



**DA 23/2902 or PAN -310940 (Lane Cove Road Overpass- Western elevation)**

**By lodgement:** [NSW Planning Portal; Lucinda.craig@dpie.new.gov.au](#)

**June 21, 2023**

**Mr Anthony Witherdin  
Director  
Key Sites Assessments**

**Dear Anthony**

**Subject: Request for Additional Information. DA 23/2902**

I refer to your letter dated May 24, 2023, in relation to DA 23/2902. Attachment A of your letter requests information be provided by the Applicant in relation to the following matters:

**Request: “provide a visual impact assessment that considers the potential impacts to residents at 1-15 Fontenoy Road.”.**

The Applicant has considered this request and kindly refers you to the visual impact analysis provided in the Statement of Environmental Effects (SEE) submitted with the DA – section 5.2.6 Visual Impact, page 66. Please note **Macquarie Gardens are the residents at 1-15 Fontenoy Road referenced within the SEE.**

In preparing the SEE, the Applicants’ planning consultant (Urban Concepts) visited the location to review the public domain as part of the work necessary to prepare the SEE. Extensive review and analysis were undertaken which is documented within the SEE at section 2. *Site and Environmental Description and Context, pages 12-15 inclusive.* Multiple photos and commentary are included from the site inspection underpinning the visual impact summary at 5.2.6.

Section 5.2.6 of the SEE- Visual Impact, details Urban Concepts professional opinion taking into consideration their site review and deep experience in planning requirements for Out of Home signage development applications, be it static or digital displays.

*In particular Urban Concepts noted – When the digital screen is viewed from Macquarie Gardens the viewing angle of the sign is perpendicular to the sign which means it is viewed side on. When combined with the vertical separation between the site and the residential apartments the amenity impact of the proposed digital sign on view lines from the public and private domain is low. Should the digital sign appear in a district view it will only occupy a minor part of the panorama.*

The Applicant requested Urban Concepts re-review the information provided within the SEE in relation to resident visual impact and their conclusion that the “proposed digital sign on view lines from the public and private domain is low”. Attached is their additional advice in relation to this matter.

The SEE also includes an independent illumination report. The lighting report found the night-time operation of the sign will not cause any reduction in visual amenity to dwellings in Macquarie Gardens. The illumination analysis by Electrolight is included in the SEE in full at Appendix D.

The Applicant is not aware of any representations by either the residents or Ryde Council in relation to adverse amenity or impacts from the proposed sign arising from the public exhibition and noting residents were contacted by letter as part of this process and provided within the opportunity to consider the proposed new sign and provide comments in relation to any concerns they might have. The Applicant therefore submits the information provided within the SEE, Appendix D and additional advice from Urban Concepts adequately addresses any view/ amenity impact from the proposed sign. To request the Applicant to perform a VIA which may involve contacting residents is effectively a repeat of the Public Exhibition process.

Can you therefore kindly confirm the information as submitted within the DA, together with the additional advice from Urban Concepts has adequately addressed potential view/ amenity impacts upon residents located within the named street.

***Request: "update of Architectural Plan to include "anti-gawk" screens".***

The Applicant, prior to lodgement of the subject DAs, held several meetings with TfNSW in relation to the subject DAs. The Applicant's DA applications for the Subject sites did not make any provision for Anti-gawk screen as in the opinion of the Applicant, based upon advice from its traffic and road safety expert (Bitzios Consulting- "Bitzios") none were required. The Applicant is therefore surprised by the request from TfNSW to include a Plan for the provision of "anti-gawk" screens in relation to the subject DAs.

The Applicant has requested additional advice from its traffic and safety expert in relation to the TfNSW request for Anti-Gawk screen in relation to DA 23.2902. Kindly refer attached for the additional advice from Bitzios. In relation to the Subject DA, Bitzios has advised as follows:

DA 23/2902- Lane Cove Road. "There is nowhere for the sign to be clearly seen from the off-ramp because it is almost entire blocked by dense vegetation".

The Applicant has re-reviewed the location where TfNSW has requested the provision of Anti-gawk screens and concurs with the advice received from Bitzios.

The Applicant therefore requests the DPE share this letter and the additional Bitzios advice with TfNSW for their consideration. Based upon the additional advice from Bitzios, the Applicant requests the requirement for Anti-Gawk screen be dropped. However, should TfNSW still consider an anti-gawk screen is required the Applicant kindly requests a marked up aerial map identifying (exact location with height and length specified) where TfNSW believes an anti-gawk screen is required together with some form of traffic safety and risk assessment which supports this requirement.

If helpful to TfNSW, the Applicant and Bitzios are available to meet to discuss this matter. Alternatively, the Applicant can engage ARRB (a leading traffic and safety consulting firm) to provide a second opinion (to that of Bitzios which is attached) if this is helpful.

Can you kindly advise how you and TfNSW would like to progress this matter. As I'm sure you appreciate, provision of Anti- Gawk screen will require considerable time, expense and resources be incurred by the Applicant. I respectfully submit this should only be required if there are material risks and related traffic safety improvements which require mitigation.

***Request: Submit the executed Public Benefit Offer via the Planning Portal .....for the proposed sign"***

The Applicant has lodged on the portal (in confidence) a copy of the Public Benefit Offer letter prepared by TfNSW dated May 9, 2023, and sent to the DPE, attention Mr Muick Cassel.

I trust the above responses and attachments adequately responds to all matters raised within Attachment A of DPE's letter dated May 24, 2023.

Yours sincerely



Ian D Riley

Director

Manboom Signage Pty Ltd

iriley@audant.com.au



21 June 2023

Ian Riley  
Manboom Signage Partnership,  
L11, 151 Macquarie Street,  
Sydney, NSW, 2000.

Dear Ian,

**Department of Planning and Environment (NSW DPE) Request for Visual Impact Assessment for DA 23/2902 seeking consent for the erection of a Digital Advertising Sign on the Lane Cove Road Overpass.**

You have asked me to comment on the NSW DPE's request for a Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) in respect of DA 23/2902. This Application seeks consent to install a digital advertising screen on the western elevation of the Lane Cove Road Overpass that forms part of the M2 Motorway. The Lane Cove Road exit ramp aligns the Motorway to the immediate north of the bridge site. The site falls within the City of Ryde Council Local Government Area.

As the author of the Statement of Environmental Effects (SEE) that accompanied the DA, I thoroughly considered the visual context and impact of the proposed digital sign on surrounding land uses. I concluded that a visual impact assessment (VIA) was not required. I drew this conclusion having regard to the following facts:

- The digital sign is viewed as part of the Motorway bridge infrastructure. The digital sign sits well below the dominant skyline and is fully contained within the bridge's profile. It does not extend above the mesh safety screen. Further, the bridge sits below the height of the Lane Cove Road exit ramp lanes, as evidenced by the sandstone outcrops that align the Motorway and exit ramp to the north.
- The sign fully complies with the bridge sign criteria set out in Clause 3.22 of Chapter 3 of the Industry and Employment SEPP 2021 (IESEPP 2021) and Section 2.5.5 of the Transport Corridor Advertising and Signage Guidelines 2017. This criterion ensures that signage mounted on road bridges is of an appropriate scale and proportion relative to the host bridge. These provisions that relate to advertisements on bridges, and specifically the subject applications, in Section 2.5.5 of the Transport Corridor Advertising and Signage Guidelines 2017 are reproduced below:

**3.22 Advertisements on bridges**

*(1) A person may, with the consent of the consent authority, display an advertisement on a bridge.*

*(2) The consent authority may grant consent only if the consent authority is satisfied that the advertisement is consistent with the Guidelines.*

**"2.5.5 Bridge signage criteria**

*a. The architecture of the bridge must not be diminished. Note: Consideration should be given to whether the advertising structure is compatible with the form and scale of the bridge, and sympathetic to the bridge style and design. Consideration should be given to whether the advertisement significantly detracts from the principle structural qualities of the bridge or any important decorative inclusions. It is preferable that the sign be directly integrated into the structural design of the bridge. The sign should not compromise the architectural and visual quality of the bridge structure.*

*b. The advertisement must not extend laterally outside the structural boundaries of the bridge. Note: The structural boundaries of the bridge include the solid part of the structure, road deck, handrail and safety guard fencing, but do not include additional devices attached to the structure such as lighting and power poles.*

*c. The advertisement must not extend below the soffit of the superstructure of the bridge to which it is attached, unless the vertical clearance to the base of the advertisement from the roadway is at least 5.8m.*

*d. On a road or pedestrian bridge, the advertisement must:*

*i. not protrude above the top of the structural boundaries of the bridge*

*ii. not block significant views for pedestrians or other bridge users (e.g. cyclists)*

*iii. not create a tunnel effect, impede passive surveillance, or in any other way reduce safety for drivers, pedestrians or other bridge users.*

*g. Any advertising sign proposed for development on a bridge over a classified road requires that construction drawings be submitted for review and approval by RMS bridge engineers prior to construction to ensure all road safety requirements are met.*

*h. Any advertising sign proposed for development on a bridge over a road requires provision of a fall arrest system (sign and sign support structure to bridge) to ensure the sign will not detach in case of impact by an over high vehicle."*

- The Lighting Impact Assessment that Electrolight prepared for the DA definitively concluded that there would be no nuisance or adverse amenity impact resulting from the night-time operation of the digital sign on adjacent residents of the Macquarie Gardens apartment complex at 1-15 Fontenoy Road that sits to the north of the development.
- The primary viewing audience of this sign is the inbound motorists travelling on the M2. There will be limited views of the digital screen face from the public domain because the Lane Cove Road exit ramp lane, the substantial landscaped M2 buffers and the height of the M2 acoustic wall barriers all effectively block direct views to the digital screen from the north. To the south of the site are commercial business park developments. These developments have landscaped car parks at the M2 Motorway frontage, and the commercial buildings are perpendicular to the outbound traffic lanes. Accordingly, I believe no adverse visual impact will arise from the proposed digital sign within the public domain to the north and south of the site.
- In terms of analysing the view impact of the proposed digital sign from the private domain of the apartments located to the north in the Macquarie Gardens Complex at 1-15 Fontenoy Road, I could not access the individual apartments to assess the view impact. However, from field investigations and from studying the views on Google Maps, I believe that:
  - Only the apartments on the upper levels of the south-facing towers will have potential views of the sign.
  - A significant vertical separation exists between the upper-level south-facing apartments and the digital screen. These apartments are angled perpendicular to the digital screen. As such, there is no direct line of sight from the apartments to the digital screen because their view outlook is well above the digital screen. Refer to Section 2.1 and 2.2 in the Lane Cove Road Overpass SEE.
  - The fact that a property may have a partial view of a sign does not translate to a negative visual impact. If part of the sign can be seen from these apartments it would be viewed against the bridge motorway infrastructure. The sign will not dominate the view as it would form a minor part of a broader district view composition. As indicated in the point above, the lighting assessment concluded that there is no night-time nuisance resulting from the illumination of the sign.

Further, I note that the Lane Cove Road Overpass DA has progressed through public exhibition. The NSW DPE has advised the Applicant that no submissions were made by adjoining residents expressing concern or comment about any aspect of the proposed development, including visual impact.

The NSW DPE has asked the Applicant 'to model perspectives that show the view of the proposed sign from affected outlooks'. As stated above, affected outlooks would be from a limited number of private apartments. Modelling perspectives for views from the private domain requires direct contact with the owner/occupant to access the private property. Modelled perspectives from the private domain are usually undertaken when property owners are located in a direct line of sight to a digital sign, or have raised a visual impact concern. None of these criteria applies to the Lane Cove Road Overpass DA. As such, should the Applicant resolve to prepare a VIA for this site, I would request the Department to nominate the views that it would like modelled. Of course, the Applicant would need to consent to this work being undertaken, which would involve additional time and expense.

Yours faithfully,



**Belinda Barnett**

Director, Urban Concepts

**Gold Coast Office**

**S:** Suite 26, 58 Riverwalk Avenue  
Robina QLD 4226  
**M:** PO Box 5102 Q Super Centre  
Mermaid Waters QLD 4218  
**P:** (07) 5562 5377  
**F:** (07) 5562 5733  
**W:** www.bitziosconsulting.com.au

**Brisbane Office**

**S:** Level 2, 428 Upper Edward Street  
Spring Hill QLD 4000  
**M:** Level 2, 428 Upper Edward Street  
Spring Hill QLD 4000  
**P:** (07) 3831 4442  
**F:** (07) 3831 4455  
**E:** admin@bitziosconsulting.com.au

**Sydney Office**

**S:** Studio 203, 3 Gladstone Street  
Newtown NSW 2042  
**M:** Studio 203, 3 Gladstone Street  
Newtown NSW 2042  
**P:** (02) 9557 6202  
**F:** (02) 9557 6219

**Your reference:** PAN-310932

**20 June 2023**

Digital Place Solutions  
90 Water Street  
Mona Vale NSW 2103

Attention: **Steve Rubie**

*Sent via email: [steve@digitalplacesolutions.com](mailto:steve@digitalplacesolutions.com)*

Dear Steve,

**RE: PROPOSED DIGITAL SIGNS ALONG THE M2 – ANTI-GAWK SCREENS  
RESPONSE TO TfNSW REQUIREMENT**

We refer to dot point 1 made by TfNSW in its Attachment A to DPE's letter dated 25 May 2023 which states:

*“Provide Architectural Plans defining the extent and design of the proposed anti-gawk screen as part of this application, or confirm how such works will be completed via an alternative planning pathway”.*

We understand that TfNSW has requested ‘anti-gawk’ screens at M2 ramps at Windsor Road inbound, Beecroft Road outbound and Lane Cove Road inbound. We do not believe that these screens will provide any benefit to road safety for the following reasons:

- **Windsor Road:** The eastbound off-ramp would have partial visibility of the sign down and to the right of the driver after passing through the toll gantry. The advertising content is not discernible at this location. Further east about 30m to 25m from the signalised intersection at the end of the off-ramp, the sign would be in the far-right periphery and far down to the right and at angle where the digital display would be difficult to decipher anyway. Drivers in this location would have absolutely no motivation to turn their head to look at the sign and a change in display would not trigger an involuntary glance because it would be outside of a driver's peripheral view. Closer than 25m to the signals, the sign would not be able to be seen. There is no need for an anti-gawk screen here
- **Beecroft Road:** There is no relevant view location where anti-gawk screens would be useful. Beecroft Road northbound is the only approach that might be under consideration but there is dense vegetation that blocks any view of the sign from this approach
- **Lane Cove Road off ramp:** There is nowhere for the sign to be clearly seen from the off-ramp because it is almost entirely blocked by dense vegetation, as shown in the pictures provided in Attachment A. This attachment shows that the digital sign would be behind mature trees / shrubs for the entire visual approach up the off ramp. Even if part of the sign's luminance could be recognised at night, there would be no way of deciphering the advertising material from the off ramp location and hence it would be of no interest to drivers on the off ramp to glance to.

Given that we are unable to decipher the intent or benefits of the 'anti-gawk' screens requested by TfNSW, we suggest that a clarification request be sent to TfNSW seeking a marked up aerial map identifying where it believes that these screens are required to block views to the signs.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions regarding this advice.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "D. Bitzios", is positioned above the printed name.

**Damien Bitzios**

**Director**

**BITZIOS CONSULTING**



## **ATTACHMENT A**

### **VIEW FROM THE LANE COVE OFF RAMP**



