Development Application (SSDA). The assessment has identified a number of significant issues requiring resolution.

In particular, Council is concerned that the proposed design does not demonstrate an adequate level of integration with the surrounding urban context. The development appears to have been designed in isolation, lacking a cohesive relationship with the character, scale, and function of adjacent sites. Furthermore, the proposal does not meet the minimum design excellence standards set out in the Burwood Local Environmental Plan 2012 and raises concerns regarding potential adverse impacts on the surrounding built environment and road network.

In addition, the internal configuration of select units results in awkward living spaces and unusable balconies, which do not comply with the Apartment Design Guide.

The above identified matters relate only to a preliminary review of the proposal within the limited timeframe provided. The comments provided do not represent a full review of all potential impacts of the proposal on the site and the surrounding community. Following the submission of additional information further issues may be identified.

Notwithstanding that Council does not support the application in its current form, and the application has resulted in significant negative community feedback. Should the Department choose to approve the application, Council would like the opportunity to provide specific conditions of consent on any final design.

Please refer to Council's response to the applicant's submission directly below within Table 1

Regards



Jai Reid
Manager City Development.

Table 1 Response to additional information

Issue	Applicant Response	Council Response
Clause 4.4A(5) and Clause 4.4A(6) of BLEP 2012 The site is permitted a maximum FSR under the BLEP of 6.6:1 in accordance with clause 4.4A(5) subject to the provision of community infrastructure and the limitation on residential development. Should you wish to utilise these provisions of the LEP it is recommended you commence discussions with Council's City Planning Team. The Manager City Planning Sumathi Navaratnam can be contacted on 9911 9911. Should you wish to utilise the bonus provisions of the Housing SEPP further information will be required to demonstrate how the GFA would be calculated when taking into consideration the bonus. It is recommended you review Council's policy – Carrying Out Bonus Development in the Public Interest which can be found at the following link under the voluntary planning agreement policy tab.	As detailed within the EIS, the site is located within 'Area 1' on the FSR Map and as such Clause 4.4A(5) applies as follows: (5) Despite clause 4.4, the floor space ratio for a building on land in Area 1 or Area 2 may exceed the floor space ratio shown for the land on the Floor Space Ratio Map if— (a) the floor space ratio for the building does not exceed— (i) 6.6:1—if the building is in Area 1, or (ii) 4.95:1—if the building is in Area 2, and (b) the gross floor area of the part of the building used for the purpose of residential accommodation does not exceed the following percentage of the gross floor area of the building— (i) 40 percent—if the building is in Area 1, or (ii) 70 percent—if the building is in Area 2. In accordance with the above clause, the site is permitted a maximum FSR under the BLEP 2012 of 6.6:1 so long as the maximum gross floor area (GFA) of the building used for the purpose of residential accommodation does not exceed 40%. The proposed development contains a total residential GFA of 4,878m², inclusive of 1,839m² of affordable housing in accordance with the affordable housing bonus GFA	Strategic The SSDA proposal is pre-emptive of a Council-led precinct master-planning process which has commenced. Early stakeholder engagement with adjoining landowners is currently underway with a view to a collaborative approach to an integrated precinct outcome, inclusive of the site that is the subject of this SSDA.

	requirements under the Housing SEPP. Notwithstanding this, the maximum 40% residential GFA is a pre-requisite for an FSR of 6.6:1 under the BLEP exclusively and does not apply to the Housing SEPP provisions. Therefore, it is logical that the bonus 30% GFA afforded by the Housing SEPP, and the subsequent GFA dedicated to affordable housing within the development, both be excluded when calculating the residential GFA percentage for the purpose of Clause 4.4A(5). Based on this application, the proposal provides a maximum residential GFA of 3,039m², exclusive of the affordable housing component. This equates to 34.64% of the permissible GFA for the site being 8,771.4m² when applying only the 6.6:1 FSR permitted under the BLEP. As such, the proposal does not exceed the maximum residential FSR permitted on the site in accordance with Clause 4.4A(5) when rightfully considering the BLEP controls in isolation. Furthermore, Clause 4.4A(6) applies to development seeking to utilise the bonus FSR under Clause 4.4A(5). Clause 4.4A(6) is reproduced below: (6) Subclause (5) applies in relation to proposed development only if— (a) the proposed development on the land includes development resulting in community infrastructure or the use of land as community infrastructure, and (b) the consent authority is satisfied that the community infrastructure is appropriate for the Burwood Town Centre, taking into account the nature of the community infrastructure and its value to the community working or residing in the Burwood Town Centre. In order to satisfy Clause 4.4A(6), a Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA) Letter of Offer has been	
--	--	--

	submitted to Burwood Council for a monetary contribution in place of the provision of community infrastructure on the site. The VPA is currently being reviewed by Council solicitors. during the SSDA process. The VPA is to include The applicant accepts that the VPA is to be formalised prior to the approval of the SSDA. Notably, the VPA Letter of Offer has been prepared in accordance with Council's policy – Carrying Out Bonus Development in the Public Interest.	
Insufficient Information No affordable housing has been depicted on the submitted plans. Further information is to be provided in order for Council to ascertain which units will be used for the purposes of affordable housing. Insufficient information has also been provided with relation to cost of works details.	The Architectural Plans submitted with the original EIS at Appendix 8 of the SSD submission provided details of the affordable housing apartments. Notably affordable housing is dedicated at Level 3 to 8 and consist of 18 dual key units in total. The EDC Report submitted with the original EIS at Appendix 5 of the SSD submission provided the cost of works.	Planning Council has reviewed the revised architectural plans and additional information, which has revealed information regarding the affordable housing units on level 3 -8, refer to drawing No. 15 Revision C, dated 15 th of August 2025. It is confirmed that the cost of works is \$117,976,065.00 as shown on page 2 of EDC prepared by Archi-QS.
Heritage A heritage assessment of the potential impact on the adjoining locally listed terraces and church is to be provided with meaningful strategies to mitigate impact. The development needs to be set back from north-west corner to provide a curtilage to the church to the west that is listed as a local heritage item. The site previously contain the 'AC/DC house' until demolished by the applicant in December 2024. Any redevelopment is to provide meaningful acknowledgment of the former house and the contribution of the band to Australian music culture.	A HIS was prepared to accompany the original EIS and SSD submission at Appendix 23. The DCP specifically identifies a 3m street front setback to Burleigh Street. This has been provided by the proposal. Furthermore, the north-west corner of the podium is chamfered at 45 degrees, which is significantly more than the minimum 3m requirement. A meaningful acknowledgement to AC/DC can be incorporated into the development in various ways including, but not limited to the potential of incorporating: - External public art; - Commemorative plaques; - Integrated interior design elements; - Themed restaurant located on Level 36 similar to a "Hard Rock Café". Further details will be provided at CC	Heritage The architectural drawings provided are not of a sufficient scale to indicate that the design merit SETBACK These set backs are not appropriate to the partially demolished terrace house form, as these had front yards. While a franchised themed AC/DC Hard Rock Café may be one way to acknowledge the former occupants of the site, a more detailed heritage interpretation to recognise the cultural contribution is required. The current mural on the northern wall of the adjacent terrace will be blocked. The design of the vehicular entrances is to suit the building use and does not reflect the subdivision pattern of rear lanes (night soil lanes) and small front gardens.

	stage.	Porte-cochere form not appropriate within context of surrounding heritage items. Detail needed now not at CC as impacts on the surrounding heritage items, the rail infrastructure, the terraces and the Greek Church Now not at CC. Heritage impact not able to be fully assessed due to insufficient detail.
Traffic The proposed four (4) driveways are not supported. The proximity of the porte-cochere to the intersection of Railway Parade and Burleigh Street is not supported	The original EIS and SSD submission was accompanied by a Transport and Accessibility Impact Statement at Appendix 26, Waste Management Plan at Appendix 29, Access Report at Appendix 15 and BCA Report at Appendix 16, all of which addressed these comments. The number of driveways matches the functions required to support a mixed use development including a hotel. Two of the driveways relate to the provision of a porte cochere which is considered to be an integral aspect of the hotel use. Importantly, the porte cochere will allow for ride share and taxi drop off to occur within the site, which would otherwise occur along the street, impacting traffic flow and parking availability. It is noted that whilst guest drop off could be encouraged to occur within the basement, the likelihood of that happening in practice is very low. Furthermore, the site has two street frontages with Burleigh Street being a one way street hence why this location is ideal for service vehicles entry/exit and porte-cochere exit only. Locating the basement entry on Burleigh Street would be inconvenient and confusing for visitors & hotel guests that would be unfamiliar with the area to navigate entry to the site from Belmore Street. The porte-cochere driveway	Consideration should still be investigated to consolidating the driveways on Railway Parade to have a combined single basement car park/porte cochere. This would improve pedestrian amenity and remove the need to have a driveway located so close to the intersection with Burleigh Street. The modification to the porte cochere exit shows a narrowed driveway which pushes exiting vehicles closer to Railway Parade. If the driveway is to be narrowed it should be required to provide greater distance from Railway Parade to address the concerns previously provided. The modification to the basement driveway which now includes an offset between the vehicle crossover at the kerb and the internal aisle is not supported as it will lead to conflict between entering and exiting traffic.

	entry at Railway Parade and exit at Burleigh Street are a minimum of 6.3m to 8.3m from the tangent point of the intersection, compliant with AS2890.1:2004 Figure 3.1. Locating the porte-cochere entry on the intersection is the most convenient for drivers that are dropping off/ picking up hotel guests unfamiliar with the area, having to navigate entry to the porte-cochere as Burleigh Street is one-way. The porte-cochere location also minimises the crossover of driveway and usable pedestrian space that's valuable for active frontages and public domain footpath.	As above, for the entry and exit driveways of the Porte Cochere. No evidence in the way of swept path analysis has been provided for the design of the Porte Cochere to show how two vehicles can use this space simultaneously, or how one vehicle is already parked in this space.
Waste facilities are to be provided onsite. No street presentation will be supported. All residential waste facilities including any loading area are to comply with Council's standards including waste vehicles. Bicycle parking is to meet DCP controls as a minimum. All car parking is to comply with Australian Standards and Council's DCP provisions.	Waste facilities are provided at ground floor, out of view from the public domain. Collection is via the loading dock, service vehicles are not required to enter the basement. The residential and commercial waste areas including recycling have been designed and located in coordination with a Waste Consultant. The waste areas are directly accessed and serviced from the ground floor loading dock for ease of servicing maintenance. Bicycle parking has been provided to meet DCP requirements as follows: - 3 spaces for hotel/ commercial at ground - 6 spaces for residential visitors at ground - 27 spaces for residential over basements 3-5 within a secured dedicated room. Car parking complies with AS2890.1:2004 and the DCP requirements.	The loading area has been designed for a medium rigid vehicle. Unclear if this is adequate for residential waste. The motorised gate at the entry to the loading dock is set to back so as to allow the largest sized vehicle to be able to pull into the site fully without blocking the footpath while waiting for the gate to open. As above. Noted. Noted. The motorised gate on the ramp on

All visitor car parking is to be provided at the upper basement levels.	Residential visitor car parking is currently shown on basement 3, however can be easily relocated to basement 1 if required.	level B2 which leads down to level B3 will restrict access to resident visitor parking spaces. All resident visitor parking spaces are therefore required to be placed on level B1 and accessible at all times, or alternately able to be accessed via an intercom to all residential units. A turning space would be required to be provided on level B2 if visitor spaces are to be located on level B3 in the event that a visitor cannot get access to B3.
All parking must be provided on-site per Council's DCP requirements for B4 Mixed use zone parking requirements.	On-site parking numbers are based on Bitzios Consulting/SEPP rates. 138 car spaces are provided in total.	For the purpose of parking calculations, the two-bedroom units have been classified as 2 x one-bedroom as advised. This therefore equates to 36 affordable one-bedroom units, and 60 non-affordable one-bedroom units.
The design of bicycle parking facilities (racks and lockers) must be in accordance with the provisions of Australian Standard 2890.3 – Parking Facilities or Cycling Aspects of Austroads Guides.	The design of bicycle parking facilities is readily capable of complying with both AS2890.3 and Cycling Aspects of Austroads Guides. Further details will be provided at CC stage	Under the DCP 96 resident and 19 visitor parking spaces are required. Under the SEPP 44 resident and 0 visitor parking spaces are required. The plans show 82 resident and 2 visitor parking spaces.
Provide parking spaces and accessible pedestrian paths for people with disabilities per AS/NZS 2890.6 and Council DCP requirements.	Accessible parking spaces and accessible pedestrian paths of travel have been provided as per AS2890.6 and Council DCP requirements.	Noted.
All the parking module dimensions must be designed per AS/NZS 2890.1:2004 - Section 2.4.4 – parallel parking in parking aisles.	All the parking module dimensions are designed per AS2890.1:2004 as required.	Noted.
Sight lines for vehicles exiting the property must comply with AS2890.1 Figure 3.3, including no visual obstructions along the first 2.5 metres within the boundary of	Sight lines for vehicles exiting the property are shown on the drawings and comply with AS2890.1	Noted.

the driveway. The access driveway, arrangement of internal roadways and aisle width must be designed per AS/NZS 2890.1:2004 Provide information in relation to driver sight distance/visibility requirements based on a minimum gap sight distance of 5 seconds in accordance with AS2890.1 -2004 published by Standards Australia and also in Chapter 3.4 Site Distance at Property Entrances (Austroads 2009). Given the current restricted parking restrictions along Railway Parade Road and the high demand for parking in this area is in not expected that a compliant egress from the site would be possible. All car parking spaces, garages and vehicle manoeuvring driveways shall be designed so that vehicles can easily enter and leave the premises by movement in a forward direction. Removal of on-street public parking to facilitate a private development is not supported.	The access driveway arrangements and aisle widths are designed per AS2890.1 as required. Sight lines for vehicles exiting the property are shown on the drawings and comply with AS2890.1 as required. Further details will be provided at CC stage. A high level review of NCC requirements regarding egress has be coordinated with both BCA and Fire Engineers. The proposed development is deemed capable of complying with the relevant NCC requirements. Performance Solutions will be prepared where DTS provisions of the NCC are not achievable. Further details will be provided at CC stage. All vehicle manoeuvring is designed so that vehicles can enter and leave the premises in a forward direction. There is currently no public parking available directly in front of the site on Burleigh Street. The removal of 3-4 on-street car parking spaces will be required on Railway Parade due to the proposed driveways. It is noted that there is currently a Council car park directly behind the site to the south for public use. The removal of the on-street car spaces on Railway Parade will not adversely impact public car parking. Refer to TIA prepared by Solution 1 Traffic Engineers at	Noted. Noted. Noted. Noted. Confirmation of what parking is required to be removed within Burleigh Street opposite the site to allow for service vehicles and vehicles exiting the Porte Cochere are to be provided.
--	---	---

Clearly label on-site parking areas for hotel visitors, commercial, residents and residential visitors.	Appendix 26 of the original EIS. The car parking allocations for each use are clearly labelled on the floor plans: - Basements 1-2 are allocated to hotel and commercial use - Basements 3-5 are allocated to residential use, with residential visitors at basement 3	Noted, with reference to the need to address residential visitor parking accessibility as noted above.
Sustainability An entire glass façade is not supported due to heat load and the requirement for continuous artificial cooling and heating Sustainability initiatives are to be identified The two floors of plant are to be justified with a mechanical engineers report	The glass façade is an aesthetic design intent, in the form a curtain wall system in concept. This has been designed in coordination with the BASIX Consultant and passes BASIX requirements. In detail and practicality, the glass facade is a combination of various gLazing types to suit each situation where required including: - fixed glass panels at hotel and commercial spaces - operable glass louvres at residential habitable spaces for natural ventilation requirements - non-operable glass louvres fixed at 45 degrees at residential balconies and hotel outdoor spaces as to not enable these areas to be fully enclosable - vision glass for views - opaque glass for privacy - false glass over solid walls Initiatives were detailed in the BASIX Certificate at Appendix 18 and ESD Report at Appendix 19 of the original EIS and SSD submission. The two plant levels 19 and 32 have been located and coordinated at a high-level concept design in conjunction with Goldfish & Bay Engineers. Level 19 plant: - residential services - hotel room services Level 32 plant: - stair pressure mechanical - fire services - commercial offices services - hotel facility services	Planning BASIX Certificate The revised architectural plans and the submitted additional information rely solely on the BASIX performance as the primary indicator of the tower's energy efficiency and thermal comfort. However, hotels, commercial offices, and restaurants are not classified as BASIX developments under the definition provided in Schedule 7 of the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2021</i>. Given that approximately half of the tower comprises uses that are not considered BASIX developments, it is unclear how the submitted BASIX certificate adequately justifies the environmental sustainability of the development as a whole. Moreover, given the scale and complexity of the proposal, additional passive cooling measures are required to mitigate the greenhouse effect associated with the glass curtain wall. The entire glass façade of the building is still considered to result in heat load and thus all internal areas of the proposed development are reliant on artificial cooling.
Building Separation Concern is raised regarding site isolation to the site to the east. 'Privacy' glazing is an inappropriate treatment to a constrained site and would limit development potential of	A concept development scheme of the surrounding sites was included in the original EIS and SSD submission. The revised Architectural Plans also detail the development potential of the adjoining site at Drawing No.	Strategic Planning The SSDA proposal is pre-emptive of a Council-led precinct master-planning process which has commenced. Early stakeholder engagement with adjoining

adjoining sites ADG compliance is required in terms of separation. This is to be shown on floor plans	45C, 46C and 47C. These drawings show that the proposed subject development is capable of allowing for a conceptual mixed use development incorporating No.18 Railway Parade (privately owned) into Councils future Precinct Masterplan. Notwithstanding this, if No.18 is not included in the Precinct Masterplan, a potential separate development on that site is still achievable and would not be dissimilar to adjacent existing 20 storey tower at No.16 Railway Parade which has a narrower site width. Ultimately, further information from Council is needed to understand their intent for their future Precinct Masterplan to develop this further. The use of opacified glazing is minimal and only proposed in the external curtain walls that directly face side boundaries. This is also a factor in the reasoning as to the oval form of the building design, allowing the corner habitable spaces to face the site corners instead of the side boundaries for optimum outlook and visual privacy. The site constraints limit the possibility of fully complying with ADG building separation as well as achieving an efficient and feasible building floor plate. As noted above, this is also a factor in the reasoning as to the oval form of the building design, allowing the corner habitable spaces to face the site corners instead of the side boundaries for optimum outlook and visual privacy. This is considered to be a well-considered design solution to achieve the intent and design objectives for separation specific to the context.	landowners is currently underway with a view to a collaborative approach to an integrated precinct outcome, inclusive of the site the subject of this SSDA. Feasibility study for No. 18 Railway Parade The building envelope for No. 18 Railway Parade, as shown on Drawing No. 25, Revision C, does not demonstrate compliance with the required building separation between the future apartment building at No. 18 and the existing residential flat building at No. 16 Railway Parade. Additional details regarding a feasibility study are required to enable Council to understand how the site can be developed in accordance with the building separation requirements of the Apartment Design Guide (ADG). Site Isolation. The response to submission package remains unclear regarding any attempts to acquire adjacent properties. However, these adjacent properties at No. 6, 8 and 10 Burleigh Street, No. 18 and No.18A, 18B Railway Parade are considered to be potentially isolated, given the impacts on their development potential as a result of the non-compliant ADG building separation distances associated with the proposed development. The applicant has only submitted potential amalgamation patterns of the adjacent lots, which are difficult to interpret.
Site Planning The applicant is to demonstrate an integrated approach to the block to allow connectivity and integration with the surrounding sites. This needs to extend to the wider network of buildings to	The integration of public domain & connectivity has been considered and addressed including: - street address - pedestrian permeability & links - vehicular movements A concept development scheme of the	Planning, Strategic, Public Domain The SSDA proposal is pre-emptive of a Council-led precinct master-planning process which has commenced. Early stakeholder

the Burwood town centre including how the site will integrate with any through site links. The current design treats the site in isolation. No ground floor modelling, place making, public art or wayfinding information has been provided No modelling for railway noise has been provided No stormwater details have been provided. Confirmation is required that one substation will be sufficient to support the new building including basement EV charging Booster locations are to be provided Any affordable housing apartments are to be identified with specific unit numbers given ADG compliance is to be shown on plans including depth of apartments, apartment sizes, cross vent, solar access, storage, private open space size and dimensions etc	surrounding sites was included in the original EIS and SSD submission. The revised Architectural Plans also detail the development potential of the adjoining site at Drawing No. 45C, 46C and 47C. The ground floor is capable of incorporating place making, public art or wayfinding information. Further details will be provided at CC stage. Traffic and railway acoustics has been considered and addressed in the documents submitted with the original EIS and SSD submission. A concept stormwater design has been prepared and incorporated onto the proposed development. A chamber substation is conceptually located at the south-west corner of the site based on Ausgrid spatial requirements. The planning of the ground floor and basement 1 below allows for increase if the substation spatial requirements and cable pits if need be. Further details will be provided at CC stage. The booster location is conceptually located adjacent the basement driveway on Railway Parade. This location is ideal as it minimises visual impact on the active frontages, far from the substation, and easily accessible for the fire brigade, and close to the fire control room. The affordable housing apartments are depicted on the floor plans, sections and apartment schedule: - Affordable housing is dedicated at L3 to L8 - 18 dual key units in total ADG compliance relating to apartment sizes, natural cross ventilation, solar access, storage, private open space size and dimensions are shown.	engagement with adjoining landowners is currently underway with a view to a collaborative approach to an integrated precinct outcome, inclusive of the site that is the subject of this SSDA. Connectivity and integration with the surrounding sites. The submitted additional information and revised architectural plans rely on Drawings No. 45 Revision C, No. 46 Revision C, and No. 47 Revision C to demonstrate how the proposed development facilitates connectivity and pedestrian wayfinding with the adjoining site and the Burwood Town Centre. However, these drawings only depict feasibility studies for the neighbouring lot at No. 18, 18A, 18B Railway Parade and No. 6, 8 and 10 Burleigh Street. The submitted documents do not adequately address the public domain concerns previously raised by Council, particularly in relation to the future connectivity of the subject site with the adjoining properties. Place making, public art and way finding. Placemaking, public art, and wayfinding form an integral part of the public domain and urban design response of the proposed development and must be assessed as part of the preliminary assessment of this Development Application. The submitted additional information does not provide any new or sufficient detail regarding the public domain strategy or urban design resolution, and the concerns previously raised by Council remain unaddressed. A conceptual design is required to demonstrate how the proposal will facilitate well-considered placemaking, the integration of public art, and effective pedestrian wayfinding.
--	--	---

		Hydrant booster The proposed hydrant booster represents a critical element of the building's streetscape presentation along Railway Parade, particularly when viewed from the ground plane. The submitted architectural elevation does not illustrate the proposed hydrant booster. A detailed design response is required to demonstrate how its visual impact can be mitigated through a well-integrated and articulated design treatment. Council's preference is to utilise landscaping or architectural elements to screen the hydrant booster where practical. Alternatively, the booster could be rotated 90 degrees so that its shorter elevation faces Railway Parade.
Communal open space needs to be shown on the plans Deep soil calculations are to be provided Any AC for individual units is to be shown on plans Back of house facilities including linen store is to be accommodated and shown on plans	Residential communal open space is located levels 2 & 38 as shown on the floor plans. The site is located in the Commercial Core Area of the Burwood Town Centre, Zoning MU1 Mixed Use. As such, no deep soil has been provided to maximise the efficiency of the basement layout and optimise the functionality of the ground floor plane suited to the mix of uses. Landscaping on structure has been provided at 25%. The plant level 19 is dedicated to house the residential AC plant equipment coordinating with Goldfish & Bay Engineers. No AC condenser units are proposed to be located on apartment balconies. All back of house and service facilities for residential, hotel and commercial are shown on the plans. Additional spaces are capable of being included where required. Further details will be provided at CC stage.	Planning It is evident that communal open space has been provided on Level 2 and Level 38 as shown on the revised architectural floor plans. However, the communal open space areas lack sufficient detail, in terms of plantings, and landscaping treatments, balustrades and useability. It is also to be noted that Section C, (drawing No,27, Revision C) indicates large scale air ventilation above the residential communal open space area, whereby their function is unknown. Concerns are raised that these vents may compromise the amenity of the communal open space area. It is noted that back of house facilities have been shown on the revised architectural plans.
Environmental Health An Environmental Management Plan will need to accompany the application. An acoustic report is to be prepared near	Suitable documents and reports have been prepared to accompany the EIS, in accordance with the Industry Specific SEARs. Refer to Noise	Health Noted - Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment report prepared by Acoustic Logic ABN 98 145 324 714, Project ID:

Railway Corridors and Busy Roads by a qualified engineer. The acoustic report is to be submitted with the development application. The report must demonstrate how the site planning and building design minimise noise impacts inclusive of plant rooms, air conditions/comfort ventilation system and the like. The acoustic report is also to detail how the proposed uses can operate while protecting the amenity of surrounding uses. This includes the hotel uses, communal open space and hotel function areas. A car wash bay is to be provided within the basement level carpark that is graded and drained to waste disposal system. A stage 1 contamination report is to be provided. A plan of management is to be provided regarding the hotel function use and restaurant areas	and Vibration Impact Assessment report prepared by Acoustic Logic which is provided at Appendix 3 of this submission. Refer to Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment report prepared by Acoustic Logic which is provided at Appendix 3 of this submission. A residential car space can be readily converted to a car wash bay, given residential car parking spaces is in excess of the minimum requirement. This can be addressed by conditions of consent. Refer to the Preliminary Site Investigation report prepared by EI Australia which accompanied the original EIS at Appendix 11 for SSD submission. This is not considered necessary at this stage of the application. It is requested that a condition of consent be placed to require a plan of management prior to the issue of a CC.	20240136.1/0808A/R4/WY, Reversion 4, dated 08/08/2025 has been received by council. A car wash bay is to be provided within the basement level carpark that is graded and drained to waste disposal system A plan of management is to be provided regarding the hotel function use and restaurant areas- A stage 1 contamination report is to be provided– Noted Preliminary Site Investigation, 2-4 Burleigh Street and 20-24 Railway Parade, Burwood NSW Report number E26516.E01_rev2 prepared by eiaustralia NSW Housing Corporation Pty Ltd dated 19 February 2025.
Urban Design The site is located within the MU1 Zone and as such the Design Excellence provisions of Clause 6.5 of the Burwood Local Environmental Plan apply. Specifically, the provisions require the highest standard of architectural, landscape and urban design. The applicant has not demonstrated the following clauses have been met or addressed: (a) whether a high standard of architectural and landscape urban design (including in the materials used and in detailing appropriate to the location, building type and surrounding buildings), (b) whether the form and external appearance of the proposed building, and ground level detailing, will significantly improve the quality and amenity of the	This was addressed in the Architectural Plans at Appendix 8, Architectural Design Report and Statement at Appendix 9, Visual Impact Assessment at Appendix 22, BASIX Certificate at Appendix 18, ESD Report at Appendix 19 and Pedestrian Wind Environment Assessment at Appendix 25 of the original EIS and SSD submission. The proposed development provides a high standard of architectural, landscape and urban design throughout a bulk and scale of development that is appropriate in the existing and desired context of the site. The development has been designed to adequately respond to the streetscape and present as a high quality built form that will improve the quality and amenity of the public domain, with no adverse impacts on the amenity of the surrounding area. The	Urban design / Planning The SSDA proposal is pre-emptive of a Council-led precinct master-planning process which has commenced. Early stakeholder engagement with adjoining landowners is currently underway with a view to a collaborative approach to an integrated precinct outcome, inclusive of the site the subject of this SSDA. It is disagreed that the proposed development is of a bulk and scale that is consistent with the desired future character of the area. More specifically, the proposal includes large expanses of driveways, and basement ramps, as well as an inability to facilitate ground floor street activation. The revised design should prioritise pedestrian movements over vehicle circulation.

public domain, (c) how any streetscape and heritage issues have been addressed, (d) whether the amenity of the surrounding area, including any view corridors, vistas or landmark locations, will be adversely affected, (e) how traffic circulation and vehicular access will be addressed and whether the proposed development supports the provision of high quality pedestrian, cycle and service access, (f) whether any adverse effect on pedestrian movement and experience will be avoided (and whether the public transport interchange as the focal point for pedestrian movement in the surrounding area will be reinforced and the ease of pedestrian access to and from that interchange will be facilitated), (g) whether the development supports an integrated land use mix in Zones E1 and MU1, including a diversity of public open spaces at the ground level, as well as the roof and other levels of buildings, (h) how the bulk, mass, modulation, separation, setback and height of buildings have been addressed and whether they are appropriate in the context of existing and proposed buildings, (i) whether a high standard of ecologically sustainable design (including low-energy or passive design) will be achieved and overshadowing, wind effects and reflectivity will be minimised.	proposed development represents a suitable response to the allocation of the permitted density at the site. The proposed development will have a visual presence and urban form that is consistent with the desired future character of the locality as envisaged by the BLEP as well as create a recognisable building matching appealing to hotel and restaurant users as well as residents and office tenants. The mass of the development is reduced by the slender design of the proposed tower above the podium creating a well-defined and strong streetscape character. The site is not identified as containing heritage items and is not located within a heritage conservation area. The site is located adjacent to St Nectarios Greek Orthodox Church which is identified as an item of local heritage significance. The two storey podium of the proposed development is primarily sandstone which relates to the heritage church in terms of materials and scale and promotes visual congruence as viewed from street level withing the public domain. A View Impact Assessment report prepared by Urbane was provided at Appendix 22 of the original EIS and SSD submission. The proposed development has two frontages; the primary being Railway Parade, and the secondary being Burleigh Street. Access to basement car parking for residents, hotel guests and commercial offices is from Railway Parade. For hotel guests, entry to the porte-cochere is also from Railway Parade and exits onto Burleigh Street. To reduce impacts on residents and hotel guests, service access is from Burleigh Street. It should also be noted that Burleigh Street is one-way. The proposed development	The brown sandstone podium facade lacks well-articulated architectural design in response to the existing streetscape of Burleigh Street and Railway Parade.
--	--	---

	introduces a 3m setback at ground floor to both Railway Parade and Burleigh Street in compliance with the DCP requirements. This setback improves the pedestrian movement and experience by increasing the publicly accessible width of the footpath on both frontages and supporting street activation and use. The pedestrian movement and experience is further improved by the proposed porte-cochere, allowing pedestrians an alternative route between both street frontages directly through the site. The site has convenient access to public transport via Burwood Train Station, which has its entry some 200m away. The proposed development has no impacts on the existing pedestrian access to Burwood Train Station. The proposed development provides a mixed use comprising of residential, hotel and commercial offices. The residential apartments provide residents both affordable and market housing options. The hotel and commercial offices provide employment opportunities and uses that serve the needs of people who live, work in or visit the area. The ground floor provides active street frontages through commercial uses that directly integrate with public spaces and are particularly welcoming and functional for their intended purposes. These all support the objectives of Zones E1 and MU. The building mass has been arranged on site to mitigate perceived bulk and scale of the proposal, particularly when viewed at street level. Specifically, tower elements are set back from the edge of the podium and this ensures that the building retains a 'human' scale at the street edge. In addition to building setbacks, physical articulation is incorporated into	
--	--	--

	building facades to ameliorate perceived bulk and scale of the development. Recessed balconies are provided at the residential levels. Similarly, balconies are provided at a number of the hotel levels. These features serve to break up the verticality of the tower and adds visual interest. Importantly, the proposed plant levels, whilst necessary, are further utilised to break up the tower and provide articulation to the built form to alleviate the proposed FSR and height and the associated visual bulk of the development. The proposed development incorporates energy efficient plant equipment, photovoltaic systems, fixtures and fittings that meet the minimum requirements of BASIX. To reduce the reliance on mechanical heating and cooling through passive design, 100 % of dual key apartments and 83% of individual apartments achieve of solar access between 9am and 3pm, exceeding the minimum 70% ADG requirement. 67% of apartments achieve natural cross ventilation, exceeding the minimum 60% ADG requirement. The proposed development has a slender and curved tower with a minimised footprint to reduce the impacts wind and reflectivity. The slender design also minimises overshadowing to surrounding sites. ESD performance, wind, shadow and reflectivity have been addressed in the documents supporting the application	
Setbacks and Separation Distances The proposed separation distances to the south above level 8 is less than 12m (half of 24m required by the ADG). The proposed design attempts to reduce the visual impacts through using opacified glasses; however, greater	The use of opacified glazing is minimal and only proposed in the external curtain walls that directly face side boundaries. The site constraints limit the possibility of fully complying with ADG building separation as well as achieving an efficient and feasible building floor plate. This is also a factor in the reasoning as to the oval form	Planning ADG Setbacks The revised architectural plans have not provided any additional setback from the neighbouring building, and the previously raised concerns regarding the non-compliance with the building separation requirements

levels of separation distances provides opportunities for a better view/landscape corridors and balances the density of built form and open spaces. Opacified glasses which limit the view of the internal spaces are not supported as a solution to compensate for insufficient separation distances.	of the building design, allowing the corner habitable spaces to face the site corners instead of the side boundaries for optimum outlook and visual privacy. As above.	of the Apartment Design Guide (ADG) remain unaddressed. Council seeks to see an increased building separation from the adjoining site to facilitate a clear view corridor and ensure a balanced relationship between built form and open space. The assertion that the rounded corners provide an optimum outlook for the corner apartments, as stated in the submitted response, is inaccurate and misleading. The revised drawings do not address the loss of outlook resulting from the use of opaque glazing on the façade of the bedrooms and lounge in Unit 03B – repeated over 14 levels of the building. Overall, Council has not identified any meaningful design modifications in response to the concerns previously raised. The current building separation proposed is 12m to No.18A Burleigh Street, thus failing to comply with the ADG requirements of 24m for 9 storeys and above.
Presentation to the street The proposal provides frontages to both Burleigh Street and Railway Parade which are heavily dedicated to vehicle entrances and ramps. The active part of façade particularly on the ground level is less than 50% of the façade which does not meet the requirements of the BDCP Part 3.2.1 P15 for the purpose of maximising the facade activation by 90%. This aims to prioritise a pedestrian environment over vehicle. Combining/minimising the number of vehicle entrances to the building on the ground level is required. Due to a large area of services and back of house areas for different uses, the usable part of the ground level is a small portion of the	The proposed development comprises of residential, hotel and commercial office uses, each having separate access requirements in addition to NCC servicing requirements. The integration of public domain & connectivity has been considered and addressed including: - street address and accessible paths of travel - pedestrian permeability & links - vehicular movements - separation of services points of access from spaces primarily used by pedestrians Refer to the Part 5 of the Architectural Design Report which is provided at Appendix 2 of this submission. The site has two street frontages. Burleigh Street is a one way street hence why this location is ideal for service vehicles entry/exit and porte-cochere exit only. Locating the basement entry on Burleigh Street would be inconvenient and confusing for	Urban design / Planning The SSDA proposal is pre-emptive of a Council-led precinct master-planning process which has commenced. Early stakeholder engagement with adjoining landowners is currently underway with a view to a collaborative approach to an integrated precinct outcome, inclusive of the site the subject of this SSDA.

site area. It is recommended that the service areas are consolidated and/or concentrated on the basement level as much as possible to free up the ground level floorplate to provide opportunities for retail /active uses. Further design analysis is required to demonstrate the relationship with the heritage item to the west. How the proposed design relates to/responds to the 2-storey heritage building?	visitors & hotel guests that would be unfamiliar with the area to navigate entry to the site from Belmore Street. Locating the porte-cochere entry on the intersection is the most convenient for drivers that are dropping off/ picking up hotel guests unfamiliar with the area, having to navigate entry to the porte-cochere as Burleigh Street is one-way. The porte-cochere location also minimises the crossover of driveway and usable pedestrian space that's valuable for active frontages and public domain footpath. The width of all vehicle crossings has been reduced to clearly reduce the movement of vehicles across the footpath and optimise space for pedestrians. Given the site constraints and separate uses that require 5 lifts, providing the loading dock and waste storage areas on ground floor the ideal location. Having service vehicles enter the basement would require excessive driveway ramp lengths resulting in an inefficient basement layout. To increase publicly accessible areas compromised at ground floor, a restaurant and bar is provided on levels 36 & 37 for public use. All pedestrian entry points designed for an appealing, safe and accessible transition from the public domain. As above. The DCP notes a maximum podium height of 15m. The height of the proposed podium is set to closely align with the height of the ridge of the heritage church. Refer to Part 4.2 of the Architectural Design Report provided at Appendix 2 of this submission.	
Environmental Impact The development proposes a full glass façade which wraps around the building. The level of sun protection for internal spaces particularly on the western façade for the residential component is questionable.	The glass façade is an aesthetic design intent, in the form a curtain wall system in concept. The glass façade design meets the BASIX and ESD requirements. In detail and practicality, the glass facade is a combination of various gazing types to suit each situation where	Planning Environmental protection from Glass Curtain Wall The revised architectural plans and submitted additional information do not address how occupants of the building will be protected from discomfort caused by western sun

	required including: - fixed glass panels at hotel and commercial spaces - operable glass louvres at residential habitable spaces for natural ventilation requirements - non-operable glass louvres fixed at 45 degrees at residential balconies and hotel outdoor spaces as to not enable these areas to be fully enclosable - vision glass for views - opaque glass for privacy - false glass over solid walls	glare. Given that the façade is almost entirely glazed, the design must demonstrate whether the glass façade can effectively shield occupants from prolonged UV exposure throughout the day. The revised design must either demonstrate that the façade can adequately protect residents without the use of solid louvres or screens or incorporate well-articulated solar louvres to mitigate the impacts of western sun glare and extended UV exposure. Additionally, given the height of the proposed development, further information is required to demonstrate how the glass curtain wall will withstand wind loads at elevated altitudes. It must also be confirmed whether the nominated façade system can ensure water tightness and prevent leakage under conditions of intense wind-driven rain.
Unit sizes and amenity The plans appear to show dual-key 2 bedroom apartments which are fully separated through internal walls. The proposed total area for each component is less than 50sqm recommend by the AGD for one-bedroom units (i.e. units 2 & 3 in each level) and less than a minimum requirement for studio (i.e. Unit 1B, 3B). It is expected that each unit will comply with the minimum standards. Balconies (i.e. 02B) do not meet the minimum requirement as per the ADG 4E-1. Clarification required to demonstrate if each balcony meets the minimum depth required as per the ADG 4E-1	The layout of the residential floor plan levels meet the minimum ADG size requirements for 1B and Studio sizes when in dual key and individual key configurations. This also applies to solar access and natural cross ventilation requirements. Refer to the Parts 7.2, 8.2 & 8.3 of the Architectural Design Report at Appendix 2 of this submission. The layout of the residential floor plan levels meet the minimum ADG size requirements balconies when in dual key and individual key configurations. This also applies to solar access requirements. Refer to the Parts 7.2, 8.2 & 8.3 of the Architectural Design Report at Appendix 2 of this submission. The balconies meet the minimum depths as required by the ADG. These are shown on the floor plans. Refer to the revised Architectural Plans at Appendix 1 of this submission.	Planning Balcony Area (1 Bedroom and Studio apartments) Section 4E of the Apartment Design Guide (ADG) stipulates that studio apartments must have a minimum balcony area of 4m², with a minimum depth of 1 metre contributing to that area. Additionally, one-bedroom apartments must have a minimum balcony area of 8m², with a minimum depth of 2 metres contributing to that area. A preliminary review of the amended plans undertaken by Council has identified that the balcony areas meeting the minimum required depths for Units 01A, 02B, 03A, and 30B do not comply with the minimum balcony area requirements outlined in the ADG. In addition, the revised architectural plans have not excluded the portions of the balconies that do not meet the

		minimum depth requirement, and the total balcony areas indicated on the plans are therefore inaccurate. A revised balcony design is required to ensure that sufficient compliant private open space is provided, and that balcony areas with non-compliant depths are minimised or excluded in accordance with the requirements from ADG. Additionally, the rounded corners of the tower have significantly reduced the portions of balconies that can achieve compliant depths. The current building form undermines both the amenity and functionality of the apartment balconies. Internal Area (1 Bedroom and Studio apartments) Section 4D of the Apartment Design Guide (ADG) stipulates that a studio apartment must have a minimum internal area of 35m², and a one-bedroom apartment must have a minimum internal area of 50m². Units 01A, 01B, 02A, 02B, 03A, and 03B do not meet the minimum internal area requirements set out in the ADG. Council has excluded internal risers from the internal area calculations, as these spaces are not considered as habitable areas and therefore cannot be included. The apartment design must be revised to increase the internal areas of the affected apartments, ensuring that the internal area calculations exclude all internal risers in accordance with the ADG. It is also important to highlight that the building's rounded corners have resulted in awkwardly shaped bedrooms and living areas. This design decision has significantly compromised the amenity of the corner apartments by creating irregularly shaped spaces.
--	--	--

Engineering Comments Stormwater Management The stormwater management and sediment control plans must be designed and prepared by suitably qualified Hydraulic/ Civil engineer in accordance with Council's Stormwater Management Code to Council's satisfaction.	A concept stormwater design has been prepared and included in this response	In accordance with Section 4.7 of Burwood Council Stormwater Management Code, the proposed On-Site Detention (OSD) must restrict out flow from the development site during 100 year ARI storms to a Permissible Site Discharge (PSD) determined from, $PSD (L/s) = Site Area (ha) \times 150$ The volume of OSD storage shall be determined from, $Vol. (m^3) = Site Area (ha) \times 300$.
Public Domain Improvement High Quality Public Domain and Streetscape Improvement elements and finishes on all publicly accessible areas at the property frontages on Railway Parade and Burleigh Street in accordance with Council's DCP & Public Works Element Manual are to be provided. In this regard a detailed 'Public Domain Plan' shall be prepared and submitted to Council.	A Public Domain plan to be prepared. This can be conditioned to be required prior to CC and this timing is likely to be more compatible with Council's preparation of a Masterplan.	Public Domain A detailed public domain plan shall be prepared prior to CC that encompasses the two frontages of the building on Burleigh Street and Railway Parade including road pavement re-sheeting (resurfacing) to Council's satisfaction. The works shall be carried out at the expense of the applicant. The SSDA proposal is pre-emptive of a Council-led precinct master-planning process which has commenced. Early stakeholder engagement with adjoining landowners is currently underway with a view to a collaborative approach to an integrated precinct outcome, inclusive of the site the subject of this SSDA.
Building Comments Accessibility Design drawings SK08 P24, SK09 P24 and SK10 P24 do not show bollards in the shared space adjoining the accessible parking (allocated) space. In addition, dimensions are not shown for the accessible parking spaces (across all basement levels).	These issues are addressed in the Architectural Plans at Appendix 8, Access Report at Appendix 15, BCA Report at Appendix 16, Stormwater Management Plan at Appendix 20, Transport and Accessibility Impact Assessment at Appendix 26, BASIX Certificate at Appendix 18 and ESD Report at Appendix 19 which accompanied the original EIS and SSD submission. Bollards and dimensions are shown to all accessible car spaces and shared zones	Building No objections raised by Council's Building Team
On drawing SK10 P24, there appears to be a substation pit above the accessible parking	All accessible car spaces and shared zones have a minimum 2.5m head clearance as per	Building No objections raised by Council's Building Team

space. Recommendation for services designer/engineer to consider relocation of this pit. Otherwise, the construction of this space must be in accordance with AS2890.6-2022 – car parking spaces for disabilities The construction of shared spaces must be designed to ensure that there are no impediments or encroachments into the shared spaces. The location of bulky goods and doorways leading into shared spaces can create unintended obstructions for the user of the accessible parking space. There is further obstruction from the location of support pillars (assumed). In the above screenshot (western end of basement), there is only 1.021m of clearance between the edge of accessible parking space and the edge of adjoining parking space. The length of space and parking angle meant that a big utility vehicle, as is now common in Australia, will not only reduce the 1.02m clearance, and make it difficult to exit shared zone if there is concurrent access to bulky goods storage. Basement 1-shared space for accessible parking space (eastern end of basement) is adjacent to a main switch room with two outward opening doors. The two doors, and the first door being additional obstruction in close proximity to a support pillar will result in an unknown path of travel for the user exiting shared space. Reconsider locations of all bulky goods storage. Reconsider the siting of doorways to each storage and review the actual door width. The door widths are not compatible with the bulky goods storage – refer to Basement 1 drawing SK10	AS2890.6. All shared zones are located and designed to comply with AS2890.6. All accessible car spaces and shared zones are designed in compliance as per AS2890.6. Further to this, the bulky goods storage is located adjacent to the loading dock on ground floor. All accessible car spaces and shared zones are designed in compliance as per AS2890.6. Further to this, the column has been relocated since Councils review and the doors to the main switch room at required to be on automatic closers as per NCC requirements. The bulky goods storage is located adjacent to the loading dock on ground floor. The proposed development has been designed in coordination with an Access Consultant and has been deemed capable of complying with all access requirements. Further details to be provided at CC stage.	
---	---	--

P24 (below) with double doors exceeding 850mm. There are other accessibility matters for assessment by the certifier, including but not limited to path of travel accessibility, TGSI – tactile, hearing loop installation, Braille signs and accessibility, ramps, luminance contrast of building surfaces throughout the building, location of adult changing rooms – public if required.		
Ground Floor The ground floor level consists of residential access lobby, hotel and commercial offices lobby and potentially a café (cannot identify location of café from drawing SK11 P24). Certifier to consider appropriate classification of each part of the building, and to make an assessment under NCC 2022 on fire safety. Fire separation for consideration by the certifier – wall between bulk goods storage and the substation. The bulky goods storage (depending on management of access) may contain hazardous goods such as a portable BBQ.	The proposed development has been designed in coordination with a BCA Consultant & Fire Engineer and has been deemed capable of complying with all NCC requirements. The design of the hotel/ commercial lobby and café will be detailed at a CC Stage. This is left as an open space and will be determined by each specific hotel operator's requirements. Further details will be provided at CC stage. The substation will be designed to Ausgrid requirements. The proposed development has been designed in coordination with a BCA Consultant & Fire Engineer and has been deemed capable of complying with all NCC requirements. Further details will be provided at CC stage.	Building No objections raised by Council's Building Team.
Fire Separation Between Floor Levels Notwithstanding Council's concerns with glazed façade, inadequate design details for the curtain walls are shown. Specifically: Minimum design considerations as per NCC 2022 Volume 1 for the application of spandrels, or curtain walls that are utilized for this proposed development. Separation of external window openings to prevent spread of fire between levels must cover 900mm, with 600mm at minimum from the edge of floor above. Red arrows are	The glass façade is an aesthetic design intent, in the form a curtain wall system in concept. The concept wall section details have been updated to show more information. Further resolved details will be developed with a façade engineer and curtain wall manufacturer to achieve full compliance with all fire rating, waterproofing, acoustic separation and thermal requirements of the NCC. The proposed façade concept has been designed in concept in coordination with a BCA, Fire, BASIX, and Acoustic Engineers. It has been deemed capable of complying with all NCC	Building No objections raised by Council's Building Team.

critical information gaps where it is unknown how this curtain wall design will achieve compliance, or a performance solution warranted for the proposal. The transome is 1000mm, and fixed vision glass is 800mm. Subtracting the fixed vision glass from transom leaves 200mm. 200mm of opacified glass, fixings and 40mm of flooring meant that the curtain wall construction has vertical protection (assumed) to 240mm. This meant 360mm of the minimum 600mm vertical protection is non-compliant. There is no detail whether the material behind fixed opaque glass is non-combustible, including the structural slab and extent of fire resistance for those materials shown.	requirements. Further details will be provided at CC stage.	
Plant Rooms and Level 19 and 22 Design details for separation between levels are not included specific to spread of fire to the hotel or offices parts of building. Generally, a spandrel would be required at the top and bottom edges of both Level 19 and Level 32 plant or a curtain wall construction as designed for this proposed development. Consideration is required for fire separation and management of hazards arising from entire floor level used for plant / utilities prior to issuing construction certificate.	Further resolved details will be developed with a façade engineer and curtain wall manufacturer to achieve full compliance with all fire rating, waterproofing, acoustic separation and thermal requirements of the NCC. The proposed façade concept has been designed in concept in coordination with a BCA, Fire, and Acoustic Engineers. It has been deemed capable of complying with all NCC requirements. Further details will be provided at CC stage.	Building No objections raised by Council's Building Team.
NCC Class 9b parts of proposed building Level 1 has two function rooms that are Class 9b. There is also a pre function space at 71m² and an outdoor space. Level 2 has a space for hotel gymnasium – Class 9b. Level 36 to Level 37 can be classified as 9b considering the adaptability of floor layouts to accommodate functions/events. Both levels	As above.	Building No objections raised by Council's Building Team.

do have the Class 6 parts – restaurant and food bar. Level 38 is a Class 9b part of residential component of the building. It included a pool and open spaces for residents to share similar to private open spaces. Consideration to NCC 2022 Volume 1 Part G6 Occupiable outdoor areas is a requirement for the design team to provide details for the certifier.		
EV Charging and EV related storage/uses EV vehicles including electrical bicycles, scooters and other appliances may occupy spaces within the proposed development. Any proposal should comply with NCC 2022 Volume 1 E1D17 and E2D21. There is no documented details on managing EV including but not limited to charging of EV batteries, mitigating fire hazards from EV charging and managing fires resulting from EV. This would include end-of-trip EV charging for hotel clients. Majority of hotels in Sydney are installing EV charge stations. No charging of e-bicycles or e scooters inside apartments, or bicycle storage space at ground level. Fire suppression mitigation infrastructure in the bicycle storage space is required prior to any use of space to charge e-bicycles. Reference to the practice note by Fire and Rescue NSW on EVs as special hazards in a building.	EV charging has been considered and allowed for. Service cupboards have coordinated at a high-level concept design in conjunction with Goldfish & Bay Engineers. This is located in basement 1 adjacent the fire pump room. Further details will be provided at CC stage.	Building No objections raised by Council's Building Team.
Conclusion Burwood Council has completed its preliminary assessment/review of the pre-Da based on the set of plans provided. The application in its current state is not suitable for lodgement as there is considerable development of the design required to ensure	The comments received by Council have been considered and the Architectural Plans have been amended where practicable and reasonable. It is noted that the majority of comments raised by Council relate to the pre-lodgement version of the proposal and additional	Planning The SSDA proposal is pre-emptive of a Council-led precinct master-planning process which has commenced. Early stakeholder engagement with adjoining landowners is currently underway with a view to a collaborative

an appropriate local response and to meet the Design Excellence provisions of the Burwood Local Environmental Plan 2012. It is recommended that a further pre-DA meeting be held at the scoping stage once design responses are developed to address Council's concerns. Thank you once again for engaging with Council. The above identified matters relate only to a preliminary review of the proposal within the limited timeframe provided. The comments provided do not represent a full review of all potential impacts of the proposal on the site and the surrounding community.	information was prepared to accompany the EIS lodgement package.	approach to an integrated precinct outcome, inclusive of the site that's the subject of this SSDA.
--	---	---

If you require information in other languages contact the Telephone Interpreter Service directly on 131 450 (free service) and ask them to call Burwood Council on 9911 9911 on your behalf.

ARABIC

إذا كنت بحاجة إلى معلومات بلغات أخرى، اتصل بخدمة الترجمة الشفهية عبر الهاتف على الرقم 131 450 (خدمة مجانية) واطلب منهم الاتصال بالنيابة عنك بمجلس بيروود على الرقم 9911 9911.

CANTONESE

如果您需要以其他語言瞭解信息，請致電131 450聯繫電話傳譯服務中心（免費服務），並請他們代您致電9911 9911聯繫Burwood市議會。

GREEK

Εάν χρειάζεστε πληροφορίες σε άλλες γλώσσες επικοινωνήστε με την Υπηρεσία Μετάφρασης και Διερμηνείας στο 131 450 (δωρεάν υπηρεσία) και ζητήστε τους να καλέσουν εκ μέρους σας το Δήμο Burwood στο 9911 9911.

HINDI

यदि आपको अन्य भाषाओं में जानकारी की आवश्यकता है, तो सीधे 131 450 (निःशुल्क सेवा) पर टेलीफोन दुभाषिया सेवा से संपर्क करें और उनसे बरवुड काउंसिल को 9911 9911 पर आपकी ओर से कॉल करने के लिए निवेदन करें।

ITALIAN

Se avete bisogno di informazioni in altre lingue contattate il servizio di interpretariato telefonico direttamente al numero 131 450 (servizio gratuito) e chiedete loro di chiamare il Burwood Council al numero 9911 9911 per conto vostro.

KOREAN

다른 언어로 정보가 필요하시면 전화통역서비스(Telephone Interpreter Service)에 바로 연락하셔서(131 450번, 무료) 귀하를 대신해 버우드 카운슬(9911 9911번)로 전화를 걸어 달라고 요청하십시오.

MANDARIN

如果您需要以其他语言了解信息，请致电131 450联系电话传译服务中心（免费服务），并请他们代您致电9911 9911联系Burwood市议会。

NEPALI

अरू भाषामा यहाँलाई जानकारी आवश्यक भएमा 131 450 (निःशुल्क सेवा) मा सिधै टेलिफोन दोभाषे सेवामा सम्पर्क गर्नुहोस् र आफ्नो तर्फबाट 9911 9911 मा बर्नवुड काउन्सिलमा सम्पर्क गर्नका लागि उनीहरूलाई भन्नुहोस्।

VIETNAMESE

Nếu quý vị cần thông tin bằng các ngôn ngữ khác xin liên lạc trực tiếp với Dịch vụ Thông dịch qua Điện thoại qua số 131 450 (dịch vụ miễn phí) và nhờ họ thay quý vị gọi cho Hội đồng Thành phố Burwood qua số 9911 9911.