

# Gore Hill Freeway, Artarmon

## Proposed Digital Sign Traffic Safety Assessment

JCDecaux

11 February 2022



**Gold Coast**

Suite 26, 58 Riverwalk Avenue  
Robina QLD 4226  
P: (07) 5562 5377

**Brisbane**

Level 2, 428 Upper Edward Street  
Spring Hill QLD 4000  
P: (07) 3831 4442

**Sydney**

Studio 203, 3 Gladstone Street  
Newtown NSW 2042  
P: (02) 9557 6202

**W:** [www.bitziosconsulting.com.au](http://www.bitziosconsulting.com.au)

**E:** [admin@bitziosconsulting.com.au](mailto:admin@bitziosconsulting.com.au)

*Copyright in the information and data in this document is the property of Bitzios Consulting. This document and its information and data is for the use of the authorised recipient and this document may not be used, copied or reproduced in whole or in part for any purpose other than for which it was supplied by Bitzios Consulting. Bitzios Consulting makes no representation, undertakes no duty and accepts no responsibility to any third party who may use or rely upon this document or its information and data.*

*The assessment team has undertaken assessments of similar digital advertising sign proposals elsewhere in NSW and Australia. In addition to the use of NSW guidelines, our assessments are founded on road safety auditing principles and traffic safety risk assessments. Where a significant change in road safety risk has been identified due to the proposal, potential treatment measures to mitigate the change in risk have been suggested. However, the adoption of any or all the treatment measures does not warrant that the site is absolutely safe from incidents in the future whether they be related or unrelated to the proposed digital sign.*

**Document Issue History**

| Report File Name                                       | Prepared           | Reviewed   | Issued    | Date       | Issued to   |
|--|--------------------|------------|-----------|------------|---|
| P5392.001R Gore Hill Freeway Artarmon Digital Sign TSA | G. Yin / S. Daizli | D. Bitzios | S. Daizli | 23/11/2021 | Timothy Brosnan, JCDecaux<br><a href="mailto:timothy.brosnan@jcdecaux.com">timothy.brosnan@jcdecaux.com</a> |
| P5392.002R Gore Hill Freeway Artarmon Digital Sign TSA | A. Suriono         | S. Daizli  | S. Daizli | 6/12/2021  | Timothy Brosnan, JCDecaux<br><a href="mailto:timothy.brosnan@jcdecaux.com">timothy.brosnan@jcdecaux.com</a> |
| P5392.003R Gore Hill Freeway Artarmon Digital Sign TSA | A. Suriono         | S. Daizli  | S. Daizli | 7/12/2021  | Timothy Brosnan, JCDecaux<br><a href="mailto:timothy.brosnan@jcdecaux.com">timothy.brosnan@jcdecaux.com</a> |
| P5392.004R Gore Hill Freeway Artarmon Digital Sign TSA | S. Daizli          | S. Daizli  | S. Daizli | 11/02/2022 | Timothy Brosnan, JCDecaux<br><a href="mailto:timothy.brosnan@jcdecaux.com">timothy.brosnan@jcdecaux.com</a> |

# CONTENTS

|  | Page      |
|--|-----------|
| <b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>   | <b>1</b>  |
| 1.1 Background   | 1         |
| 1.2 Methodology  | 1         |
| <b>2. SIGN VIEWING LOCATIONS</b>   | <b>2</b>  |
| 2.1 Viewing Approaches   | 2         |
| 2.2 Driver Views   | 3         |
| 2.2.1 Lane Cove Tunnel Exit onto the Gore Hill Freeway                           | 3         |
| 2.2.2 Pacific Highway Eastbound On-ramp to the Gore Hill Freeway                 | 4         |
| <b>3. STATIC AND DIGITAL SIGN SPECIFICATIONS</b>                                 | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>4. LITERATURE REVIEW</b>  | <b>6</b>  |
| 4.1 Context  | 6         |
| 4.2 Relationships between Distraction and Crashes                                | 6         |
| 4.3 Relationships between Digital Sign Glances and Distraction                   | 8         |
| 4.4 The Relationship between Digital Signs and Crashes                           | 10        |
| 4.4.1 International Examples   | 10        |
| 4.4.2 Local Examples   | 11        |
| 4.5 Recent Rulings by the Court  | 14        |
| 4.5.1 Planning and Environment Court of Queensland – Gold Coast                  | 14        |
| 4.5.2 Land and Environment Court of NSW Ruling – Kogarah                         | 14        |
| 4.5.3 Environment, Resources and Development Court of South Australia – Adelaide | 14        |
| 4.6 Research Interpretation  | 15        |
| <b>5. TRAFFIC SAFETY ASSESSMENT</b>  | <b>16</b> |
| 5.1 Key Assumptions  | 16        |
| 5.2 Site Inspections   | 16        |
| 5.3 Review of Crash Data   | 16        |
| 5.4 Approach Sightline Assessments   | 18        |
| 5.4.1 Description of Approaches  | 18        |
| 5.4.2 Driver Sightline Assessment  | 18        |
| 5.5 Compliance Assessment  | 22        |
| 5.5.1 SEPP 64 Schedule 1   | 22        |
| 5.5.2 Transport for NSW Advertising Sign Safety Assessment Matrix                | 22        |
| 5.5.3 Transport Corridor Outdoor Advertising and Signage Guidelines Table 3      | 23        |
| <b>6. CONCLUSIONS</b>  | <b>25</b> |
| <b>REFERENCES</b>  | <b>26</b> |

## Tables

|            |   |
|------------|---|
| Table 3.1: | Specifications and Site Information for the Static and Digital Signs        |
| Table 4.1: | Causes of Vehicle Crashes in NSW and Victoria                               |
| Table 4.2: | Crash Comparison Pre and Post-installation – Constitution Hill (2013-2017)* |
| Table 4.3: | Crash Comparison Pre and Post-installation – Petersham (2013-2017)*         |
| Table 4.4: | Crash Comparison Pre and Post-installation – Milperra (2014-2018)           |
| Table 5.1: | Crash Severity Summary on Approach to the Site (2016-2020)                  |
| Table 5.2: | Approach Attributes – Gore Hill Freeway eastbound                           |
| Table 5.3: | Approach Attributes – Pacific Highway eastbound on-ramp                     |
| Table 5.4: | Assessment against SEPP 64 Schedule 1                                       |
| Table 5.5: | Assessment against the Transport for NSW Advertising Sign Assessment Matrix |
| Table 5.6: | Assessment against the Signage Guidelines Digital Sign Criteria             |

## Figures

|             |   |
|-------------|---|
| Figure 1.1: | Locations of the Existing Static Sign and Proposed Digital Sign   |
| Figure 2.1: | Driver Sightlines to the Sign                                     |
| Figure 2.2: | Daytime view from the Lane Cove Tunnel exit eastbound             |
| Figure 2.3: | Night-time view from the Lane Cove Tunnel exit eastbound          |
| Figure 2.4: | Daytime view from the Pacific Highway eastbound on-ramp           |
| Figure 2.5: | Night-time view from the Pacific Highway eastbound on-ramp        |
| Figure 4.1: | Location of an Existing Digital Sign in Constitution Hill         |
| Figure 4.2: | Location of an Existing Digital Sign in Petersham                 |
| Figure 4.3: | Location of an Existing Digital Sign in Milperra                  |
| Figure 5.1: | In-vehicle sightlines along the Lane Cove Tunnel exit eastbound   |
| Figure 5.2: | In-vehicle sightlines along the Pacific Highway eastbound on-ramp |

## Appendices

|             |                           |
|-------------|---------------------------|
| Appendix A: | Proposed Development Plan |
| Appendix B: | Photo Montages            |
| Appendix C: | Crash Data                |



# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background

JCDecaux is seeking development approval for the installation of a digital LED advertising sign subject to the removal of an existing adjacent static advertising sign. The static sign is located on the northern side of the Gore Hill Freeway and the digital sign will be located on the western elevation of the North Shore rail bridge over the Gore Hill Freeway in Artarmon as shown in Figure 1.1.



\*Sign location is indicative. / Adapted from Nearmap

**Figure 1.1: Locations of the Existing Static Sign and Proposed Digital Sign**

Bitzios Consulting has been engaged by JCDecaux to undertake a traffic safety assessment of the proposal. The proposed development plan is provided in **Appendix A**.

## 1.2 Methodology

The process used to assess the impact of the proposal involved:

- A review of the viewing locations and sightlines to the existing site and hence the proposed digital sign to define the geographical scope of the assessment
- A review of the existing static sign and proposed digital sign specifications
- A review of relevant research and case study examples of the effects of digital signs on driver distraction in different driving circumstances
- Site inspections during day and night conditions to understand the road user's perspective of the sign, then a driver sightline assessment using images captured from in-vehicle video recordings
- A first-principles safety assessment of the proposed digital sign, including reviewing road approaches, driver sightlines, surrounding environment, and proximity of intersections
- A review of the most recently available five years of crash data in proximity to the sign
- An assessment of the proposed digital sign against:
  - State Environmental Planning Policy No. 64—Advertising and Signage (SEPP 64)
  - The Transport for NSW Advertising Sign Safety Assessment Matrix
  - The *Transport Corridor Outdoor Advertising and Signage Guidelines: Assessing development applications under SEPP 64* (Department of Planning and Environment, November 2017) (Signage Guidelines).

## 2. SIGN VIEWING LOCATIONS

### 2.1 Viewing Approaches

The digital sign will face west towards eastbound drivers exiting the Lane Cove Tunnel onto the Gore Hill Freeway and on the Pacific Highway on-ramp to the Gore Hill Freeway. The driver sightlines to the sign from this approach are illustrated in Figure 2.1.



*\*Sign location is indicative.  
Adapted from Nearmap*

**Figure 2.1:** Driver Sightlines to the Sign



## 2.2 Driver Views


### 2.2.1 Lane Cove Tunnel Exit onto the Gore Hill Freeway

The eastbound sign views from the Lane Cove Tunnel exit onto the Gore Hill Freeway during the day and night-time periods are shown in Figure 2.2 and Figure 2.3 respectively.



*\*Sign location is indicative, not to scale and for illustration purposes only.*

**Figure 2.2:** Daytime view from the Lane Cove Tunnel exit eastbound



*\*Sign location is indicative, not to scale and for illustration purposes only.*

**Figure 2.3:** Night-time view from the Lane Cove Tunnel exit eastbound

### 2.2.2 Pacific Highway Eastbound On-ramp to the Gore Hill Freeway

The eastbound sign views from the Pacific Highway eastbound on-ramp to the Gore Hill Freeway during the day and night-time periods are shown in Figure 2.4 and Figure 2.5 respectively.



*\*Sign location is indicative, not to scale and for illustration purposes only.  
Source: Google Street View (December 2020)*

**Figure 2.4:** Daytime view from the Pacific Highway eastbound on-ramp



*\*Sign location is indicative, not to scale and for illustration purposes only.*

**Figure 2.5:** Night-time view from the Pacific Highway eastbound on-ramp



### 3. STATIC AND DIGITAL SIGN SPECIFICATIONS

The specifications for the existing static sign and the proposed digital sign, as well as other relevant site information, are summarised in Table 3.1.

**Table 3.1: Specifications and Site Information for the Static and Digital Signs**

| Attribute   | Details  |
|---|--|
| Location  | Western elevation of the North Shore rail bridge over the Gore Hill Freeway, Artarmon, NSW |
| Local Government Area (LGA)   | Willoughby   |
| Land use zoning   | SP2 Infrastructure   |
| Existing and proposed facing direction  | West   |
| Existing type of advertisement/sign   | Freestanding advertisement – supersite   |
| Proposed type of advertisement/sign   | Bridge advertisement – supersite   |
| Existing display format   | Externally illuminated general advertising   |
| Proposed display format   | Internally illuminated digital (LED)   |
| Existing visual screen size   | 12.66m x 3.35m = 42.41m <sup>2</sup>   |
| Proposed visual screen size   | 12.48m x 3.20m = 39.94m <sup>2</sup>   |
| Proposed advertising display area   | 12.53m x 3.75m = 47.00m <sup>2</sup>   |
| Visual screen size greater than 20m <sup>2</sup> ?  | Yes  |
| Visual screen size greater than 45m <sup>2</sup> ?  | No   |
| Minimum vertical pavement clearance   | 5.8m   |
| Structure higher than 8m above the ground?  | No   |
| Is the site located within 250m of and visible from a classified road under the <i>Roads Act 1993</i> ? | Yes  |
| Consent authority   | NSW Minister for Planning and Public Spaces  |
| Does the sign contain moving parts?   | No   |
| Is it a Variable Message Sign?  | No   |
| Does it have any flashing or flickering content?  | No   |

## 4. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 4.1 Context

Crashes directly related to digital signs would typically fall into two categories:

- Crashes due to the collision of a vehicle with the mounting structure of a digital sign where the sign is placed in a location where there is a reasonable risk of this occurring
- Crashes which occur as a consequence of a driver being distracted by a digital sign.

The available *Digital Signage Guidelines* generally provide well-researched information on the location of 'clear zones' and other areas where there is a reasonable risk of an object being collided with by an errant vehicle. The linkages between driver distraction due to digital signs and crashes is less well dealt with in the available *Digital Signage Guidelines* and many of the criteria used have no direct relevance of the risk of distraction in time and in space on approach to digital signs located in different parts of the visual driving environment and in different driving environments.

The chain of events that is required to link a digital sign to increased crash rates is that:

- *A driver is aware of an external event (i.e. outside the vehicle) which is a digital sign display change and that the event distracts a driver sufficiently to lead to involuntary driver inattention which then leads to driver error at a critical time in a driving environment and driving circumstance that leads to a crash.*

As there is no body of research that links the installation of a digital sign or the conversion of a static sign to a digital sign to increased crash rates, the available research has been disaggregated into:

- The relationship between distractions (generally) and crashes
- The relationship between digital signs and distractions
- Studies which have attempted to interpret before v after installation crash statistics to see if there is a correlation of digital signs with crash rates (without defining a causal relationship).

Research on each of these topics is summarised below.

### 4.2 Relationships between Distraction and Crashes

It is important to note that distraction from digital or static billboards did not feature in the top 15 causes of driver distraction. As such, this data further validates the research consensus that there is no valid link between roadside advertising and increased crash risk. There is consensus in the literature that the majority of crashes which occur in urban areas are due to driver error. Victor et al. (2005) highlights that human error is the cause of up to 92.6 percent of accidents on the road. In order to minimise the risk of crashes drivers need to: be aware of external environmental influences, interpret the risks associated with these external environmental influences, make decisions, and carry out actions (Perez & Bertola 2011).

Even though human error is the cause of most crashes, Lam (2002) reviewed NSW crash data and found that out of 414,136 crashes, distraction was a factor in 15,059 (3.6%) of them. Distractions coming from outside the vehicle were determined to be a factor in only 2.5% of all crashes. This low influence of external distractions to crashes was reinforced by the Monash University Accident Research Centre (MUARC) carried out a study on crashes in Victoria and NSW between 2000 and 2011 and found the most common causes of crashes as summarised in Table 4.1. The most common cause of crashes was a combination of driver inattention and driver distraction. Distraction and inattention may occur separately. That is, a driver may be distracted but still attentive.

**Table 4.1: Causes of Vehicle Crashes in NSW and Victoria**

| Percentage of Crashes | Cause                       |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| 13.5%                 | Intoxication                |
| 11.8%                 | Fell asleep                 |
| 10.9%                 | Fatigued                    |
| 3.2%                  | Failed to look              |
| 3.2%                  | Passenger interaction       |
| 2.6%                  | Fell ill                    |
| 2.6%                  | Blacked out                 |
| 1.8%                  | Feeling stressed            |
| 1.5%                  | Looked but failed to see    |
| 1.4%                  | Animal or insect in vehicle |
| 0.9%                  | Using a mobile phone        |
| 0.9%                  | Changing CD/cassette/radio  |
| 0.9%                  | Adjusting vehicle systems   |
| 0.9%                  | Looking at vehicle systems  |
| 0.3%                  | Searching for objects       |

Source: <http://www.keepyoureyesontheroad.org.au/pages/Accident-statistics-Cont>

Austroads (2013) provides a comprehensive review of research on the effect of roadside advertising on road crashes. It found from its extensive literature review that *“while looking at an external object appears to be quite risky behaviour when it is engaged in, it is not a frequent cause of crashes overall”*.

Many studies have been undertaken to determine the main causes of both driver distraction and driver inattention, and how they contribute to an increase in crashes. Regan et al. (2011, p.1771) describes driver distraction as a *“diversion of the mind, attention, etc., from a particular object or course; the fact of having one’s attention or concentration disturbed by something”*. This includes objects brought into the vehicle, vehicle systems, vehicle occupants, moving objects or animals in the vehicle, internalised activity, and external objects, events or activities (Perez & Bertola 2011). A broader definition of driver inattention is defined as *“when the driver’s mind has wandered from the driving task for some non-compelling reason”* (Regan et al. 2011, p.1772).



### 4.3 Relationships between Digital Sign Glances and Distraction

Samsa (2015) conducted a study that used eye tracking technology to track participant's natural eye movements and prioritisation behaviour whilst driving. Several number of participants were each instructed to drive a single loop of the study route (14.6km section of a road through Brisbane and its surrounding suburbs to Woolloongabba) between 11am and 2pm. This study found that participants prioritised tasks based on the complexity of the driving demands, which was particularly evident during heavy traffic in AM and PM peak hours. The research found that in demanding driving environments, drivers will prioritise focussing on "on-road" factors such as the rate of cars braking and on pedestrian and cyclist movements over off-road factors such as billboards. Moreover, Samsa (2015) found no significant difference in driver prioritisation when comparing static billboards, digital billboards and on-premises signs. This research concluded that there is a smaller chance of driver distraction from digital billboards whilst driving in demanding environments.

The Samsa (2015) finding supported the US Department of Transport and Federal Highway Administration research (2012) which found that drivers look at the forward roadway between 73% and 85% of the time depending on the demands of the driving task. This study also found that where billboards are introduced, drivers may substitute saccades / glance fixations from other things towards billboard glances but the percentage of time fixating on the forward roadway is consistent.

Victor et al. (2005) revealed similar results when they undertook a much larger study that examined eye glance movement on the road during both light and heavy traffic flows. Data was collected via the EU project HASTE, which used "in vehicle information systems" (S-IVIS). Data was sourced from 119 participants across three separate experiments, from four separate driving routes. The study included an examination of auditory and visual tasks to test driver glance behaviour. The results showed that as driving tasks became more difficult, drivers increased their viewing time in the road centre, rather than on other visual tasks (such as observing signs) off-road.

Also, there are general misconceptions that drivers "stare" at digital billboards, that changing messages on digital billboards draw a driver's attention to them and that these influences alone lead to crashes. The literature suggests that instead of "staring" at billboards, drivers "glance" at billboards. The US Department of Transport and Federal Highway Administration (2012) found that the average glance duration to an electronic billboard was 0.335 seconds with a maximum of 1.335 seconds, well below the 2.0-second distraction time threshold that Austroads research (and other research) suggests as the critical time for increased crash risk. Smiley et. al. (2005) found an average glance length of 0.5 seconds for electronic billboards and that viewings of the electronic billboard were undertaken by up to 50% of drivers.

The research of Decker et al. (2015) supported the glance time findings of other studies. This research summarised the results of 8 studies and concluded that the "*range of mean glance durations was 0.27 to 0.953 s (mean, 0.51) for passive billboards and 0.27 to 1.0 s (mean, 0.54) for active billboards*". This research did note "*strong evidence of substantial variability among individual billboards in each category*".

Participant's glance behaviour was recorded and analysed in terms of the number of fixations and the duration of these fixations to both static and digital billboards in the work of Samsa (2015). Out of a total of 144 fixations toward four digital billboards, the average fixation duration was below 0.75 seconds. This is considered to be "*the equivalent minimum-perception reaction time to the slowing of a vehicle ahead*" (Samsa 2015, p.8). Less than 1% of the records presented an average fixation duration of above 0.75 seconds. This average was apparent for both static and digital sign types. Furthermore, Samsa's (2015) results showed that participants that fixated on a digital billboard for longer than 0.75 seconds tended to do so when travelling conditions were relaxed (i.e. car was stationary, or traffic was minimal).

Samsa's (2015) results followed those of Perez and Bertola (2011) which also used eye-tracking technology to survey driver behaviour when glancing to digital billboards. Perez and Bertola (2011) also found that the maximum glance duration off the centre of the road was 0.75 seconds and claimed that that these small glances away from the road generally occur when there is low demand from the road network, and that these glances are not likely to result in adverse or critical events. Overall, a number of studies have concluded that drivers glance at digital billboards at a mean rate of 0.5 seconds and almost all are less than 1.0 seconds.

The available literature confirms that:

- External sources have a minimal effect on driver distraction that led to crashes
- Driver distraction in general reduces as the driving environment becomes more complex because drivers prioritise their attention effort to higher risk tasks
- The number and duration of glances due to digital billboards that result in driver inattention to the scale that might influence the series of events that would lead to a crash is immeasurably small.

## 4.4 The Relationship between Digital Signs and Crashes

### 4.4.1 International Examples

Due to the relatively short time digital billboards have been present in Australia and the relatively few locations that they have been present (until recent years), there is limited before and after installation crash data in Australia that specifically targets identifying a relationship between digital signs and crash rates and under what conditions. A selection of international research is presented below.

Hawkins, Kuo and Lord (2012) was based on 135 “on-premises digital sign” locations and undertook statistical analysis of crash data for before and after each sign installation. The signs were located in California, North Carolina, Ohio, and Washington. This study concluded “that the installation of digital on-premises signs does not lead to a statistically significant increase in crashes on major roads”.

Tantala and Tantala (2010) was based on “26 existing, non-accessory, advertising digital billboards along routes with periods of comparison as long as 8 years in the greater Reading area, Berks County, Pennsylvania”. This research looked at both temporal and spatial crash details around the electronic signs and compared the data to 51 non-electronic signs. The digital signs had message duration times of 6, 8 or 10 seconds. This research concluded that:

- *“The before and after rates of accidents near the twenty digital billboards show an 11.1% decrease within 0.5 miles of all digital billboards over eight years near twenty locations. Similar decreases and trends in both averages and peaks are observed for both smaller and larger vicinity ranges, and for specific groups of locations by duration time.”*
- *“The accident statistics and metrics remain consistent, exhibiting statistically insignificant variations at each of the digital billboards. The metrics include the total number of accidents in any given month, the average number of accidents, the peak number of accidents in any given month, and the number of accident-free months. These conclusions account for variations in traffic-volume and other metrics.”*
- *“The statistical evaluation of the Empirical Bayes method and actual versus predicted results show that the total number of accidents is comparable to what would be statistically expected with or without the introduction of digital technology and that the safety near these locations is consistent with the model benchmarked by 77 locations within Berks County.”*

Pandey and Shafizadeh (2011) reviewed a range of traffic flow parameters upstream of electronic billboards on Highway 50 near Sacramento. The study concluded that *“the presence of the electronic billboard does not appear to have a significant negative impact in traffic performance (flow, speed, and lane occupancy) or incidents in the study section of the freeway”*.



## 4.4.2 Local Examples

### Constitution Hill

Bitzios Consulting reviewed available crash data on the Cumberland Highway, Constitution Hill (see Figure 4.1), where a digital sign was installed in February 2017. The installation of a digital sign did not result in an increase in crash rates at that site. The crash data for both pre- and post-installation of the digital sign was compared as shown in Table 4.2 to confirm the findings of the available research. It is to be noted that the crash comparison data is available only up to 2017 and 2018.



Adapted from Nearmap

**Figure 4.1:** Location of an Existing Digital Sign in Constitution Hill

**Table 4.2:** Crash Comparison Pre and Post-installation – Constitution Hill (2013-2017)\*

| Year              | Crash Severity |                |                 |                    |                        | Total |
|-------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------------------|-------|
|                   | Fatal          | Serious Injury | Moderate Injury | Minor/Other Injury | Non-casualty (towaway) |       |
| Pre-installation  |                |                |                 |                    |                        |       |
| 2013              | -              | 1              | 1               | 1                  | 3                      | 6     |
| 2014              | -              | -              | 1               | 1                  | 2                      | 4     |
| 2015              | -              | -              | 2               | -                  | -                      | 2     |
| 2016              | -              | -              | -               | 3                  | -                      | 3     |
| Total             | -              | 1              | 4               | 5                  | 5                      | 15    |
| Post-installation |                |                |                 |                    |                        |       |
| 2017              | -              | 1              | -               | 2                  | 1                      | 4     |

\*2018-2020 crash data not available.

The above table shows no increase in crash rate after the installation of the digital sign. Whilst based on a limited sample, this data further supports the research of the absence of a link between roadside digital advertising signage and crashes.

## Petersham

Bitzios Consulting reviewed available crash data on Parramatta Road, Petersham (see Figure 4.2), where a digital sign was installed in May 2017. The crash data both pre- and post-installation of the digital sign was compared as shown in Table 4.3 to confirm the findings of the available research.



Adapted from Nearmap

**Figure 4.2:** Location of an Existing Digital Sign in Petersham

**Table 4.3:** Crash Comparison Pre and Post-installation – Petersham (2013-2017)\*

| Year              | Crash Severity |                |                 |                    |                        | Total |
|-------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------------------|-------|
|                   | Fatal          | Serious Injury | Moderate Injury | Minor/Other Injury | Non-casualty (towaway) |       |
| Pre-installation  |                |                |                 |                    |                        |       |
| 2013              | -              | -              | -               | -                  | 1                      | 1     |
| 2014              | -              | -              | 1               | -                  | 1                      | 2     |
| 2015              | -              | -              | -               | -                  | -                      | -     |
| 2016              | -              | 1              | 2               | -                  | -                      | 3     |
| 2017              | -              | -              | -               | -                  | -                      | -     |
| Total             | -              | 1              | 3               | -                  | 2                      | 6     |
| Post-installation |                |                |                 |                    |                        |       |
| 2017              | -              | 1              | 1               | -                  | -                      | 2     |


\*2018-2020 crash data not available.

The above table shows no increase in crash rate after the installation of the digital sign. Whilst based on a limited sample, this data further supports the research of the absence of a link between roadside digital advertising signage and crashes.



## Milperra

Bitzios Consulting reviewed available crash data near the corner of Milperra Road, Newbridge Road and Henry Lawson Drive, Milperra (see Figure 4.3), where a digital sign was installed in August 2018. The crash data both pre- and post-installation of the digital sign was compared as shown in Table 4.4 to confirm the findings of the available research.



Adapted from Nearmap

**Figure 4.3:** Location of an Existing Digital Sign in Milperra

**Table 4.4:** Crash Comparison Pre and Post-installation – Milperra (2014-2018)

| Year              | Crash Severity |                |                 |                    |                        | Total |
|-------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------------------|-------|
|                   | Fatal          | Serious Injury | Moderate Injury | Minor/Other Injury | Non-casualty (towaway) |       |
| Pre-installation  |                |                |                 |                    |                        |       |
| 2014              | -              | 3              | 1               | 3                  | 3                      | 10    |
| 2015              | -              | 2              | 2               | 3                  | 3                      | 10    |
| 2016              | -              | 1              | 1               | 4                  | 1                      | 7     |
| 2017              | -              | 1              | 5               | 5                  | 1                      | 12    |
| 2018*             | -              | -              | -               | 3                  | -                      | 3     |
| Total             | -              | 7              | 9               | 18                 | 8                      | 42    |
| Post-installation |                |                |                 |                    |                        |       |
| 2018*             | -              | -              | 1               | 1                  | 1                      | 3     |

\*Only preliminary data was available at the time of this assessment.

The above table shows no increase in crash rate after the installation of the digital sign. Whilst based on a limited sample, this data further supports the research of the absence of a link between roadside digital advertising signage and crashes.



## 4.5 Recent Rulings by the Court

### 4.5.1 Planning and Environment Court of Queensland – Gold Coast

In May 2015, the Planning and Environment Court of Queensland upheld an appeal against refusal of a digital sign on Bundall Road, an urban arterial road near a signalised intersection on the Gold Coast on the basis that there was insufficient evidence to support the link between digital signs and road safety risk changes. The case is cited in *Malchada Pty Ltd v Gold Coast City Council [2015] QPEC 21*. The court ruled that the appeal be allowed, subject to operating conditions. The Commissioner concluded that:

- In terms of the intersection between Bundall Road and Ashmore Road, *“I note that .... there is only one accident for about every two million vehicles which pass through it and that it was performing ‘pretty safely’ ”.*
- *“A detailed analysis of the intersection failed to convince me that it was dangerous.”*
- *“On the evidence before me, I am satisfied that the proposed development is safe from a traffic perspective.”*

### 4.5.2 Land and Environment Court of NSW Ruling – Kogarah

In April 2017, Outdoor Systems Pty Ltd (the applicant) sought approval from the Land and Environment Court of NSW to allow for a 15 second dwell time for a new digital sign on the Princes Highway, Kogarah. In assessing the application, Transport for NSW was concerned that the dwell time proposed for the sign did not address SEPP 64 Schedule 1 and did not comply with its 2015 *Draft Guidelines*. Transport for NSW's position was that the sign should remain as a static sign and recommended that Georges River Council refuse the application. An appeal was lodged, and the case is cited in *Outdoor Systems Pty Ltd v Georges River Council and Roads and Maritime Services [2017] NSWLEC 1505*.

*The Commissioner found that in this case there was no evidence that digital signs contribute to crashes.* Key statements included that:

- *“After careful consideration of all of the evidence I must agree with Ms Samra's assessment that the scientific literature is vastly inconclusive of any direct evidence that digital billboards contribute to crashes.”*
- *“While billboards are clearly designed to attract attention there is no satisfactory evidence before me to conclude that there is a significant difference in average fixation durations between digital and static billboards.”*

In reaching his determination, the Commissioner noted the importance of considering each case on its merit.

### 4.5.3 Environment, Resources and Development Court of South Australia – Adelaide

In August 2017, the Environment, Resources and Development Court of South Australia upheld an appeal, subject to operating conditions, against refusal of a digital sign replacement of an existing static sign adjacent to a signalised intersection in North Adelaide. The case is cited in *oOh! media Pty Ltd v The Corporation of the City of Adelaide [2016] ERDC 297*. The Commissioner considered that *“the change to an LED sign as proposed is unlikely to materially change the risk factors nor will it put into jeopardy the safety of the public at this intersection”*.

## 4.6 Research Interpretation

The chain of events that is required to link a digital sign to increased crash rates is: *a driver is aware of an external event (i.e. outside the vehicle) which is a digital sign display change and that the event distracts a driver sufficiently to lead to involuntary driver inattention which then leads to driver error in a driving environment at a critical instance in time that leads to a crash*".

The combination of probabilities of these events would be extremely difficult to quantify and aligns with the absence of a comprehensive body of research that links digital signs (to driver distraction leading to driver inattention leading to driver error) leading to an increased rate of crashes.

The literature review presented in this chapter has established an absence of a causal relationship between digital signs and driver distraction to the level that creates additional crashes.

Furthermore, there is also an absence of any correlation between new digital signs and increasing crash rates. There are currently over 2,000 digital roadside advertising signs in Australia and there has not been a single claim, as far as the industry is aware, of a digital sign being blamed for a crash.

Based on traffic crash risk management principles however, the criteria where digital signs should be considered with greater scrutiny are:

- Locations that are highly unusual in their configuration complexity, or
- Locations that are inherently unsafe anyway, based on crash records.

**The proposed sign location does not meet either of the above criteria and is considered to be a very low risk to driver distraction, based on the summary of the research.**

## 5. TRAFFIC SAFETY ASSESSMENT

### 5.1 Key Assumptions

The assessment of the proposed digital sign was undertaken on the basis that:

- The existing static sign will be removed with a digital LED sign installed above the Gore Hill Freeway and hence have a slightly different orientation (in line with the carriageway) and lower height
- The dimensions of the proposed sign will be relatively consistent with the dimensions of the existing sign. It is noted that the dimensions of the proposed digital screen will result in a slightly reduced advertising display area
- No change is proposed to the structure that will support the digital screen (i.e. rail bridge to remain in its current form and function)
- The display of content will be static for a minimum dwell time of 25 seconds with a transition time of no more than 0.1 seconds based on the *Signage Guidelines* criteria
- Illumination/lighting levels for the digital sign will comply with the *Signage Guidelines* and maintain lighting levels to match the surrounding environment at the site.

### 5.2 Site Inspections

Site inspections were undertaken on Tuesday, 2 November 2021 during day and night-time hours (around 1:00pm and 8:30pm respectively). The weather was clear and traffic conditions were moderate on both occasions. In-vehicle video recordings were taken for further analysis and for use in compiling photo montages of the driver's perspective on the approaches to the site.

The photo montages can be found in **Appendix B**.

### 5.3 Review of Crash Data

Crash data for the relevant section of the Gore Hill Freeway was obtained from Transport for NSW and used to assess the crash history in proximity to the subject site. The most recent five years of crash data at the time of the data request was for 2016-2020. Crashes involving vehicles travelling in the direction of and in view of the sign were used for the assessment. The viewing area of the proposed digital sign is from approximately 320m west along the Gore Hill Freeway and 290m west along the Pacific Highway eastbound on-ramp.

As per Rule 287 (3) of the Australian Road Rules, crashes are only recorded if they are reported to the police and when one of the following occurs:

- Any person is killed or injured
- Drivers involved in the crash do not exchange particulars
- When a vehicle involved in the crash is towed away.

The crash data was provided in the following severity categories:

- **Fatal** – a crash in which at least one person was killed
- **Serious injury** – a crash involving at least one person identified in a police report and matched to a health record indicating a hospital stay due to injuries sustained in a crash, or is identified as an iCare (Lifetime Care) participant AND no one was killed in the crash



- **Moderate injury** – a crash involving at least one person identified in a police report who is matched to a health record that indicates that they were treated at an emergency department but were not admitted for a hospital stay, or is matched to a CTP claim indicating a moderate or higher injury AND no one was killed or seriously injured
- **Minor/Other injury** – a crash involving at least one person identified as an injury in a police report who is not matched to a health record that indicates the level of injury severity, or is matched to a minor injury CTP claim AND no one was killed, seriously injured or moderately injured
- **Non-casualty (towaway)** – a crash in which no one was killed or injured but at least one motor vehicle was towed away.

The crash data was mapped using GIS software and is presented in **Appendix B** along with a detailed record list. The crash maps are presented in terms of severity and type (road user movement describing the first impact of the crash), with a severity summary provided in Table 5.1.

**Table 5.1: Crash Severity Summary on Approach to the Site (2016-2020)**

| Year         | Crash Severity |                |                 |                    |                        | Total    |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------------------|----------|
|              | Fatal          | Serious Injury | Moderate Injury | Minor/Other Injury | Non-casualty (towaway) |          |
| 2016         | -              | -              | -               | -                  | -                      | -        |
| 2017         | -              | 1              | -               | 1                  | -                      | 2        |
| 2018         | -              | -              | -               | 1                  | 2                      | 3        |
| 2019         | -              | -              | 1               | -                  | -                      | 1        |
| 2020         | -              | -              | -               | -                  | -                      | -        |
| <b>Total</b> | -              | <b>1</b>       | <b>1</b>        | <b>2</b>           | <b>2</b>               | <b>6</b> |

Key outcomes from the 6 reported crashes between January 2016 and December 2020 include that:

- There were 3 'rear end' crashes:
  - With one occurring within 50m of the proposed site, resulting in minor injury.
- There was 1 'lane change left' crash:
  - Located at the Pacific Highway on-ramp merge with the Gore Hill Freeway.
- There was 1 'out of control on carriageway':
  - Located immediately west of the Hampden Road bridge, resulting in serious injury.
- There was 1 'other manoeuvring':
  - Located at the Pacific Highway on-ramp merge with the Gore Hill Freeway.

The above findings indicate a very low crash rate based on an average of 1 crash per year and when considering the very high volumes that the Gore Hill Freeway carries. Furthermore, the analysis of the crash records suggests that the existing static sign would not have influenced the crash history in any way. The proposed digital sign location above the carriageway would likely improve the situation as it will be directly within a driver's forward primary view range, requiring no visual deviation from the road and vehicles ahead, particularly when merging onto the Gore Hill Freeway.

## 5.4 Approach Sightline Assessments

### 5.4.1 Description of Approaches

The eastbound approaches in proximity to the sign are described in Table 5.2 and Table 5.3.

**Table 5.2: Approach Attributes – Gore Hill Freeway eastbound**

| Attribute                               | Details  |
|---|--|
| Posted speed limit                      | 80km/h   |
| Decision points within view of the site | Merge with the Pacific Highway on-ramp (located approximately 70m before the sign) |
| Approach arrangement                    | 2 lanes  |
| Sight length                            | From approximately 320m west of the sign   |
| Minimum duration of visibility          | 17s at free-flow speed   |

**Table 5.3: Approach Attributes – Pacific Highway eastbound on-ramp**

| Attribute                               | Details  |
|---|--|
| Posted speed limit                      | 80km/h   |
| Decision points within view of the site | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>On-ramp metering signals – (located approximately 200m before the sign)</li><li>Merge onto the Gore Hill Freeway (located approximately 70m before the sign)</li></ul> |
| Approach arrangement                    | 2 lanes  |
| Sight length                            | From approximately 290m west of the sign   |
| Minimum duration of visibility          | 13s at free-flow speed   |

### 5.4.2 Driver Sightline Assessment

#### Process

In-vehicle observations were undertaken to assess the subject site considering intersection points and other traffic control devices. An assessment of still images taken from the driver's perspective with a windscreen-mounted camera is presented in the following section. It should be noted that the assessment was undertaken based on a standard passenger car and as such a driver's eye height may vary for larger and smaller vehicles.

The premise of the assessment is to ensure that the proposed location of the digital sign maintains a driver's sightline to intersections and traffic control devices and is not located as such that it may be confused with, or confuse, the interpretation of these traffic control devices.

The cognitive load within the driving environment on approach to the proposed sign is also considered. The locations where digital signs could influence crash risk are locations where rapid, complex, multi-factor decision making is required.

### **Lane Cove Tunnel Exit onto the Gore Hill Freeway**

The eastbound approach along the Lane Cove Tunnel exit onto the Gore Hill Freeway is primarily flat with a slight left-hand curve on approach to the rail bridge. As drivers approach the merge point with the Pacific Highway on-ramp, the sign becomes dominant in the forward field of view and merge decision point approximately 70m before the proposed sign.

A digital sign in this location will not obstruct sightlines to or influence the messaging of traffic control devices or signs. The eastbound approach does not require rapid, complex decision making by drivers and is not a location of high cognitive load. Drivers approaching this area looking forward, if glancing towards the digital display will also see merging vehicles and brake lights (if they are activated) are exactly the same time as the glance. There are no distraction or cognitive load issues on this approach.

The in-vehicle sightlines along Gore Hill Freeway eastbound are shown in Figure 5.1.

### **Pacific Highway eastbound on-ramp to the Gore Hill Freeway**


The approach along the Pacific Highway eastbound on-ramp to the Gore Hill Freeway is primarily flat with a slight left-hand curve on approach to the rail bridge. As drivers approach the merge point with Gore Hill Freeway, the sign becomes dominant in the forward field of view and the merge decision point would be approximately 70m before the proposed sign.

A digital sign in this location will not obstruct sightlines to, or influence the messaging of, traffic control devices or signs. The approach does not require rapid, complex decision making by drivers and is not a location of high cognitive load.

On this approach, if vehicles are in the T2 lane, they stay in the T2 lane. If vehicles are approaching from Lane 2 and need to merge they will saccade their views between their right side mirror, possibly also turning their head over their left shoulder as well, to accelerate, or decelerate to accept gaps to merge into. This usual process of merging would be unaffected by a change in the digital display on the sign because, merging drivers would need to return their view to the front anyway from time to time. Even though it is improbable that drivers would glance at the digital sign when concentrating on merging, if they did, such a glance would not extend their forward view duration to the extent that it would reduce their merge-related glances, given that all forward glances to traffic and the digital sign would occur in exactly the same view. That is, the digital sign would not be a significant distraction, and this is a movement/area of relatively low cognitive load (i.e. just the decisions needed for merging)

The in-vehicle sightlines along the Pacific Highway eastbound on-ramp are shown in Figure 5.2.






\*Distances measured in Google Maps / Images adapted from Google Street View.

**Figure 5.1:** In-vehicle sightlines along the Lane Cove Tunnel exit eastbound





\*Distances measured in Google Maps / Images adapted from Google Street View.

**Figure 5.2:** In-vehicle sightlines along the Pacific Highway eastbound on-ramp

## 5.5 Compliance Assessment

### 5.5.1 SEPP 64 Schedule 1

The assessment against SEPP 64 Schedule 1 is provided in Table 5.4. Whilst the SEPP 64 criteria are quite generic, the basis for the responses to each criterion are provided next to them.

**Table 5.4: Assessment against SEPP 64 Schedule 1**

| Section   | Criteria  | Response   |
|-----------|---|--|
| 8. Safety | Would the proposal reduce the safety for any public road?   | <b>No</b> – The proposal is unlikely to reduce the safety to the public road because the traffic safety risks associated with a digital sign are not materially different to the traffic safety risks associated with the existing static sign. There is little evidence to suggest crashes (and associated risks) are linked to the existing sign apparent in the crash data. |
|           | Would the proposal reduce the safety for pedestrians or bicyclists?   | <b>No</b> – There are no on-road cyclists in this area and no adjacent pedestrian facilities.  |
|           | Would the proposal reduce the safety for pedestrians, particularly children, by obscuring sightlines from public areas? |  |

### 5.5.2 Transport for NSW Advertising Sign Safety Assessment Matrix

Table 5.5 details the assessment against the TfNSW Advertising Sign Safety Assessment Matrix.

**Table 5.5: Assessment against the Transport for NSW Advertising Sign Assessment Matrix**

| Consideration  | Response  | Risk Rating | Risk Level |
|--|---|-------------|------------|
| <b>A.</b> It obscures a view of an object/vehicle/pedestrian that creates a hazard   | The proposed sign will be located above all surrounding objects/vehicles/pedestrians etc.   | 1           | Low        |
| <b>B.</b> Sign positioning relative to travel direction  | The proposed sign will be positioned over the travel lanes on Gore Hill Freeway and would be in the ordinary field of view. It will be visually prominent eastbound.  | 1           | Low        |
| <b>C.</b> It distracts a driver at a critical time   | The Pacific Highway eastbound on-ramp to the Gore Hill Freeway has two lanes: a 24-hour T2 Transit Lane and a general traffic lane. The T2 Lane continues as its own lane while the general traffic lane merges onto the Gore Hill Freeway approximately 70m from the proposed site.<br><br>There are a number of signs (e.g. 'prepare to stop') on approach but all outside the visibility range of the sign. The only distraction risk of significance is drivers selecting a gap to merge by glancing to their right-side mirror/blind spot and then forward again and any distractions the digital sign might cause to that. This is not a negligible risk but given that the crash rates in this area are very low, the resulting change in risk is also expected to be low. | 5           | Low        |
| <b>D.</b> It interferes with the effectiveness and safety of a traffic control device (e.g. traffic signs, traffic signals or other traffic control devices) | The proposed sign is unlikely to noticeably obstruct or directly interfere with any traffic control devices.  | 1           | Low        |
| <b>E.</b> Sign Clutter   | No other advertising sign is visible when a driver is in view of the subject sign.  | 1           | Low        |



### 5.5.3 Transport Corridor Outdoor Advertising and Signage Guidelines Table 3

Table 5.6 details the assessment against the digital sign criteria in Table 3 of the *Signage Guidelines*.

**Table 5.6: Assessment against the Signage Guidelines Digital Sign Criteria**

| Criteria  | Response   |
|---|--|
| a. Each advertisement must be displayed in a completely static manner, without any motion, for the approved dwell time as per criterion (d) below.  | Conditions can be imposed by the consent authority to ensure that the sign is completely static for the specified dwell time.  |
| b. Message sequencing designed to make a driver anticipate the next message is prohibited across images presented on a single sign and across a series of signs.  | Conditions can be imposed by the consent authority to ensure there is no message sequencing that creates driver anticipation for the next message on the proposed sign or with any other signs.  |
| c. The image must not be capable of being mistaken: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. for a prescribed traffic control device because it has, for example, red, amber or green circles, octagons, crosses or triangles or shapes or patterns that may result in the advertisement being mistaken for a prescribed traffic control device</li> <li>ii. as text providing driving instructions to drivers.</li> </ul> | Conditions can be imposed by the consent authority to ensure that sign content, design, imagery and messages neither replicate nor can be mistaken for a prescribed traffic control device or instruction to drivers.<br>For example, advertisements must not instruct drivers to perform an action such as 'Stop'.  |
| d. Dwell times for image display must not be less than: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. 10 seconds for areas where the speed limit is below 80km/h</li> <li>ii. 25 seconds for areas where the speed limit is 80km/h and over.</li> </ul>   | The minimum allowed dwell time is 25 seconds based on the posted speed limit of 80km/h. Conditions can be imposed by the consent authority to ensure this minimum dwell time.  |
| e. The transition time between messages must be no longer than 0.1 seconds, and in the event of image failure, the default image must be a black screen.  | Conditions can be imposed by the consent authority to ensure that the sign has a transition time of no more than 0.1 seconds and a black screen in the event of image failure.   |
| f. Luminance levels must comply with the requirements in Section 3 below.   | This area is Zone 3 as categorised in Section 3.3 of the <i>Signage Guidelines</i> . Acceptable luminance levels for this zone as specified in Table 6 of the <i>Signage Guidelines</i> are: no limit (full sun on face of signage), 6000cd/m <sup>2</sup> (daytime), 700cd/m <sup>2</sup> (twilight and inclement weather) and 350cd/m <sup>2</sup> (night-time). Conditions can be imposed by the consent authority specifying maximum allowable luminance levels. |
| g. The images displayed on the sign must not otherwise unreasonably dazzle or distract drivers without limitation to their colouring or contain flickering or flashing content.   | Conditions can be imposed by the consent authority to ensure that the sign's images comply with requirements to not contain flickering or flashing content.  |
| h. The amount of text and information supplied on a sign should be kept to a minimum (e.g. no more than a driver can read at a short glance).   | Conditions can be imposed by the consent authority to ensure that minimal text and information is supplied on a sign no more than a driver can read at a short glance.   |
| i. Any sign that is within 250m of a classified road and is visible from a school zone must be switched to a fixed display during school zone hours.  | N/A – The sign is not visible from a school zone.  |

| Criteria  | Response  |
|---|---|
| j. Each sign proposal must be assessed on a case-by-case basis including replacement of an existing fixed, scrolling or tri-vision sign with a digital sign, and in the instance of a sign being visible from each direction, both directions for each location must be assessed on their own merits.   | All relevant traffic directions have been assessed on their own merits.   |
| k. At any time, including where the speed limit in the area of the sign is changed, if detrimental effect is identified on road safety post installation of a digital sign, TfNSW reserves the right to re-assess the site using an independent TfNSW-accredited road safety auditor. Any safety issues identified by the auditor and options for rectifying the issues are to be discussed between TfNSW and the sign owner and operator.  | Noted.  |
| l. Sign spacing should limit drivers' view to a single sign at any given time with a distance of no less than 150m between signs in any one corridor. Exemptions for low speed, high pedestrian zones or CBD zones will be assessed by TfNSW as part of their concurrence role.   | The proposed digital sign replaces an existing static sign and no other sign is visible less than 150m.   |
| m. Signs greater than or equal to 20sqm must obtain TfNSW concurrence and must ensure the following minimum vertical clearances;<br>i. 2.5m from lowest point of the sign above the road surface if located outside the clear zone<br>ii. 5.5m from lowest point of the sign above the road surface if located within the clear zone (including shoulders and traffic lanes) or the deflection zone of a safety barrier if a safety barrier is installed. If attached to road infrastructure (such as an overpass), the sign must be located so that no portion of the advertising sign is lower than the minimum vertical clearance under the overpass or supporting structure at the corresponding location.  | The proposed sign will be greater than 20sqm and as such must obtain TfNSW concurrence. It will be located on a pedestrian bridge above the road within a clear zone. The sign will have a minimum vertical clearance of 5.8m from the lowest point above the road surface. |
| n. An electronic log of a sign's operational activity must be maintained by the operator for the duration of the development consent and be available to the consent authority and/or TfNSW to allow a review of the sign's activity in case of a complaint.  | Conditions can be imposed by the consent authority to ensure that an electronic log is kept for the duration of the consent and be available to the consent authority and/or TfNSW for review in case of a complaint.   |
| o. A road safety check which focuses on the effects of the placement and operation of all signs over 20sqm must be carried out in accordance with Part 3 of the TfNSW Guidelines for Road Safety Audit Practices after a 12 month period of operation but within 18 months of the signs installation. The road safety check must be carried out by an independent TfNSW-accredited road safety auditor who did not contribute to the original application documentation. A copy of the report is to be provided to TfNSW and any safety concerns identified by the auditor relating to the operation or installation of the sign must be rectified by the applicant. In cases where the applicant is the TfNSW, the report is to be provided to the Department of Planning and Environment as well. | Conditions can be imposed by the consent authority for a road safety check to be carried out after 12 months but within 18 months of the sign's installation.   |



## 6. CONCLUSIONS

The key conclusions from the traffic safety assessment of the proposed removal of the existing static advertising sign on the northern side of the Gore Hill Freeway and installation of a digital LED advertising sign on the western elevation of the North Shore rail bridge over the Gore Hill Freeway in Artarmon are summarised as follows:

- The proposed sign will have a slightly different orientation (in line with the carriageway) and height than the existing sign, as well as a changing display at fixed time intervals. The newly proposed location is for the sign to be situated as a bridge signage
- The dimensions of the proposed visual screen size of sign will be slightly different with the dimensions of the existing visual screen size, with an overall display area of 39.94m<sup>2</sup>. However, it is observed that the proposed advertising display area of the sign which includes the JCDecaux logo contributes to a wider area of 47m<sup>2</sup> compared to the existing visual screen size
- The proposed sign will not obstruct or interfere with the view of or restrict sight distances to any intersections, traffic control devices, vehicles, pedestrians or cyclists given its location above the road
- The proposed sign is not expected to reduce the safety of any traffic, pedestrians or cyclist movements given its location above the road. It will be located within a driver's ordinary field of view and a glance at the sign will still permit co-incident recognition of front and merging drivers in the forward view
- A review of available five years of crash data within 320m of the site was undertaken as part of the traffic safety assessment. The crash data showed a very low crash rate (averaging one crash per annum) especially given that this is a high-volume road. The data does not identify an unusually high or inherently high crash risk on approach to the site that would not deem the proposed location unsuitable
- The proposed sign complies with the requirements of SEPP 64 and the Transport for NSW Advertising Sign Safety Assessment Matrix in terms of its obscurity, positioning and sign clutter. Furthermore, its proposed location above the carriageway would likely improve the situation relative to glances to the existing static sign (which will be removed) as it will be within a driver's normal field of view, requiring little deviation from the road and vehicles ahead, which is particularly relevant when merging onto the Gore Hill Freeway
- The proposed digital sign should be conditioned to comply with the requirements of the *Signage Guidelines* in terms of display and operational requirements, including:
  - Message displays remaining static
  - Sequencing of displays or messaging
  - Images not being mistaken for a traffic control device
  - Minimum dwell time
  - Transition of displays
  - Luminance levels
  - The use of flickering, flashing or moving content
  - Quantity/size of text used on message displays
  - A re-assessment of the digital sign should any detrimental effects on road safety be identified post-installation
  - Maintaining a log of the sign's activity
  - A road safety check after 12 months but within 18 months of the sign's installation.

Given the above conclusions, the digital sign should be approved as proposed.


# REFERENCES

- Austroroads (2013). The Impacts of Roadside Advertising on Road Safety, AP-R420-13.
- Decker et al. (2015), The Impact of Billboards on Driver Visual Behavior: A Systematic Literature Review, National Center for Biotechnology Information, U.S. National Library of Medicine. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4411179/>
- Hawkins, H.G., Kuo, P-F & Lord, D. (2012). Statistical Analysis of the Traffic Safety Impacts 5 of On-Premises Digital Signs. [https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/e3b6/2957b23906769969f4a00f8815f9bdce7e.pdf?\\_ga=2.258010442.1941184793.1579676989-2095687016.1579676989](https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/e3b6/2957b23906769969f4a00f8815f9bdce7e.pdf?_ga=2.258010442.1941184793.1579676989-2095687016.1579676989)
- Lam, L.T. (2002). Distractions and the risk of car crash injury: The effect of drivers' age. *Journal of Safety Research*, pp. 411-419.
- Perez, W., & Bertola, M.A. (2011). The effect of visual clutter on driver eye glance behaviour. *Proceedings of the Sixth International Driving Symposium on Human Factors in Driver Assessment, Training and Vehicle Design*, Olympic Valley –Lake Tahoe, CA. Retrieved from [http://drivingassessment.uiowa.edu/sites/default/files/DA2011/Papers/027\\_PerezBertola.pdf](http://drivingassessment.uiowa.edu/sites/default/files/DA2011/Papers/027_PerezBertola.pdf).
- Regan, M.A., Hallett, C. & Gordon, C. (2011). Driver distraction and driver inattention: Definition, relationship and taxonomy. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, vol. 43, no. 5, pp. 1771-1781.
- Samsa, C. (2015). Digital billboards “down under”. Are they distracting to drivers and can industry and regulators work together for a successful road safety outcome? *Proceedings of the 2015 Australasian Road Safety Conference*, Retrieved from <http://acrs.org.au/files/papers/arsc/2015/SamsaC%20199%20Digital%20billboards%20down%20under.pdf>.
- Smiley, A., Bhagwant, P., Bahar, G., Mollett, C., Lyon, C., Smahel, T. & Kelman, W.L. (2005). Traffic safety evaluation of video advertising signs. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 1937, pp 105-112.
- Tantala, M.W. & Tantala, A.M. (2010). A study of the relationship between digital billboards and traffic safety in the Greater Reading Area, Berks County, Pennsylvania. Submitted to the Foundation for Outdoor Advertising Research and Education (FOARE).
- US Department of Transport Federal Highway Administration (2012). Driver visual behavior in the presence of commercial electronic variable message signs (CEVMS).
- Victor, T.W., Harbluk, J.L. & Engstrom, J.A. (2005). Sensitivity of eye-movement measures to in-vehicle task difficulty. *Transportation Research*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 167-190.

## Appendix A: Proposed Development Plan









AERIAL PHOTO  
NTS


LOCATION OF  
EXISTING SIGN  
TO BE REMOVED



SITE PLAN  
SCALE 1:100



ELEVATION A  
SCALE 1:100



SECTION 1  
SCALE 1:50

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

| ISS | DATE     | COMMENT             |
|-----|----------|---------------------|
| A   | 04/11/21 | ISSUED FOR APPROVAL |
| B   | 16/11/21 | ISSUED FOR APPROVAL |
|     |          |                     |
|     |          |                     |
|     |          |                     |
|     |          |                     |




Suite 1, Building 8, 49 Frenchs Forest Road East,  
Frenchs Forest, NSW 2086  
P.O. Box 652, Forestville, NSW 2087  
Ph: 02 9451 3455 Fax: 02 9451 3466  
Email: info@dbce.com.au  
ABN 23 039 013 724

CLIENT:  
**JCDecaux**  
  
PROJECT:  
GORE HILL FWY, ARTARMON, SUPER 8

TITLE:  
**EXISTING  
GENERAL ARRANGEMENT &  
SITE PLAN**



|                      |               |              |
|----------------------|---------------|--------------|
| DRAWN<br>A.T         | DESIGN<br>J.L | DATE: NOV 21 |
| JOB NO: 21260        | DWG NO: DA01  |              |
| SCALE @ A1: AS SHOWN | REV: B        |              |






AERIAL PHOTO  
NTS


LOCATION OF NEW  
DIGITAL SIGN



SITE PLAN  
SCALE 1:100



ELEVATION A  
SCALE 1:100



SECTION 1  
SCALE 1:50

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

| ISS | DATE     | COMMENT             |
|-----|----------|---------------------|
| A   | 03/11/21 | ISSUED FOR APPROVAL |
| B   | 16/11/21 | ISSUED FOR APPROVAL |
| C   | 18/11/21 | ISSUED FOR APPROVAL |
|     |          |                     |
|     |          |                     |
|     |          |                     |



Suite 1, Building 8, 49 Frenchs Forest Road East,  
Frenchs Forest, NSW 2086  
P.O. Box 652, Forestville, NSW 2087  
Ph: 02 9451 3455 Fax: 02 9451 3466  
Email: info@dbce.com.au  
ABN 23 039 013 724

CLIENT:  
**JCDecaux**  
  
PROJECT:  
GORE HILL FWY, ARTARMON, SUPER 8

TITLE:  
**PROPOSED DIGITAL SIGN  
GENERAL ARRANGEMENT &  
SITE PLAN**


|                      |               |              |
|----------------------|---------------|--------------|
| DRAWN<br>A.T         | DESIGN<br>J.L | DATE: NOV 21 |
| JOB NO: 21260        | DWG NO: DA02  |              |
| SCALE @ A1: AS SHOWN | REV: C        |              |



## Appendix B: Photo Montages



## 1. Lane Cove Tunnel exit eastbound approach (Day)





## 2. Pacific Highway on-ramp eastbound approach (Day)






# 1. Lane Cove Tunnel exit eastbound approach (Night)



## 2. Pacific Highway on-ramp eastbound approach (Night)




## Appendix C: Crash Data











Hampden Road

Gore Hill Freeway

Existing Digital Sign Location

Proposed Digital Sign Location

## Legend

- Crash Type (RUM Code Group)**
- Yellow circle: Vehicles from same direction
  - Yellow diamond: Manoeuvring
  - Red asterisk: Off path, on straight



**Project Title:** P5392 Sydney Trains Sites Digital Sign TSAs – Gore Hill Freeway - Artarmon  
**Figure Title:** Type of Crashes by RUM Code Group – 2016 to 2020  
**Version:** 001  
**Date:** 22/11/2021  
**File Path:** P:\P5392 Sydney Trains Sites Digital Sign TSAs\Technical Work\Mapping\Work Spaces\1 Gore Hill Fwy - Artarmon



| Crash ID | Degree of crash - detailed | RUM - code | RUM - description    | Year of crash | Month of crash | Day of week of crash | Time of crash | Surface condition | Weather  | Natural lighting | Street of crash | Street type | Distance | Direction         | Identifying feature | Identifying feature type | Town     | Type of location | Latitude   | Longitude  | Speeding involved in crash | Fatigue involved in crash | Key Traffic Unit direction of travel |
|----------|----------------------------|------------|----------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------|-------------------|----------|------------------|-----------------|-------------|----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|----------|------------------|------------|------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1129584  | Minor/Other Injury         | 30         | Rear end             | 2017          | February       | Monday               | 0745          | Dry               | Fine     | Daylight         | GORE HILL       | EXP         | 0        | Right on the spot | LANE COVE TUNNEL    | TO                       | ARTARMON | Dual freeway     | -33.813645 | 151.188956 | No or unknown              | No or unknown             | East                                 |
| 1133922  | Serious Injury             | 74         | On road-out of cont. | 2017          | March          | Wednesday            | 0640          | Unknown           | Unknown  | Daylight         | GORE HILL       | EXP         | 0        | Right on the spot | HAMPDEN ROAD        | OP                       | ARTARMON | Divided road     | -33.813509 | 151.189094 | No or unknown              | No or unknown             | East                                 |
| 1160419  | Non-casualty (towaway)     | 30         | Rear end             | 2018          | January        | Thursday             | 0745          | Dry               | Overcast | Daylight         | GORE HILL       | EXP         | 400      | East              | RESERVE ROAD        | OP                       | ARTARMON | Dual freeway     | -33.813460 | 151.189373 | No or unknown              | No or unknown             | East                                 |
| 1176106  | Minor/Other Injury         | 30         | Rear end             | 2018          | May            | Friday               | 1730          | Dry               | Fine     | Darkness         | GORE HILL       | EXP         | 0        | Right on the spot | LANE COVE TUNNEL    | TO                       | ARTARMON | Dual freeway     | -33.813001 | 151.191929 | No or unknown              | No or unknown             | East                                 |
| 1186993  | Non-casualty (towaway)     | 49         | Other manoeuvring    | 2018          | November       | Saturday             | 1910          | Dry               | Fine     | Dusk             | GORE HILL       | EXP         | 0        | Right on the spot | LANE COVE TUNNEL    | TO                       | ARTARMON | Dual freeway     | -33.813001 | 151.191929 | No or unknown              | No or unknown             | Unknown                              |
| 1201531  | Moderate Injury            | 35         | Lane change left     | 2019          | January        | Thursday             | 0815          | Dry               | Fine     | Daylight         | GORE HILL       | EXP         | 200      | East              | HAMPDEN ROAD        | OP                       | ARTARMON | Dual freeway     | -33.813148 | 151.191271 | No or unknown              | No or unknown             | East                                 |