

9 August 2022

Summary of public submissions for Pacific Highway, Pymble Digital Advertising Signage (DA22/5184) – Pacific Highway, Pymble

SUB-1760 (11/05/2022)

This is a test submission to see where it goes.

SUB-1782 (13/05/2022)

As a nearby office owner, no objections are raised in respect of this application, however please do consider any adverse amenity impacts upon the nearest residential receptors (1022 and 1026-1028 Pacific Highway) in detail in your assessment report.

SUB-2018 (06/06/2022)

I am submitting this response, objecting to DA 22/5184, as the owner and resident of Unit 2 at the affected address on the basis of reduced amenity for this property from the proposed development.

The attached document sets out my objections in detail and disagreement with certain statements made in the DA documents and why this development will result in meaningful negative amenity for my property as it will have a direct adverse impact on areas including our main living room and a bedroom.

I am putting forward that the digital advertising sign is shown to have a clear negative impact on the amenity of surrounding property and therefore the DA warrants rejection.

Attachment content:

To the Department of Planning and Environment and other involved parties,

I am submitting this response, objecting to DA 22/5184, as the owner and resident of Unit 2 at the affected address on the basis of reduced amenity for this property from the proposed development.

- The proposed location of the digital billboard is directly visible from the north facing main living spaces including a bedroom in this property. Windows and balconies where this proposed replacement billboard will be directly visible from are highlighted below.



- The statement of environment effects (220325 KEYLAN Sign 19 Pymble SEE) claims that the proposal results in “Positive visual impacts”. As one of the “sensitive receivers within the visual catchment of the sign” I disagree strongly with this statement on the basis of the following points;
 - The static billboard in place does not change colour or composition, minimising how noticeable the image is from living and bedroom spaces. The proposed digital billboard will be a negative distraction on visual amenity as it cycles through different projected colours and images that are noticeably different every 10 seconds, drawing significant attention towards the billboard.
 - The existing static billboard is lit during evening hours, however this is no information provided about the existing light levels and how the proposed development changes this impact. In order to claim a positive impact, the onus should be on the applicant to show a reduction in brightness across evening

hours in addition to any size changes. Obtrusive light is a key component of the assessment criteria however the change from the current state is not assessed and should be assumed to have negative impact unless shown otherwise.

- There is insufficient foliage or elevation to restrict any meaningful visibility of this billboard from this property, meaning that this proposed change will impact directly on amenity. The “dense vegetation” claimed in the statement of environment effects should not be considered as a mitigating factor. See photo below for example view of the billboard from living room windows.



- Having a digital, ever changing billboard visible from living spaces in this property will detract from property valuation, placing an unfair burden on the current owners who will be financially disadvantaged from this change should the property be put up for sale in future.
- The existing southbound digital billboard has had a number of instances in the past 2 years where the automatic brightness reduction has failed, leaving the billboard in daytime brightness mode overnight. Despite complaints to the billboard operator, fixes were not implemented for between 3-5 days. There is risk that this will occur with this proposed development, with no material deterrent for the billboard operator to prevent this occurring or to fix it quickly, further impacting on residents in affected buildings.

In light of the above, I am putting forward that the digital advertising sign is shown to have a direct adverse impact on the amenity of surrounding property and therefore the DA warrants rejection.