

# **Statement of Environmental Effects**

Digital Advertising Signage Pacific Highway, Hornsby



Prepared for JCDecaux on behalf of Sydney Trains Submitted to the Department of Planning and Environment

# October 2023





This report has been prepared by:

Danielle Wigg <sub>BP</sub> Planner E: <u>Danielle@keylan.com.au</u>

Cover image: the site (Source: JCDecaux)

Padraig Scollard <sub>BA MRUP</sub> Associate E: padraig@keylan.com.au

This report has been reviewed by:

11

Michael Woodland BTP MPIA Director E:michael@keylan.com.au

All Rights Reserved. No material may be reproduced without prior permission of KEYLAN Consulting Pty Ltd. While KEYLAN Consulting Pty Ltd working on this project has tried to ensure the accuracy of the information in this publication, it accepts no responsibility or liability for any errors, omissions or resultant consequences including any loss or damage arising from reliance in the information in this report. This report has relied on information provided by JCDecaux in good faith and accepts no responsibility or liability for any errors, omissions or resultant consequences including any loss or damage arising from reliance in the information in this report.

| Revision | Prepared by | Reviewed by | Date     | Revision Type |
|----------|-------------|-------------|----------|---------------|
| 1        | DW/PS       | MW          | 20/10/23 | Draft         |
| 2        | DW/PS       | MW          | 20/10/23 | Final         |



# **Table of Contents**

| 1 | Intr  | oduction  | 8  |
|---|---|---|--|
|   | 1.1   | Pre-lodgement meeting with DPE  | 9  |
|   | 1.2   | Consultation with TfNSW   | 9  |
| 2 | The   | e site and locality   | . 10   |
|   | 2.1   | Site description  | . 10   |
|   | 2.2   | Surrounding locality  | . 10   |
|   | 2.3   | Existing Road Environment   | . 15   |
| 3 | The   | e Proposal  | . 16   |
|   | 3.1   | Digital LED Technology for Outdoor Advertising  | . 22   |
|   | 3.2   | Digital LED Screen Operation and Management   | . 23   |
|   | 3.3   | Hours of Operation  | . 23   |
|   | 3.4   | Excavation and Footings   | . 24   |
|   | 3.5   | Sign Access and Maintenance   | . 24   |
|   | 3.6   | Vegetation Management   | . 24   |
| 4 | Sta<br>4.1<br>4.2<br>4.3<br>4.3<br>4.3<br>4.3<br>4.4<br>4.4<br>4.4<br>4.4   | tutory Planning Framework<br>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979<br>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016<br>State Environmental Planning Policies<br>1 State Environmental Planning Policy (Industry and Employment) 2021<br>2 Transport Corridor Advertising and Signage Guidelines 2017<br>3 State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021<br>Hornsby Local Environmental Plan 2013<br>2 Heritage  | . 25<br>. 27<br>. 28<br>. 28<br>. 32<br>. 33<br>. 39<br>. 39<br>. 39<br>. 39                   |
| 5 | 4.5<br>Env<br>5.1<br>5.1<br>5.1<br>5.1<br>5.1<br>5.1<br>5.1<br>5.1<br>5.1<br>5.2<br>5.2<br>5.2<br>5.2<br>5.2<br>5.2<br>5.2<br>5.2<br>5.2<br>5.2 | <ul> <li>Hornsby Development Control Plan 2013</li> <li>vironmental Planning Assessment</li> <li>Road safety</li> <li>.1 Road environment.</li> <li>.2 Signage exposure</li> <li>.3 Road accident history.</li> <li>.4 Stopping sight distance.</li> <li>.5 Road Safety Criteria – Signage Guidelines</li> <li>.6 Road safety summary</li> <li>Illumination criteria – Signage Guidelines.</li> <li>.1 Illumination criteria – Signage Guidelines.</li> <li>.2 AS 4282-2019 Control of the Obtrusive Effects of Outdoor Lighting</li> <li>.3 Illumination summary</li> <li>Heritage</li> <li>Vegetation</li> <li>Structural Integrity</li> <li>Visual Impacts</li> <li>Site suitability.</li> <li>Public benefit</li> </ul> | .41<br>.46<br>.46<br>.46<br>.49<br>.51<br>.52<br>.58<br>.59<br>.60<br>.61<br>.62<br>.63<br>.63 |
| 6 | Co  | nclusion  | . 65   |



# Figures

| Figure 1: Location of existing sign, view from northbound traffic (Source: Keylan)           | 10 |
|--|----|
| Figure 2: Site context (Source: Near maps)   | 11 |
| Figure 3: Developments at 135-137 Pacific Highway and 2 Pound Road, Hornsby (Source: Keylan) | 12 |
| Figure 4: Mixed use development at 208-226 Pacific Highway, Hornsby(Source: Keylan)          | 12 |
| Figure 5: Mixed use development to the southeast (Source: Keylan)                            | 13 |
| Figure 6: Retail shopping centre to the north (Source: Keylan)                               | 13 |
| Figure 7: Vacant site with approved DA at 228-234 Pacific Highway, Hornsby (Source: Keylan)  | 14 |
| Figure 8: Non-permanent banners on the eastern side of the bridge overpass (Source: Keylan)  | 14 |
| Figure 9: Road directional signage and business identification signage (Source: Keylan)      | 15 |
| Figure 10: Digital signage plan (Source: Dennis Blunt Consulting Engineers)                  | 17 |
| Figure 11: Elevation A of proposed sign (Source: Dennis Blunt Consulting Engineers)          | 18 |
| Figure 12: Elevation B of proposed sign (Source: Dennis Blunt Consulting Engineers)          | 19 |
| Figure 13: Elevation C of proposed sign (Source: Dennis Blunt Consulting Engineers)          | 20 |
| Figure 14: Indicative view from northbound traffic (Source: JCDecaux)                        | 21 |
| Figure 15: Indicative view from the entrance of Government Road (Source: JCDecaux)           | 21 |
| Figure 16: Indicative view from eastern side of Pacific Highway (Source: JCDecaux)           | 22 |
| Figure 17: Indicative view from the carpark east of the site (Source: JCDecaux)              | 22 |
| Figure 18: Biodiversity values map (Base source: Spatial viewer)                             | 28 |
| Figure 19: Land use zoning map (Source: HLEP 2013)   | 39 |
| Figure 20: Heritage map (Source: HLEP 2013)  | 40 |
| Figure 21: Northbound Approach Sign Exposure – Through Lane 1 (Source: TTPP)                 | 47 |
| Figure 22: Northbound Approach Sign Exposure – Through Lane 2 (Source: TTPP)                 | 48 |
| Figure 23: Northbound Approach Sign Exposure – Through Lane 2 (Source: TTPP)                 | 49 |
| Figure 24: Transport for NSW crash data (Source: TTPP)                                       | 50 |
| Figure 25: SSD (Source: TTPP)  | 51 |
| Figure 26: Location of assessed residential properties (Source: Electrolight)                | 60 |
|  |    |

# Tables

| Table 1: Project Summary  | 7  |
|---|----|
| Table 2: List of Appendices   | 8  |
| Table 3: Development summary  | 16 |
| Table 4: Assessment against Objectives of the EP&A Act  | 26 |
| Table 5: Section 4.15(1) assessment   | 27 |
| Table 6: Schedule 5, SEPP (Industry and Employment) 2021 consideration                              | 32 |
| Table 7: Transport and Infrastructure SEPP assessment   | 38 |
| Table 8: Heritage items within the vicinity of the site (Source: HLEP 2013)                         | 40 |
| Table 9: DCP Assessment   | 45 |
| Table 10: Existing road environment (Source: The Transport Planning Partnership)                    | 46 |
| Table 11: Sign location criteria – Section 3.2 of the Signage Guidelines (Source: TTPP)             | 56 |
| Table 12: Sign design and operation criteria - Section 3.3 of the Signage Guidelines (Source: TTPP) | 58 |
| Table 13: Luminance levels for digital advertisements criteria – Signage Guidelines                 | 59 |
| Table 14: Maximum lighting limit (pre and post-curfew)  | 60 |



# Appendices

| Appendix 1  | Industry and Employment SEPP & Signage Guidelines Assessment |
|-------------|--|
| Appendix 2  | Architectural Plans  |
| Appendix 3  | Digital Sign Safety Assessment                               |
| Appendix 4  | Lighting Impact Assessment                                   |
| Appendix 5  | Visual Impact Statement                                      |
| Appendix 6  | Public Benefit Statement                                     |
| Appendix 7  | Site Survey  |
| Appendix 8  | Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement         |
| Appendix 9  | Structural Feasibility Statement                             |
| Appendix 10 | Cost of Works Summary  |
|             |  |



# **Project Summary**

| Project Element             | Summary of the project  |  |
|-----------------------------|---|--|
| Proposed Signage            | <ul> <li>removal of existing 42.41m<sup>2</sup> (12.66m x 3.35m) static advertising sign at the site</li> <li>installation of a new monopole digital advertising sign on the western side of the Pacific Highway, Hornsby</li> <li>setback 1m from Pacific Highway footpath</li> <li>display of illuminated advertisements 24 hours a day, 7 days a week</li> <li>will have a minimum dwell time of 15 seconds for message changes</li> </ul>   |  |
| Site Description            | <ul> <li>Lot 1023 DP 1192060</li> <li>Corner of Government Road and Pacific Highway, Hornsby</li> <li>Land zoned MU1 Mixed Use</li> </ul>   |  |
| Advertising Display<br>Area | <ul> <li>Dimensions: 3.172m x 4.708m</li> <li>Area: 14.93m<sup>2</sup></li> </ul>   |  |
| Visual Screen Size          | <ul> <li>Dimensions: 3.072m x 4.608m</li> <li>Area: 14.15m<sup>2</sup></li> </ul>   |  |
| Visual Impacts              | <ul> <li>a Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) accompanies this application at Appendix 5</li> <li>the VIA confirms:         <ul> <li>the surrounding area has a high visual amenity sensitivity due to the number of high density residential dwellings</li> <li>the sign is consistent with the highly urbanised character of the Hornsby Town Centre area and will seamlessly integrate with its surroundings being significantly smaller than nearby built form and mature vegetation</li> <li>the reduction of the signs size from 42.41m<sup>2</sup> vs 14.93m<sup>2</sup> reduces the signs visual catchment area</li> <li>the location and orientation of the proposed sign has been carefully considered to limit the number of residential dwellings within the visual catchment</li> <li>views to the proposed sign are largely obstructed by road signage and mature trees</li> <li>the windows and balconies of residential receivers are largely orientated away from the proposed signage location</li> <li>the proposal does not impact upon any scenic views and will not protrude above the dominant skyline.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |  |
| Lighting Impacts            | <ul> <li>a Lighting Impact Assessment (LIA) has been undertaken by Electrolight (Appendix 4)</li> <li>the LIA confirms the proposal:         <ul> <li>complies with the relevant illumination criteria</li> <li>will not result in unacceptable glare</li> <li>will not adversely impact the safety of pedestrians, residents or vehicular traffic.</li> <li>will not cause any reduction in visual amenity to nearby residences or accommodation</li> </ul> </li> </ul>  |  |



| Project Element          | Summary of the project  |  |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| Road Safety<br>Impacts   | <ul> <li>a Traffic Safety Assessment (TSA) has been prepared by TTPP (Appendix 3)</li> <li>the TSA confirms the proposed sign:         <ul> <li>would not obstruct and/or reduce visibility of any traffic control devices, signage, road alignment or cyclists</li> <li>would not give incorrect information on the alignment of the road.</li> <li>would be located within a driver's peripheral vision for motorists travelling in the northbound direction of Pacific Highway, and does not require motorists to turn their head away from the roadway ahead.</li> </ul> </li> <li>having consideration for the TSA, the analysis suggests that the installation of the digital sign would be acceptable based on the minimal crash rate within the vicinity of the existing static sign and proposed digital sign</li> </ul> |  |
| Public Benefit           | <ul> <li>a Public Benefit Statement has been prepared by Sydney Trains (Appendix 6)</li> <li>the statement confirms the statement confirms the revenue will support essential Sydney Trains services, the proposed sign may be available for emergency messaging and messaging from Sydney Trains and TfNSW for 5 minutes per hour</li> </ul>   |  |
| Hours of Operation       | • 24 hours a day, 7 days a week   |  |
| Cost of Works            | • \$563,750   |  |
| Table 1: Project Summary |   |  |



# 1 Introduction

This Statement of Environmental Effects (SEE) has been prepared by *Keylan Consulting Pty Ltd* (Keylan) for JCDecaux on behalf of *Sydney Trains* (the Applicant) to accompany a Development Application (DA) for the installation of a digital advertising sign on the western side of Pacific Highway, Hornsby in the Hornsby Local Government Area (LGA).

As Sydney Trains is the Applicant, the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces (the Minister) is the consent authority for the application, as prescribed under section 3.10(c) of *State Environmental Planning Policy (Industry and Employment) 2021* (Industry and Employment SEPP). Accordingly, this SEE has been prepared and is submitted to the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) pursuant to the provisions of Part 4 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* (EP&A Act).

As the Applicant is a public authority, the subject application is a Crown Development Application pursuant to Part 4 Division 4.6 of the EP&A Act.

This SEE also includes a detailed assessment of the operation of the proposed digital advertising signage against the requirements outlined in the *Transport Corridor Outdoor Advertising and Signage Guidelines, Assessing Development Applications under SEPP* 64 (DP&E, 2017) (Signage Guidelines).

The proposed development comprises the removal of the existing static sign and installation of a digital advertising sign. The new digital advertising sign provides:

- an advertising display area of 14.93m<sup>2</sup>
- a visual screen size of 14.16m<sup>2</sup>
- the continued display of illuminated advertisements (24-hour operation)
- a minimum dwell time of 15 seconds for message changes
- a maximum night time luminance of 250cd/m<sup>2</sup>

The proposed digital advertising sign has a 65% smaller advertising display area than the existing 42.41m<sup>2</sup> illuminated static sign, reducing the extent of signage in the area.

The application seeks consent to operate the sign for a period of 15 years. The estimated cost of works is \$563,750. This SEE should be read in conjunction with the following supporting documents:

| Supporting documentation                                     | Appendices |  |
|--|------------|--|
| Industry and Employment SEPP & Signage Guidelines Assessment | Appendix 1 |  |
| Architectural Plans  | Appendix 2 |  |
| Traffic Safety Assessment                                    | Appendix 3 |  |
| Lighting Impact Assessment                                   | Appendix 4 |  |
| Visual Impact Statement                                      | Appendix 5 |  |
| Public Benefit Statement                                     | Appendix 6 |  |
| Site Survey  | Appendix 7 |  |
| Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement         | Appendix 8 |  |
| Structural Feasibility Statement                             | Appendix 9 |  |
| able 2: List of Appendices                                   |            |  |



# 1.1 Pre-lodgement meeting with DPE

On 22 May 2023, a DA pre-lodgement meeting and was convened with DPE to discuss key issues associated with the development application.

The meeting provided an opportunity for JCDecaux to introduce the site and the proposal and to facilitate discussion on key issues that are considered as part of this DA. The application has been prepared in accordance with the advice given at the pre-lodgement meeting with DPE.

Key matters discussed at the meeting include:

- relationship between the proposed sign and existing wall at the site
- application of setbacks to the footpath along Pacific Highway
- height and scale of the sign
- vegetation impacts

These issues are addressed in the report.

#### **1.2 Consultation with TfNSW**

A meeting was convened with TfNSW to discuss traffic and road safety issues associated with the development application. During this meeting no significant issues were raised with the proposal from a traffic safety perspective.

Following the pre-lodgement meeting, an independent peer review of the proposed sign was undertaken by TfNSW. This peer review did not raise any significant issues from a traffic safety perspective.

Road safety is address at Section 5.1.



# 2 The site and locality

# 2.1 Site description

The site is legally described as Lot 1023, DP 1192060 and is located in an established Sydney Trains corridor on the corner of Government Road and Pacific Highway, Hornsby. The subject site is in the Hornsby LGA and located approximately 28 kilometres northwest of the Sydney Central Business District.

As shown in the figure below, the site contains an existing advertisement sign, retaining wall and electrical box. There is also existing vegetation with small shrubs south of the existing sign and mature trees to the north and west.



Figure 1: Location of existing sign, view from northbound traffic (Source: Keylan)

# 2.2 Surrounding locality

The site in context to its surrounding locality is described, and shown on the figure below:

- high density residential flat building to the west at 2 Pound Road, Hornsby (approximately 63m from the site)
- mixed use to the southwest (approximately 23m from the site)
- mixed use to the southeast (approximately 50m from the site)
- retail shopping centre to the north (approximately 86m from the site)
- Hornsby Shire Girl's School to the east (approximately 176m from the site)
- vacant site with approved DA (DA/416/2020) to the north at 228-234 Pacific Highway, Hornsby (approximately 40m from the site)
  - number DA/416/2020 was determined on 16 September 2022 approving the construction of a 10-12 storey development comprising retail tenancies at the ground floor level, commercial tenancies at the first-floor level, a residential aged care facility at Levels 3-11, a residential apartment at Level 12 and strata subdivision.





Figure 2: Site context (Source: Near maps)

In terms of surrounding transport infrastructure, the proposed digital advertising sign will be visible from the Pacific Highway which is an established Transport for NSW (TfNSW) road corridor (Classified Road, Highway No 10).

The Pacific Highway is located east of the site and is frequented by drivers travelling northeast to Berowra and Mount White and southeast towards Chatswood and North Sydney. The Pacific Highway east of the site is a bridge overpass with the T9 Northern Line and Central Coast & Newcastle railway lines operating underneath. The Railway Lines connect to Hornsby Railway Station located 300m from the site.

Additionally, there are non-permanent banners currently attached to the western and eastern sides of the bridge are orientated towards the road corridor. These signs are controlled by Sydney Trains.

The surrounding locality is shown in the figures below:





Figure 3: Developments at 135-137 Pacific Highway and 2 Pound Road, Hornsby (Source: Keylan Consulting)



Figure 4: Mixed use development at 208-226 Pacific Highway, Hornsby(Source: Keylan Consulting)





Figure 5: Mixed use development to the southeast (Source: Keylan Consulting)



Figure 6: Retail shopping centre to the north (Source: Keylan Consulting)





Figure 7: Vacant site with approved DA at 228-234 Pacific Highway, Hornsby (Source: Keylan Consulting)



Figure 8: Non-permanent banners on the eastern side of the bridge overpass (Source: Keylan Consulting)





Figure 9: Road directional signage above north-bound traffic and business identification signage attached to the façade of Westfield (Source: Keylan)

# 2.3 Existing Road Environment

The Pacific Highway (west of the site) is an established arterial road corridor comprising six lanes. Three lanes are travelling north which decreases to two due to a right turning bay. Three lanes (comprising one bus lane) are travelling south which decreases to two due to a left merging lane. The speed limit along Pacific Highway is 60km/h in both directions.

The Pacific Highway and Government Road intersection is the closest intersection located immediately south of the proposed sign. The intersection is accessible from traffic travelling northbound on Pacific Highway and includes a left turn lane in and out of Government Road.

Pedestrian footpaths are provided on both sides of the Pacific Highway.



# 3 The Proposal

The proposal involves the installation of a new digital advertising monopole sign on the corner of Pacific Highway and Government Road, Hornsby. The sign will be in a vegetated area, adjacent to the Pacific Highway bridge overpass above the railway line.

The development is summarised in the table below.

| Development Aspect       | Description   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Development summary      | <ul> <li>removal of existing 42.41m<sup>2</sup> (12.66m x 3.35m) static advertising sign at the site</li> <li>installation of a new monopole digital advertising sign on the western side of the Pacific Highway, Hornsby</li> <li>display of illuminated advertisements 24 hours a day, 7 days a week</li> </ul>   |
| Signage location         | <ul> <li>Lot 1023 DP 1192060</li> <li>corner of Government Road and Pacific Highway, Hornsby</li> <li>oriented south to face northbound traffic.</li> </ul>   |
| Advertising display area | • 14.93m <sup>2</sup> (3.172m x 4.708m)   |
| Visual Screen Size       | • 14.16m <sup>2</sup> (3.072m x 4.608m)   |
| Dwell time               | 15 seconds  |
| Signage exposure         | <ul> <li>the Traffic Safety Assessment (Appendix 3) confirms the digital sign will likely be visible from the following traffic lanes:         <ul> <li>Government Road left turn slip lane, 60m from the sign</li> <li>northbound through lane 1, 100m from the sign</li> <li>northbound through lane 2, 105m from the sign</li> <li>northbound right turn lane, 115m from the sign</li> </ul> </li> <li>the digital sign would become out of driving view approximately 5m north of the proposed sign.</li> </ul> |
| Illumination             | the digital signage is illuminated using LEDs installed<br>within the front face  |
| Consent time period      | • 15 years  |
| Existing signage         | • a static advertising sign with an advertising display area of 42.41m <sup>2</sup> exists at the site. The proposal includes the removal of this signage.  |
| Vegetation Management    | • The Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement<br>(Appendix 8) confirms no trees are required to be<br>removed  |

Table 3: Development summary

The proposed sign may be available for display of emergency messaging by Sydney Trains and other NSW Government agencies such as NSW Police, NSW Health and Transport for NSW.

Architectural drawings for the sign are shown in the below figures and provided within the Architectural package at Appendix 2. Indicative photomontages of the sign, as viewed from the Pacific Highway (northbound) are provided in the figures below.





Figure 10: Digital signage plan (Source: Dennis Blunt Consulting Engineers)





Figure 11: Elevation A of proposed sign (Source: Dennis Blunt Consulting Engineers)





Figure 12: Elevation B of proposed sign (Source: Dennis Blunt Consulting Engineers)





Figure 13: Elevation C of proposed sign (Source: Dennis Blunt Consulting Engineers)





Figure 14: Indicative view from northbound traffic (Source: JCDecaux)



Figure 15: Indicative view from the entrance of Government Road (Source: JCDecaux)





Figure 16: Indicative view from eastern side of Pacific Highway (Source: JCDecaux)



Figure 17: Indicative view from the carpark east of the site (Source: JCDecaux)

# 3.1 Digital LED Technology for Outdoor Advertising

Outdoor advertising requires changeable signs or images. Traditional outdoor advertising billboards require manual change of materials (paint, paper and vinyl) either pasted onto billboards or tensioned across support frames. The introduction of digital technology has enabled new methods to change signage without regular manual change to the advertising signage.

An LED or digital screen will present a very high quality image by adopting a pixel pitch of 10mm in accordance with industry standards. A digital screen is comprised of a cluster



of red, green, blue, and amber diodes driven together to form a full colour pixel usually square in shape. These pixels are spaced evenly apart and are measured from center to center for absolute pixel resolution.

The proposed digital advertising sign will only display static content. The LED display will not scroll, flash, or feature motion pictures or emit intermittent light. The advertising signage includes an operation management system to ensure that only static images are displayed.

# 3.2 Digital LED Screen Operation and Management

JCDecaux will operate the content management system for the advertising signage. This management system ensures that unapproved content is not downloaded either by mistake or without appropriate authorisation.

The LED screen will display content in feed cycles that are sequentially rotated on a loop cycle. Static digital advertisements will appear on the screen for a 15 second dwell time before changing to a new static digital image. There will be a 0.1 second transition time between images, which appears instantaneous.

The proposed dwell time is consistent with the global and national operation of LED screens, variable messaging and scrolling technology as demonstrated below:

- the dwell time for electronic signage in the United States is typically 8 seconds
- scrolling technology is typically 7 to 8 seconds
- NSW TfNSW variable messaging signage works on a 3 second transition time for both information and emergency displays
- a dwell time of 10 seconds would typically be suitable for the proposed digital signage in a 60km/hr speed zone

JCDecaux will implement content controls for the proposed signage, including:

- no tobacco products
- no overtly religious advertising
- no advertising that contains overt and sexually graphic images
- no pornography and illegal drugs.

Further, all advertising copy material will comply with the following:

- Australian Advertising Industry Code of Conduct
- The Outdoor Media Association (OMA) Code of Conduct.

# 3.3 Hours of Operation

The proposed signage is for 24-hour operation, 7 days a week.



# 3.4 Excavation and Footings

A Structural Feasibility Statement has been prepared by Dennis Bunt Consulting Engineers (Appendix 9).

The statement confirms the works involve excavation to a depth of 8m below the existing ground level. A pier and pile cap are proposed to support the sign and structure.

Details regarding the structural integrity are provided at Section 5.5.

# 3.5 Sign Access and Maintenance

The site will be accessed from the existing footpath along the western side of Pacific Highway and will include a lockable door at the bottom of the structure.

JCDecaux will be responsible for maintenance of the signage structure. Maintenance will be undertaken by employees/representatives of JCDecaux during the night to protect the surrounding road and pedestrian environment.

# 3.6 Vegetation Management

The area in which the proposed sign is located has existing vegetation comprising shrubs south of the sign and mature vegetation north of the sign, refer to Figure 1. Maintenance of this vegetation will be undertaken by employees/representatives of JCDecaux to protect the surrounding road and pedestrian environment.

Additionally, an Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement has been prepared by Naturally Trees and included at Appendix 8. The Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement includes an assessment of the significance of nine trees surrounding the site. The statement concludes, no trees need to be removed and the proposal will have no adverse impacts on the existing nine trees if the recommended tree protection measures are successfully implemented, the recommendations are addressed at Section 5.4.



# 4 Statutory Planning Framework

# 4.1 Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979

#### Crown Development

As the Applicant is a public authority, the subject application is a Crown Development Application pursuant to Part 4 Division 4.6 of the EP&A Act.

#### Integrated Development

Under section 4.44 of the EP&A Act, integrated development provisions under Division 4.8 of the EP&A Act do not apply to Crown Development Applications (other than development that requires a heritage approval). The development does not require heritage approval as it is not listed on the State Heritage Register and therefore the subject application is not considered Integrated Development.

#### **Objects of the Act**

The proposal is consistent with the objects of the EP&A Act as it is considered to promote the orderly and economic use and development of land without resulting in an adverse impact on the environment. Detailed assessment against the objects of the EP&A act is provided below.

| Ob  | jective  | Comment   |  |
|-----|--|---|--|
| (a) | To promote the social and economic<br>welfare of the community and a better<br>environment by the proper management,<br>development and conservation of the<br>State's natural and other resources,      | The development promotes the social and<br>economic welfare of the community by<br>generating revenue to improve and maintain<br>the Sydney Trains network and provide<br>messages to the community during key<br>periods on behalf of the NSW Government.  |  |
| (b) | to facilitate ecologically sustainable<br>development by integrating relevant<br>economic, environmental and social<br>considerations in decision-making about<br>environmental planning and assessment, | This SEE provides information on the relevant economic, environmental and social impacts of the proposed development to enable the consent authority to undertake a thorough environmental assessment and assist in its decision-making on the application.   |  |
| (c) | to promote the orderly and economic use<br>and development of land,  | The development promotes the orderly and<br>economic use of the land by providing a new<br>digital advertising sign within an established<br>transport corridor that may provide public<br>benefits including the generation of revenue<br>to contribute to improving and maintaining<br>the Sydney Trains network. |  |
| (d) | to promote the delivery and maintenance of affordable housing,   | Affordable housing does not form part of this application.  |  |
| (e) | to protect the environment, including the<br>conservation of threatened and other<br>species of native animals and plants,<br>ecological communities and their<br>habitats.                              | The development will not impact on any threatened or other species of native animals, ecological communities and their habitats.  |  |



| Objective |  | Comment  |  |
|-----------|--|--|--|
|           |  | An Arboricultural Impact and Method<br>Statement has been provided at Appendix 8.<br>This confirms no tree removal is proposed.  |  |
| (f)       | to promote the sustainable management<br>of built and cultural heritage (including<br>Aboriginal cultural heritage),                                     | There are no significant historical or<br>Aboriginal cultural heritage features at the<br>site that will be impacted by the<br>development.  |  |
| (g)       | to promote good design and amenity of<br>the built environment,  | <ul> <li>The development will be located within an established transport corridor. The design of the sign is considered to promote good design as it:</li> <li>significantly reduces the signage size from what is existing on the site</li> <li>is substantially smaller than surrounding built form and therefore will not dominate the skyline</li> <li>As the illuminated side of the sign is visible by residential receivers, a VIA has been prepared (Appendix 5). The VIA ultimately concludes the impacts of the proposal are acceptable and therefore promotes good design and amenity.</li> </ul> |  |
| (h)       | to promote the proper construction and<br>maintenance of buildings, including the<br>protection of the health and safety of<br>their occupants,          | The development will be constructed and<br>maintained in accordance with any<br>conditions of approval issued by the consent<br>authority and the relevant requirements that<br>relate to health and safety, construction and<br>maintenance.  |  |
| (i)       | to promote the sharing of the<br>responsibility for environmental planning<br>and assessment between the different<br>levels of government in the State, | This SEE is submitted to DPE to enable an<br>environmental assessment of the application.<br>It is expected that the SEE will be referred by<br>DPE to other State agencies and Council for<br>further assessment and comment.   |  |
| (j)       | to provide increased opportunity for<br>community participation in environmental<br>planning and assessment.   | As part of DPE's assessment of the<br>application, the SEE will be made publicly<br>available and the community, Council and<br>State agencies will be invited to provide<br>comment via a submission on the proposal.<br>Any submissions received will be addressed<br>as part of a Response to Submissions<br>Report.  |  |

Table 4: Assessment against Objectives of the EP&A Act

#### Matters for Consideration

This section of the report provides the planning assessment against the key statutory environmental planning instruments and Development Control Plans relevant to the development. The following detailed assessment of the proposal is provided and which is based on the heads of consideration contained in section 4.15 of the EP&A Act.



| Relevant Provision |                                    | nt Provision   | Comment   |
|--------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| (a)                | (a) the provisions of:             |  |   |
|                    | (i)                                | any environmental planning<br>instrument, and  | The relevant environmental planning instruments are addressed at Section 4.   |
|                    | (ii)                               | any proposed instrument that is or<br>has been the subject of public<br>consultation under this Act and that<br>has been notified to the consent<br>authority (unless the Secretary has<br>notified the consent authority that<br>the making of the proposed<br>instrument has been deferred<br>indefinitely or has not been<br>approved), and | The relevant proposed environmental planning instruments are addressed at Section 4.                                |
|                    | (iii)                              | any development control plan, and  | The Hornsby Development Control Plan 2013 is addressed at Section 4.5.  |
|                    | (iiia,                             | ) any planning agreement that has<br>been entered into under section<br>7.4, or any draft planning<br>agreement that a developer has<br>offered to enter into under section<br>7.4, and  | No planning agreement or draft planning<br>agreement has been entered into as part of<br>this application.          |
|                    | (iv)                               | the regulations (to the extent that<br>they prescribe matters for the<br>purposes of this paragraph),  | The application is consistent with the relevant matters of the EP&A Regulations.                                    |
|                    | (v)                                | (Repealed)   | N/A.  |
| (b)                | the<br>inc<br>bo<br>en<br>ec       | e likely impacts of that development,<br>cluding environmental impacts on<br>th the natural and built<br>vironments, and social and<br>onomic impacts in the locality,   | The impacts of the proposal are addressed in Section 5.   |
| (C)                | the<br>de                          | e suitability of the site for the velopment,   | Site suitability is addressed at Section 5.7.   |
| (d)                | an<br>wii                          | y submissions made in accordance<br>th this Act or the regulations,  | Any submissions made on this subject<br>Development Application will be duly<br>considered and addressed by Keylan. |
| (e)                | the                                | e public interest.   | Public interest is addressed at Section 5.8.  |
| Table              | able 5: Section 4.15(1) assessment |  |   |

# 4.2 Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016

The Biodiversity Values Map has been prepared by DPE under Part 7 of the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*. The map identifies land of high biodiversity value that is particularly sensitive to impacts from development and clearing. It is one of the triggers for determining whether the Biodiversity Offset Scheme applies to a clearing or Development Application.

As shown in the figure below, the site is partially located on high biodiversity value land. Notwithstanding, it is anticipated there will be no impact on the land identified as high biodiversity value as all trees within the vicinity of the site will be retained and protection measures as described within the Arboriculturally Impact Appraisal and Method



Statement (Appendix 8) will be implemented. Because of this, no further assessment is required, and the Biodiversity Offset Scheme will not apply.



Figure 18: Biodiversity values map (Base source: Spatial viewer)

# 4.3 State Environmental Planning Policies

The proposal has been designed with regard to the objectives and standards of the relevant planning instruments and policies that apply to the site. Under the provisions of the EP&A Act, the key applicable state environmental planning policies are:

- State Environmental Planning Policy (Industry and Employment) 2021
- State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021

The application of the above plans and policies are discussed in detail in the following sections of this SEE.

# 4.3.1 State Environmental Planning Policy (Industry and Employment) 2021

# Chapter 3 – Advertising and Signage

Chapter 3 of the Industry and Employment SEPP aims to ensure that advertising and signage is well located, compatible with the desired amenity of an area and of high quality. Chapter 3 applies to all signage, advertisements that advertise or promote any goods, services or events and any structure that is used for the display of signage.



Regardless of permissibility under the *Hornsby Local Environmental Plan 2013* (HLEP 2013), the proposed sign is permissible with consent under Section 3.14 of the Industry and Employment SEPP as it is on behalf of Sydney Trains and is within a railway corridor. Further, under Section 3.10(c) of the Industry and Employment SEPP, the Minister is the consent authority for the application as it is for an advertisement displayed on behalf of Sydney Trains in a rail corridor.

A comprehensive assessment against the provisions of Chapter 3 of the Industry and Employment SEPP that apply to the development is provided at Appendix 1.

#### Schedule 5 Assessment

Section 3.6 of the Industry and Employment SEPP requires the consent authority to assess the proposal against the criteria within Schedule 5 prior to granting consent to carrying out of any development on that land. An assessment of these matters is provided in the table below:

| Schedule 5  | Comment   | Compliance |
|---|---|------------|
| 1. Character of the Area  |   |            |
| Is the proposal compatible with the<br>existing or desired future character<br>of the area or locality in which it is<br>proposed to be located?  | <ul> <li>The proposal is compatible with<br/>the existing character as it is:         <ul> <li>located within the Hornsby<br/>Town Centre</li> <li>consistent with the highly<br/>urbanised area</li> <li>significantly smaller than<br/>surrounding built form such as<br/>the high-density, mixed-use<br/>development approximately<br/>24m south of the site and<br/>existing mature trees directly<br/>west and south of the sign<br/>and therefore will not<br/>dominate the skyline.</li> <li>will reduce the size of the<br/>existing static sign by 65% or<br/>27.48m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>the signs design is creative<br/>and a bish quality outcome</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | Yes        |
| <i>Is the proposal consistent with a particular theme for outdoor advertising in the area or locality?</i>  |   | Yes        |
| 2. Special Areas  | <b>0</b> 1 <i>3</i>   |            |
| Does the proposal detract from the<br>amenity or visual quality of any<br>environmentally sensitive areas,<br>heritage areas, natural or other<br>conservation areas, open space<br>areas, waterways, rural landscapes<br>or residential areas? | <ul> <li>As the site is not located in proximity to environmentally sensitive land, open space, conservation area, waterways or rural landscapes, the proposal will not have any adverse amenity of visual quality impacts.</li> <li>It is noted the site is located nearby local heritage items (no. 475, 476 and 501 being Street Trees on Edgeworth Drive,</li> </ul>  | Yes        |



| Schedule 5   | Comment   | Compliance |
|--|---|------------|
|  | <ul> <li>Hornsby Girl's High School and<br/>Barker College respectively.</li> <li>However, the proposal will not<br/>have any adverse impacts on<br/>these items given: <ul> <li>It is not anticipated Items 457<br/>and 476 will have any views of<br/>the sign as there is dense<br/>vegetation screening the site<br/>and significant distance<br/>(approximately 70m from item<br/>475 and 176m from item 476)</li> <li>Item 501 is approximately<br/>300m south of the proposal<br/>and will have limited<br/>sightlines. The lighting and<br/>visual impacts (if any) would<br/>be negligible.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |            |
| 3. Views and vistas  |   |            |
| Does the proposal obscure or<br>compromise important views?  | <ul> <li>the proposal will not obscure or<br/>compromise any important views.</li> </ul>  | Yes        |
| Does the proposal dominate the<br>skyline and reduce the quality of<br>vistas?                                 | <ul> <li>the proposal does not dominate<br/>the skyline, it is proposed to be<br/>lower in height than nearby mixed</li> </ul>  | Yes        |
| Does the proposal respect the viewing rights of other advertisers?   | <ul> <li>use developments and mature vegetation</li> <li>the proposal does not conflict with the viewing rights of other advertisers</li> </ul>   | Yes        |
| 4. Streetscape, Setting or Landsca   | аре   |            |
| Is the scale, proportion and form of<br>the proposal appropriate for the<br>streetscape, setting or landscape? | <ul> <li>the proposal involves the erection<br/>of a monopole sign with an<br/>advertising display area of</li> </ul>   | Yes        |
| Does the proposal contribute to the visual interest of the streetscape, setting or landscape?                  | 14.93m <sup>2</sup> which is appropriate for<br>the streetscape, will not detract<br>from the existing road corridor and  | Yes        |
| Does the proposal reduce clutter<br>by rationalizing and simplifying<br>existing advertising?                  | <ul> <li>will complement the surrounding area</li> <li>the advertisement is flat and is mounted on a monopole. The scale, proportion and form are appropriate as the proposal is located wholly within the railway corridor and does not protrude into the road reserve</li> </ul>  | Yes        |
| Does the proposal screen unsightliness?  |   | Yes        |
| Does the proposal protrude above<br>buildings, structures or tree<br>canopies in the area or locality?         |   | Yes        |
| Does the proposal require ongoing vegetation management?   | <ul> <li>the proposal contributes to the visual interest along the Pacific Highway through the display of high-quality advertisements</li> <li>the proposal replaces a larger free-standing advertising sign</li> </ul>   | Yes        |



| Schedule 5  | Comment   | Compliance |
|---|---|------------|
|   | <ul> <li>the proposal is smaller than<br/>surrounding built form, structures<br/>such as light poles and tree<br/>canopies.</li> <li>Maintenance of surrounding<br/>vegetation will be undertaken by<br/>employees/representatives of<br/>JCDecaux to protect the<br/>surrounding road and pedestrian<br/>environment.</li> </ul>   |            |
| 5. Site and Building  |   |            |
| Is the proposal compatible with the<br>scale, proportion and other<br>characteristics of the site or<br>building, or both, on which the<br>proposed signage is to be located? | <ul> <li>the proposal is compatible with<br/>the scale, proportion, and<br/>characteristics of the site</li> <li>the height of the sign is reflective<br/>of surrounding built form</li> </ul>  | Yes        |
| Does the proposal respect<br>important features of the site or<br>building, or both?  | <ul> <li>the site is located nearby the road<br/>corridor and mixed-use buildings,<br/>as such the proposed sign is</li> </ul>  | Yes        |
| Does the proposal show innovation<br>and imagination in its relationship<br>to the site or building, or both?   | <ul> <li>compatible with the nature of the road/environment</li> <li>the location of the sign is appropriate as it will contribute to the visual interest of the area whilst ensuring minimal impacts on the surrounding development</li> <li>the sign represents a contemporary form of digital advertising signage which will be a high-quality design outcome</li> </ul>   | Yes        |
| 6. Associated Devices and Logos   | with Advertisements and Advertising s   | tructures  |
| Have any safety devices,<br>platforms, lighting devices or logos<br>been designed as an integral part<br>of the signage or structure on<br>which it is to be displayed?       | <ul> <li>JCDecaux will operate the content<br/>management system for the sign.<br/>This management system ensures<br/>that unapproved content is not<br/>downloaded either by mistake or<br/>without appropriate authorisation</li> <li>a compliant operator logo will also<br/>be located at the bottom of the<br/>screen and within the skirting of<br/>the sign</li> </ul> | Yes        |
| 7. Illumination   |   |            |
| Would illumination result in<br>unacceptable glare?   | <ul> <li>a Lighting Impact Assessment<br/>(LIA) prepared by Electrolight is<br/>included at Apparedix 4</li> </ul>  | Yes        |
| Would illumination affect safety for pedestrians, vehicles or aircraft?   | <ul> <li>the LIA confirms that the proposed digital sign would not result in</li> </ul>   | Yes        |
| Would illumination detract from the<br>amenity of any residence or other<br>form of accommodation?  | unacceptable glare or have any detrimental impacts to safety of pedestrians, residents at 121,  | Yes        |



| Schedule 5   | Comment   | Compliance |
|--|---|------------|
| Can the intensity of the illumination be adjusted, if necessary?   | <ul><li>135-137 and 192 Pacific Highway or vehicular traffic</li><li>the sign complies with all relevant</li></ul>  | Yes        |
| <i>Is the illumination subject to a curfew?</i>  | <ul> <li>criteria for luminance of digital<br/>advertisements and should not<br/>cause any reduction in visual<br/>amenity to nearby residences</li> <li>the brightness of the LEDs will be<br/>controlled to provide upper and<br/>lower thresholds as required as<br/>well as automatically via a local<br/>light sensor to adjust to ambient<br/>lighting conditions</li> <li>the proposal is consistent with the<br/>applicable 'post curfew'<br/>illuminance limits established<br/>under AS 4282-2019</li> </ul>  | Yes        |
| 8. Safety  |   |            |
| Would the proposal reduce the<br>safety for any public road?<br>Would the proposal reduce the<br>safety for pedestrians or bicyclists?<br>Would the proposal reduce the<br>safety for pedestrians, particularly<br>children, by obscuring sightlines<br>from public areas? | <ul> <li>the analysis provided within the<br/>Traffic Safety Assessment<br/>(Appendix 3) concludes the<br/>installation of the proposed sign is<br/>acceptable and safe based on the<br/>minimal crash rate within the<br/>vicinity of the existing static sign<br/>and proposed digital sign.</li> <li>the crash analysis indicates that<br/>there was no crash incident that<br/>involved pedestrians or cyclists<br/>during the most recent 5-year<br/>period, indicating no crash in the<br/>vicinity that can be specifically<br/>associated with the existing static<br/>sign. Since the proposed digital<br/>sign would be maintained at the<br/>same position, the proposal is not<br/>likely to reduce safety for<br/>motorists, pedestrians or cyclists</li> <li>no sightlines for pedestrians and<br/>children are obscured by the<br/>proposal as the sign is elevated<br/>above the road</li> <li>the proposed sign will not obscure<br/>any sightlines towards any traffic<br/>safety devices, directional signs or<br/>the like</li> </ul> | Yes        |

Table 6: Schedule 5, SEPP (Industry and Employment) 2021 consideration

# 4.3.2 Transport Corridor Advertising and Signage Guidelines 2017

The *Transport Corridor Outdoor Advertising and Signage Guidelines* (Signage Guidelines) sets out a best practice approach for the planning and design of outdoor advertisements in transport corridors in NSW.



The Signage Guidelines have been established to compliment the provisions of the Industry and Employment SEPP. The DA for any advertising sign that is located in, or adjacent to, a transport corridor to demonstrate how the proposal addresses the Signage Guidelines. An assessment against the criteria within Signage Guidelines is provided at Appendix 1 and Section 5.

The assessment provided at Appendix 1 demonstrates the proposal is consistent with:

- the Land Use Compatibility Criteria for Transport Corridor Advertising
- the Digital Sign Criteria
- the Freestanding Signage Criteria
- Road Safety (refer section 5.1)
- Luminance Levels for Digital Advertisements (refer section 5.2)
- the Public Benefit Test (refer section 5.8)

#### 4.3.3 State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021

Chapter 2 of *State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure)* 2021 (Transport and Infrastructure SEPP) identifies the environmental assessment category into which different types of infrastructure and services development fall.

In addition, Chapter 2 identifies those matters that are to be considered in the assessment of development that is adjacent to particular types of infrastructure, including development in and adjacent to road corridors.

An assessment against the relevant provisions of the Transport and Infrastructure SEPP is provided in the table below.

| Section  | Comment   | Compliance |
|--|---|------------|
| 2.98 Development adjacent to rail corrid   | lors  |            |
| <ul> <li>(1) This section applies to development<br/>on land that is in or adjacent to a rail<br/>corridor, if the development— <ul> <li>(a) is likely to have an adverse<br/>effect on rail safety, or</li> <li>(b) involves the placing of a metal<br/>finish on a structure and the rail<br/>corridor concerned is used by<br/>electric trains, or</li> <li>(c) involves the use of a crane in air<br/>space above any rail corridor, or</li> <li>(d) is located within 5 metres of an<br/>exposed overhead electricity<br/>power line that is used for the<br/>purpose of railways or rail<br/>infrastructure facilities.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul> <li>The proposed signage is unlikely to adversely impact on the safety and operation of the rail line as:</li> <li>the advertising structure will be orientated so to be visible to vehicular traffic travelling north on the Pacific Highway</li> <li>the Applicant is Sydney Trains and it will ensure no structure is approved to be erected that may impact the ongoing operation of the Sydney Trains rail network</li> <li>The proposed sign will comprise metal finishes. However, it is not anticipated that the railway line will be impacted by the installation of the sign.</li> </ul> | Yes        |



| Section  | Comment   | Compliance |
|--|---|------------|
|  | The construction and operation of<br>the sign will involve the use of a<br>crane in the air space above the<br>rail corridor. The operation of the<br>crane will be during the<br>construction stage only and will<br>be appropriately managed in<br>accordance with DPE's<br><i>Development Near railways and<br/>busy corridors Guideline (2008).</i><br>Furthermore, the proposed sign<br>is not located within 5m of an<br>exposed overhead power line as<br>detailed in the Architectural Plans<br>(Appendix 2). |            |
| <ul> <li>(2) Before determining a development<br/>application for development to which<br/>this section applies, the consent<br/>authority must— <ul> <li>(a) within 7 days after the application<br/>is made, give written notice of the<br/>application to the rail authority for<br/>the rail corridor, and</li> <li>(b) take into consideration— <ul> <li>any response to the notice that is<br/>received within 21 days after the<br/>notice is given, and</li> </ul> </li> <li>ii. any guidelines that are issued by<br/>the Secretary for the purposes of<br/>this section and published in the<br/>Gazette.</li> </ul></li></ul> | It is anticipated DPE will notify<br>the application accordingly.   | Yes        |
| <ul> <li>(3) Despite subsection (2), the consent<br/>authority is not required to comply<br/>with subsection (2)(a) and (b)(i) if<br/>the development application is for<br/>development on land that is in or<br/>adjacent to a rail corridor vested in<br/>or owned by ARTC or the subject of<br/>an ARTC arrangement.</li> </ul>  | Not applicable. As above, it is<br>anticipated DPE will notify the<br>application in accordance with<br>Section 2.98(2).  | N/A        |
| (4) Land is adjacent to a rail corridor for<br>the purpose of this section even if it<br>is separated from the rail corridor by<br>a road or road related area within<br>the meaning of the Road Transport<br>Act 2013.  | Noted.  | Yes        |
| 2.99 Excavation in, above, below or adj  | acent to rail corridors   |            |
| (1) This section applies to development<br>(other than development to which<br>section 2.101 applies) that involves<br>the penetration of ground to a depth<br>of at least 2m below ground level<br>(existing) on land—  | A Structural Feasibility Statement<br>has been prepared by Dennis<br>Bunt Consulting Engineers<br>(Appendix 9).   | Yes        |



| Section   | Comment  | Compliance |
|---|--|------------|
| <ul> <li>(a) within, below or above a rail corridor, or</li> <li>(b) within 25m (measured horizontally) of a rail corridor, or</li> <li>(c) within 25m (measured horizontally) of the ground directly below a rail corridor, or</li> <li>(d) within 25m (measured horizontally) of the ground directly above an underground rail corridor.</li> </ul>   | A concrete pile and pile cap are<br>proposed to minimise the impact<br>of the sign footing on the<br>adjacent railway track. The pile<br>cap will be 1m <sup>2</sup> in area and 1m<br>deep.<br>The concrete pile will be 750mm<br>in diameter and extend below<br>ground by approximately 8m.<br>An assessment against the<br>provisions of Section 2.99 is<br>provided below.                          |            |
| <ul> <li>(2) Before determining a development application for development to which this section applies, the consent authority must— <ul> <li>(a) within 7 days after the application is made, give written notice of the application to the rail authority for the rail corridor, and</li> <li>(b) take into consideration— <ul> <li>(i) any response to the notice that is received within 21 days after the notice is given, and</li> <li>(ii) any guidelines issued by the Planning Secretary for the purposes of this section and published in the Gazette.</li> </ul> </li> </ul></li></ul> | DPE are required to give written<br>notice of the subject application<br>to the rail authority within 7 days<br>after the application is made.   | Yes        |
| (3) Subject to subsection (5), the<br>consent authority must not grant<br>consent to development to which<br>this section applies without the<br>concurrence of the rail authority for<br>the rail corridor to which the<br>development application relates.  | DPE is required to seek<br>concurrence from the rail<br>authority before granted consent<br>to the development.  | Yes        |
| <ul> <li>(4) In deciding whether to provide concurrence, the rail authority must take into account— <ul> <li>(a) the potential effects of the development (whether alone or cumulatively with other development or proposed development) on— <ul> <li>(i) the safety or structural integrity of existing or proposed rail infrastructure facilities in the rail corridor, and</li> <li>(ii) the safe and effective operation of existing or proposed rail</li> </ul> </li> </ul></li></ul>  | The rail authority is required to<br>assess the potential effects of the<br>development on the safety and<br>structural integrity of the rail<br>infrastructure and rail activity.<br>A Structural Feasibility Statement<br>is provided at Appendix 9 that<br>details the structural integrity of<br>the proposed signage structure.<br>The proposed structure has been<br>designed and located so as to | Yes        |



| Section   | Comment   | Compliance |
|---|---|------------|
| infrastructure facilities in the rail<br>corridor, and<br>(b) what measures are proposed, or<br>could reasonably be taken, to avoid<br>or minimise those potential effects.   | prevent interference with rail<br>activities.<br>It is also noted that the Applicant<br>is Sydney Trains and it will<br>ensure no structure is approved<br>to be erected that may impact the<br>ongoing operation of the Sydney<br>Trains rail network.   |            |
| <ul> <li>(5) The consent authority may grant consent to development to which this section applies without the concurrence of the rail authority concerned if— <ul> <li>(a) the rail corridor is owned by or vested in ARTC or is the subject of an ARTC arrangement, or</li> <li>(b) in any other case, 21 days have passed since the consent authority gave notice under subsection (2)(a) and the rail authority has not granted or refused to grant concurrence.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>  | Noted.  | Yes        |
| 2.119 Development with a frontage to a  | classified road   |            |
| <ul> <li>(1) The objectives of this section are— <ul> <li>(a) to ensure that new development does not compromise the effective and ongoing operation and function of classified roads, and</li> <li>(b) to prevent or reduce the potential impact of traffic noise and vehicle emission on development adjacent to classified roads.</li> </ul> </li> <li>(2) The consent authority must not grant consent to development on land that has a frontage to a classified road unless it is satisfied that— <ul> <li>(a) where practicable and safe, vehicular access to the land is provided by a road other than the classified road, and</li> <li>(b) the safety, efficiency and ongoing operation of the classified road will not be adversely affected by the development as a result of— <ul> <li>(i) the design of the vehicular access to the land, or</li> </ul> </li> </ul></li></ul> | The proposal comprises<br>development with a frontage to a<br>classified road, Pacific Highway<br>(No. 10).<br>The assessment contained in this<br>SEE and supporting reports<br>concludes that the proposed<br>signage is not likely to adversely<br>impact on the effective and<br>ongoing operation and function of<br>the Pacific Highway.<br>A Traffic Safety Assessment<br>(TSA) has been prepared as part<br>of the application and is included<br>at Appendix 3. The TSA<br>considers the ongoing operation<br>and function of the Pacific<br>Highway in context to the<br>development and concludes the<br>proposal is acceptable based on<br>the minimal crash rate within the<br>vicinity of the existing static sign<br>and proposed digital sign. Road<br>safety is further discussed at<br>Section 5.1. | Yes        |



| Section  |  | Comment   | Compliance |
|--|--|---|------------|
| (ii)<br>(iii)<br>(c) the dev<br>not sen<br>vehicle<br>located<br>measur<br>traffic n<br>within t<br>arising  | the emission of smoke or<br>dust from the development,<br>or<br>the nature, volume or<br>frequency of vehicles using<br>the classified road to gain<br>access to the land, and<br>relopment is of a type that is<br>sitive to traffic noise or<br>emissions, or is appropriately<br>and designed, or includes<br>res, to ameliorate potential<br>oise or vehicle emissions<br>he site of the development<br>from the adjacent classified   |   |            |
| 2 121 Exc  | avation in or immediately adia   | acent to corridors  |            |
| <ul> <li>(1) This set that involve to a depth level (exist corridor of road projec 2)—</li> <li>(2) Before applica modified develo applies must—a. giv ap da b. tak (i)</li> <li>(ii)</li> <li>(iii)</li> <li>(iii)</li> </ul> | ection applies to development<br>es the penetration of ground<br>of at least 3m below ground<br>ing) on land that is the road<br>any of the following roads or<br>cts (as described in Schedule<br>determining a development<br>ation (or an application for<br>cation of a consent) for<br>pment to which this section<br>s, the consent authority<br>we written notice of the<br>plication to TfNSW within 7<br>ys after the application is<br>ade, and<br>ke into consideration—<br>any response to the notice<br>that is received within 21<br>days after the notice is<br>given, and<br>any guidelines that are<br>issued by the Planning<br>Secretary for the purposes of<br>this section and published in<br>the Gazette, and<br>any implications of the<br>ground penetration for the<br>structural integrity of the<br>road or project, and<br>any cost implications for the<br>ground penetration so the<br>ground penetration so the<br>ground penetration so the<br>ground penetration for the<br>structural integrity of the<br>road or project, and<br>any cost implications for the<br>ground penetration so the ground | The sign is located along the<br>Pacific Highway corridor and<br>involves a concrete pile that will<br>extend below ground by<br>approximately 8m.<br>The development application will<br>be referred to TfNSW by DPE as<br>part of the assessment process. | Yes        |



| Section  | Comment | Compliance |
|--|---------|------------|
| (3) The consent authority must provide<br>TfNSW with a copy of the<br>determination of the application<br>within 7 days after the determination<br>is made |         |            |

Table 7: Transport and Infrastructure SEPP assessment



# 4.4 Hornsby Local Environmental Plan 2013

The *Hornsby Local Environmental Plan 2013* (HLEP 2013) is the principal Environmental Planning Instrument applicable to the land.

# 4.4.1 Zoning

The proposed sign is located on land zoned MU1 Mixed Use under the HLEP 2013. Signage is permissible with consent in the MU1 zone under the HLEP 2013.

Additionally, as the proposed sign is on behalf of Sydney Trains and is within a railway corridor, it is also permissible with consent under section 3.14 of the Industry and Employment SEPP.



Figure 19: Land use zoning map (Source: HLEP 2013)

#### 4.4.2 Heritage

As shown on the figure below, the site has no statutory heritage listings, however, lies within the vicinity of three heritage items as defined by Schedule 5 Part 1 of the HLEP 2013.





Figure 20: Heritage map (Source: HLEP 2013)

| HLEP Schedule<br>5 Item No | Item name  | Approximate<br>distance from site |
|----------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| 475                        | Street trees   | 70m                               |
| 476                        | Hornsby Girl's High School – buildings and<br>masonry fence (excluding other school<br>structures and grounds) | 176m                              |
| 501                        | Barker College – group of buildings, grounds and gate  | 300m                              |

Table 8: Heritage items within the vicinity of the site (Source: HLEP 2013)

Notwithstanding the proposal's proximity to these items, it is anticipated there will be no adverse heritage impacts for the following reasons:

- the visibility of the sign to the heritage items are restricted primarily due to the surrounding mature vegetation within the railway corridor and existing built form
- the approved development located at 228-234 Pacific Highway, Hornsby DA/416/2020 (if constructed) will further obstruct sightlines towards the sign from items 476 and 475 due to the buildings bulk and scale
- Item 501 is approximately 300m south of the proposal and will have limited sightlines. Therefore, the lighting and visual impacts (if any) would be negligible



- Item 475 and 476 are located to the north-east and east of the sign and therefore views will be limited to the side and rear of the sign
- the illuminance of the proposed sign will be calibrated to the levels recommended in the LIA, which is an acceptable level which will not produce any lighting impacts on the heritage items.

# 4.5 Hornsby Development Control Plan 2013

The proposal complies with the aims, objectives and key provisions of the DCP. A detailed assessment of the proposal against the relevant provisions of the DCP is provided in the table below:

| Pro | ovision  | Comment   | Complies |
|-----|--|---|----------|
| Pa  | rt 1C.2.11 - Signage   |   |          |
| De  | sired Outcomes   |   |          |
| a.  | Signage compatible with the character of the locality.   | The proposal is consistent with the MU1<br>zone objectives in the HLEP 2013 as it is<br>compatible with the surrounding land<br>uses comprising mixed use, high density<br>typologies and highly frequented road<br>corridors.  | Yes      |
|     |  | The site is located within the Hornsby<br>Town Centre. The proposed sign is<br>compatible with the surrounding highly<br>urbanised area and is proposed within a<br>suitable location. The bulk and scale of<br>the sign is appropriate given the nature<br>of the surrounding built environment<br>which includes 12 storey buildings. |          |
|     |  | There is an existing sign at the sign<br>which is proposed to be replace. The<br>proposed digital advertising sign has a<br>65% smaller advertising display area<br>than the existing 42.41m <sup>2</sup> illuminated<br>static sign, reducing the extent of<br>signage in the area.  |          |
| b.  | Signage that complements the scale, size and architecture of the building or structure on which it is displayed. | The advertisement will be flat and<br>mounted on a monopole. The sign will<br>not be located within or attached to any<br>existing built form elements and located<br>at least 25m from the nearest building.<br>The sign will be an appropriate scale and  | Yes      |
|     |  | size for the locality as it will be lower in<br>height than nearby mixed use<br>developments and mature vegetation.   |          |
|     |  | obscure or compromise any important<br>views nor will it dominate the skyline.  |          |



| Pre               | ovision   | Comment   | Complies |
|-------------------|---|---|----------|
| С.                | c. Signage that does not<br>compromise pedestrian,<br>cyclist or motorist safety  | The sign will not compromise safety as it<br>will be located on Sydney Trains behind<br>an existing retaining wall. The sign will<br>be setback a minimum of 1m from the<br>footpath and 4.4m from Pacific Highway.<br>The traffic and lighting reports at<br>Appendix 3 & 4 provide further detail that<br>the proposal is adequate for the site and<br>will have acceptable impacts.<br>Furthermore, advertising material will not<br>be visible to trains travelling on the rail<br>tracks.  | Yes      |
| Pre               | escriptive Measures   |   |          |
| a.<br>•<br>•<br>• | Signs should be designed and<br>located to:<br>be consistent with best<br>practice guidelines,<br>be integrated with the<br>architecture of the supporting<br>building, not obscure<br>significant architectural<br>features and maintain the<br>dominance of the architecture,<br>be limited in number to avoid<br>cluttering, distraction and<br>unnecessary repetition,<br>not cover mechanical<br>ventilation inlets or outlets,<br>not comprise a roof sign,<br>not compromise road or<br>pedestrian safety,<br>be a minimum of 2.6 metres<br>above any footpath where the<br>sign is not flush with the wall,<br>and<br>be at least 600mm from a kerb<br>or roadway edge where the<br>sign is over a public road. | <ul> <li>The sign is consistent with the Signage Guidelines and assessment is provided at Appendix 1.</li> <li>The advertisement will be flat, mounted on a monopole. It will not be located within or attached to any existing built form elements.</li> <li>As described in Section 2.2, non-permanent advertising poster signage is located on the inside of the rail bridge just after the proposed sign location.</li> <li>The proposal does not comprise of a roof sign nor will it cover mechanical ventilation inlets or outlets.</li> <li>The Traffic Safety Assessment confirms (Appendix 3) confirms the proposal does not compromise road or pedestrian safety.</li> <li>The proposed advertising display area is 3.3m above the ground which is compliant with the 2.6m requirement.</li> <li>As shown on the Architectural Plans (Appendix 2), the sign is not proposed over a public road, it is setback 1m from the road</li> </ul> | Yes      |
| b.                | In addition to the above,   | The sign is proposed to be a digital  | Yes      |
| illu<br>•<br>•    | mination of signage should:<br>be integrated with the design<br>of the sign,<br>not cause light spillage into<br>nearby residential properties,<br>not use complex displays,<br>moving signs, flashing lights or  | advertisement and will therefore<br>incorporate an illuminated digital panel<br>that is integrated into the signage<br>structure.<br>The Lighting Impact Assessment<br>(Appendix 4) assessed potential light  |          |



| Provision  | Comment   | Complies |
|--|---|----------|
| the like that hold driver's<br>attention beyond 'glance<br>appreciation', and<br>• be fitted with an automatic<br>timing device, controlling the<br>illumination hours | <ul> <li>spillage and illuminance impacts on the nearest dwellings with potential views of the signage (described below):</li> <li>121 Pacific Highway</li> <li>135-137 Pacific Highway</li> <li>192 Pacific Highway</li> <li>208 Pacific Highway</li> <li>208 Pacific Highway</li> <li>208 Pacific Highway</li> <li>2A Pound Road</li> <li>4-10 Pound Road</li> </ul> The lighting report concludes that the proposed digital signage should not result in unacceptable glare, nor should it adversely impact the safety of pedestrians, residents or vehicular traffic. Additionally, the signage should not cause any reduction in visual. In accordance with the recommendation of the, Digital Sign Safety Assessment (Appendix 3) the proposal will have a dwell time of 15 seconds to ensure the sign only requires a short glance and is not distracting to road users. The sign will be fitted with automatic timing technology to control the dwell time and illuminance throughout the day and night |          |
| c. In residential zones, signage<br>should not be illuminated.   | The proposal is located within the MU1<br>Mixed Use zone and is permitted with<br>consent. It is noted residential uses are<br>nearby the site. The Lighting Impact<br>Assessment at Appendix 4 includes a<br>review of nearby residential dwellings<br>and a calculation of the amount of<br>illuminance (measured in Lux) that the<br>properties are likely to receive from the<br>signage during nighttime operation.<br>The Assessment concludes the<br>illuminance levels comply with the<br>maximum AS4282 limit of 5 lux.<br>Therefore, proposal should not cause<br>any reduction in visual amenity to nearby<br>residences or accommodation.   | Yes      |
| d. All commercial advertising<br>should comply with the State<br>Environmental Planning Policy<br>(Industry and Employment) 2021<br>(Industry and Employment SEPP).    | An assessment against the Industry and<br>Employment SEPP is provided in this<br>SEE and at Appendix 1.   | Yes      |



| Provision  | Comment   | Complies               |  |
|--|---|------------------------|--|
| Part 4.5 – Hornsby Town Centre   |   |                        |  |
| 4.5.1 Desired Future Character   |   |                        |  |
| <u>Desired Outcome</u><br>a. Development that contributes<br>to the desired future character<br>of the area.   | The site is located within the East<br>Precinct of the town centre.<br>The area is of a mixed-use character<br>with high density-built form, a  | Yes                    |  |
|  | commercial shopping centre with highly<br>frequented rail and road corridors. The<br>proposal is compatible as it will have a<br>high design quality and will provide<br>visual interest to motorists travelling<br>along the highway.  |                        |  |
| <u>Prescriptive Measures – East</u><br><u>Precinct</u><br>a. Development applications<br>should demonstrate<br>compatibility with the<br>statements of desired<br>character for the East<br>Precinct.                          | The proposal will be consistent with the role of the East Precinct as it is the commercial core with a strong retail and commercial focus.  | Yes                    |  |
| 4.5.4 Scale within Hornsby LGA   |   |                        |  |
| <u>Desired Outcome</u><br>a. Development with a height,<br>scale and intensity compatible<br>with the role and function of<br>the centre under the<br>commercial centres hierarchy.  | This section relates to the development<br>of buildings.<br>Notwithstanding, the proposal will be<br>compatible with the role and function of<br>the Hornsby Town Centre (East Precinct)<br>as signage is suitable for a mixed use<br>and largely commercial area and it will<br>create visual interest along a highly<br>frequented road corridor. | Yes                    |  |
| 4.5.5 Setbacks   |   |                        |  |
| <u>Desired Outcome</u><br>a. Well articulated building forms<br>with a pedestrian-friendly<br>scale that encourages<br>commercial activity and<br>provides for landscaping, open<br>space and separation between<br>buildings. | The proposal is a free standing<br>monopole. It will be located on the<br>western side of the Pacific Highway<br>behind a retaining wall with surrounding<br>landscaping such as shrubs and existing<br>mature vegetation.<br>The signage panel will exist<br>approximately 3.3m above ground level.<br>On this basis, the sign will not interfere  | Yes                    |  |
| <u>Prescriptive Measures – East</u><br><u>Precinct</u>   | with pedestrian activity. The sign will<br>encourage commercial activity as it will<br>include the display of advertising that will<br>generate visual interest along the Pacific<br>Highway.<br>The sign will be setback approximately<br>1m from the site boundary. This is a   | No,<br>however         |  |
| n. The setbacks of all buildings<br>and structures to the  | minor departure from the control and acceptable given:  | acceptable<br>on merit |  |



| Provision   | Comment  | Complies |
|---|--|----------|
| boundaries of the site are<br>prescribed in Table 4.5.4(b)<br>for the East Precinct: Pacific<br>Highway (south of rail line) –<br>4m  | <ul> <li>existing signage is significantly larger<br/>(65%) than the proposed sign and<br/>has no setback to the site boundary</li> <li>existing vegetation would need to be<br/>pruned or removed to accommodate<br/>a compliant 4m setback</li> <li>provides appropriate clearance from<br/>other surrounding infrastructure such<br/>as electrical box (2.9m), brick<br/>retaining wall (4.3m), balustrade pier<br/>(1m) and light pole (4.4m)</li> </ul> |          |
| 4.5.12 Public Domain and Traffic Ma   | nagement Works   |          |
| <ul> <li><u>Desired Outcome</u></li> <li><i>A public domain that</i><br/>encourages vitality around and<br/>within development precincts.</li> <li><u>Prescriptive Measures</u></li> <li>a. Development of the public<br/>domain should make each<br/>precinct an attractive place<br/>that encourages development<br/>and provides amenity for<br/>workers, residents and<br/>visitors.</li> </ul> | The proposal will be located on a site<br>that is not visible from any areas of open<br>space or major public domain.<br>Notwithstanding, the proposal will be<br>visible from the pedestrian footpath. The<br>proposal will positively contribute to the<br>Hornsby Town Centre (East Precinct)<br>public domain by providing visual<br>interest.   | Yes      |
| 4.5.13 Design Details   |  |          |
| <u>Desired Outcome</u><br>a. Development that contributes<br>positively to the streetscape<br>and the creation of a vibrant<br>active precinct.   | The proposal involves is compatible and<br>will integrated well with the urbanised<br>environment. The contemporary digital<br>sign will make a positive contribution to<br>the vibrancy of the precinct.  | Yes      |

Table 9: DCP Assessment



# 5 Environmental Planning Assessment

# 5.1 Road safety

A Traffic Safety Assessment (TSA) has been prepared by The Transport Planning Partnership (Appendix 3). The TSA considers the signage exposure and road accident history and has been prepared having considered the requirements for road safety set out in the Signage Guidelines.

#### 5.1.1 Road environment

The existing road environment along the Pacific Highway in proximity to the proposed sign is summarised in the table below.

| Existing Feature                                       | Description   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| Road classification                                    | Pacific Highway is a classified State Road (No. 10)   |  |  |
| Speed limit  | 60 km/h for northbound and southbound traffic   |  |  |
| Nearby intersections<br>and traffic control<br>devices | <ul> <li>the proposed sign is located on the north-west corner of the Pacific<br/>Highway and Government Road, Hornsby intersection</li> <li>the signalised intersection of Edgeworth David Avenue/Pacific<br/>Highway is approximately 45m north of the site</li> </ul>  |  |  |
| Road configuration<br>and geometry                     | <ul> <li>Pacific Highway has two northbound through travel lanes and one short dedicated right turn lane approximately 220m in length extending from Edgeworth David Avenue</li> <li>a short-left turn slip lane from Pacific Highway to Government Road commences south of the proposed digital sign</li> </ul>  |  |  |
| Crash data   | <ul> <li>one crash was reported resulting in a minor injury in a five year period from 2017 – 2022</li> <li>no crash incident involving pedestrians or cyclists</li> </ul>  |  |  |
| Pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure                  | <ul> <li>pedestrian pathways are located on either side of the bridge overpass on the Pacific Highway</li> <li>no cyclist infrastructure is provided along either side of the Pacific Highway as the digital sign board will be placed behind the retaining wall in the Sydney Trains corridor, it will not:</li> <li>cantilever over the pedestrian footpath</li> <li>physically obstruct any vehicle, pedestrian or cyclists movements</li> </ul> |  |  |
| Parking  | • no stopping or car parking is permitted along the northbound Pacific Highway approach in proximity to the sign.   |  |  |
| Safe Stopping<br>Distance                              | • 64m   |  |  |

Table 10: Existing road environment (Source: The Transport Planning Partnership)

#### 5.1.2 Signage exposure

The proposed sign will be visible to northbound traffic travelling on the Pacific Highway near Government Road.

The digital sign would likely be visible from the following traffic lanes and will become out of driving view approximately 5m north of the sign:

- northbound through lane 1, 100 m from the sign
- northbound through lane 2, 105 m from the sign
- northbound right turn lane, 115 m from the sign
- Government Road left turn slip lane, 60m from the sign



The likely visible distance and readable distance in each lane on approach to the sign is shown in the figures below:



Figure 21: Northbound Approach Sign Exposure – Through Lane 1 (Source: TTPP)





Figure 22: Northbound Approach Sign Exposure – Through Lane 2 (Source: TTPP)





Figure 23: Northbound Approach Sign Exposure – Through Lane 2 (Source: TTPP)

#### 5.1.3 Road accident history

Historic crash data has been obtained from TfNSW for a five-year period between 1 January 2017 to 31 December 2021. The data was assessed for crash incidents on the Pacific Highway northbound lanes on approach to the digital sign as well as the left turn slip lanes from Pacific Highway to Government Road and from Government Road to Pacific Highway.

One crash was recorded within the readable distance of the sign (95m) which resulted in a minor injury. There was no other crash incident involving between the visible



distance and the readable distance (i.e. the remainder of the segment within the visible distance, see figure below) or on Government Road.

Furthermore, given the low crash rate and the proposed sign is reduced in size, the proposal is not likely to reduce safety for motorists, pedestrians or cyclists.



Figure 24: Transport for NSW crash data (Source: TTPP)



#### 5.1.4 Stopping sight distance

Based on the 60 km/h speed limit along the Pacific Highway, TTPP calculated the stopping sight distance (SSD) at 64m.

In this instance, the nearest signalised intersection at Edgeworth David Avenue is approximately 45m north of the proposed sign.



Figure 25: SSD (Source: TTPP)

As detailed above, there has only been one crash in the northbound direction on approach to the proposed digital sign during the most recent 5-year period. Therefore, the existing large static sign has not resulted in reduced safety for motorists travelling northbound on Pacific Highway.

As addressed in the updated TSA, the non-compliance of the SSD is considered to be acceptable in this instance as the proposed sign would not be expected to cause an unsafe level of distraction for motorists on approach to the respective traffic signals.



# 5.1.5 Road Safety Criteria – Signage Guidelines

The SSA includes an assessment of the proposal against the criteria for road safety set out under Section 3 of the Signage Guidelines.

| Sig | n Location Criteria   | Response provided by TTPP  | Compliance |
|-----|---|--|------------|
| Ro  | ad clearance  |  |            |
| a.  | <ul> <li>The advertisement must not create a physical obstruction or hazard. For example: <ol> <li>Does the sign obstruct the movement of pedestrians or bicycle riders? (e.g. telephone kiosks and other street furniture along roads and footpath areas)?</li> <li>Does the sign protrude below a bridge or other structure so it could be hit by trucks or other tall vehicles? Will the clearance between the road surface and the bottom of the sign meet appropriate road standards for that particular road?</li> </ol> </li> <li>Does the sign protrude laterally into the transport corridor so it could be hit by trucks or wide vehicles?</li> </ul> | The proposed digital sign would be<br>installed on a column (a monopole-<br>like structure) within the existing<br>vegetated area on the north-<br>western corner of the Pacific<br>Highway and Government Road<br>intersection. The edge of the<br>proposed sign would be offset<br>approximately 1m from the edge of<br>the pedestrian footpath along<br>Pacific Highway and approximately<br>4m from the road. The proposed<br>sign would be approximately 4m<br>from the edge of the pedestrian<br>footpath along Government Road<br>and approximately 8m from the<br>road. Hence, the sign would not<br>protrude over the pedestrian<br>footpath and road carriageway.<br>The sign would not physically<br>obstruct any vehicle, pedestrian,<br>and cyclist movements                                     |            |
| b.  | Where the sign supports are not<br>frangible (breakable), the sign<br>must be placed outside the clear<br>zone in an acceptable location in<br>accordance with Austroads Guide<br>to Road Design (and RMS<br>supplements) or behind an RMS<br>approved crash barrier.   | The proposed digital sign would be<br>installed on the western side of<br>Pacific Highway (approximately 4m<br>away), and Government Road<br>(approximately 8 m away). The<br>monopole supporting the sign is<br>located approximately 6m from the<br>edge of the road of Pacific<br>Highway. The Austroads Guide to<br>Road Design Part 6 states that a<br>clear zone is the area adjacent to<br>the traffic lane that should be kept<br>free from features that would be<br>potentially hazardous to errant<br>vehicles. The proposed digital sign<br>is located within an urban area<br>where there is kerb and guttering<br>which would redirect an errant<br>vehicle. Therefore, the proposed<br>sign is deemed to be in an<br>acceptable location according to<br>the Austroads Guide to Road<br>Design. |            |



| Sig | n Location Criteria   | Response provided by TTPP   | Compliance   |
|-----|---|---|--------------|
| C.  | Where a sign is proposed within<br>the clear zone but behind an<br>existing RMS-approved crash<br>barrier, all its structures up to<br>5.8m in height (relative to the<br>road level) are to comply with any<br>applicable lateral clearances<br>specified by Austroads Guide to<br>Road Design (and RMS<br>supplements) with respect to<br>dynamic deflection and working<br>width.  | As stated in (b), the proposed sign<br>and associated support structure<br>would be located in an acceptable<br>location according to the Austroads<br>Guide to Road Design.  | $\checkmark$ |
| d.  | All signs that are permitted to<br>hang over roads or footpaths<br>should meet wind loading<br>requirements as specified in AS<br>1170.1 and AS1170.2. All vertical<br>clearances as specified above are<br>regarded as being the height of<br>the sign when under maximum<br>vertical deflection.  | As part of the detailed design<br>phase, the digital sign would be<br>designed in accordance with<br>Australian Standards AS1170.2<br>and AS1170.2 to meet the<br>requirements for wind loading,<br>whilst having consideration for<br>height of the sign boards when<br>under maximum vertical deflection                                  | $\checkmark$ |
| Lin | e of sight  |   |              |
| а.  | An advertisement must not<br>obstruct the driver's view of the<br>road, particularly of other<br>vehicles, bicycle riders or<br>pedestrians at crossings.   | The proposed digital sign would<br>not obstruct the view of the road<br>for motorists travelling on Pacific<br>Highway and Government Road  | $\checkmark$ |
| b.  | An advertisement must not<br>obstruct a pedestrian or cyclist's<br>view of the road.  | The proposed digital sign is not<br>anticipated to obstruct pedestrian<br>or cyclist's view of the surrounding<br>road.   | $\checkmark$ |
| C.  | The advertisement should not be<br>located in a position that has the<br>potential to give incorrect<br>information on the alignment of<br>the road. In this context, the<br>location and arrangement of<br>signs' structures should not give<br>visual clues to the driver<br>suggesting that the road<br>alignment is different to the actual<br>alignment. An accurate photo-<br>montage should be used to<br>assess this issue. | The sign would be located outside<br>the carriageway boundary. There<br>would be clear definition between<br>the proposed digital sign and the<br>surrounding road network which<br>would not provide misleading<br>information on the roadway<br>alignment   | $\checkmark$ |
| d.  | The advertisement should not<br>distract a driver's attention away<br>from the road environment for an<br>extended length of time. For<br>example:<br>i. The sign should not be<br>located in such a way that<br>the driver's head is required<br>to turn away from the road  | The proposed digital sign would be<br>located within a driver's peripheral<br>vision whilst travelling northbound<br>on Pacific Highway. Motorists<br>would not be required to turn their<br>heads when spotting the sign, and<br>all motorists would be able to see<br>the road simultaneously when<br>viewing the sign. Motorists turning | $\checkmark$ |



#### Sign Location Criteria

and the components of the traffic stream in order to view its display and/ or message. All drivers should still be able to see the road when viewing the sign, as well as the main components of the traffic stream in peripheral view.

The sign should be oriented ii. in a manner that does not create headlight reflections in the driver's line of sight. As a guideline, angling a sign five degrees away from right angles to the driver's line of sight can minimise headlight reflections. On a curved road alignment, this should be checked for the distance measured back from the sign that a car would travel in 2.5 seconds at the design speed.

left from Government Road into Pacific Highway, would face the opposite direction (look south) in order to find a suitable gap in oncoming northbound traffic on Pacific Highway. Therefore, the proposed sign would not divert drivers' attention on the Government Road approach to Pacific Highway. The positioning and angle of the sign would not be expected to result in headlight reflection or glare.

#### Response provided by TTPP

Compliance

# No, however, acceptable.

#### Proximity to decision making points and conflict points

- a. The sign should not be located:
  - i. less than the safe sight distance from an intersection, merge point, exit ramp, traffic control signal or sharp curves
  - *ii.* less than the safe stopping sight distance from a marked foot crossing, pedestrian crossing, pedestrian refuge, cycle crossing, cycleway facility or hazard within the road environment
  - iii. so that it is visible from the stem of a T-intersection.

As referenced in the Guide to Road Design, Part 3, sight distance refers to the distance required to enable a driver to react and stop before reaching a hazard. This distance is dependent on the operating (85th percentile) speed of the road, road gradient and other road characteristics. An operating speed of 60 km/h has been used to calculate the safe stopping sight distance (SSD) which is the signposted speed limit on Pacific Highway. Also, it is the speed which motorists were observed to be driving during the site inspection. According to the Austroads guide, the minimum safe stopping sight distance for a 60km/h speed zone is 64 m. In this instance, the nearest signalised intersection at Edgeworth David Avenue is approximately 45 m north of the proposed sign, falling short by approximately 20 m than the required SSD guidelines.



| Sign Location Criteria   | Response provided by TTPP  | Compliance   |
|--|--|--------------|
|  | As detailed in Section 2.4, there<br>has only been one crash in the<br>northbound direction on approach<br>to the proposed digital sign during<br>the most recent 5-year period.<br>Therefore, the existing large static<br>sign has not resulted in reduced<br>safety for motorists travelling<br>northbound on Pacific Highway. As<br>such, for road safety assessments<br>of digital signs, the Signage<br>Guidelines should be applied as<br>general principles rather than<br>standards or warrants   |              |
|  | The proposed sign is located<br>adjacent to the Government Road<br>to Pacific Highway intersection left<br>turn slip lane. Government Road<br>traffic gives way to northbound<br>traffic on Pacific Highway.<br>Motorists turning left from<br>Government Road on to Pacific<br>Highway look south to find a<br>suitable gap in oncoming traffic. As<br>such, the proposed sign would not<br>divert motorists' attention as<br>Government Road motorists would<br>look towards the south and not<br>towards the proposed digital sign<br>(north). The proposed digital sign<br>would not be visible from<br>Edgeworth David Avenue. As<br>documented in Section 2.4 under<br>crash analysis, there has only<br>been one crash in the northbound<br>direction on approach to the<br>proposed digital sign during the<br>most recent 5-year duration. This<br>infers the existing large static sign<br>has not resulted in reduced safety<br>for motorists travelling northbound<br>on Pacific Highway or entering /<br>exiting Government Road. |              |
| <ul> <li>b. The placement of a sign should<br/>not distract a driver at a critical<br/>time. In particular, signs should<br/>not obstruct a driver's view: <ol> <li>of a road hazard</li> <li>to an intersection</li> <li>to a prescribed traffic<br/>control device (such as<br/>traffic signals, stop or give<br/>way signs or warning signs)</li> </ol> </li> </ul> | A "critical time" is understood to<br>refer to a point in time when a<br>driver's decision is required<br>implying that a road safety<br>implication could occur if a driver<br>was distracted at this time. The<br>proposed digital sign would be<br>positioned to the side of the<br>carriageway without obstructing a   | $\checkmark$ |



| Sign Location Criteria   | Response provided by TTPP  | Compliance |
|--|--|------------|
| iv. to an emergency vehicle<br>access point or Type 2<br>driveways (wider than 6-<br>9m) or higher.  | driver's view of any potential hazards on the roadway.   |            |
| Sign spacing   |  |            |
| a. Sign spacing should limit drivers<br>view to a single sign at any given<br>time with a distance of no less<br>than 150m between signs in any<br>one corridor. Exemptions for low<br>speed, high pedestrian zones or<br>CBD zones will be assessed by<br>RMS as part of their concurrence<br>role. | There is no digital advertising sign<br>located within 150m of the<br>proposed digital sign. Several<br>small advertising signs and<br>billboards are located on both<br>sides of the Pacific Highway bridge<br>located immediately after the<br>proposed digital sign. In addition,<br>advertising signage is visible on<br>the Westfield Shopping Centre<br>building façade, as shown in<br>Figure 3-11. Notwithstanding this,<br>this is a common scenario along<br>the Pacific Highway and in urban<br>environments where numerous<br>signs are displayed in close<br>proximity to intersections.<br>The road alignment within the<br>vicinity of the proposed digital sign<br>is relatively straight, with clear<br>visibility to the signal controls and<br>traffic conditions along Pacific<br>Highway. |            |

Table 11: Sign location criteria – Section 3.2 of the Signage Guidelines (Source: TTPP)

| Sig | n Design and Operation Criteria  | Response provided by TTPP   | Compliance   |
|-----|--|---|--------------|
| Ad  | vertising signage and traffic contro   | l devices   |              |
| а.  | The advertisement must not<br>distract a driver from, obstruct or<br>reduce the visibility and<br>effectiveness of, directional signs,<br>traffic signals, prescribed traffic<br>control devices, regulatory signs or  | An advance directional and<br>information sign is provided on an<br>overhead gantry structure on the<br>Government Road splitter island.  | $\checkmark$ |
|     | advisory signs or obscure<br>information about the road<br>alignment.  | information sign faces northbound<br>traffic and does not overlap the<br>existing static sign, as shown in  |              |
| b.  | The advertisement must not<br>interfere with stopping sight<br>distance for the road's design<br>speed or the effectiveness of a<br>prescribed traffic control device.<br>For example:<br>i. Could the advertisement be<br>construed as giving<br>instructions to traffic such as<br>'Stop', 'Halt' or 'Give Way'? | Figure 3-12. As the existing static<br>sign is located beyond the<br>directional and information sign<br>and at a lower level, motorists<br>would likely have full visibility of the<br>directional and information signage<br>prior to observing the existing static<br>sign. The advance directional and<br>information sign is readable at<br>approximately 100 m in Lane 1<br>(kerbside lane), whist the existing | $\checkmark$ |



Compliance

| imitate a prescribed traffic<br>control device?<br>iii. If the sign is in the vicinity of<br>traffic lights, does the<br>advertisement use red,<br>amber or green circles,<br>octagons, crosses or<br>triangles or shapes or<br>patterns that may result in<br>the advertisement being<br>mistaken for a traffic signal?   | <ul> <li>approximately 80m due to trees<br/>and building awning restricting<br/>visibility. Similarly, the advance<br/>directional and information sign is<br/>readable at approximately 110 m in<br/>lane 2, whilst the static sign is not<br/>readable until 25m later<br/>approaching the sign.</li> <li>Details of the advertisement/s are<br/>not yet known since the project is<br/>still within the early design stage.<br/>However, it is noted that the sign<br/>would not display colours and<br/>shapes which could be mistaken<br/>for traffic signals.</li> <li>Notwithstanding this, it is<br/>recommended that the content of<br/>the proposed sign be reviewed<br/>against Table 5 of the Guidelines to<br/>avoid any content that may be<br/>construed as imitating a traffic<br/>control device</li> </ul> |              |
|--|--|--------------|
| Dwell time and transition time - criteri   | a for digital signs  |              |
| <ul> <li>a. Each advertisement must be displayed in a completely static manner, without any motion, for the approved dwell time as per criterion (b) below.</li> <li>b. Dwell times for image display must not be less than: <ol> <li>10 seconds for areas where the speed limit is below 80km/h.</li> <li>25 seconds for areas where the speed limit is 80km/h and over</li> </ol> </li> <li>c. Any digital sign that is within 250 metres of a classified road and is visible from a school zone must be switched to a fixed display during school zone hours.</li> <li>d. Digital signs must not contain animated or video/movie style advertising or messages including live television, satellite, Internet or similar broadcasts.</li> </ul> | The digital sign is proposed to<br>contain text and images. Based on<br>the Guidelines with a speed limit<br>below 80km/h, the minimum dwell<br>time for content displayed on the<br>proposed digital sign would be 10<br>seconds. However, it is<br>recommended to increase the<br>dwell time up to 15 seconds for the<br>digital sign given that it is in close<br>proximity to traffic signals.<br>In the northbound direction of<br>Pacific Highway, an "End School<br>Zone" sign was observed 220m<br>prior to the proposed sign, which is<br>located beyond the visible and<br>readable distance of the proposed<br>digital sign.  | $\checkmark$ |
| Illumination and Reflectance   |  |              |
| a. Luminance levels must comply<br>with the requirements in Table 6 in<br>Transport Corridor Outdoor   | Section 3.3.3 of the Guidelines details assessment criteria to ensure that illumination and  | $\checkmark$ |

Sign Design and Operation Criteria Response provided by TTPP

static sign is only readable at

Does the advertisement

ii.



| Sig      | n Design and Operation Criteria  | Response provided by TTPP   | Compliance   |
|----------|--|---|--------------|
| b.       | Advertising and Signage<br>Guidelines<br>The image displayed on the sign<br>must not otherwise unreasonably<br>dazzle or distract drivers without<br>limitation to their colouring or<br>contain flickering or flashing<br>content.  | reflectance qualities of the sign do<br>not cause a road safety hazard. It<br>is understood that these criteria<br>would be addressed in a separate<br>specialist report prepared by a<br>qualified consultant                        |              |
| Int      | eraction and Sequencing  |   |              |
| a.<br>b. | The advertisement must not<br>incorporate technology which<br>interacts with in-vehicle electronic<br>devices or mobile devices. This<br>includes interactive technology or<br>technology that enables opt-in<br>direction communication with road<br>users.<br>Message sequencing designed to<br>make a driver anticipated the next<br>message is prohibited across<br>images presented on a single sign<br>and across a series of signs. | The proposed sign would not<br>contain interactive technology or<br>technology that enables optin<br>direction communication with<br>motorists. The digital sign would<br>not be designed to make motorists<br>anticipate information | $\checkmark$ |

Table 12: Sign design and operation criteria – Section 3.3 of the Signage Guidelines (Source: TTPP)

#### 5.1.6 Road safety summary

Road safety impacts have been comprehensively assessed as part of the application in accordance with the requirements of the Industry and Employment SEPP and the road safety criteria set out in the Signage Guidelines.

The TSA determines the signage is will not obstruct and/or reduce visibility of any traffic control devices, signage, road alignment or cyclists and therefore is suitable for the site. Particularly that:

- The proposed digital sign would not obstruct and/or reduce visibility of any traffic control devices, signage, road alignment or cyclists.
- The sign would be located within a driver's peripheral vision for motorists travelling in the northbound direction of Pacific Highway and does not require motorists to turn their head away from the roadway ahead.
- Motorists turning left from Government Road into Pacific Highway would look south to find gaps in oncoming northbound traffic on Pacific Highway. Therefore, motorists turning left from Government Road into Pacific Highway are not distracted by the existing static sign nor the proposed digital sign.
- The proposed digital sign is located within the safe stopping distance to the traffic signals at the Pacific Highway and Edgeworth David Avenue intersection. However, between the proposed digital sign and the traffic signals is straight and comprises good visibility to the traffic signal lanterns. Further, this is not an uncommon scenario as there are multiple digital and static signs located within the safe stopping distance of traffic signals
- The safety at the two left turn slip lanes at Government Road is not anticipated to be further impacted by the proposed digital sign, as there is no evidence of any crash incidents in the past 5-year duration.



In summary, based on the findings of the TSA, the road environment along the Pacific Highway in proximity to the proposed sign is considered acceptable on road safety grounds.

# 5.2 Illumination

The proposed signs will be illuminated using LEDs installed within the front face on a 24 hour, 7 days per week basis. The brightness of the LEDs shall be controlled to provide upper and lower thresholds (as required) and will include a light sensor to automatically adjust the brightness of the display area to adjust to ambient lighting conditions.

A Lighting Impact Assessment (LIA) has been prepared by Electrolight (Appendix 4). The LIA has assessed the proposal against the illumination criteria under:

- Chapter 3 of the Industry and Employment SEPP
- the Signage Guidelines
- AS 4282-2019 Control of the Obtrusive Effects of Outdoor Lighting

#### 5.2.1 Illumination criteria – Signage Guidelines

Section 3.3.3 of the Signage Guidelines sets out the illumination criteria for digital signs. The LIA has categorised the site as being within Zone 3 of the Signage Guidelines, which is described as an area with generally medium off-street ambient lighting, e.g., small to medium shopping/commercial centres.

The luminance levels for digital advertisements that are within a Zone 3 environment, as outlined in the Signage Guidelines, are shown in Table 13 below.

| Lighting Condition                                | Max Permissible<br>Luminance for Zone 3<br>(cd/m²) | Complies     |
|---|--|--------------|
| Full sun on face of signage                       | No limit   | $\checkmark$ |
| Daytime luminance                                 | 6000   | $\checkmark$ |
| Morning and evening twilight and overcast weather | 700  | $\checkmark$ |
| Night time  | 250  | $\checkmark$ |

Table 13: Luminance levels for digital advertisements criteria – Signage Guidelines

The maximum permissible night time luminance allowable under both the Signage Guidelines and AS4282 is actually  $350 \text{ cd/m}^2$ . However, the luminance limit shown above was derived as a result of the calculation and assessment in Section 5 and 6 of the LIA, to ensure compliance with other criteria of AS4282 and any additional lighting requirements as described in this report.

The LIA confirms that the sign, once illuminated to the maximum luminance, will be visually consistent with the existing ambient lighting and is therefore suitable for the local area. It is noted that the maximum luminance limit during the night time period will not exceed the recommended maximum permissible luminance level set out in the Signage Guidelines of 250 cd/sqm for Zone 3.



#### 5.2.2 AS 4282-2019 Control of the Obtrusive Effects of Outdoor Lighting

The Control of the Obtrusive Effects of Outdoor Lighting (AS 4282-2019) sets out limits for different obtrusive factors associated with the night time operation of outdoor lighting systems. The LIA has undertaken an assessment of the sign during the 'post-curfew' period (11pm to 6am), which is considered the most obtrusive night time period and generally when residents are trying to sleep.

The LIA has categorised these residential dwellings as all being within Environmental Zone A4 of AS 4282-2019, which is described as having high district brightness (e.g., town and city centres, commercial areas, and residential areas abutting commercial areas). Lighting impacts on these residential dwellings with potential views to the sign are assessed and shown in the figure below.



Figure 26: Location of assessed residential properties (Source: Electrolight)

The maximum lighting limits for Environmental Zone A4 during the pre-curfew and postcurfew periods, as set out in AS 4282-2019, are shown in the table below:

| Environmental | Maximum vertical illuminance (lux) |             | Complies     |
|---------------|------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|
| Zone          | Pre-curfew                         | Post-curfew |              |
| A4            | 25                                 | 5           | $\checkmark$ |

Table 14: Maximum lighting limit (pre and post-curfew)

The LIA modelled the light spill from the proposed sign based on the proposed maximum night time illumination level of 200 cd/sqm. It is noted that some of the residential properties are shielded by mature vegetation which will obstruct any spill light from the



signs. Notwithstanding, the model results presented in the LIA are provided on the assumption that there was no vegetation present at the site, in accordance with AS 4282-2019.

During night time operation, it can be seen from the lighting model that the maximum illuminance is 4.1 lux within zone A4 Zone which is compliant with the maximum AS4282 limit of 5 lux.

#### 5.2.3 Illumination summary

The LIA recommends the Applicant ensure that the average luminance difference between successive images do not exceed 30 per cent to ensure compliance with AS 4282-2019 and for the dwell time to be 10 seconds or greater. The Applicant has committed to these recommendations.

In summary, the LIA determines that the sign:

- is found to be compliant with the criteria set out in AS 4282-2019 and the Signage Guidelines
- will not result in unacceptable glare or adversely impact the safety of pedestrians, residents or vehicular traffic
- will not unreasonably impact on the visual amenity of nearby residences or accommodation.

# 5.3 Heritage

As discussed in Section 4.4.2, the site has no statutory heritage listings, however, the site lies within the vicinity of three heritage items as defined by Schedule 5 Part 1 of the HLEP 2013.

The impacts of the proposed sign are considered minimal for the following reasons:

- the visibility of the sign to the heritage items are restricted primarily due to the surrounding mature vegetation within the railway corridor and existing built form
- distance from the items from the proposed signage
- the illuminance of the proposed sign will be calibrated to the levels recommended in the LIA, which is an acceptable level which will not produce any lighting impacts on the heritage items.

On this basis of the above, the proposal is not expected to produce any adverse impacts on the heritage significance, associated fabric, settings or views of the surrounding heritage items.



# 5.4 Vegetation

An Arborist Impact Appraisal and Method Statement has been prepared by Naturally Trees (Appendix 8) to review the trees likely to be impacted within the vicinity of the sign.

The Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement notes:

- no trees are required to be removed
- the implementation or protective measures for nine trees. If these measures are successfully implemented, the proposal will have no impact on the contribution of trees to the local character.

As discussed in Section 3.5, the maintenance will be undertaken by employees/ representatives of JCDecaux to protect the surrounding road and pedestrian environment.

# 5.5 Structural Integrity

A Structural Feasibility Statement has been prepared by Dennis Bunt Consulting Engineers (Appendix 9) to determine the structural integrity and extent of the proposed sign.

The proposed structure contains two integral elements, being the steel frame and the footing. Details of these elements are outlined below:

#### Steel Frame

- the proposed structure will consist of a fabricated steel column (600 mm x 400mm x 20 mm) and a rectangular box section welded to the top of the column to form an L shape
- a door is located in the rear of the column to store equipment so the column will act as a C section for most of its height
- a welded steel frame will be bolted to the top of the horizontal box section
- the LED screen will be clamped to the welded frame

# Footings

- a pile and pile cap are proposed to be implemented into the structure of the sign to minimise the impact of the footing
- the pile cap will be 1m<sup>2</sup> in area and 1 m deep
- the concrete pile will be 750mm in diameter and will extend below ground by approximately 8m

Based on the above, it is considered that the proposed sign will be structurally sound.

As the works involve penetration of 8m below the existing ground level consideration against Section 2.99 and 2.121 of the Transport and Infrastructure SEPP is provided in Section 4 of this report.



# 5.6 Visual Impacts

A detailed Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) has been prepared by Keylan Consulting and is included at Appendix 5.

The VIA assesses the impact of the proposed signage from a number of viewpoints and concludes that it will not have any additional visual impacts than those currently present.

The VIA concludes:

- the surrounding area has a high visual amenity sensitivity due to the number of high density residential dwellings
- the sign is consistent with the highly urbanised character of the Hornsby Town Centre area and will seamlessly integrate with its surroundings being significantly smaller than nearby built form and mature vegetation
- the reduction of the signs size from 42.41m2 vs 14.93m<sup>2</sup> reduces the signs visual catchment area
- the location and orientation of the proposed sign has been carefully considered to limit the number of residential dwellings within the visual catchment
- views to the proposed sign are largely obstructed by road signage and mature trees
- the windows and balconies of residential receivers are largely orientated away from the proposed signage location
- the proposal does not impact upon any scenic views and will not protrude above the dominant skyline

# 5.7 Site suitability

The site is a suitable location for the provision of digital advertising signage on the basis that:

- the proposal is compatible with the existing and desired future character of the area, noting that the advertising sign is proposed on a rail corridor
- there will be no impact on any significant European or Aboriginal cultural heritage items or heritage conservation zones
- the site is screened from heritage items by mature vegetation on either side of the railway line
- there will be an acceptable level of visual impacts on sensitive land uses due to the sign's orientation and screening by mature vegetation
- detailed investigations of the road network have determined that the development will not impact on the continued and safe operation of the Pacific Highway in its function as a classified road
- the illumination of the sign will not result in unacceptable glare or adversely lead to an unacceptable impact on the visual amenity of surrounding residences or heritage items
- the development fully complies with the relevant statutory and policy provisions that govern outdoor advertising signage and LED technology in NSW

Further to the above, the site is an effective location for outdoor advertising that will generate revenue to the benefit of the local community. The public benefits of the proposal are discussed in further detail at section 5.8.



# 5.8 Public benefit

In accordance with the Signage Guidelines, an application for digital advertising that is proposed by Sydney Trains is to demonstrate how the local community will benefit from the proposal, such as railway station upgrades, rail crossings or amenity improvements along rail corridors including landscaping, litter removal or vandalism and graffiti management.

A Public Benefit Statement prepared by Sydney Trains is included as part of the application (Appendix 6). The statement confirms that all revenue generated by the proposed advertising sign will help fund essential Sydney Trains services to the benefit of the local community, including:

- improvements and maintenance programs
- ensuring the continued provision of clean, frequent, and reliable services for customers
- supporting the next generation of transport solutions online
- provision of emergency messaging and announcements to the public such as during:
   station emergency situations
  - o any major disruption which is likely to cause delays to train running times
  - o Sydney Trains, NSW Trains and TfNSW promotions and events
  - o threat-to-life alerts by NSW Government Emergency and Police Agencies

The proposed new digital advertising signage will be capable of providing public benefit through availability to be used for an emergency or community message (e.g. display of information relating to major disruption to the operation of the surrounding road network which is likely to cause delays to traffic or emergency information). The emergency messaging system may be available to Sydney Trains and other NSW Government agencies such as NSW Police, NSW Health and Transport for NSW.

Further, Sydney Trains and Transport for NSW will also be able to display messages on the digital screens for up to 5 minutes per hour for customer and event promotions at no cost.

Accordingly, the application addresses the public benefit test outlined in the Signage Guidelines through the provision of funding toward improvements to the Sydney Trains network and direct messaging to the community.



# 6 Conclusion

This SEE supports a DA for the installation of a new digital advertising sign on the western side of the Pacific Highway, Hornsby.

The sign will be visible to motorists travelling northbound along the Pacific Highway. The sign is proposed to comprise an advertising display area of approximately 14.93m<sup>2</sup> with a visual screen size of 14.16m<sup>2</sup>.

Following a detailed consideration of the proposal in its legislative and physical context, this SEE determines that the proposal:

- meets the objectives of Chapter 3 of the Industry and Employment SEPP as it is compatible with the amenity and visual character of the surrounding area
- demonstrates compliance with the assessment criteria set in Schedule 5 of the Industry and Employment SEPP
- demonstrates compliance with the criteria set out in the Signage Guidelines in regard to land use compatibility, digital signage, road safety and illumination requirements and the public benefit test
- the proposed digital advertising sign has a 65% smaller advertising display area than the existing 42.41m<sup>2</sup> static sign, reducing the extent of signage in the area.
- the proposed sign is located within the Hornsby Town Centre which is an area identified by Council to be a highly urbanised area and is compatible with the character of the area
- will not impact on any items of European or Aboriginal heritage
- will be of high quality design and finish and will provide visual interest for motorists using the Princes Highway
- will be in the public interest as the revenue that is generated by the advertising signage will be used by Sydney Trains to improve the network through projects such as railway station upgrades, rail crossings or amenity improvements along rail corridors including landscaping, litter removal or vandalism and graffiti management

In consideration of the above, it is considered that the digital advertising sign will not have an adverse impact on the environment or on the safety of road users and therefore warrants approval.