DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION ASSESSMENT

Application No: D/2018/799
Date of Lodgement 16-Jul-2018
Applicant LOUIS VUITTON AUSTRALIA PTY LTD
Application Site: 345-355 GEORGE STREET, SYDNEY NSW 2000
Proposal: Erection of one illuminated business identification (top hamper) sign to the George Street frontage of the temporary 'Louis Vuitton' Store at 345 George Street.
Cost of Works: $11,884.68
Zoning: The site is within the B8 Metropolitan Centre Zone and is permissible with consent.

SITE AND SURROUNDING DEVELOPMENT

The site is a corner site with an area of approximately 1617m². It has a primary street frontage to George Street to the east and a secondary frontage to Barrack Street to the north. The site is known as the 'Landmark Building' and contains a 17 storey building with two basements. The site is linked to 357-363 George Street via a pedestrian thoroughfare at level 1 that extends to the rear of 22 York Street.

Surrounding land uses are primarily commercial.

A site visit was carried out on 19 July 2018. Photos of the site and surrounds are provided below:

Figure 1: Aerial image of subject site (in yellow) and surrounding area.
PROPOSAL

Approval is sought for the erection of one illuminated top hamper sign for business identification purposes. The proposal states the sign will be installed for a temporary ‘Louis Vuitton’ store which will operate during renovation of the existing store at 365 George Street, Sydney. The signage panel is approximately 3.43m in length and 0.62m in height. The materials are described as ‘metal panel in RAL 8022 finish’ with acrylic backlit lettering.
The internal fitout of the temporary store will be subject to a separate Complying Development Certificate (CDC) and is not sought as part of this application.

HISTORY RELEVANT TO THE DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION

The following applications are relevant to the current proposal:

- **D/2015/1191 (as amended)**

  On 25 July 2016, development consent was granted for internal and external alterations to the retail and commercial areas of the ground level and levels 1-3 of 345-355 George Street, reconfiguration of the ground level lobby areas and entry to 357-363 George Street, removal of windows and repainting of the wall of 22-26 York Street, and a signage strategy for the George and Barrack Street elevations of 345-355 and 357-363 George Street.

  This consent has subsequently been modified under the provisions of Section 96 of the EP & A Act (Amendments A-J). An overview of these amendments to the consent include:

  - the staging of construction works;
  - approval of extended construction hours;
  - deferment of public domain conditions;
  - the modification of staged Construction Certificate works;
  - the provision of new stormwater drainage connections to the George Street kerb for stormwater overflow;
  - change of use of level 2 at 345-355 George Street from retail to commercial (office);
  - provision of hand rails to secondary George Street entry to 357-363 George Street; and
Development Application

Compliance Action

The site is subject to a compliance action which is not directly relevant to the subject application and has no impact on the outcome of this assessment.

ECONOMIC/SOCIAL/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

The application has been assessed under Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, including consideration of the following matters:

(a) Environmental Planning Instruments and DCPs.

State Environmental Planning Policy No 64—Advertising and Signage

The application proposes the following signage:

- 1 x illuminated top hamper business identification sign, with the text ‘Louis Vuitton’ approximately 3.43m x 0.62m in size.

SEPP 64 was gazetted on 16 March 2001 and aims to ensure that outdoor advertising is compatible with the desired amenity and visual character of an area, provides effective communication in suitable locations and is of high quality design and finish.

Clause 8 of SEPP64 states the following:

A consent authority must not grant development consent to an application to display signage unless the consent authority is satisfied:

(a) that the signage is consistent with the objectives of this Policy as set out in clause 3 (1) (a), and
(b) that the signage the subject of the application satisfies the assessment criteria specified in Schedule 1.

Assessment Criteria

The following table outlines the manner in which the proposed signage addresses the assessment criteria of SEPP64.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Character of the area</td>
<td>The site is within the Martin Place Special Character Area and Martin Place Signage Precinct. The proposal is consistent with the objectives for these parts under the Sydney DCP 2012, subject to conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the proposal compatible with the existing or desired future character of the area or locality in which it is proposed to be located?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the proposal consistent with a particular theme for outdoor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Special areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposal detract from the amenity or visual quality of any environmentally sensitive areas, heritage areas, natural or other conservation areas, open space areas, waterways, rural landscapes or residential areas?</td>
<td>The site is adjacent to a heritage item along Barrack Street, and opposite Martin Place which is a local heritage item. Subject to conditions, the signage is not likely to create any adverse impacts on the heritage significance of these surrounding sites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>Views and vistas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposal obscure or compromise important views?</td>
<td>The proposal does not compromise important views, reduce the quality of vistas or dominate the skyline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposal dominate the skyline and reduce the quality of vistas?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposal respect the viewing rights of other advertisers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>Streetscape, setting or landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the scale, proportion and form of the proposal appropriate for the streetscape, setting or landscape?</td>
<td>The proposed signage is generally in keeping with the streetscape, setting and landscape character of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposal contribute to the visual interest of the streetscape, setting or landscape?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposal reduce clutter by rationalising and simplifying existing advertising?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposal screen unsightliness?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposal protrude above buildings, structures or tree canopies in the area or locality?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposal require ongoing vegetation management?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>Site and building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the proposal compatible with the scale, proportion and other characteristics of the site or building, or both, on which the proposed signage is to be located?</td>
<td>The site has recently undergone internal and external renovation, and has a signage strategy for the building approved under a prior consent. The location of the sign is consistent with the intent of the signage strategy and the proportions and characteristics of the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposal respect important features of the site or building, or both?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the proposal show innovation and imagination in its relationship to the site or building, or both?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6</th>
<th>Associated devices and logos with advertisements and advertising structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have any safety devices, platforms, lighting devices or logos been designed as an integral part of the signage or structure on which it is to be displayed?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7</th>
<th>Illumination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Would illumination result in unacceptable glare?

Would illumination affect safety for pedestrians, vehicles or aircraft?

Would illumination detract from the amenity of any residence or other form of accommodation?

Can the intensity of the illumination be adjusted, if necessary?

Is the illumination subject to a curfew?

The proposal includes backlit lettering to be illuminated. To mitigate any potential impacts arising from the illumination, conditions are included on the consent to ensure the sign is of an appropriate brightness and to ensure the sign does not flash or flicker.

8 Safety

Would the proposal reduce the safety for any public road?

Would the proposal reduce the safety for pedestrians or bicyclists?

Would the proposal reduce the safety for pedestrians, particularly children, by obscuring sightlines from public areas?

The proposal will not reduce safety to pedestrians, cyclists or motor vehicles, or obscure sightlines from public areas.

The proposed signage is consistent with the aims and objectives of Clause 3 of SEPP64 and as such, is supported.

Sydney Regional Environmental Plan (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005 (Deemed SEPP)

The site is located within the designated hydrological catchment of Sydney Harbour and is subject to the provisions of the above SREP.

The Sydney Harbour Catchment Planning Principles must be considered in the carrying out of development within the catchment. The key relevant principles include:

- Protect and improve hydrological, ecological and geomorphologic processes.
- Consider cumulative impacts of development within the catchment.
- Improve water quality of urban runoff and reduce quantity and frequency of urban run-off.
- Protect and rehabilitate riparian corridors and remnant vegetation.

The site is within the Sydney Harbour Catchment and eventually drains into the Harbour. However, the site is not located in the Foreshores Waterways Area or adjacent to a waterway and therefore, with the exception of the objective of improved water quality, the objectives of the SREP are not applicable to the proposed development. The development is consistent with the controls contained with the deemed SEPP.
Sydney LEP 2012

The site is located within the B8 Metropolitan Centre zone. The proposed use is defined as signage and is permissible.

The relevant matters to be considered under Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2012 for the proposed development are outlined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Control</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Height of Buildings</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A maximum height of 130m is permitted. No change to the height of buildings control is proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Floor Space Ratio</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A maximum FSR of 8:1 is permitted. No change to the FSR is proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division 4 Design excellence 6.21 Design Excellence</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The proposed development satisfies the requirements of this provision. Subject to conditions, the proposal for an illuminated top hamper sign is compatible with the site and context, will be constructed of high quality materials and will improve the site’s relationship with the public domain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sydney DCP 2012

The relevant matters to be considered under Sydney Development Control Plan 2012 for the proposed development are outlined below.

2. Locality Statements – Martin Place Special Character Area

The subject site is located in the Martin Place Special Character Area. The proposed signage is in keeping with the unique character of the area and design principles.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Control</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Public Domain Elements</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The proposed development will make a positive contribution to the public domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Defining the Public</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The proposed development will enhance the public domain by ensuring adequate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ISSUES

**Signage**

Pursuant to Part 3.16.1 of the Sydney DCP 2012, a Signage Strategy is to be prepared for all signage applications on sites that involve heritage items, on sites that are strata titled or contain more than four business premises.

It is noted a Signage Strategy for the site was submitted for assessment and approval under previous consent D/2015/1191 *(as amended)*.

![Figure 6: Signage strategy submitted under D/2015/1191 (George Street elevation)](image)

In the Council Officer's report, the three top hamper signs to 345-355 George Street, relating to retail tenancies at ground floor were deemed acceptable. Other signage elements within the Signage Strategy were not approved, including first floor signs to 345-355 George Street, and top hamper signs directly beneath the proposed street number signs at 357-363 George Street. Amended plans detailing these amendments are required to be submitted to Council in accordance with Condition 2 of the consent, prior to the issue of a ‘Stage 2’ Construction Certificate.
The approved Signage Strategy's signage zone for the subject top hamper sign is approximately 2.6m x 0.993m in size. The proposed top hamper sign exceeds this signage zone in length, at a proposed 3.43m x 0.62m.

The applicant states:

‘The proposed minor variation is deemed acceptable in context of the building design and character, the intent of the Signage Strategy and the consistency of the proposed sign in the location of the signage zone.’

The minor change in size is considered suitable for the site and building, and is still considered consistent with the intent of the signage strategy for the site. The application was also referred to Council’s Urban Design Specialist, who supports the proposal.

(b) Other Impacts of the Development

The proposed development is capable of complying with the BCA.

The proposal will have no significant detrimental effect relating to environmental, social or economic impacts on the locality, subject to imposition of appropriate conditions.

(c) Suitability of the site for the Development

The proposal is considered to be suitable for the site. The premises are in commercial surroundings and amongst similar uses to that proposed.

(d) CONSULTATION

Internal Referrals

The conditions of other sections of Council have been included in the proposed conditions.

The application was discussed with the Heritage and Urban Design Specialists; who advised that the proposal is acceptable subject to the recommended conditions.

NOTIFICATION, ADVERTISING AND DELEGATION (No Notification)

In accordance with Schedule 1, the proposed development is not required to be notified or advertised development under the Sydney DCP 2012. As such the application was not notified as it is by way of scale, character and operation is likely to have minimal or acceptable impacts.

(e) Public Interest

It is considered that the proposal will have no detrimental effect on the public interest, subject to appropriate conditions being proposed.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

S61 CONTRIBUTION
The cost of the development is under $200,000 and the development is therefore not subject to a levy pursuant to the Central Sydney (Section 61) Contributions Plan 2013.

CONCLUSION

Having regard to all of the above matters, it is considered that the proposal for top hamper signage generally satisfies the relevant strategy, objectives and provisions of the Sydney LEP 2012 and the Sydney DCP 2012.

The application is Approved under delegated authority of Council.

The undersigned declare, to the best of their knowledge that they have no interest, pecuniary or otherwise, in this development application or persons associated with it and have provided an impartial assessment.
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