
From: Deborah Ely [REDACTED] >
Sent: Saturday, 18 July 2020 4:24 PM
To: DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox <information@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: Director, Key Sites Assessments

Attention: Director, Key Sites Assessments

To whom it may concern,

Reference: SSD-7317-Mod-19

Whilst supporting, and having taken a positive part as a community member in the South Eveleigh developments, I have strong OBJECTIONS to a part of this proposed modification: Location 4, Redfern station light tower is 12-metres height of signage, immediately adjacent to residential units in the Watertower building where I have lived for over seven years.

I argue this case not only as a resident affected by this imposition, but as a Redfern citizen concerned that the totality of the heritage area is protected. We disagree with the consultant in stating that "...the development proposed will not directly impact any built heritage item.." The Watertower building is every part a bit of the heritage of the South Eveleigh neighbourhood, partly acknowledged by the consultant:

The simple, strong functional forms of the **buildings** have landmark quality, not only as important **townscape** elements in the Redfern/Eveleigh area, but as part of the visual train journey of thousands of passing commuters.

The Watertower is part of this experience for travellers and pedestrians and should be regarded as such, for its visual presence not to be impacted by vulgar signage. The consultant goes on to anticipates such a collision:

In order to minimise the visual impact and soften the overall aesthetic of the piece the tower will utilise see-through and industrial materials...

Whilst appreciating the design rational, this will not lessen the diminishing effect the tower will have on the lines of the Watertower building, a well-preserved industrial building, the first of Sydney's conversions to residential. In addition, the light emitted by the tower will be an unwarranted and unreasonable invasion of domestic space within the building.

We note in the provisions for SEPP 64, 1.3.1: *The display of advertisements other than business or building identification signs is prohibited in ... heritage conservation areas and recreation zones*. We contend the Watertower is a heritage item that the proposal for Location 4 will essentially transgress; furthermore that the immediate proximity of a recreational zone, the garden, will be compromised.

We note too in 1.c (p5) digital signs, *that face the road reserve and are visible to road users are prohibited*. The shared zone is immediately adjacent and is already contentious as a hazard for when the South Eveleigh site is fully occupied.

Mirvac are ignoring their neighbours with the statement:

...the marker has been strategically positioned at the edge of the precinct...

as the precinct includes the Watertower, and by positioning the tower at the edge, diminishes the impact of the precinct. The siting of the garden at the lead in and lead out to the precinct was a brilliant move; surely if a site as large as South Eveleigh requires a significant marker, it should be placed centrally, away from residences; I doubt this is necessary as the buildings, new and heritage, are powerful enough statements. After the improvement to the station are completed in 2021, station signage will certainly enable Blind Freddie to find ATP without the need for this tower!

We are also puzzled that a major art installation is going to be installed immediately adjacent, following the line of the steps down through the garden. Is the artist aware of this overbearing signage so close by? Does this not compromise a yet to be realised and expensive artwork addition to the precinct?

We note similar towers at Location 2 are of 9-metres height and are not affecting places of residence. The remaining signage Locations are what I would describe as passive, without emitting light and being closer to the ground. Large lettering along fence lines can similarly be employed along the fence lines of the railway; is not this more cohesive as a design element? We also record that the use of the reference images 1, 2 and 5 is disingenuous as none of these are illuminated and are not adjacent to residences.

We have attended community meetings with Mirvac in the recent past, it is disappointing that we have not been informed of further consultations and that this signage planning has been sprung on us, with very little notice to respond. It is the kind of approach that gives corporations a bad name and frustrates the ability of communities to cohere.

I trust the State to intervene in this matter.

Yours faithfully

Deborah Ely
Sent from my iPad