

11 May 2021

Your Ref: SSD-6966-MOD-1  
Our Ref: R/2016/37/C  
File No: 2021/186292

Marcus Jennejohn  
Senior Planning Officer  
Department of Planning, Industry and Environment

via Planning Portal

Dear Marcus

**Advice on Response to Submissions – Barangaroo Building R5 Mod 1 Design Amendments – SSD-6966-MOD-1**

Thank you for your correspondence dated 27 April 2021 requesting advice from the City of Sydney Council ("the City") in relation to the submitted Response to Submissions (RtS) for the proposed design amendments for Building R5 at Barangaroo. The City has reviewed the RtS and notes the responses provided regarding the increased building bulk and wind impacts.

The City maintains our disappointment in the lack of residential amenity provided to the Kew Worker Housing (KWH) proportion of the development and makes the following comments for your consideration.

**1 Key Worker Housing**

The proponent has still made no attempt to increase the residential amenity of the KWH component by further decreasing solar access compliance and restricting access to communal open spaces to an overshadowed terrace at Level 2. Whilst it is acknowledged that the ADG is to be used to inform and guide residential apartment developments, the lack of effort in increasing amenity provided to Key Workers is unacceptable. As raised in the City's previous submission, the proportion of KWH units that meet recommendations of the ADG is significantly smaller than the general residential component of the development.

The building should be designed in a way to, at minimum, allow KWH access to other shared facilities within the building. This is a suitable compromise and would improve residential amenity for key workers within the building.

The City notes the proponent's response to acoustic compliance and access arrangements at the Level 1 retail area the response is acceptable, where no further issues are raised.

**2 Residential apartments**

The City has reviewed the RtS responding to the proposed increased apartment sizes and additional studies without direct access to natural light or ventilation and are not

satisfied with the proponent's response. The City's concerns are discussed in further detail as follows:

## **2.1 Inboard study rooms**

The justification put forward by the proponent regarding the proposed inboard study rooms are not supported. The ADG includes a study as a habitable room and must be provided with access to natural light and ventilation in accordance with ADG sections 4A-1 and 4B-1. The proposed inboard study rooms such as those in apartments P05-06, LA5-07, LA5-08, MA5-08, MA5-07, L05-07, L05-08, UA5-07, UA5-08, DA5-02 and DA5-03 are therefore not supported due to the lack of natural light and air.

In some instances, it may be possible to reconfigure apartments and relocate the study to form a sunroom to the bedroom, with a non-habitable room such as bathrooms located deep into the plan.

## **2.2 'Updated balconies to full height glazing facades'**

Noted as item 7 on the submitted elevations, it is not clear if the intention for full height glazed facades are for wintergardens or an enclosed balcony (a room) as the elevation appear to show full height glazing.

Section 4.2.3.13 of the Sydney Development Control Plan 2012 notes that wind-affected balconies require at least 25% of the external face of the balcony to be permanently open however, it is not clear if this amended scheme achieves this. Detailed section drawings are recommended to be submitted to clarify the amount of enclosure to the balcony and how the habitable rooms behind the enclosed balcony can maintain adequate access to natural ventilation.

Should you wish to speak with a Council officer about the above, please contact Marie Burge, Planner, on 9265 9333 or at [mburge@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au](mailto:mburge@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au)

Yours sincerely,



**ANDREW REES**

Area Planning Manager