

20 February 2020

Mr Anthony Witherdin  
Director, Key Sites Assessments  
NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment  
320 Pitt Street  
Sydney NSW 2000

Attention: Amy Watson, Key Sites Assessments

Dear Mr Witherdin

### **Response to Submissions**

#### **New Digital Advertising Signage – Church Street Overpass above Burns Bay Road, Hunters Hill**

This Response to Submissions (RtS) has been prepared for JCDecaux on behalf of Transport for NSW (TfNSW) (the Applicant) to address the submissions received on the above development application (DA 10082).

The RtS also addresses the issues raised in the Department's letter to the Applicant, received on 15 November 2019.

We note that the application received a total of 26 submissions including one submission from Hunters Hill Council (Council), one submission from the then RMS (now known as TfNSW), one submission from Heritage NSW and 23 submissions from the public, including a submission from the Hunters Hill Trust.

A response to the issues raised by the Department (DPIE), Council, RMS and Heritage NSW is provided at **Attachment A**. A response to the issues raised in the public submissions is provided at **Attachment B**.

A Visual Impact Assessment has been prepared for 12 Church Street, Hunters Hill as requested by the DPIE and is provided at **Attachment C**.

The responses provided in this RtS are supported by specialist advice in relation to heritage and lighting impacts provided in **Attachment D** and **Attachment E** respectively.

We note that the key issues raised in the submissions primarily relate to visual, lighting, road safety and heritage impacts and the public benefit.

As requested by the DPIE, JCDecaux (on behalf of TfNSW) consulted with Council on 6 November 2019 to better understand the issues raised in its submission and where possible to mitigate or eliminate Council's concerns. The RtS addresses Council's issues as they are understood by the Applicant.

The RtS reinforces the findings made within the SEE that the proposed digital advertising signs:

- are appropriate for the site being a busy road corridor
- will result in acceptable impacts on heritage items or conservation areas
- will result in acceptable lighting impacts
- will result in acceptable visual impacts especially from residential properties including 12 Church Street, Hunters Hill

The Applicant has also further refined the proposed signage to reduce the overall dimensions. The revised plans are provided in **Appendix G**.

We trust that the RtS provides sufficient information required for the DPIE to finalise its assessment and approve the application.

Please do not hesitate to contact Rebecka Groth, Senior Planner on (02) 8459 7510 or via email at [rebecka@keylan.com.au](mailto:rebecka@keylan.com.au) should you wish to discuss any aspect of this project.

Yours sincerely



Michael Woodland BTP  
Director

Attachments:

- Attachment A:** Response to the submissions received from DPIE, Council, RMS and Heritage NSW
- Attachment B:** Response to the submissions received from the public
- Attachment C:** Supplementary Visual Impact Assessment
- Attachment D:** Supplementary Heritage Impact Assessment (Urbis)
- Attachment E:** Supplementary Lighting Impact Assessment (Electrolight)
- Attachment F:** Sydney Regional Environmental Plan (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005
- Attachment G:** Revised Signage Plans

## Attachment A

### Response to Submissions received from DPIE, Council and RMS (DA 10082)

Ref.	Agency and issues raised	Response
<b>A</b>	<b>Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE)</b>	
A1	<p><i>The Department requires that you provide a response to all of the issues raised in those submissions. In particular, the Department encourages you to engage with Hunter's Hill Council staff to understand and respond to its concerns.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, the Department requires you to provide additional information on the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>an assessment of visual impacts from 12 Church Street</i></li> <li><i>further justification for the categorisation of the site within zone 3 for the purposes of illumination levels under the Transport Corridor Outdoor Advertising and Signage Guidelines.</i></li> </ul>	<p>A response to the public and agency submissions is provided at <b>Appendix A</b> and <b>B</b> respectively.</p> <p>A supplementary visual impact assessment from 12 Church Street, Hunters Hill is provided in <b>Appendix C</b>.</p> <p>A supplementary lighting impact assessment from 12 Church Street, Hunters Hill is provided in <b>Appendix E</b>.</p> <p>A response to the issues raised by Hunters Hill Council (Council) is provided in the table reference numbers B1 to B12. As requested by the DPIE, JCDecaux on behalf of TfNSW consulted with the Council to understand and respond to its issues and where possible to mitigate or eliminate Council's concerns. The RtS addresses Council's issues as they are understood by the Applicant.</p>
<b>B</b>	<b>Hunters Hill Council</b>	
B1	<p><i>The proposal for this Major Projects development application on behalf of Transport for NSW (Roads &amp; Maritime Services) based on your correspondence with Council dated 14 October 2019, has been subject of a report to Council at its meeting of 11 November 2019 at which it resolved as follows:</i></p> <p><i>A. That the Team Leader, Key Sites Assessments, Planning &amp; Assessment of the Department of Planning, Industry &amp; Environment be advised that Council opposes the relevant Development Application of Transport for NSW (Roads and Maritime Services) for the Church Street Overpass, Hunters Hill, due to following reasons that:</i></p> <p>A</p>	<p>The Statement of Environmental Effects (SEE) submitted with the Development Application 10082 (DA) was accompanied with a Heritage Impact Statement (HIS) prepared by Urbis and dated 4 September 2019 which addressed impacts on the conservation area and the setting of the heritage items.</p> <p>The RtS is also accompanied by further heritage advice from Urbis dated 29 November 2019 (refer <b>Appendix D</b>) which responds to the submissions received including Council's submission. The heritage advice confirms that the proposed signage will not lead to any heritage impacts, as detailed below in the extract from the report provided by Urbis:</p>

Ref.	Agency and issues raised	Response
	<p>1. <i>The proposed LED advertising signs will have adverse impacts on the character of the conservation area and the setting of the heritage items within the vicinity through the introduction of dynamic commercial advertising during both daytime and night time.</i></p>	<p><i>...There is no Statement of Significance for the Hunters Hill Conservation Area – The Peninsula (C1) and Figtree Subdivision, DP 988 (C450), only general statements indicating the Hunters Hill LGA “has a special character that is emphasised by the numerous and mature trees, its stone walls, natural landscape and foreshore, including heritage listing reserves and the numerous state and local heritage listed buildings”.</i></p> <p><i>The HIS discusses in detail the heritage impact of the proposed LED signs on proximate heritage items and conservation areas.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed signs on the Church Street bridge have minimal detrimental visual impact on the Hunters Hill Hotel (1479), a heritage item of local significance.</i></p> <p><i>The signs are proposed to be placed at an oblique angle to the building in line with the upper bar of the present railing. Furthermore, roadside plantings in Joubert Street. opposite the hotel, screen views to and from the subject site.</i></p> <p><i>A visual analysis was undertaken in the HIS to assess the impacts of the proposed signs on proximate heritage items. The analysis found there was minimal visual impact...</i></p> <p><i>As requested by the Department, JCDecaux on behalf of TfNSW has consulted with the Council to understand the issues raised in its submission and where possible mitigate or eliminate Council’s concerns. The RtS addresses Council’s issues as they are understood by the Applicant.</i></p>
B2	<p>2. <i>Since the overpass bridge and Burns Bay Road are appurtenant structures and part of the "way" associated with the State Heritage Register (SHR) listed Gladesville Bridge, the impacts on the setting of this item are detrimental. Despite the fact that the signs will not be within the SHR curtilage of the Bridge and indicated on State Heritage Register Plan 2625, they will nonetheless be visibly intrusive within the setting of the State Heritage listed Gladesville Bridge.</i></p>	<p><i>The heritage advice also confirms that the proposed signs are acceptable from a heritage perspective as detailed below in the extract from the report provided by Urbis:</i></p> <p><i>...As the Council affirms in its submission, the subject site is distant from the SHR listed Gladesville Bridge (Listing Number 01935). The Church Street overpass is also distant from the northern boundary of the defined curtilage of the SHR. (See Figure 1). The Statement of Significance for</i></p>

Ref.	Agency and issues raised	Response
		<p><i>Gladesville Bridge makes no reference to the appurtenant structures and roadways and are not included as part of the curtilage.</i></p> <p><i>There is no sight line from the identified northern boundary of the curtilage of the SHR item to the subject site. There is no view of the outward bound (south) side of the Church Street bridge approach along the Burns Bay Road on the outward run until Tarban Creek Bridge.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed signage on the Church Street bridge will have no detrimental impact on the heritage significance of the SHR item and its curtilage and setting.</i></p> <p><i>As the Gladesville Bridge, an SHR item, is some distance from the subject site this was not included in the HIS....</i></p> <p><i>The supplementary heritage advice in <b>Appendix D</b> includes Figure 1 to demonstrate the State Heritage Register Curtilage for the Gladesville Bridge and the proximate heritage items, heritage conservation and landscape conservation area. The Figure shows the Gladesville Bridge is some distance from the subject site.</i></p>
B3	<p><i>3. The LED signs will intrude into views to and from the Gladesville Bridge when travelling along Burns Bay Road in both southbound and northbound directions and will have adverse impacts on the setting of the Bridge and the associated way. In this regard, the "...historical and contemporary relationships..." with the bridge and "... views to and from.. ." the bridge will suffer adverse setting impacts.</i></p>	<p>The comments provided on behalf of the Heritage Council of NSW advises:</p> <p><i>...The signs proposed for either side of the Church Street overpass are not considered to have any adverse impact on the identified State values of the Gladesville Bridge as they would be too distant, except potentially in glimpses when travelling across the bridge, to generate a negative visual impact</i></p> <p><i>Similarly, the cultural landscape of The Priory is separated from the Church Street overpass and the identified values are unlikely to be impacted by the proposed signs. Whilst the signs may be partially visible from some parts of the curtilage, they will not obstruct significant views to important elements within the SHR curtilage.</i></p> <p><i>The signs would have no physical impacts on either SHR items in the vicinity...</i></p>

Ref.	Agency and issues raised	Response
		<p>The Applicant's heritage advice (<b>Attachment D</b>) also confirms that the proposed signs are acceptable from a heritage perspective as detailed in the relevant extract below:</p> <p><i>...There are only distant views to and from the Gladesville Bridge an SHR item and the proposed signage.</i></p>
B4	<p>4. <i>It is considered that the proposal is contrary to Regulation 17(3)(a) of SEPP No.64 - Advertising and Signage in that the proposal is not acceptable in terms of its impacts not being compatible with the amenity and visual character of the surrounding area and, hence, is not permitted in this location.</i></p>	<p>Clause 17 of SEPP 64 applies to advertisements with a display area greater than 20 m<sup>2</sup> or higher than 8 metres above the ground.</p> <p>Sub-clause (3) of clause 17 states that a consent authority must not grant consent to an application to display an advertisement to which this clause applies unless:</p> <p><i>(a) the applicant has provided the consent authority with an impact statement that addresses the assessment criteria in Schedule 1 and the consent authority is satisfied that the proposal is acceptable in terms of its impacts</i></p> <p>The Applicant has provided the consent authority (DPIE) with a SEE that addresses the impacts of the development and provides an assessment against the criteria set out in Schedule 1 of SEPP 64 (refer Section 4.3.1 of the SEE). This included an assessment of the proposal on the character of the surrounding area, views and vistas. The findings of the Schedule 1 assessment found that the proposed digital advertising signs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• are compatible with the existing character of the area (being an established road corridor) and is not expected to have any adverse impacts on the future character of the area</li> <li>• will not obscure or detract from the amenity or visual quality of any special areas</li> <li>• will not compromise important views, dominate the skyline or reduce the quality of vistas</li> <li>• will not protrude above any building, structures or tree canopies and will not protrude above the existing pedestrian safety barriers located on either side of the overpass.</li> </ul>

Ref.	Agency and issues raised	Response
B5	<p>5. <i>The signs are deemed to be and designed to be distracting to motorists using this classified road and may significantly obstruct views of motorists on the Burns Bay Road exit ramps and will distract their attention away from the road as they approach the overpass.</i></p>	<p>The DA was accompanied with a Signage Safety Assessment (SSA) prepared by WSP (Appendix 5 of the SEE) which confirmed that the proposed signage is acceptable on road safety grounds as detailed in the relevant extract detailed below:</p> <p><i>...Stopping Sight Distance (SSD) is defined in the Guide to Road Design, Part 3: Geometric Design (Austroads, 2016) as: 'the distance to enable a normally alert driver, travelling at the design speed on wet pavement, to perceive, react and brake to a stop before reaching a hazard on the road ahead'.</i></p> <p><i>The SSD along Burns Bay Road is derived using a formula prescribed in the Guide to Road Design, Part 3 which uses the posted speed limit of the road, road gradient and other road characteristics. Accordingly, Burns Bay Road's SSD is 103 metres.</i></p> <p><i>No intersections, merge points, pedestrian or cyclist crossings or traffic control devices are located within the 103 metres SSD of the proposed signs location.</i></p> <p><i>The Church Street off-ramps in both directions, start outside the SSD and their respective directional signage are readable prior to the proposed advertising signs being readable. Therefore, the signs wouldn't distract a driver while diverging to these off-ramps.</i></p> <p><i>The signs would not distract a driver from an intersection or emergency vehicle access point given that the proposed signs would not be located within the SSD requirements of any of these features...</i></p>
B6	<p>6. <i>The proposal will effectively remove the non-advertising banners which are currently in high demand for short exposure period opportunity for community groups including schools and Council itself, to promote their own special and regular community based events locally. This impact is likely to lead to their demise as they could afford to commercially advertise with banners and the like.</i></p>	<p>The Applicant is not aware of any approvals for these community signs. Should the application be approved, the Applicant will explore opportunities with Council to use any downtime for the purposes of displaying community messages. In addition, TfNSW has included as part of its public benefit offer for the digital advertising screens to be used for the display of road safety messages for a minimum of 5 per cent of all advertising time and for the signs to be made available for use by TfNSW</p>

Ref.	Agency and issues raised	Response
		in the event of a 'threat to life' emergency (refer the Public Benefit Statement at Appendix 1 of the SEE).
B7	7. <i>The proposed illuminated advertising sign to be placed on the northern side of the Church Street overpass will be detrimental to the amenity of the residents living in the residential flat building on the north eastern corner of Church Street and Durham Street.</i>	<p>A Supplementary VIA has been prepared as part of the RtS for 12 Church Street, Hunters Hill and is included at <b>Attachment C</b>.</p> <p>The VIA undertakes an assessment of the potential visual impacts in the context of SEPP 64 and related Guidelines. The VIA concludes that the proposed sign on the northern elevation of the overpass is unlikely to result in unacceptable visual impacts from 12 Church Street due to the surrounding topography, existing mature vegetation and positioning of the sign.</p> <p>Further, the VIA found that the sign on the southern elevation of the overpass would not be visible from 12 Church Street due to its placement and orientation.</p>
B8	8. <i>The illuminated advertising sign that is proposed to be installed on southern side of the overpass will detrimentally appear in the foreground views to Hunters Hill (Heritage Item No.1479 - the Hunters Hill Hotel), when viewed from Durham Street, which provides pedestrian egress from the nearby Tarban Creek bridge.</i>	<p>The heritage advice prepared to accompany the RtS (refer <b>Attachment D</b>) confirms that the proposed signs are acceptable from a heritage perspective as detailed in the relevant extract below:</p> <p><i>...The Urbis view analysis concludes there is no sight line to the Hunters Hill Hotel (Item 1479) from Durham Street. A visual assessment was undertaken in the preparation of the HIS. Views were examined from the adjoining roads and pedestrian pathways north and south of the Church Street bridge. Mature tree plantings along the Burns Bay Road corridor screen views to and from the subject site.</i></p> <p><i>Urbis assesses there is minimal detrimental visual impact on views of the Hunters Hill Hotel (1479) from the proposed signs ...</i></p>
B9	9. <i>The residents in the existing residential flat building located on the north eastern corner of Church Street and Durham Street will have the 24 hour light from the signs detrimentally affecting their amenity.</i>	The DA was accompanied with a Lighting Assessment Report prepared by Electrolight (Appendix 6 of the SEE) which confirmed that the signs are acceptable from an illumination perspective as detailed in the relevant extract from their report:



Ref.	Agency and issues raised	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>...The proposed signage has been found to comply with all relevant requirements of AS 4282-2019 Control of the Obtrusive Effects of Outdoor Lighting</i></li> <li>• <i>The proposed signage has been found to comply with all the relevant requirements of SEPP 64 Transport Corridor Outdoor Advertising &amp; Signage Guidelines.</i></li> <li>• <i>In complying with the above requirements, the proposed signage should not result in unacceptable glare nor should it adversely impact the safety of pedestrians, residents or vehicular traffic. Additionally, the proposed signage should not cause any reduction in visual amenity to nearby residences or accommodation...</i></li> </ul> <p>The RtS is accompanied by further advice from Electrolight (<b>Attachment E</b>) which confirms that (<b>BOLD</b> our emphasis):</p> <p><i>...The proposed signage complies with the Transport Corridor Outdoor Advertising and Signage Guidelines (SEPP 64) and AS4282 Control of the Obtrusive effects of outdoor lighting. This means that, as defined under the standards, <b>there will not be a reduction in amenity to residential properties or obtrusive glare to motorists which could impact upon traffic safety...</b></i></p>
B10	<p><i>10. The proposal is contrary to the aims of Regional Environmental Plan (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005.</i></p>	<p>The aims of the <i>Sydney Regional Environmental Plan (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005 (SREP)</i> are addressed in <b>Attachment F</b> of this RtS.</p> <p>Consideration of the SREP finds that the proposal is unlikely to be visible from the waterway (Lane Cove River) or impact the efficient operation of Burns Bay Road.</p>
B11	<p><i>11. The Statement of Environmental Effects as prepared for the application, does not properly or adequately address the criteria for formal assessment as set out in Schedule 1 of the State Policy.</i></p>	<p>It is understood that this comment is in relation to Schedule 1 Assessment Criteria under SEPP 64.</p> <p>A detailed assessment of the requirements listed under Schedule 1 of SEPP 64 is provided at Sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.2 of the SEE and within Appendix 4 of the SEE.</p> <p>It is noted that the DPIE has not requested further clarification with regards to the assessment provided in the SEE.</p>

Ref.	Agency and issues raised	Response
B12	<p>12. The proposal would not be in the public interest and will create an undesirable precedent for other such signs over public roads and waterways.</p>	<p>Noted. The SEE outlines the significant public benefits associated with the proposal in accordance with the Guidelines. TfNSW has included as part of its public benefit offer for the digital advertising screens to be used for the display of road safety messages for a minimum of 5 per cent of all advertising time and for the signs to be made available for use by TfNSW in the event of a ‘threat to life’ emergency (refer the Public Benefit Statement at Appendix 1 of the SEE).</p>
B13	<p>B: That prior to any decision being made by the Department in relation to this development application, Council formally seeks the Minister to appoint a design review panel to provide the necessary advice concerning the design quality of the proposed advertisement under clause 16(2) of SEPP No.64 - Advertising and signage.</p>	<p>Noted. The SEE outlines the significant public benefits associated with the proposal in accordance with the Guidelines as detailed in the response to B12 above.</p> <p>As addressed in the SEE, the Minister may appoint a Design Review Panel, however the Applicant considers this is not required in this instance.</p>
<b>C Roads and Maritime Services</b>		
C1	<p>Roads and Maritime has reviewed the development application and would provide concurrence to the proposed advertising signage at the Church Street overpass of Burns Bay Road under Section 138 of the Roads Act 1993 and Clause 18 of State Environmental Planning Policy No. 64 – Advertising and Signage, subject to Department of Planning, Industry and Environment approval and the following requirements being included in the development consent:</p> <p>1. The proposed advertising signage at the Church Street overpass shall be designed to meet Roads and Maritime requirements, and endorsed by a suitably qualified practitioner. The design requirements shall be in accordance with AUSTRROADS and other Australian Codes of Practice. The certified copies of the civil design plans shall be submitted to Roads and Maritime for consideration and approval prior to the release of the Construction Certificate by the Principal Certifying Authority and commencement of road works.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Documents should be submitted to Development.Sydney@rms.nsw.gov.au</p>	<p>It is noted that TfNSW does not object to the proposed advertising signage.</p> <p>The supporting reports submitted with the DA confirm that the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• proposed signs and illumination levels are in accordance with relevant guidelines and standards</li> <li>• proposal will not impact the structural integrity of the overpass</li> <li>• existing vertical clearance from the road will be maintained</li> <li>• existing bridge elements will not be impacted as a result of the proposal.</li> </ul>

Ref.	Agency and issues raised	Response
	<p><i>The developer is required to enter into a Works Authorisation Deed (WAD) for the abovementioned works.</i></p> <p><i>Roads and Maritime fees for administration, plan checking, civil works inspections and project management shall be paid by the developer prior to the commencement of works.</i></p>	
C2	<p>2. <i>A Construction Traffic Management Plan detailing construction vehicle routes, number of trucks, hours of operation, access arrangements and traffic control should be submitted to Council for approval prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate.</i></p>	Noted.
C3	<p>3. <i>A Road Occupancy Licence (ROL) should be obtained from Transport Management Centre for any works that may impact on traffic flows on Burns Bay Road during construction activities. A ROL can be obtained through <a href="https://myrta.com/oplinc2/pages/security/oplincLogin.jsf">https://myrta.com/oplinc2/pages/security/oplincLogin.jsf</a>.</i></p>	Noted.
C4	<p>4. <i>Signage should not compromise structural integrity of the overpass.</i></p>	Noted.
C5	<p>5. <i>Vertical clearance from the road way to the bottom of the bridge must remain the same.</i></p>	Noted.
C6	<p>6. <i>The maintenance of bridge elements including existing railing should not be impacted by the installation of the advertising signage.</i></p>	Noted.
C7	<p>7. <i>The installation of advertising signage on the Church Street Overpass should not interfere with any Roads and Maritime assets.</i></p>	Noted.
C8	<p>8. <i>All works associated with the subject development shall be at no cost to Roads and Maritime.</i></p>	Noted.

Ref.	Agency and issues raised	Response
C9	<p><i>In addition to the above, Roads and Maritime provides the following advisory comments to Department of Planning, Industry and Environment for consideration in its determination of the development application:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Any relevant SEPP 64 assessment criteria, design, road safety and any public benefit test requirements under the Guidelines, the consent authority must be satisfied that the digital sign (if greater than 20m2) meets the attached criteria under section 2.5.8 of the Draft Transport Corridor Advertising and Signage Guidelines August 2014.</i></li> </ol>	<p>The SEE submitted as part of the application and this RtS provides an assessment of the proposal in accordance with the provisions of SEPP 64 (refer Section 4.3.1 of the SEE) and in accordance with the following criteria set out in the Guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land Use Compatibility Criteria for Transport Corridor Advertising (refer Section 4.3.2 of the SEE)</li> <li>Digital Sign Criteria (refer Section 4.3.2 of the SEE)</li> <li>Bridge Sign Criteria (refer Section 4.3.2 of the SEE)</li> <li>Sign Location Criteria (refer Section 5.1 of the SEE)</li> <li>Sign Design and Location Criteria (refer Section 5.1 of the SEE)</li> <li>Luminance Levels for Digital Advertisements Criteria (refer Section 5.2 of the SEE)</li> <li>the public benefit test (refer Section 5.6 of the SEE).</li> </ul> <p>The assessment provided in the SEE and this RtS confirms that the proposed digital advertising signs are consistent with the relevant criteria set out in the Guidelines (listed above) and meets the public benefit test. Further, JCDecaux on behalf of TfNSW has consulted with the Council to understand its issues.</p>
C10	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Signage displays must not contain/use:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Flashing lights.</i></li> <li><i>Animated display, moving parts or simulated movement.</i></li> <li><i>Complex displays that hold a drivers attention beyond “glance appreciation”.</i></li> <li><i>Displays resembling traffic signs or signals, or giving instruction to traffic by using colours and shapes that imitate a prescribed traffic control device or words such as ‘halt’ or ‘stop’.</i></li> <li><i>A method of illumination that distracts or dazzles.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<p>The application does not seek approval for any of the signage display types listed in the RMS’ submission.</p> <p>The Applicant notes this recommended condition.</p>
C11	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>DPIE should ensure that the proposed signage and illumination levels are in accordance with relevant guidelines and standards.</i></li> </ol>	<p>The LIA submitted as part of the application confirms that the digital advertising signs comply with the criteria set out in the Guidelines and will meet the standards set out in AS 4282-2019: <i>Control of the Obtrusive Effects of Outdoor Lighting.</i></p>

Ref.	Agency and issues raised	Response
		The Applicant notes this recommended condition.
C12	4. <i>The signage shall not hinder driver sightlines to critical road infrastructure.</i>	<p>The signage will not hinder driver sightlines to critical road infrastructure. The SSA submitted as part of the application (refer Appendix 5 of the SEE) confirms there are no intersections, crossing, merge points or traffic control devices located within the stopping sight distance of the proposed sign locations.</p> <p>In addition, the SSA states that the proposed signs will not distract drivers from any directional signs, traffic signals, prescribed traffic control devices, regulatory signs or advisory signs and they will not obscure information relating to the road alignment.</p> <p>The SSA concluded that the road environment along Burns Bay Road in proximity to the Church Street bridge presents a low risk environment for the proposed signs.</p> <p>The Applicant notes this recommended condition.</p>
C13	5. <i>All works associated with the subject development shall be at no cost to Roads and Maritime.</i>	The Applicant notes this recommended condition.
<b>D</b>	<b>Heritage NSW</b>	
D1	<p>As delegate of the Heritage Council of NSW, I provide the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The signs proposed for either side of the Church Street overpass are not considered to have any adverse impact on the identified State values of the Gladesville Bridge as they would be too distant, except potentially in glimpses when travelling across the bridge, to generate a negative visual impact.</i></li> </ul>	<p>The comments from Heritage NSW are supported.</p> <p>The Applicant's supporting heritage advice (<b>Attachment D</b>) confirms that the proposed signs are acceptable from a heritage perspective as detailed in the following extract from the heritage report (refer Heritage Response to Item no's 12 and 13):</p> <p><i>Item 12</i>  <i>As the Council affirms in its submission, the subject site is distant from the SHR listed Gladesville Bridge (Listing Number 01935). The Church Street overpass is also distant from the northern boundary of the defined</i></p>
D2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Similarly, the cultural landscape of The Priory is separated from the Church Street overpass and the identified values are unlikely to be</i></li> </ul>	

Ref.	Agency and issues raised	Response
	<p><i>impacted by the proposed signs. Whilst the signs may be partially visible from some parts of the curtilage, they will not obstruct significant views to important elements within the SHR curtilage.</i></p>	<p><i>curtilage of the SHR. (See Figure 1). The Statement of Significance for Gladesville Bridge makes no reference to the appurtenant structures and roadways and are not included as part of the curtilage.</i></p>
D3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The signs would have no physical impacts on either SHR items in the vicinity.</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>There is no sight line from the identified northern boundary of the curtilage of the SHR item to the subject site. There is no view of the outward bound (south) side of the Church Street bridge approach along the Burns Bay Road on the outward run until Tarban Creek Bridge.</i></p>
D4	<p><i>These comments relate to potential impacts to SHR items only. It is noted that the works are partially within a local conservation area and are in the vicinity of a number of local heritage items. The impacts to these items have been considered by Hunter's Hill Council.</i></p>	<p><i>The proposed signage on the Church Street bridge will have no detrimental impact on the heritage significance of the SHR item and its curtilage and setting.</i></p> <p><i>As the Gladesville Bridge, an SHR item, is some distance from the subject site this was not included in the HIS.</i></p> <p><i>Item 13</i>  <i>There are only distant views to and from the Gladesville Bridge an SHR item and the proposed signage.</i></p> <p><i>Statement of Significance: "Gladesville Bridge has state heritage significance as the longest concrete arch span bridge in the world at the time of its completion in 1964 (1000 feet). One of only two of its type in NSW, Gladesville Bridge is considered to be a leading example of technical and engineering achievement on the international stage. An innovative design that set new global standards for design and construction, Gladesville Bridge was one of the first bridges in the world (if not, the first) to utilise computer programming in its construction.</i></p> <p><i>With particular social significance and an important association with a number of internationally acclaimed engineers and engineering firms (including G. Maunsell &amp; Partners and Eugene Freyssinet), Gladesville Bridge is one of the landmark engineering achievements of the world."</i></p> <p><i>As, The Priory, a SHR cultural landscape, is some distance from the subject site this was not included in the HIS... (Heritage Advice provided in Attachment D).</i></p>

## Attachment B

### Response to public submissions (DA 10082)

A total of 23 public submissions were received on the application including one submission from an organisation (the Hunters Hill Trust). The issues raised in the submissions are addressed in the table below.

Ref.	Issues raised	Response
<b>A</b>	<b>Public submissions</b>	
A1	<p><i>I do not believe this LED billboard is in keeping with Hunters Hill as a historic village. The Hunters Hill council does not allow advertising to ensure the integrity of the suburb and this would be contrary to that vision.</i></p> <p><i>This would also affect residents who live close to the billboard.</i></p>	<p>The proposed advertising signage was developed in consultation with TfNSW, town planners and advice from heritage and lighting consultants to ensure the design is respectful to the heritage values and character of Hunters Hill.</p> <p>The heritage advice accompanying the RtS (<b>Attachment D</b>) confirms that (<b>BOLD our emphasis</b>):</p> <p><i>The subject signs will have <b>negligible impact</b> on the established character of Hunters Hill. The Church Street bridge and Burns Bay Road form part of the road corridor within the locality. The proposed signs <b>do not alter the heritage significance</b> of the Hunters Hill Village.</i></p> <p><i>The signs are screened by trees and not visible from the residential sections of the area.</i></p>
A2	<p><i>The church street overpass is linked to two major traffic merging zones within 100 metres of the bridge. I am concerned that large digital marketing signs will distract drivers from the difficult merging traffic situation ahead of them</i></p> <p><i>What research and studies have Transport for NSW performed to show that the suggested signage will not increase the possibility of multiple vehicle accidents? Further information is required for the residents to be comfortable that you are not increasing the possibility of injury or fatality</i></p>	<p>The road safety advice confirms that the signage will not distract drivers and is appropriate for the site.</p> <p>The DA was accompanied with a SSA prepared by WSP (Appendix 5 of the SEE) confirms that:</p> <p><b>3.2.3 PROXIMITY TO DECISION MAKING POINTS AND CONFLICT POINTS</b></p> <p><b>a. The sign should not be located:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. less than the safe sight distance from an intersection, merge point, exit ramp, traffic control signal or sharp curves</b></li> </ul>

Ref.	Issues raised	Response
		<p>ii. less than the safe stopping sight distance from a marked foot crossing, pedestrian crossing, pedestrian refuge, cycle crossing, cycleway facility or hazard within the road environment</p> <p>iii. so that it is visible from the stem of a T-intersection.</p> <p>Stopping Sight Distance (SSD) is defined in the Guide to Road Design, Part 3: Geometric Design (Austroads, 2016) as: 'the distance to enable a normally alert driver, travelling at the design speed on wet pavement, to perceive, react and brake to a stop before reaching a hazard on the road ahead'</p> <p>The SSD along Burns Bay Road is derived using a formula prescribed in the Guide to Road Design, Part 3 which uses the posted speed limit of the road, road gradient and other road characteristics. Accordingly, Burns Bay Road's SSD is 103 metres.</p> <p>No intersections, merge points, pedestrian or cyclist crossings or traffic control devices are located within the 103 metres SSD of the proposed sign location.</p> <p>The Church Street off-ramps in both directions, start outside the SSD and their respective directional signage are readable prior to the proposed advertising signs being readable. Therefore, the sign wouldn't distract a driver while diverging to these off-ramps.</p> <p>The Road Safety Assessment Report (Appendix 5 of the SEE) also considered previously recorded traffic incidents provided by the then RMS between 1 July 2013 and 30 June 2018, concluding that the proposal is acceptable on traffic safety grounds:</p> <p>The SSA has relied upon historical crash data supplied by RMS. Two road accidents were recorded along Burns Bay Road close to the Church Street overpass during the 5 year period between 1 July 2013 and 30 June 2018. These included a non-casualty (towaway) incident and a collision between a motorcycle and a car (injury).</p>



Ref.	Issues raised	Response
		<p><i>The proposed signs will be positioned above the northbound and southbound traffic lanes and therefore drivers will not need to turn away from their direct line-of-sight to view the full extent of the signs. Further, there are no intersections, crossings, merge points or critical traffic control devices located within the readable distances of the signs.</i></p> <p><i>The SSA concludes that the locality presents a low risk environment for the proposed digital advertising signs and is acceptable on road safety grounds...</i></p>
A3	<p><i>Submission re DA 10082: Installation of digital advertising signage on the Church St overpass at Hunters Hill:</i></p> <p><i>I object to the proposed installation of commercial LED billboards on the Hunters Hill overpass for the following reasons:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• The concept of using public roads for commercial advertising is objectionable. The proposed signage would create a precedent for the installation of commercial advertising on other suburban roads.</i></li> <li><i>• I object to any change likely to decrease road safety by distracting drivers' attention from the roadway. Item 2.5 of the Signage Safety Assessment (JCDECAUX, dated Sept 2019) shows that there have been few crashes (two in five years) on this stretch of road. But the very intent of billboards is to attract the attention of drivers away from the roadway. It is stated that these large (12.5m x 3.3m), brightly lit signs will change their display every ten seconds, and will be visible to drivers from 250m away. Thus, travelling at the speed limit of 70km/h, they will be visible for 13 seconds (longer for slower traffic), meaning they will change at least once in the view of every driver. Given this distraction, it seems inevitable that the signs will increase the incidence of motor vehicle crashes.</i></li> <li><i>• Drivers using the UP ramps, in either direction, will be especially distracted as they see the screens at increasingly acute angles.</i></li> </ul>	<p>The proposed advertising signage is permitted within the road corridor. The road safety assessment confirms the proposed signage will not distract drivers and is appropriate for the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed advertising signage is permissible within the road corridor under Clause 16(1)(b)(ii) of SEPP 64.</li> <li>• JCDecaux on behalf of TfNSW has consulted with the Council to understand its issues. The proposed public benefits of the proposal are outlined at Section 5.6 and Appendix 1 of the SEE.</li> <li>• The Road Safety Assessment Report (Appendix 5 of the SEE) considered the previously recorded traffic incidents provided by the RMS between 1 July 2013 and 30 June 2018. Refer to the response provided to A2 with regards to the traffic incidents.</li> <li>• The supplementary lighting impact assessment provided as part of this RtS, prepared by Electrolight (<b>Attachment E</b>) confirms that:</li> </ul> <p><i>The proposed signage complies with the Transport Corridor Outdoor Advertising and Signage Guidelines (SEPP 64) and AS4282 Control of the Obtrusive effects of outdoor lighting. This means that, as defined under the standards, there will not be a reduction in amenity to residential properties or obtrusive glare to motorists which could impact upon traffic safety.</i></p>

Ref.	Issues raised	Response
	<p><i>This would further endanger the many school students and other pedestrians who cross the UP ramps walking to or from the overpass.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>I object to the intrusion these bright, ever-changing lights would impose on those residents who overlook the overpass.</i></li> <li>• <i>As a member of an organisation devoted to preserving the heritage of Hunters Hill, I object to the disruption of the aesthetic appeal of the Gladesville, Tarban Creek and Fig Tree Bridges, shared by drivers travelling this route, and the crass ugliness of illuminated commercial billboards.</i></li> <li>• <i>More particularly, I object to the installation of commercial signage within the Hunters Hill General Conservation Area.</i></li> <li>• <i>I note that there is no proposed benefit to the residents of Hunters Hill or to motorists (apart from the 5% of time the signs will display RMS information) from the operation of these signs.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Thank you for the opportunity to submit this objection.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heritage NSW and the Applicant's heritage advice (<b>Attachment D</b>) confirms that there will be no impacts upon the surrounding heritage items or conservation areas.</li> </ul>
A4	<p><i>I strongly object to the erection of LED advertising boards in Hunters Hill. This will create an eyesore and will destroy the historic value of hunters hill. I object to the commercialisation of public space. Hunters hill should be maintained as a historic village - a peaceful tree lined sanctuary for its residents. Residents should be entitled to escape the gross commercialism of modern life and not have intruding into their home community. This would completely change the look and feel of the peninsula. And it would be an unsafe distraction to motorists. I object in the strongest terms.</i></p>	<p>The proposed advertising signage was developed in consultation with TfNSW, town planners and advice from heritage and lighting consultants to ensure the design is respectful to the heritage values and character of Hunters Hill.</p> <p>The supplementary heritage advice accompanying the RtS (<b>Attachment D</b>) confirms that the proposed signs are acceptable on heritage grounds:</p> <p><i>The Church Street bridge is not a heritage item. The proposed signs are located on a major road corridor within the Hunters Hill HCA.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed location of signage is on the Church Street bridge above the Burns Bay Road corridor. The Church Street bridge forms the southern boundary of the Hunters Hill Conservation Area No 1 – The Peninsula (C1). The site adjoins the Figtree Subdivision, DP 988 (C450).</i></p> <p><i>A visual assessment was undertaken in the HIS. It was determined the tree-lined verge along the Burns Bay Road corridor screens views to and</i></p>

Ref.	Issues raised	Response
		<p>from the subject signage. Existing views to and from the conservation areas and proximate heritage items are retained.</p>
A5	<p><i>I object to the above proposal to install digital advertising signage on the ballustrading of the overpass bridge at Hunters Hill on the grounds of safety. It poses a distraction to motorists approaching and passing under the bridge and extra danger to the already busy passage of traffic entering the two up ramps at either end of the bridge. There is already great concern for the safety of Hunters Hill School students who must daily use this bridge going to and returning from school. Many elderly residents of Hunters Hill also use the bridge on foot, as well as mothers with young children. If it is dangerous to be distracted by mobile phones so it is to be distracted by external factors designed precisely to distract!</i></p>	<p>The road safety advice confirms that the proposed advertising signage will not distract drivers and is appropriate for the site.</p> <p>The road safety advice (SSA) accompanying the SEE (Appendix 5) confirms that the signs are acceptable with regards to road safety:</p> <p><i>The SSA has relied upon historical crash data supplied by RMS. Two road accidents were recorded along Burns Bay Road close to the Church Street overpass during the 5 year period between 1 July 2013 and 30 June 2018. These included a non-casualty (towaway) incident and a collision between a motorcycle and a car (injury).</i></p> <p><i>The proposed signs will be positioned above the northbound and southbound traffic lanes and therefore drivers will not need to turn away from their direct line-of-sight to view the full extent of the signs. Further, there are no intersections, crossings, merge points or critical traffic control devices located within the readable distances of the signs.</i></p> <p><i>The SSA concludes that the locality presents a low risk environment for the proposed digital advertising signs and is acceptable on road safety grounds.</i></p>
A6	<p><i>I object to the LED billboard proposed to be put on Church Street bridge - Hunters Hill states it is a heritage leafy suburb and has a low key image - this billboard flies in the face of this image/reputation which is what the residents are proud of.</i></p>	<p>The proposed advertising signage was developed in consultation with TfNSW, town planners and advice from heritage and lighting consultants to ensure the design is respectful to the heritage values and character of Hunters Hill.</p> <p>Refer to the response provided to Item No A4 which addresses heritage impacts.</p>
A7	<p><i>I strongly object to the proposed installation of commercial LED billboards on the Hunters Hill overpass.</i></p>	<p>The road safety advice confirms that the proposed advertising signage will not distract drivers and is appropriate for the site.</p>

Ref.	Issues raised	Response
	<p><i>This ill-conceived project will inevitably be a distraction for pedestrians and cars alike and could cause real danger for everyone using this stretch of an already complicated overpass.</i></p> <p><i>It will decrease road safety by distracting drivers' attention which is obviously its aim and will inevitably increase the likelihood of crashes with potentially tragic consequences.</i></p> <p><i>Drivers using the ramps, in either direction, will also be distracted which could pose a threat to the many schoolchildren who daily cross these ramps.</i></p> <p><i>I object to the intrusion of bright, ever-changing lights in a Conservation Area and the blight it will cause on the current tranquil view of treetops and Riverview College.</i></p> <p><i>There is no benefit to the residents of Hunters Hill in this crass money-making exercise which could have terrible consequences.</i></p> <p><i>Please ensure this project does not go ahead.</i></p>	<p>The proposed advertising signage was developed in consultation with TfNSW, town planners and advice from heritage and lighting consultants to ensure the design is respectful to the heritage values and character of Hunters Hill.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The road safety advice (SSA) accompanying the SEE (Appendix 5) confirms that the signs are acceptable in terms of road safety: <p><i>The SSA has relied upon historical crash data supplied by RMS. Two road accidents were recorded along Burns Bay Road close to the Church Street overpass during the 5 year period between 1 July 2013 and 30 June 2018. These included a non-casualty (towaway) incident and a collision between a motorcycle and a car (injury).</i></p> <p><i>The proposed signs will be positioned above the northbound and southbound traffic lanes and therefore drivers will not need to turn away from their direct line-of-sight to view the full extent of the signs. Further, there are no intersections, crossings, merge points or critical traffic control devices located within the readable distances of the signs.</i></p> <p><i>The SSA concludes that the locality presents a low risk environment for the proposed digital advertising signs and is acceptable on road safety grounds.</i></p> </li> <li>The lighting advice accompanying the RtS (<b>Attachment E</b>) confirms the signs are acceptable in terms of lighting impacts: <p><i>The proposed signage complies with the Transport Corridor Outdoor Advertising and Signage Guidelines (SEPP 64) and AS4282 Control of the Obtrusive effects of outdoor lighting. This means that, as defined under the standards, there will not be a reduction in amenity to residential properties or obtrusive glare to motorists which could impact upon traffic safety.</i></p> </li> <li>The Heritage advice accompanying the RtS (<b>Attachment D</b>) confirms:</li> </ul>

Ref.	Issues raised	Response
		<p><i>There are no views to and from Riverview College and the subject signage.</i></p>
A8	<p><i>I am not in favour of a large LED light advertising board. Should it get through I strongly oppose night time advertising</i></p>	<p>The advice from the Applicant's lighting consultant confirms that the proposed advertising signage will not reduce the amenity of residential properties.</p> <p>The supplementary lighting impact assessment provided as part of this RtS, prepared by Electrolight (<b>Attachment E</b>) confirms that:</p> <p><i>The proposed signage complies with the Transport Corridor Outdoor Advertising and Signage Guidelines (SEPP 64) and AS4282 Control of the Obtrusive effects of outdoor lighting. This means that, as defined under the standards, there will not be a reduction in amenity to residential properties or obtrusive glare to motorists which could impact upon traffic safety.</i></p>
A9	<p><i>We are the owners of Unit 7, 12 Church St Hunters Hill located within approximately 70 metres of the proposed electronic signage. Our unit is on the second level of the block and has three west facing windows that will be directly impacted by the intense light emitted by this LED signage located on the northern railing of the Church St overpass. In particular, we object to the proposed signage on the following grounds.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• The bright light will have a direct impact on the occupant's quality of life due to the intrusion of the light during hours in which one may normally be trying to sleep.</i></li> <li><i>• Because of the position of our unit with respect to the proposed signage, and the effect that it will have as indicated above, we believe it will reduce the value of our property.</i></li> <li><i>• This bright and changing signage, placed above the normal line of sight of a driver on a VERY busy major road, will be a major distraction to drivers and hence has the potential to lead to serious road accidents.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Notwithstanding the above objections, should the signage be approved it should be restricted for use during daylight hours.</i></p>	<p>The advice from the Applicant's lighting consultant confirms that the proposed advertising signage will not reduce the amenity of residential properties and in particular 12 Church Street, Hunters Hill.</p> <p>Refer to the response provided to Item No A8 which addresses illumination impacts.</p>

Ref.	Issues raised	Response
A10	<p><i>My wife, Gillian, and I are totally opposed to the proposed illuminated signage on the Hunters Hill overpass.</i></p>	<p>The advice from the Applicant's lighting consultant confirms that the proposed advertising signage will not reduce the amenity of residential properties or impact upon traffic safety.</p> <p>Refer to the response provided to Item No A8 which addresses illumination impacts.</p>
A11	<p><i>I object to the installation of the electronic signage as this interchange is already congested in all directions and to have a large sign bombarding us with useless advertising would create distraction to drivers and pedestrians. I already flirt with death every time I try and cross the road. I think these signs should be limited to large highways where the traffic is always moving and you don't have to think about the traffic ahead.</i></p> <p><i>What an eye sore particularly as I live in a conservation area that I think should be kept this way.</i></p>	<p>The road safety assessment report accompanying the SEE (Appendix 5 of the SEE) confirms that the signs are acceptable in terms of road safety and suitable for the site. The Road Safety Assessment confirms that only one crash has occurred within the readable distance of both signs in the last 5 years. The Applicant's heritage consultant also confirms that the proposed advertising signage will not impact upon the surrounding heritage items or conservation areas.</p> <p><i>...The SSA has relied upon historical crash data supplied by RMS. Two road accidents were recorded along Burns Bay Road close to the Church Street overpass during the 5 year period between 1 July 2013 and 30 June 2018. These included a non-casualty (towaway) incident and a collision between a motorcycle and a car (injury).</i></p> <p><i>The proposed signs will be positioned above the northbound and southbound traffic lanes and therefore drivers will not need to turn away from their direct line-of-sight to view the full extent of the signs. Further, there are no intersections, crossings, merge points or critical traffic control devices located within the readable distances of the signs.</i></p> <p><i>The SSA concludes that the locality presents a low risk environment for the proposed digital advertising signs and is acceptable on road safety grounds...</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage NSW and the Applicant's heritage advice accompanying the RtS (<b>Attachment D</b>) confirms that the proposal will <b>not impact</b> upon the surrounding heritage items and conservation areas. Refer to the response provided to Item No A4 which further addresses heritage impacts.</li> </ul>

Ref.	Issues raised	Response
A12	<p><i>Please find letter attached submitted to Hunters Hill Council from Mr and Mrs Nash. We are lodging on their behalf due to time constraints.</i></p> <p><i>Dear Sir/Madam,</i>  <i>We are writing to object to the proposed installation of digital advertising signage on the Church St overpass at Hunters Hill. We object strongly to this proposal on 2 grounds:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. We believe that signs such as those proposed constitute a serious traffic and pedestrian safety hazard. The site is a complex traffic point and the distraction the proposed signs will cause is very likely to result in regular accidents and would create an undesirable hazard.</i></li> <li><i>2. The proposed signs would be unsightly and degrade the streetscape of a heritage suburb – it would look tack and unsightly.</i></li> </ol>	<p>The road safety advice confirms that the proposed advertising signage will not distract drivers and is appropriate for the site. The Applicant's heritage consultant also confirms that the proposed advertising signage will not impact upon the surrounding heritage items or conservation areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SSA submitted with the DA (Appendix 5 of the SEE) confirms that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>the proposed signs would be positioned above the northbound and southbound traffic lanes and therefore drivers would not need to turn away from their direct line-of-sight to view the full extent of the signs</i></li> <li>• <i>no intersections, crossing, merge points or critical traffic control devices are located within the Stopping Sight Distance (SSD) requirements for the signs</i></li> <li>• <i>two crashes occurred within the readable distance of both signs in the last 5 years</i></li> <li>• <i>the surrounding environment presents a low risk environment for the proposed digital advertising signs.</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• Heritage NSW and the Applicant's heritage advice accompanying the RtS (Attachment D) confirms that the proposal will not impact upon the surrounding heritage items and conservation areas. Refer to the response provided to Item No A4 which further addresses heritage impacts.</li> </ul>
A13	<p><i>I am objecting to the proposed installation of two digital LED illuminated advertising signs on the north and south sides of the Church Street Overpass above Burns Bay Road, Hunters Hill which will operate 24hours a day.</i></p> <p><i>These signs will be a distraction to drivers, especially in the vicinity of entry and exit ramps and visual pollution on a grand scale. They will also prevent local community groups advertising events with their stationary, unlit banners.</i></p>	<p>The road safety advice confirms that the proposed advertising signage will not distract drivers and is appropriate for the site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refer to the response provided to Item No A12 which addresses road safety impacts.</li> <li>• Further, the LIA submitted as part of the application (Appendix 6 of the SEE) confirms: <p><i>The proposed signage complies with the Transport Corridor Outdoor Advertising and Signage Guidelines (SEPP 64) and AS4282 Control of the Obtrusive effects of outdoor lighting. This means that, as defined</i></p> </li> </ul>



Ref.	Issues raised	Response
		<p><i>under the standards, there will not be a reduction in amenity to residential properties or obtrusive glare to motorists which could impact upon traffic safety.</i></p> <p>The Applicant is not aware of any approvals for these community signs. Should the application be granted consent the Applicant will explore opportunities with Council to use any downtime for the purposes of display of community messages.</p>
A14	<p><i>I frequently drive Burns Bay Rd. coming home via Hunter's Hill or coming from Gladesville on my way to Lane Cove. It is a beautiful drive with greenery and water glimpses. This will be ruined by digital billboard advertising and bring down the beauty of the unique Hunter's Hill suburb.</i></p> <p><i>Secondly, driving in peak traffic on Burns Bay Rd. is difficult enough with access and exiting to the turn offs or approaching traffic going to the city. A driver does not need any further distraction looking at advertising on billboards. If you go hard on mobile phone accessing of info. why would you allow distraction when driving?</i></p>	<p>The proposed advertising signage was developed in consultation with TfNSW, town planners and advice from heritage and lighting consultants to ensure the design is respectful to the heritage values and character of Hunters Hill.</p> <p>The road safety advice confirms that the proposed advertising signage will not distract drivers and is appropriate for the site.</p> <p>Refer to the response provided to Item No A12 which addresses road safety impacts.</p>
A15	<p><i>I am the owner of a unit at 12 Church st Hunters Hill. I object to the installation of new digital advertising signs on Church Street overpass, Hunters Hill LGA for the following reasons:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• LED lighting is very very bright and it will make it difficult to sleep. Particularly in the bedroom facing the development.</i></li> <li><i>• The signage will be a distraction to drivers thus increasing the probability of car accidents.</i></li> <li><i>• The signs will be ugly and reduce the ambience and amenity of the Hunters Hill LGA, which is an historic area with a very nice ambience. This kind of sign pollution diminishes the feel and vibe of an area.</i></li> <li><i>• The installation of the signs will reduce the value of my property.</i></li> </ul>	<p>The RtS further considers the visual and illumination impacts on 12 Church Street to ensure the proposal is appropriate for the site.</p> <p><b>Visual impacts</b></p> <p>A supplementary visual impact assessment (VIA) has been prepared for 12 Church Street, Hunters Hill to consider the likely visual impact of the proposed signage on this property. The supplementary VIA concludes that the proposal will have an acceptable visual impact from 12 Church Street, Hunters Hill due to the siting of the signs, the surrounding topography and the existing mature vegetation.</p>



Ref.	Issues raised	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Light pollution affects the migration of birds and Bogong moths and it should be reduced in cities not increased as it has a detrimental effect on the environment.</i></li> <li>• <i>This kind of signage increases the carbon footprint of NSW.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>If the signs are to be installed at all, they should be smaller and not operate across 24 hours. They should only operate during daylight hours. Nor should they be lit with LED lights, so that residents are not as adversely affected as they would be if the development proceeds in its current form. LED lights are way too bright and will reduce the amenity and enjoyment for residents of their properties. Particularly at night.</i></p>	<p><b>Illumination impacts</b></p> <p>The supplementary lighting advice accompanying the RtS (<b>Attachment E</b>) confirms the signs are acceptable in terms of lighting impacts:</p> <p><i>The proposed signage complies with the Transport Corridor Outdoor Advertising and Signage Guidelines (SEPP 64) and AS4282 Control of the Obtrusive effects of outdoor lighting. This means that, as defined under the standards, there will not be a reduction in amenity to residential properties or obtrusive glare to motorists which could impact upon traffic safety.</i></p> <p><b>Road safety impacts</b></p> <p>The road safety advice accompanying the application (Appendix 5 of the SEE) confirms that the signs are acceptable in terms of road safety:</p> <p><i>Stopping Sight Distance (SSD) is defined in the Guide to Road Design, Part 3: Geometric Design (Austroads, 2016) as: ‘the distance to enable a normally alert driver, travelling at the design speed on wet pavement, to perceive, react and brake to a stop before reaching a hazard on the road ahead’</i></p> <p><i>The SSD along Burns Bay Road is derived using a formula prescribed in the Guide to Road Design, Part 3 which uses the posted speed limit of the road, road gradient and other road characteristics. Accordingly, Burns Bay Road’s SSD is 103 metres.</i></p> <p><i>No intersections, merge points, pedestrian or cyclist crossings or traffic control devices are located within the 103 metres SSD of the proposed sign location.</i></p> <p><i>The Church Street off-ramps in both directions, start outside the SSD and their respective directional signage are readable prior to the proposed advertising signs being readable. Therefore, the sign wouldn’t distract a driver while diverging to these off-ramps.</i></p>

Ref.	Issues raised	Response
		<p><b>Other considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage NSW and the Applicant's heritage advice accompanying the RtS (<b>Attachment D</b>) confirms that the proposal will not impact upon the surrounding heritage items and conservation areas.</li> <li>Property values are not a relevant consideration under the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i> (EP&amp;A Act).</li> <li>The proposed signs are to be located within a busy transport road corridor and it is unlikely that the proposed signage would result in adverse impacts upon wildlife.</li> </ul>
A16	<p><i>I am an owner occupier at 5/12 Church St Hunters Hill and have lived here for 20 years. I viewed the SEE documents and strongly object for the following reasons.</i></p> <p><i>The documents have pointed out that No.12 Church St is the property most affected. We will be living in daylight 24/7 and dimming the lights will make no difference. We have bedrooms facing the overpass. Spare a thought for those trying to sleep and the stress this will cause them. Myself included.</i></p> <p><i>These signs are so huge and ugly and spoil the ambience of a historical suburb like Hunters Hill. They will no doubt devalue my home. We will also lose a lot of birds and wild life.</i></p> <p><i>I will finish by saying, please do not allow this to happen.</i></p>	<p>The advice from the Applicant's lighting consultant confirms that the proposed advertising signage will not reduce the amenity of residential properties, in particular 12 Church Street, or impact upon traffic safety.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As discussed in response to Item No A15 above, a VIA has been prepared for 12 Church Street, Hunters Hill to consider the likely visual impact of the proposed signage on this property. The VIA concludes that the proposal will have an acceptable visual impact on the residents of 12 Church Street due to the siting of the signs, the surrounding topography and the existing mature vegetation.</li> <li>Advice from Electrolight accompanying this RtS is provided in <b>Attachment E</b> confirms that:</li> </ul> <p><i>The proposed signage complies with the Transport Corridor Outdoor Advertising and Signage Guidelines (SEPP 64) and AS4282 Control of the Obtrusive effects of outdoor lighting. This means that, as defined under the standards, there will not be a reduction in amenity to residential properties or obtrusive glare to motorists which could impact upon traffic safety.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heritage NSW and the Applicant's heritage advice accompanying the RtS (<b>Attachment D</b>) confirms that the proposal will not impact upon the surrounding heritage items and conservation areas.</li> <li>Property values are not a consideration under the EP&amp;A Act.</li> </ul>

Ref.	Issues raised	Response
A17	<p><i>I would ask that given the areas strong heritage value and character that illuminated signs will not accord with the overall character of a entrance to the peninsula, as this bridge is seen as the mouth of Hunters Hill</i></p>	<p>The Applicant's heritage consultant confirms that the proposed advertising signage will not impact upon the surrounding heritage items or conservation areas.</p> <p>Refer to the response provided to Item No A4 which addresses heritage impacts.</p>
A18	<p><i>I do not agree with the erection of advertising signage in this position, it is in clear contrast with the surrounding area and will be a negative stand out. This is a suburban area with heritage characteristics, not a high rise busy commercial zone where large advertising would be less offensive.</i></p>	<p>The proposed advertising signage is to be located within a busy road corridor. The proposed advertising signage has been developed in consultation with heritage consultants to ensure it is appropriate and sympathetic to the surrounding heritage items and conservation area. The Applicant's heritage consultant confirms that the proposed advertising signage will not impact upon the surrounding heritage items or conservation areas.</p> <p>Refer to the response provided to Item No A4 which addresses heritage impacts.</p>
A19	<p><i>I object to this proposal on 2 grounds:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>I believe that signs such as those proposed constitute a serious traffic and pedestrian safety hazard. The site is a complex traffic point and the distraction the proposed signs will cause is very likely to result in regular accidents and would create an undesirable hazard.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>The proposed signs would be unsightly and degrade the streetscape of a heritage suburb - it would look tacky and unsightly.</i></p>	<p>The road safety advice confirms that the proposed advertising signage will not distract drivers and is appropriate for the site.</p> <p>The proposed advertising signage has been developed in consultation with heritage consultants to ensure it is appropriate and sympathetic to the surrounding heritage items and conservation area.</p> <p>Refer to the response provided to Item No A15 which addresses road safety impacts.</p> <p>Refer to the response provided to Item No A4 which addresses heritage impacts.</p>
A20	<p><i>I am writing to voice my objection to the installation of illuminated advertising signs at the Church Street overpass. I believe this will increase the ambient lighting to an area that is already significantly lit and is likely to disturb the sleep of residents in the area.</i></p> <p><i>I understand the signage will be used for advertising and likely not to be related to safety or community needs. This form of advertising is not</i></p>	<p>The advice from the Applicant's lighting consultant confirms that the proposed advertising signage will not reduce the amenity of residential properties.</p> <p>TfNSW has included as part of its public benefit offer for the digital advertising screens to be used for the display of road safety messages for a minimum of 5 per cent of all advertising time in accordance with the Guidelines and for the signs to be made available for use by TfNSW in the</p>

Ref.	Issues raised	Response
	<i>acceptable and contributes to the visual pollution which is unnecessary given the impact on local residents who reside nearby.</i>	<p>event of a 'threat to life' emergency (refer to the Public Benefit Statement at Appendix 1 of the SEE).</p> <p>Refer to the response provided to Item No A8 which addresses illumination impacts.</p>
A21	<i>Hunters Hill is a historic village with a large proportion of heritage homes and buildings. An illuminated LED billboard does not fit this and would material affect the appeal of the suburb.</i>	<p>The proposed advertising signage has been developed in consultation with heritage consultants to ensure it is appropriate and sympathetic to the surrounding heritage items and conservation area.</p> <p>Refer to the response provided to Item No A4 which addresses heritage impacts.</p>
A22	<i>I do not believe the sign fits with Hunters Hill small suburb and village feel. I strongly disagree to the motion.</i>	<p>The proposed advertising signage has been developed in consultation with heritage consultants to ensure it is appropriate and sympathetic to the surrounding heritage items and conservation area.</p> <p>Burns Bay Road is characterised as a transport corridor. The proposed advertising signage is permissible at the site under clause 16(1)(b)(ii) of SEPP 64.</p> <p>Heritage NSW and the heritage advice accompanying the RtS (<b>Attachment D</b>) confirms that the proposal will not impact upon the surrounding heritage items and conservation areas.</p>
<b>B</b>	<b>Organisation submission - Hunters Hill Trust</b>	
B1	<p><i>The Hunters Hill Trust objects to the proposed installation of commercial LED billboards on the Hunters Hill overpass for the following reasons:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>We object to the concept of using public roads for commercial advertising, and fear that the proposed signage would create a precedent for the installation of commercial advertising on other roads</i></li> </ol>	<p>JCDecaux on behalf of TfNSW has consulted with the Council to understand to its issues.</p> <p>Burns Bay Road is characterised as a busy transport corridor. The proposed advertising signage is permissible within the site via Clause 16(1)(b)(ii) of SEPP 64.</p>

Ref.	Issues raised	Response
B2	<p>2. We object to any change that would tend to decrease road safety by distracting drivers' attention from the roadway. Item 2.5 of the Signage Safety Assessment (JCDECAUX, dated Sept 2019) shows that there have been few crashes (two in five years) on this stretch of road. But the very intent of billboards is to attract the attention of drivers away from the roadway. It is stated that these large (12.5m x 3.3m), brightly lit signs will change their display every ten seconds, and will be visible to drivers from 250m away. Thus, travelling at the speed limit of 70km/h, they will be visible for 13 seconds (longer for slower traffic), meaning they will change at least once in the view of every driver. Given this distraction, it seems inevitable that the signs will increase the incidence of motor vehicle crashes.</p>	<p>The road safety advice confirms that the proposed advertising signage will not distract drivers and is appropriate for the site.</p> <p>The road safety advice accompanying the application (Appendix 5 of the SEE) confirms that the signs are acceptable in terms of road safety:</p> <p><i>Stopping Sight Distance (SSD) is defined in the Guide to Road Design, Part 3: Geometric Design (Austroads, 2016) as:</i></p> <p><i>'the distance to enable a normally alert driver, travelling at the design speed on wet pavement, to perceive, react and brake to a stop before reaching a hazard on the road ahead'</i></p> <p><i>The SSD along Burns Bay Road is derived using a formula prescribed in the Guide to Road Design, Part 3 which uses the posted speed limit of the road, road gradient and other road characteristics. Accordingly, Burns Bay Road's SSD is 103 metres.</i></p> <p><i>No intersections, merge points, pedestrian or cyclist crossings or traffic control devices are located within the 103 metres SSD of the proposed sign location.</i></p> <p><i>The Church Street off-ramps in both directions, start outside the SSD and their respective directional signage are readable prior to the proposed advertising signs being readable. Therefore, the sign wouldn't distract a driver while diverging to these off-ramps.</i></p> <p><i>... the surrounding environment presents a low risk environment for the proposed digital advertising signs.</i></p>
B3	<p>3. Drivers using the UP ramps, in either direction, will be especially distracted as they see the screens at increasingly acute angles. This would endanger the many school students and other pedestrians who cross the UP ramps walking to or from the overpass.</p>	<p>The road safety advice confirms that the proposed advertising signage will not distract drivers and is appropriate for the site.</p> <p>Refer to the response provided to Item No B2 which addresses road safety impacts.</p>
B4	<p>4. We object to the intrusion these bright, ever-changing lights would impose on those residents who overlook the overpass.</p>	<p>The advice from the Applicant's lighting consultant confirms that the proposed advertising signage will not reduce the amenity of residential properties or impact upon traffic safety.</p>

Ref.	Issues raised	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The supplementary lighting impact assessment accompanying the RtS (<b>Attachment E</b>) confirms the signs are acceptable in terms of lighting impacts: <i>The proposed signage complies with the Transport Corridor Outdoor Advertising and Signage Guidelines (SEPP 64) and AS4282 Control of the Obtrusive effects of outdoor lighting. This means that, as defined under the standards, there will not be a reduction in amenity to residential properties or obtrusive glare to motorists which could impact upon traffic safety.</i></li> </ul>
B5	<p>5. <i>As an organisation devoted to preserving the heritage of Hunters Hill, we object to the `mis-match' between the simple beauty of the Gladesville, Tarban Creek and Fig Tree Bridges and their peaceful environment, which is shared by drivers travelling this route, and the crassness of illuminated commercial billboards.</i></p>	<p>The proposed advertising signage has been developed in consultation with heritage consultants to ensure it is appropriate and sympathetic to the surrounding heritage items and conservation area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Heritage advice accompanying the RtS (<b>Attachment D</b>) confirms: <i>The proposed illuminated signs will not detract from the present oblique distant views to the Gladesville, Tarban Creek and Fig Tree Bridges.</i> <i>The proposed signage will have a negligible detrimental impact on existing views.</i></li> </ul>
B6	<p>6. <i>More particularly, we object to the installation of commercial signage within the Hunters Hill General Conservation Area.</i></p>	<p>The proposed advertising signage has been developed in consultation with heritage consultants to ensure it is appropriate and sympathetic to the surrounding heritage items and conservation area.</p> <p>The proposed advertising signage will also be used for the display of road safety messages for a minimum of 5 per cent of all advertising time (<b>Appendix 1 of the SEE</b>).</p> <p>Burns Bay Road is characterised as a transport corridor. The proposed advertising signage is permissible at the site under clause 16(1)(b)(ii) of SEPP 64.</p>

Ref.	Issues raised	Response
B7	<p>7. <i>We note that there is no proposed benefit to the residents of Hunters Hill or to motorists (apart from the 5% of time the signs will display RMS information) from the operation of these signs</i></p>	<p>A Public Benefit Statement prepared by RMS is included as part of the SEE (refer to SEE Appendix 1). The statement confirms that part of the revenue generated by the proposed advertising signs in Hunters Hill will help fund essential RMS services to the benefit of the local community, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the maintenance and repair of existing road infrastructure</li> <li>• the ongoing maintenance of the existing road network</li> <li>• planning and development of future road networks</li> <li>• road safety programs across NSW in conjunction with the Transport for NSW Centre for Road Safety.</li> </ul> <p>TfNSW has included as part of its public benefit offer for the digital advertising screens to be used for the display of road safety messages for a minimum of 5 per cent of all advertising time in accordance with the Guidelines.</p>

## Attachment C

### Supplementary Visual Impact Assessment – 12 Church Street, Hunters Hill

#### Digital Advertising Signage on the Church Street Overpass, Hunters Hill

##### 1. Statement of Environmental Effects

The Statement of Environmental Effects (SEE) submitted as part of the development application included a visual impact assessment at Section 5.4. The assessment considered the visual exposure of the signs from the limited residential catchment located on the eastern side of the Church Street overpass and included 16A to 16D Joubert Street and 12 Church Street, Hunters Hill.

The assessment acknowledged that the advertising sign (on the northern elevation) is likely to only be visible from a limited number of residential properties. On balance, the proposal was assessed as having a negligible impact on the visual amenity of the adjacent residential catchment and will not significantly change the existing visual character of the locality being an established major road corridor.

In summary, the proposal was assessed as having a negligible visual impact on the surrounding area, on the basis that:

- the signs will not extend outside of the structural boundaries of the Church Street overpass (including the existing pedestrian safety barriers) and will, therefore, not obstruct a viewline or any significant scenic views
- the topography that surrounds the site results in the adjacent residential area being situated higher than the road corridor. Therefore, the viewing catchment of the signs is primarily restricted to those within the road corridor
- the steep embankments alongside Burns Bay Road restricts views of the signs from the residential areas surrounding the site
- the presence of mature trees and vegetation along the carriageway of Burns Bay Road and surrounding local roads (including Durham Street, Reiby Road and Joubert Street) further restricts views of the signs from the residential areas surrounding the site.

##### 2. Supplementary Visual Impact Assessment – 12 Church Street, Hunters Hill

The Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE) requested a further visual impact assessment (VIA) in the RtS which considers view impacts of the proposal from 12 Church Street, Hunters Hill.

The Supplementary VIA is based on the following:

- Visual character of the site and surrounding locality
- Visual assessment methodology
- Visual impact analysis – 12 Church Street, Hunters Hill
- Conclusion

To support the Supplementary VIA, a further site inspection was conducted on 4 December 2019. The site inspection involved viewing the sign locations from the Church Street overpass towards 12 Church Street and viewing the sign locations from the relevant boundaries of 12 Church Street, Hunters Hill to the east of the Burns Bay Road corridor.



The site inspection confirmed the sign proposed on the southern elevation will not be visible from 12 Church Street. The site inspection also identified that the proposed sign on the northern elevation will potentially be visible from the residential development at 12 Church Street.

This VIA therefore considers the proposed sign on the northern elevation of the site in relation to 12 Church Street.

## 2.1 Visual character of the site and surrounding locality

The Church Street overpass (the site) travels in an east-west alignment between Durham Street (east) and Joubert Street (west) and extends above Burns Bay Road, Hunters Hill.

The overpass is constructed at a height of approximately 5.8 metres above Burns Bay Road and includes pedestrian rails on either side of the overpass.

The land uses located on either side of the road corridor and in proximity to the site include:

- low and medium density residential development on the eastern side of the road corridor
- mixed uses including the Hunters Hill Hotel and low and medium density residential development on the western side of the road corridor

The existing built form throughout Hunters Hill is predominantly characterised by one and two storey developments. The property at 12 Church Street is located to the east of the site and is bound by Church Street and Durham Street.

A landscaped embankment runs parallel to Burns Bay Road and is located directly east of Durham Street. The landscaped embankment is located directly opposite 12 Church Street. In addition, mature trees and vegetation is present along the eastern side of this section of the Burns Bay Road (Figure 1).

The landscaped embankment steeply slopes from Durham Street up towards Burns Bay Road (Figures 2 & 3). Figure 3 demonstrates the indicative view from the western boundary of 12 Church Street towards the site.



Figure 1: Landscaped embankment and mature trees adjacent to Burns Bay Road (Source: Google maps)



Figure 2: View of landscaped mound from Durham Street (Source: Keylan Consulting)



Figure 3: View towards overpass from 12 Church Street, adjacent to Durham Street (Source: Keylan Consulting)

## 2.2 Visual assessment methodology

The VIA has considered the site's visual exposure from the relevant site boundaries of 12 Church Street, Hunters Hill as requested by the DPIE.

In assessing the impacts on 12 Church Street, the assessment has primarily relied upon the assessment criteria for views and vistas set out in Schedule 1 of *State Environmental Planning Policy No. 64 – Advertising and Signage* (SEPP 64).

The assessment criteria include the following considerations:

- *Does the proposal obscure or compromise important views?*
- *Does the proposal dominate the skyline and reduce the quality of vistas?*
- *Does the proposal respect the viewing rights of other advertisers?*

### 2.3 Visual impact analysis – 12 Church Street, Hunters Hill

The residential development at 12 Church Street, Hunters Hill is the nearest property to the Church Street overpass and is located approximately 35m east of the overpass (Figure 4).



Figure 4: Site plan used to determine visual impacts (Source: Keylan Consulting)

Views of the overpass from within the property will be largely shielded from view, due to the alignment of the existing mature vegetation and the landscaped embankment (Figures 2, 3 and 5).

Consequently, it will not be possible to view the Church Street overpass from within the lower levels of the development at 12 Church Street. However, there is a potential to view the sign on the northern elevation from the second storey (when looking towards the west).

Due to the adjoining sloping topography, 12 Church Street is below the site which assists to minimise opportunities to view the sign from the lower levels of the residential development at 12 Church Street.

Figures 5, 6 and 7 demonstrate that the view towards the sign (northern elevation) from the second storey windows is likely to be partially screened by the existing mature vegetation immediately adjacent to 12 Church Street. The existing mature vegetation is located on either side of the Durham Street and within the landscaped embankment.





Figure 5: View towards 12 Church Street adjacent to Burns Bay Road (Source: Keylan Consulting)



Figure 6: View east from overpass towards 12 Church Street (Source: Keylan Consulting)



Figure 7: View east from overpass towards 12 Church Street (Source: Keylan Consulting)

### 3. Conclusion

The Supplementary VIA provided as part of the RtS has considered views towards the site from 12 Church Street, Hunters Hill.

The VIA was supported by a site inspection that involved viewing the sign locations from the Church Street overpass towards 12 Church Street and viewing the sign locations from the relevant boundaries of 12 Church Street, Hunters Hill to the east of the Burns Bay Road corridor.

In summary, the Supplementary VIA undertaken as part of this RtS supports the original findings outlined in the SEE in that the sign on the northern elevation is found to have a minor visual impact on the residential development at 12 Church Street. These conclusions are made on the basis that:

- the topography that surrounds the site results in 12 Church Street being situated lower than the site. Therefore, the viewing catchment of the sign on the northern elevation is primarily restricted to those located within the Burns Bay Road corridor, with the potential for this sign (northern elevation) to be viewed from the upper storey of the residential development at 12 Church Street
- the presence of mature trees and vegetation, particularly along the eastern side of the Burns Bay Road corridor, assists to shield views of the sign on the northern elevation on the Church Street overpass in its entirety.

Further, the assessment confirms that the proposed digital advertising signs meet the criteria under Schedule 1 of SEPP 64, as:

- the sign will not obscure or compromise any important views as it is attached to the existing pedestrian safety guards currently positioned on the overpass
- the sign will not dominate the skyline or reduce the quality of vistas as they are proposed within an established road corridor, is attached to an existing overpass and is partly obscured from the adjacent residential development by the mature trees and vegetation.

Based on the above analysis, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of any potential view impacts on the residential property at 12 Church Street, Hunters Hill in the context of SEPP 64 and relevant Guidelines.

## Attachment D

### Supplementary Heritage Impact Assessment

#### Digital Advertising Signs on the Church Street Overpass, Hunters Hill

##### Statement of Environmental Effects

The Statement of Environmental Effects (SEE) submitted as part of the application assessed heritage impacts at Section 5.3. The assessment was supported by a Heritage Impact Statement (HIS) prepared by Urbis which considered the potential impacts of the proposal on the surrounding heritage items and conservation areas.

The HIS found that the existing views to the subject site from the HCA and the heritage items are minimal due to screening by established mature tree plantings along the Burns Bay Road corridor and the adjoining streets. The HIS finds that existing views from heritage items located to the north of the overbridge are minimal as they are located within the slopes leading to the Lane Cove River and screened by the steep embankments along the Burns Bay Road corridor.

In summary, the HIS concluded that the proposed signage will not generate any adverse impacts on the heritage significance of the HCA and heritage items in the vicinity due to the siting of the signs.

##### Further heritage impact assessment

The Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE) has requested further assessment which responds to the issues raised in the submissions. The further heritage advice confirms that the proposal will not lead to any unacceptable heritage impacts as detailed in the following relevant extracts from the heritage report (**BOLD** our emphasis):

- *The subject signs will have **negligible impact** on the established character of Hunters Hill. The Church Street bridge and Burns Bay Road form part of the road corridor within the locality. The proposed signs do not alter the heritage significance of the Hunters Hill Village.*
- *The Church Street bridge is not a heritage item. The proposed signs are located on a major road corridor within the Hunters Hill HCA.*

*The proposed location of signage is on the Church Street bridge above the Burns Bay Road corridor. The Church Street bridge forms the southern boundary of the Hunters Hill Conservation Area No 1 – The Peninsula (C1). The site adjoins the Figtree Subdivision, DP 988 (C450).*

*A visual assessment was undertaken in the HIS. It was determined the tree-lined verge along the Burns Bay Road corridor screens views to and from the subject signage. Existing views to and from the conservation areas and proximate heritage items are retained.*

- *As the Council affirms in its submission, the subject site is distant from the SHR listed Gladesville Bridge (Listing Number 01935). The Church Street overpass is also distant from the northern boundary of the defined curtilage of the SHR. (See Figure 1). The Statement of Significance for Gladesville Bridge makes no reference to the appurtenant structures and roadways and are not included as part of the curtilage.*

*There is no sight line from the identified northern boundary of the curtilage of the SHR item to the subject site. There is no view of the outward bound (south) side of the Church Street bridge approach along the Burns Bay Road on the outward run until Tarban Creek Bridge.*

*The proposed signage on the Church Street bridge **will have no detrimental impact on the heritage significance of the SHR item** and its curtilage and setting.*

*As the Gladesville Bridge, an SHR item, is some distance from the subject site this was not included in the HIS.*

## **Attachment E**

### **Supplementary Lighting Impact Assessment**

#### **Digital Advertising Signs on the Church Street Overpass, Hunters Hill**

##### **Statement of Environmental Effects**

The Statement of Environmental Effects (SEE) submitted as part of the application assessed illumination impacts at Section 5.2. The assessment was supported by a Lighting Impact Assessment (LIA) prepared by Electrolight which considered the proposal against the illumination criteria set out under:

- *State Environmental Planning Policy No. 64 – Advertising and Signage (SEPP 64)*
- the Transport Corridor Outdoor Advertising and Signage Guidelines (the Guidelines)
- AS 4282-2019 – Control of the Obtrusive Effects of Outdoor Lighting

The LIA found the signs to be compliant with the relevant criteria set out in SEPP 64, AS 4282-2019 and the Guidelines. Accordingly, the SEE concluded that the proposal will not unreasonably impact on the visual amenity of nearby residences or accommodation.

##### **Further lighting impact assessment**

The Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE) has requested further assessment which responds to the issues raised in the submissions. The advice prepared by Electrolight confirms that the proposal will not lead to any unacceptable illumination impacts to any surrounding residential properties or traffic as detailed in the following relevant extract from the report:

*The proposed signage complies with the Transport Corridor Outdoor Advertising and Signage Guidelines (SEPP 64) and AS4282 Control of the Obtrusive effects of outdoor lighting. This means that, as defined under the standards, there will not be a reduction in amenity to residential properties or obtrusive glare to motorists which could impact upon traffic safety.*



## Attachment F

### Sydney Regional Environmental Plan (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005 Part 1 Clause 2

#### Digital Advertising Signs on the Church Street Overpass, Hunters Hill

An analysis of the proposal against the aims of the *Sydney Regional Environmental Plan (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005* is detailed below:

Aims of Plan	Comments
(1) <i>This plan has the following aims with respect to the Sydney Harbour Catchment:</i>	
<p>(a) <i>to ensure that the catchment, foreshores, waterways and islands of Sydney Harbour are recognized, protected, enhanced and maintained:</i></p> <p>(i) <i>as an outstanding natural asset, and</i></p> <p>(ii) <i>as a public asset of national and heritage significance, for existing and future generations</i></p>	<p>The proposed signage on Church Street overpass is not likely to be visible from Tarban Creek and the Lane Cove River. The existing development, mature vegetation, topography of the land and the physical distance of the sign from the waterways will limit any viewlines.</p> <p>View corridors from Church Street overpass towards the waterways will not be disturbed.</p> <p>The proposed works are minor elements that will not add unacceptable bulk or scale to the Church Street overpass and will not impact upon the character of the locality being a busy road corridor adjacent to mixed use development. The proposal in its current form will comply with <i>clause 25 scenic quality</i> and <i>clause 26 protection of views</i>.</p> <p>The proposal is not anticipated to impact upon the national and heritage significance of the waterways.</p>
<p>(b) <i>to ensure a healthy, sustainable environment on land and water</i></p>	<p>The development site does not contain any threatened or vulnerable species, populations, communities or significant habitats and will comply with <i>clause 21 biodiversity and environmental protection</i>.</p> <p>The proposed signage will be located within a busy road corridor and will not impact upon the operation of healthy sustainable environments on land and water.</p>
<p>(c) <i>to achieve a high quality and ecologically sustainable urban environment</i></p>	<p>The proposed signage will have no ecological implications on the existing urban environment.</p>
<p>(d) <i>to ensure a prosperous working harbour and an effective transport corridor</i></p>	<p>The proposed signage will have no implications on Sydney Harbour to continue to be used as a prosperous working harbour and effective transport corridor.</p>
<p>(e) <i>to encourage a culturally rich and vibrant place for people</i></p>	<p>The proposed signage will not have any adverse impacts on the surrounding heritage items or conservation areas as confirmed by NSW Heritage and the heritage advice provided by the Applicant (<b>Attachment D</b> of the RtS).</p>

<p><i>(f) to ensure accessibility to and along Sydney Harbour and its foreshores</i></p>	<p>The proposed signage will not impact upon accessibility to and along Sydney Harbour and its foreshores as it will see compliance with <i>clause 22 public access to and use of the foreshores and waterways</i>.</p>
<p><i>(g) to ensure the protection, maintenance and rehabilitation of watercourses, wetlands, riparian lands, remnant vegetation and ecological connectivity</i></p>	<p>The signage will be wholly located on the overpass and will not impact upon nearby waterways.</p>