



URBAN  
PERSPECTIVES

Suite 23, Level 6, 58 Pitt St, GPO Box 4507 Sydney NSW 2001  
P • 02 8071 4590 F • 02 9252 4516 W • [urbanperspectives.com.au](http://urbanperspectives.com.au)  
ABN • 13 095 904 224

30/04/2014

Lauren Rose  
NSW Department of Planning & Environment  
Head Office  
GPO Box 39  
Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Ms Rose

RE: RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS MADE FOR SECTION 75W APPLICATION TO MODIFY  
DEVELOPMENT CONSENT FOR MP05\_0187: LOT 34 DP 1151746, JAMES CRAIG RD, ROZELLE

Our client, Longitude Rozelle Bay Pty Ltd ATF Sydney Slipways Unit trust (the Applicant), seeks to modify an existing consent to allow the installation of a light box feature on a building (known as Longitude) located at James Craig Road, Rozelle Bay (Lot 34 DP1151746). This letter responds to the two submissions received during the exhibition of the Application under Section 75W of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment (EP&A) Act 1979*.

The first submission received from the Roads and Maritime Services raised no objections to the proposed modification. The second submission from Leichhardt Council concluded that while the proposed sign does not fully meet the objectives of three clauses under SREP (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005, the Environmental Assessment does demonstrate that the impacts would be minimal. The table appended to this letter addresses each of Council's specific concerns.

If you have further questions or require additional information, please contact Rebecca Sio on (02) 8071 4589 or [rebecca@urbanperspectives.com.au](mailto:rebecca@urbanperspectives.com.au).

Regards,

Rebecca Sio  
Town Planner  
Direct ph: (02) 8071 4589  
[rebecca@urbanperspectives.com.au](mailto:rebecca@urbanperspectives.com.au)

## APPENDIX A

| Comments from Leichardt Council  | Applicant's Response   |
|--|--|
| <p><i>The principal environmental planning instrument applying the site is Sydney Regional Environmental Plan No.26- City West (SREP 26) under which the site is zoned "Port and Employment" and part "Waterfront Use". We note the current use of the premises is not permissible in the part of the site zoned "Waterfront Use".</i></p> | <p>The Longitude Building is located on land zoned "Port and Employment" and part "Waterfront Use". The "Waterfront Use" zone consists of a small slither of land under the Anzac Bridge. Uses within the Longitude Building consist of Marine Retail on the ground floor and commercial services to various businesses including maritime related businesses on the 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floors.</p> <p>A permissible use within the "Waterfront Use" zone is any use that the consent authority is satisfied is generally consistent with one or more of the zone objectives. The Applicant submits the current uses are generally consistent with the zone objective to allow a range of commercial maritime facilities, which take advantage of the harbour location.</p> <p>I note that the current use of the Longitude building is not pertinent to determination of this Modification application. However, if the Department forms the view, the current use within the Waterfront Use zone is not permissible; the proponent would make a separate application under Clause 48 of SREP 26 for Ministerial consent to allow for a use that is consistent with the current use permissible on the remaining part of the site zoned "Port and Employment".</p> |
| <p><i>The proposed signage structure is not complementary to the building, but the nature of the surrounding area means this issue would have minimal impact.</i></p>  | <p>The proposed light box feature is complementary to the building. The light box would be on top of an existing stairwell. The stairwell provides articulation to the northern façade of the existing building.</p> <p>The architect specifically designed the light box to be the same dimensions as the northern stairwell. Therefore, the light box would be a natural protrusion of the stairwell and articulated form at this end of the building.</p>   |
| <p><i>In principle the application is not compatible with</i></p>  | <p>Section 6.2 of the modification addresses impact</p>  |

| Comments from Leichardt Council  | Applicant's Response  |
|--|---|
| <p><i>the DCP for SREP (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005 in relation to the following clauses:</i></p> <p><i>Section 3.2- General Aims: "all development should aim to: minimise any significant impact on views and vistas from and to: - public places, landmarks identified on the maps accompanying the DCP, and heritage items."</i></p> <p><i>Section 5.3 – Siting of Buildings and Structures: "buildings should not obstruct views and vistas from public places to the waterway; buildings should not obstruct views and vistas from public places to the waterway; buildings should not obstruct views of landmarks and features identified on the maps accompanying this DCP"</i></p> | <p>on views and vistas. There are no public places or landmarks identified on Map 8 (which includes the site) of the DCP. The nearest heritage site is the Grain Silos. The proposed light box would obscure a very small portion of the grain silos when viewed from Rozelle Bay or the Anzac Bridge through the guard rails. The assessment also considers views from the Anzac Bridge and found the light box would only obscure a portion of the flitting panoramic views through the existing guardrails when pedestrians, cyclist and drivers travel over the Anzac Bridge. The profile of proposed light box is relatively small and the surrounding environmental and built features of the locality would remain dominant.</p> |
| <p><i>Section 4.6 – Signage: "Signs on privately-owned land should meet the following requirements: their dimensions should be minimal and consistent with the commercial or community identity of the premises; they should not be brightly illuminated to avoid becoming navigational hazards. Lighting of signs should be directed downward, away from the water; they should preferably be placed on the facades of buildings, rather than on roofs or free standing; and signs that intrude on the skyline should be avoided."</i></p>  | <p>The subject site is not located on privately - owned land and is therefore not subject to this Section of the DCP.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the proposed light box would not be brightly illuminated. The acrylic panels would disperse the light so that the light box glows rather than creating a glare source. There will be no direct light on the waterway or surrounding roads.</p> <p>The signage will not protrude on the skyline but be incorporate in the lightbox. As discussed above the light box has been designed to complement the existing building design.</p>  |
| <p><i>Councils' traffic engineers have no concerns about the proposed sign, but have suggested that if not already done so, the application should be referred to RMS traffic engineers for comment.</i></p>   | <p>The Department of Planning and Environment referred the modification application to the Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) for comment. RMS had no objections to the proposed sign.</p>   |