Attachment A

Plans and Documentation of the Rooftop Plant Area and Parapet Zone of Building C

From:	Stephen Kerr
То:	Jessica Symons
Cc:	Christopher Corradi; Angela Guo; Sky Zheng
Subject:	Wattle Street - Courtyard Building Plant Room
Date:	Wednesday, 27 March 2024 2:11:01 PM
Attachments:	M-2013 HVAC - BUILDING C- ROOF[].pdf
	M-5014 HVAC - BUILDING C- ROOF SECTIONS[].pdf
	M-6015 HVAC - BUILDING C- ROOF ISOMETRIC[].pdf

Caution: This email came from outside the organisation. Don't click links or open attachments unless you know the sender, and were expecting this email.

Hi Jessica

Please find attached the mechanical plans that were tabled at yesterday's meeting. As discussed at the meeting and illustrated in the mechanical drawings and details:

- The roof of the courtyard building is proposed to accommodate the air-cooled chillers that will service the entire development.
- The chillers require unobstructed access to the sky and cannot be located in a basement. Pumps and other mechanical plant that do not require air and sky access have been located in the basement.
- Alternate locations for the chillers were investigated including the roof of the Jones Street building, however, this was deemed unsatisfactory by the applicant and Council's planning experts because of the visual impact.
- The height of the rooftop plant enclosure (parapet) corresponds with the height of the chillers as illustrated in the additional plans and details.
- Any lowering of the parapet will expose the chillers to view and disrupt the building architecture.
- Lowering the height of the rooftop plant, if it were possible, is not required to achieve compliance with numerical planning controls. It would not eliminate the need to vary the height of buildings development standard and the proposal, in its current form, complies with the controls that ensure adequate sunlight access to Wentworth Park.

Tree 40 (conditions 44 and 45)

Tree 40 (an oriental plane tree on Fig Street) was approved for removal in the concept development consent because of the impact on the TPZ (27%) pruning required by the Fig Street building (35% crown loss).

The second sentence in Paragraph 107 (a) of the assessment report I believe refers to the arborist's recommendation regarding tree 46 (discussed in paragraph (b)) but has mistakenly been attributed to tree 40.

We would be grateful if conditions 44 and 45 could be amended to permit the removal of tree 40 consistent with the concept development approval and the arborist report.

Stephen Kerr Executive Director

Gyde Consulting		
	?	

0414 980 690 | 02 9071 1888 | stephenk@gyde.com.au Level 6, 120 Sussex St, Sydney NSW 2000 gyde.com.au



Confidentiality Notice: This message contains privileged and confidential information intended for the use of the addressee named above. If you are not the intended recipient of this message you are hereby notified that you must not disseminate, copy or take any action or place any reliance on it. If you have received this message in error please notify us immediately and then delete this document. Violation of this notice may be unlawful.













