

Our Ref: JC:PJB:SZH

31 January 2018

The Director
Planning Frameworks
NSW Department of Planning &
Environment
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Dear Sir

Supplementary submission from advertising of SEPP (Environment) - Explanation of Intended Effect

Property: 10 Poole Street, Longueville

1. We refer to the above matter and our submission provided on the *SEPP (Environment) - Explanation of Intended Effect* on behalf of David Fite and Danita Lowes of 10 Poole Street, Longueville by letter dated 30 January 2018. This was sent by post and via the online portal. The submission contained a number of photographs. We have today received further relevant photographs taken from the ferry channel in the middle of the Lane Cove River. Consequently we provide the following short supplementary feedback for your consideration.
2. The photographs below (Figure 1 and 2) clearly show the existing waterfront improvements on our clients' property as previously referred to. These are the masonry and concrete sea wall (which extends along the entirety of the water frontage), the concrete launching ramp, boatshed, landing and steps from the seawall into the Lane Cove River, and a swimming pool cabana and paved area.

Figure 1:



Adelaide
Brisbane
Canberra
Darwin
Hobart
Melbourne
Norwest
Perth
Sydney

Doc ID 463519553/v1

Level 14, Australia Square, 264-278 George Street, Sydney NSW 2000 Australia
GPO Box 5408, Sydney NSW 2001 Australia
DX 129 Sydney

Telephone +61 2 9334 8555
Facsimile 1300 369 656 (Australia) +61 2 8507 6584 (International)
hwlebsworth.com.au

ABN 37 246 549 189

Figure 2:



3. These two photographs show that, as previously suggested, a ramp and pontoon would have little, if any, discernible visual impact and no interference with public access. The local character and visual amenity of the waterfront would not, we submit, be detrimentally affected.
4. Similarly, the ability to construct a ramp and pontoon from the existing landing would have a very minimal environmental impact and facilitate the safe landing and unloading of our clients' family and friends, thus facilitating the recreational use of the waterway. A W7 zone, as proposed to be amended, would at least allow a fair consideration of this.
5. The photograph on the following page (Figure 3) shows our clients' boat (red and white), which is berthed on a swing mooring in the waterway adjacent to the property. As discussed in our previous submission, the boat at present normally swings either in an east-west direction or west-east direction. As this photograph demonstrates, the current visual exposure of their boat is apparent, and an appropriately designed mooring pen would allow a north-south berthing, which could be at least given the opportunity to be assessed on its merits if the amended W7 zone is applied. We note this photograph was taken from the ferry and therefore illustrates the existing visual attributes of the property on members of the public using the waterway.

Figure 3



6. These additional photographs reinforce that the continued application of the W8 zone as discussed in the *SEPP (Environment) - Explanation of Intended Effect* to the waterway adjoining our clients' land could be revised and corrected to new W7 to avoid an incongruous application of a redefined W8 zone to our clients' built up waterfront.

Thanking you in anticipation of your consideration of this submission.

Yours faithfully

John Cole
Partner
HWL Ebsworth Lawyers
Registered Town Planner

+61 2 9334 8676
jcole@hwle.com.au

Simon Hill
Solicitor
HWL Ebsworth Lawyers

+61 2 9334 8558
shill@hwle.com.au