

14 August 2018

File No: R/2015/8/D
Our Ref: 2019/406219

Rodger Roppolo
Planning Officer, Key Sites Assessments
Department of Planning, Industry and Environment
320 Pitt Street
Sydney NSW 2000

via Planning Portal

Dear Rodger

Response to Submissions – Crown Sydney Hotel Resort, Barangaroo South – SSD 6957 MOD 1

Thank you for your correspondence, dated 29 July 2019 which invites the City of Sydney ('the City') to review the Response to Submissions (RtS) in respect of SSD 6957 MOD 1 regarding the Crown Sydney Hotel Resort at Barangaroo South.

This letter is to be read in conjunction with our earlier objection sent in response to the proposed modification dated 3 July 2019.

The City has reviewed the submitted RtS and notes some amendments and clarification has been provided in regards to the reference to mass gaming within the site and wind mitigation measure. The City does not agree with the applicant's justification in regards to the provision of parking on site and response to residential amenity and thus maintains an objection to the proposed modifications. The City's response is discussed in detail below.

1 Transport

1.1 Parking rates

The RtS notes there are no comparable developments in the City of Sydney area that would reflect the parking rates required on the site. This may have been misinterpreted by the applicant as the intention was to highlight comparable parking rates of the Sydney LEP to the proposed commercial, retail and residential uses. Division 1 of Part 7 of the Sydney LEP identifies maximum parking rates for a number of uses. When comparing these rates to the proposed uses within the site, the parking rates are significantly higher than those prescribed under the LEP.

The RtS notes that parking rates are consistent with the maximum approved parking rates as approved under the Barangaroo South Concept Plan (MP 06_0162 MOD 8).

MP 06_0162 MOD 8 was determined by the Planning Assessment Commission on 28 June 2016 that varied Condition C4 of the consent to include parking rates relating to hotel uses. Condition C4 states the following:

C4 Car Parking

- (1) The following maximum car parking rates shall apply to future development within the site:
- (a) Commercial: 1 space/600m² GFA
 - (b) Residential: - 1 bedroom/bedsitter unit – 1 space/2 units
- 2 bedroom unit – 1.2 spaces/unit
- 3+ bedroom unit – 2 spaces/unit
 - (c) Other Uses:- City of Sydney Council rates
 - (d) **Hotel: City of Sydney Council rates or as otherwise approved by the relevant delegate of the Minister.**

By applying these rates to the proposed development, the recommended maximum, previously approved and currently proposed parking rates are identified in Table 1 below.

Proposed Use	Condition C4 maximum	Approved	Proposed
Residential	157.2	110	157
Commercial	21.3	500	484
Hotel	76.4		
Total	254.9	610	641

Table 1 Recommended and proposed parking rates within the site

It is acknowledged that part (d) of Condition C4 notes hotel rates are as per City of Sydney rates or otherwise approved by minister or delegate, however, it is noted that the proposed parking for the commercial/hotel components of the site are almost five times over the numeric rates in parts (a) and (d) in Condition C4 of MP 06_0162. This is excessive and totally unreasonable when considering the site is within easy walking distance to ferry, bus and train services and Barangaroo Metro station currently under construction.

Although a reduction in parking for commercial use is proposed and is acknowledged that residential parking has a lesser impact on congestion than commercial parking, the City strongly objects to the overall increase in parking on site. An increase in residential parking rates is to be accommodated within the existing approved parking rates. Further, it is pressed that the Concept Plan grants consent to **maximum** rates only and is not “required” as the application suggests. Each application is then assessed on its merits and the City’s objection regarding the massive inconsistency with the proposed parking and similar LEP rates is reiterated.

It should also be noted that the approved parking rates in the most recent concept plan modification were granted consent prior to the determination of the Chatswood to Sydenham Metro project (SSI 7400), being granted consent in January 2017. The approval and commencement of tunnelling works from early 2018 for the major rail infrastructure project must be taken into account when considering parking rates and the encouragement of alternative transport methods for residents and visitors.

Recently, it has been observed that the streets are becoming busier with the use of private cars and taxis queuing along the streets to access surrounding car parks and wharves. An increase in parking and potential increased queuing on the surrounding

streets may exacerbate unacceptable street congestion and have a negative impact on public amenity.

1.2 Bicycle Parking and End of Journey Facilities

It is noted that residential bicycle parking is proposed to be within the basement storage areas. The submitted plans, however, note a separate colour code for residential bicycle parking from storage areas, which is not reflected on the drawings. Plans are to be amended to identify the location of bicycle parking regardless of whether they are combined within general storage areas.

Further, staff end of journey and bicycle parking are separated by a valet ramp that poses a safety risk. The City wishes to clarify that although parking and amenities are not separated by two basement floors, they are separated by the valet car ramp. This poses a safety risk and needs to be addressed in the basement design. Bicycle parking and amenities should not be separated by a car ramp and a safe path of travel for staff must be provided.

2 Residential Amenity

The city acknowledges the mixed use nature of the development, however, maintains objection to the shared communal open space facilities between residents and hotel guests noting that the open spaces associated with the hotel are not an acceptable alternative to provisions for communal open space and private open space in parts 3D and 4E of the Apartment Design Guide (ADG).

The proposed shared commercial/residential terraces do not meet the objectives or design criteria of the ADG and the development is not considered to provide adequate residential amenity. The ADG does not provide a waiver of the required communal open space area for the exclusive use of the residents of a development if other uses within the development provide open space. These aspects of the development are to be separate. Further, the applicant's response to Council's earlier comments notes that "*The residential component caters to a specific market, this being high end luxury apartments*" to justify the lack of an area of open space which is only available to the owners and occupiers of the apartments at the building. There is no provision in the ADG that allows the use of the residential communal area by other users of a mixed use development on the basis of its marketing positioning.

The applicant justifies the lack of private open space to each apartment by providing floor to ceiling windows and Juliet balconies. The submitted plans, however, do not provide a level of detail to determine how many windows are operable nor do they show any Juliet balconies.

The residential component of the development must provide adequate private and communal open space areas that are freely accessible by residents only and are not shared with other uses within the site. The current application does not:

- (a) provide adequate communal open space consistent with Part 3D of the ADG;
- (b) provide minimum balcony sizes in each apartment, does not satisfactorily meet the alternative provisions in Part 4E of the ADG in providing Juliet balconies or a larger communal open space area

The proposed modification is not supported in its current form and alternatives should be investigated to deliver a dedicated open space area for the building's residents that meet the relevant provisions of the ADG.

3 Mass Gaming

It is also noted that a response has been provided regarding wind mitigation and the mass gaming component of the development. Council notes the plans have removed the “mass gaming” reference and no other comment in raised regarding this aspect.

4 Wind Mitigation

The applicant's RtS notes wind blades surrounding the outdoor bar terrace are glazed and are only 1.8m in height. There is a discrepancy on the submitted plans, however, that is yet to be addressed. The City's previous correspondence provides an excerpt from the submitted section drawing showing wind blades to be 3.4m in height and not 1.8m as suggested in written documentation. This is to be amended prior to the determination of the application.

The City also recommends that a condition be imposed that restricts the height of the blades to 1.8m and requires blades to remain staggered and not form a continuous glazed wall. Further, a condition is recommended to be imposed that ensures blade panels remain 100% transparent at all times and are not obstructed by any coverings (i.e. signage).

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.

Yours sincerely,



Graham Jahn AM
Director
City Planning | Development | Transport