



ANGEL PLACE
LEVEL 8, 123 PITT STREET
SYDNEY NSW 2000

URBIS.COM.AU
Urbis Pty Ltd
ABN 50 105 256 228

27 October 2023

Anthony Witherdin
Director, Key Sites Assessments
Department of Planning and Environment
12 Darcy Street, Parramatta NSW 2150

Attention: Jill Rassaby (Planning Officer, Key Sites Assessment)

Dear Jill,

RFI RESPONSE | DIGITAL ADVERTISING SIGN - CLEVELAND STREET OUTBOUND DA | DA22/6816

This submission has been prepared on behalf of the applicant (**Sydney Trains**) in relation to the letter issued to Department of Planning and Environment (**DPE**) (dated 13 October 2023) with a request for additional information (**RFI**) regarding DA22/6816 (**the DA**). This RFI is further to the Response to Submission (**RtS**) and RFI letter submitted to DPE on 7 September 2023.

This submission is supported by the following documentation:

- Letter from Sydney Trains (**Appendix A**); and
- Correspondence and consultation with Balarinji (**Appendix B**).

1. RESPONSE TO DPE RFI

The applicant's formal response to the Department's RFI is provided in **Table 1** as follows.

Table 1 Applicant's Response to DPE's RFI

DPE Comment	Applicant Response
Provide evidence of consultation and agreement with the owner(s) and/or beneficiaries of the adjoining lot containing airspace and vegetation in the foreground of the proposed sign and any vegetation management agreement.	<p>As per the letter from Sydney Trains (at Appendix A), the subject site (Lot 2 of DP 1011782) is owned by Transport Asset Holding Entity of NSW (TAHE). The adjoining land to the north is also TAHE owned land (Lot 1 of DP 862513).</p> <p>As advised by Agents acting on behalf of TAHE, there is an informal arrangement in place between TAHE (including Sydney Trains) and the City of Sydney (the City), for the City to maintain the vegetation on the land to the north of the</p>

DPE Comment	Applicant Response
	proposed sign (Lot 1 of DP 862513). As this is an informal arrangement there is no specific contract in place.
Address the assessment considerations relating to streetscape, setting and landscape In Schedule 5, Part 4 of the SEPP (Industry and Employment)	<p>An assessment against the fourth criteria 'Streetscape, setting or landscape' is provided below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p><i>Is the scale, proportion and form of the proposal appropriate for the streetscape, setting or landscape?</i></p> <p>The proposed advertisement is in keeping with the prevailing mixed-use setting of Redfern. The scale, proportion, and form of the proposed structure is appropriate in the context of the surrounding streetscape and broader locality which is characterised by signage.</p> <p><i>Does the proposal contribute to the visual interest of the streetscape, setting or landscape?</i></p> <p>The form and location of the proposed structure is appropriate to the surrounding vegetation and railway corridor. The colour palette is contemporary yet subdued and materials are of a high-quality finish that contribute positively to the streetscape and wider public domain.</p> <p><i>Does the proposal reduce clutter by rationalising and simplifying existing advertising?</i></p> <p>The sign is appropriately distanced from other signage and does not result in clutter of advertisements in the area. The previous concurrent DA for the 'Inbound' sign has been withdrawn; accordingly, the Outbound sign is the only sign proposed within this intersection.</p> <p><i>Does the proposal screen unsightliness?</i></p> <p>The location of the proposed advertisement is such that it does not screen any unsightly items.</p> <p><i>Does the proposal protrude above buildings, structures or tree canopies in the area or locality?</i></p> <p>The structure protrudes over the vegetation located in adjoining land to the north (Lot 1 of DP 862513). The structure does not protrude above the tree canopies located along Regent Street to the south. Further, the proposed structure remains well below the height of</p>

DPE Comment	Applicant Response
	<p>surrounding development and does not create adverse visual impact when viewed from the public domain.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Does the proposal require ongoing vegetation management?</i> <p>The proposed structure does not require ongoing vegetation management.</p>
Provide evidence of consultation with the artist and commissioning body of the existing public artwork along the railway fence and consider relevant impacts.	As per the correspondence at Appendix B , the applicant has consulted with Balarinji (the commissioning organisation undertaking the artwork along Cleveland Street) to discuss this proposal and future opportunities for collaboration on public artworks. The correspondence confirms that Balarinji did not raise any objection to the proposal.
Clarify inconsistencies between the Arborist letter, prepared by Naturally Trees and the Response to RFI, in relation to the Bismarck Palm, in terms of it obstructing views towards the proposed sign and ongoing maintenance noting it has a mature height of over 15 metres.	As detailed in Appendix A , the City maintains the land to the north subject to an informal agreement. As such, the vegetation (on Lot 1 of DP 862513) will be pruned by the City as and when necessary. It is noted that the Bismark palms can grow up to a height of 15m, potentially blocking the screen. As the City is responsible for garden maintenance, the decision to trim vegetation to prevent screen obstruction rests with the City and will not be the responsibility of the applicant. Notwithstanding, it is unlikely the Bismark palms will grow to their maximum height as it is native of Madagascar and differing climatic conditions in Sydney.

2. CONCLUSION

We trust that the information provided in this submission and the accompanying documentation addresses the matters raised by DPE.

Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned if any further information is required.

Yours sincerely,



Rob Battersby
Associate Director
+61 2 8233 9936
rbattersby@urbis.com.au