

26 September 2022

**Summary of public submissions for Western Distributor, Pyrmont Digital Advertising Signage (DA 22/10079) – Pyrmont**

The following is a detailed listing of all public submissions received to date.

SUB-2748 (03/09/2022)

Please provide your view on the application  
I object to it

submission

This eyesore in our neighborhood will degrade the visual tranquility of Paradise Park. I don't see any benefit this provides to the community nor the traffic that will pass this blemish every day. One needs to step back and ask who this really benefits. It's certainly not the community nor the commuters. This is just not necessary.

The visual impact appendix does not cover the afternoon shadow arc over the seasons and its impact on Paradise Park.

The lighting impact does not cover the lamination effects and frequency of advertisement changes. As an owner in the A3 zone on the lighting impact, what are the flickering effects during night. How will that leak within and across Paradise Park?

Based on these grounds I strongly oppose this proposal.

SUB-2801 (19/09/2022)

Please provide your view on the application  
I object to it

submission

Viewing this proposal is disspriting.

Pyrmont & surrounds are under relentless congestion - noise, air particles, water pollution and visual pollution..

To a certain extent, as residents, my wife & I understood this environment when we moved here in 2017.

The proposed installation of an electronic bill board prompts the question - why? The answer might well be - "because they can".

A large electronic sign adds zero to the ambience and liveability of the surrounding mix of residential, light commercial & retail. It will add zero to the community & tourist presence of the new fish market, not to mention the planned development of new residential apartments as presently proposed.

I lodge objection on behalf of my wife and myself and urge you to decline the proposal.

Enough is enough. Let's support the residents, rather than the project proponents as they seek to dazzle and distract motorists as they drive west.

SUB-2802 (19/09/2022)

Please provide your view on the application  
I object to it

submission

I object to this signage being allowed to proceed on environmental grounds. I believe this will create visual pollution by displaying illuminated advertisements 24 hours every day. It is in direct view of established residential apartments and future Blackwattle Bay and Wattle Street developments.

To show illustrations of a grey screen and no images or wording is not a true reflection of how the sign will look and how visually off putting it will be.

Submission received via email (objection)

I have received advice about this proposed development at 4pm today, the closing date for submissions and strongly object to the failure of the Department to advise local residents and community groups such as Pymont Action Inc. of this proposal.

On behalf of members of our organization, and local residents who as yet, know nothing of this proposal, I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the erection of the large illuminated advertising structure which will have a significant impact on the amenity of residents living in Bulwara Road and the many people who enjoy Paradise Reserve over which the sign will throw glaring light,

There is absolutely no justification for this project which benefits no-one and which has the potential to distract drivers using the Western Distributor and is therefore a traffic hazard, as well as a visual obscenity.

I ask that the Department reject the application on the grounds of intrusion of light pollution in a residential street and park, scale of the structure and safety of drivers on the Western Distributor. I also object to the lack of notice to members of the Pymont community and local community groups.

Elizabeth Elenius, Convenor

Pymont Action Inc.

Submission received via email (objection)

I am an owner in the neighbouring location, adjacent to the Western Distributor.

The proposal describes the erection of a new 15 metre high digital advertising sign on the eastern side of the Western Distributor, north of Pymont Bridge Road, facing west-bound traffic.

The location and height of this proposed signage will be at a similar height to my apartment and it will project in the direct line of sight of every room in our apartment.

I am greatly concerned about the nature and amount of negative impact that this type of advertising display in a digital lighting format, will have to our amenity, health and wellbeing.

Further, I hold concerns for the subsequent devaluation of our property due to the visual clutter and pollution of the supporting structure and a 12.8 X 3.2 m display of primarily commercial content rotating at 10 second intervals, 24 hours per day.

Prior to this submission, I contacted both the Department of Planning and Environment - Marcus Jennejohn and JCDecaux - Damien Rath, in order to clarify specific details and concerns.

In both conversations, I described my relationship to this location and specific observations regarding traffic flow and existing problems with spill light.

In order to inform my submission, I requested both parties for the location of any examples of advertising displays similar in size and/or this type of digital light display.

Unfortunately, no examples that are similar were provided however, I have considered the examples of JCDecaux advertising signage (both static and digital), along the Western Distributor, M4 and Princess Highway, for context.

My observations of the signs that I did see are that all were along main roadways, at substantially commercial locations, positioned in the direction of traffic and not residences.

I have resided in this location, immediately south of Pyrmont Bridge Road, since 2016. My apartment provides me with a view of the Western Distributor between Channel 10 and Allen Street.

I acknowledge that there has been and will continue to be a significant amount of change to influence the look and activity within this community. To-date, however, it is a unique setting that maintains a quieter and almost village-style of life. And this is despite the greater population of Pyrmont living in high density housing. I object to this sign being in the centre of a densely and soon to be even more densely populated residential area.

The decision to install this large advertising monopole, even though it is "architecturally designed" with the proposed plantings, is incongruous with past installations by JCDecaux and other such companies - in location, size and operation (using digital lights).

I understand the purpose of this project being the anticipated advertising influence and subsequent revenue generation (for all parties).

I was informed that there may be future opportunities to review the location of this advertising sign (within 10- 15 years), but it would be highly unlikely for the DA Approval to be rescinded.

It is therefore imperative that the most stringent and valid assessment of this DA proposal prevails. It is hoped that this decision that does not rely primarily on anticipated financial gains when there may be equally important but somewhat intangible or immeasurable qualitative issues affecting residents of this community.

It is reported that there has been limited access to locations at the height and distance of visual impact south of Pyrmont Bridge Road.

The study therefore fails to determine the exact number and range of residences impacted by the view and effects of this large sign.

This application presents a report finding that the area is of mixed commercial and residential use supposedly, inferring that this is a suitable location for a commercial structure.

The truth is, that the locations that will suffer the visual discourse are near 100% residential.

Any commercial use buildings and spaces are almost all located below the height of the Western Distributor.

The reports provided to inform the decision about this Development Application do not mention or take into account the well-known Developments and Proposed Development Applications of Blackwattle Bay Precinct. They all are adjacent to this sign with 100% residential apartments to be located above the line of the roadway.

I can only surmise that the residents of Blackwattle Bay will be equally if not more affected by the type, operation and obtrusive nature of this proposed advertising structure.

Why is this Development Application not acknowledging and factoring in these residential changes?

Why is this Development Application not waiting for further studies to inform on the soon to be different living conditions of the community?

Further investigation into the qualitative and health impacts of flashing, active LED lighting is required. There is sufficient documentation to seriously consider the detrimental effects of such a visual display.

There are scientific papers that alert us to the impact of the light spill which damages, the ambiance and repose of the return to home after work. There is damage created to the circadian rhythm of all species.

Given the experiences that have come from this period of Covid restrictions, which demand home settings to be restful, as a mental health measure; or greater use of home settings for work - a disruptive visual display is unacceptable.

There is no statement about the monitoring and maintenance of this proposed development. I am concerned that there is no practical way that residents may lodge complaints and have the matter resolved should the the illuminations from this sign cause disturbance.

My experience relates to the "eAustralia" illuminated sign on a property at Miller Lane and behind the proposed site for this advertising structure. The sign is an LED static display which has consent to operate between 6:00 am and 10:30pm. It took several months before a complaint regarding the operating times were addressed. It had been operating 24 hours per day.

When the westbound traffic is near non-existent on the Western Distributor in late evening and early morning hours - why is a 24 hour cycle being applied for?

How will the measurements of LUX etc be monitored in a maintenance schedule?

When a request to check the brightness of the "eAustralia" illuminated sign was made to City of Sydney Council, the Officer admitted that they Council did not have the technical ability to check the certified luminosity.

I will agree that sensitivity to light and other visual disruptions may be individual.

However, it is clear that there are no scheduled mechanisms and technical expertise/equipment to ensure that the lighting is compliant. Therefore, if this Development Application constraint cannot be measured and ensured each time that a resident has a concern then, this project must fail.

At my home, I am able to observe the traffic at various times of the day and night; before, during and since Covid restrictions. I have noticed impacts to work and leisure times of vehicle traffic flows.

A report identifying the amount and flow of traffic at various hours of the day must be critical to the purpose and financial value of this Development Application.

My observations are that the overall amount of traffic flow travelling in a westbound direction on the Western Distributor is less than the amount of traffic flow travelling in an eastbound direction on the Western Distributor.

I am willing to provide visual monitoring of traffic at various times of the day. It is clearly obvious that apart from end of workday car travels to the west, the profoundly greater amount of traffic travels in the opposite direction.

From reports by State Government, the opening of the WestConnex tunnel will have a significant impact on lowering the volume of traffic on the Western Distributor.

Why is this Development Application not acknowledging and factoring in these traffic changes?

Why is this Development Application not cautiously waiting for further studies to inform on the soon to be different traffic conditions?

If DA 10665 was originally considered the preferred site, why is it being moved?

In surrendering the Development Consent DA 10665 granted 1 April 2022 were further studies for residential impact applied to this new site - surely, both locations are not of equal residential and traffic impact?

Is it moved due to the costs involved drilling into the rock of the first location?

How have the concerns presented by the community at the exhibition of DA 10665 been resolved?

Surely, with a higher residential impact - due to a greater population of the area (existing and soon to be), are the concerns presented by the community at the exhibition of DA 10665 even of a higher importance and impetus to decline approval of the Development Application for Digital Advertising Signage (DA 22/10079)?

I do not agree with locating such a sign of great size and lighted animation on a roadway that I have witnessed a great number of vehicles travelling at speed.

Vehicles must travel out of a right-side bend, manoeuvre around the left-side exit ramp of Pyrmont Bridge Road; up the incline to the Anzac Bridge; past the traffic monitoring point for alcohol/drug tests and speeding; and into a left-side bend at the point of future Blackwattle Bay residences and then, up to and past Channel 10.

There are far too many critical points requiring full concentration that demand an even greater level of attention when emergency vehicles require access to pass.

The process of inviting community submissions aims to provide better informed decisions. The community is at a disadvantage in a range of ways including levels of expertise, time to respond, understanding of the technical reports and ability to present a factual argument to counter documents already presented.

It is a trust in good, fair and honest government that inspires open discussion and requests for change.

This Development Application, whilst needed by this government to deliver revenue must surely be found to be wanting in all other measures.

It will profoundly alter the landscape of the roadway, influence driver safety, impose upon the quality of habitat for residents and nature and lower the property values of the surrounds.

This Development Application is not in-keeping with current and future residential use of the area.

This Development Application has presented reports that are incorrect or deficient.

Greater weight must be applied to amenity and wellbeing of the residents.

Further investigation is required to establish the true effects and measurements of combined lighting output from established advertising signs, traffic lights, current and future residential buildings.

I ask that this Development Application is not approved.