

Technical Note

Additional Permitted Use (Advertising Signage) Existing Bridge, R8292 Wentworth Avenue, Eastlakes

Technical Peer Review - Traffic & Transport

File Name	Prepared	Reviewed	Issued by	Date	Issued to
P019.01T Wentworth Ave Independent Review_ABTT (Traffic)	A.Bitzius	A.Bitzius	A.Bitzius	19/09/23	adrian@theplanningstudio.com.au
P019.02T Wentworth Ave Independent Review_ABTT (Traffic)	A.Bitzius	A.Bitzius	A.Bitzius	19/09/23	adrian@theplanningstudio.com.au

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

Council has received a Planning Proposal lodged for advertising signage mounted to the pedestrian bridge over Wentworth Avenue, Eastlakes. The pedestrian bridge has no formal description; however, the road is legally described as ROAD R8292F and has the address R8292 Wentworth Avenue Eastlakes, NSW 2018.

1.2 Purpose

Bayside Council have sought the services of a suitably qualified traffic engineer to review the Traffic and Road Safety Assessment report associated with the above-mentioned planning proposal.

1.3 Location

The subject land is located as shown in Figure 1.1 and Figure 1.2 below.

The existing two (2) digital advertising signages contain dimensions of approximately 12.48m x 3.2m and are erected on each side of the pedestrian bridge over Wentworth Avenue. Eastlakes Golf Course at 67 Gardeners Road, Eastlakes (formally described as Lot 1 DP 1144655) is located on both sides of Wentworth Avenue, and the pedestrian bridge connects the northern and southern parts of the Golf Course.

The pedestrian bridge is situated approximately 450m southeast of the Southern Cross Drive overpass intersection on Wentworth Avenue and approximately 300m north-west of the Bay Street intersection on Wentworth Avenue.



Figure 1.1: Site Location Overview (Source: GoogleMaps, Nearmaps)



Figure 1.2: Site Location (Streetview) (Source: Google Streetview)

2 PLANNING PROPOSAL

The Planning Proposal seeks to amend the Bayside Local Environmental Plan 2021 as follows:

- Introduce new Additional Permitted Use in Schedule 1 which enables signage as a permissible use; and
- Amend the Additional Permitted Uses Map, Sheet APU_011 to identify where the proposed APU applies.

The Planning Proposal is supported by a Traffic & Road Safety Assessment, which considers the appropriateness of the proposed signage and impacts on adjacent road corridor. The existing signs are visible to eastbound and westbound traffic in Wentworth Avenue, Pagewood. TfNSW has granted concurrence for the sign to operate until 31st December 2025.

3 TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT

3.1 Overview

The Traffic & Road Safety Assessment considers the likely impact of signage, with reference to the criteria specified in the *'NSW PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING TRANSPORT CORRIDOR OUTDOOR ADVERTISING AND SIGNAGE GUIDELINES – ASSESSING DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS UNDER SEPP 64 (NOVEMBER 2017)'* (TCOASG).

The independent review has assessed the submitted Traffic & Road Safety Assessment report in the context of this governing document.

It should be noted that the original signs were installed July 2017, whereas the TCOASG came into force in November 2017. Furthermore, the original sign was installed prior to the completion of the LEP and DCP amendments. Therefore, it should not be expected that as the sign is existing that it automatically complies with current technical guidelines and planning policies. Whilst this review is limited to its merits under a planning proposal submission, some of the below matters will require further consideration as part of any future development application, should the planning proposal be supported and the additional permitted land use come into effect.

It is noted that the original signage development application was however considered in the context of the draft 2015 TCOASG, therefore most of the principles required by that document are expected to have carried through into the final adopted 2017 guideline, and therefore are expected to have been addressed.

3.2 TCOASG Assessment

The TCOASG has been reviewed against the technical assessments received as part of the planning proposal submission. The following key applicable sections of the guideline have been identified for further discussion and confirmation of outcomes as appropriate, as part of the independent assessment.

Most of the items raised relate to matters that would otherwise pertain to a development application rather than a planning proposal submission. Noting that there were no significant traffic/transport issues identified within the report which would affect the planning proposal.

Section 1.1e – Bridge Structures

Section 1.1e specifies that any advertising on bridge structures is to include a 'fall arrest' system from the sign to the bridge structure to prevent the sign structure from falling onto traffic. It is recommended that Council confirm that this arrangement is currently in place.

Section 2.3 (Table 2 – Design Assessment Criteria) (4) - Vegetation

The TCOASG questions whether ongoing vegetation maintenance is required as a result of the signage installation.

Site observations revealed that in the eastbound direction of travel, vegetation was partially obscuring the visibility of the advertising signage making the sign difficult to see/read on approach.

It is recommended that the vegetation is trimmed to ensure sight lines are maintained and monitoring for further maintenance be conducted on a periodic and ongoing basis.



Figure 3.1: Partially Obscured Sight Lines – Tree Trimming Required (Source: Google Streeview)

Section 2.3.2 and Section 2.4 - Sign Placement

The sign has been observed to be placed in a location that does not contribute to visual clutter and is generally in accordance with the TCOASG.

Section 2.5.5 Bridge Signage Criteria

2.5.5 d ii – Block Significant Views

The height of the sign appears to reside slightly higher than the path fencing / barricading. Whilst not included within the assessment, it appears as though sight lines have been maintained for bridge users.

2.5.5 d iii – Tunnelling Effect

Whilst the signs have been placed on both sides of the bridge, they have been placed at a relatively low height with respect to the structure and provide a moderate – good level of passive surveillance for passing bridge users.

Whilst the signs appear to be slightly higher than the handrail height (refer Figure 3.2), they are less than 14m in length and is less than half the length of the bridge, and approximately half of the length of the visible section of the bridge available to motorists and therefore is generally consistent with the recommendations of the TCOASG.

The sign is however higher than the handrail height and therefore does not comply with the 'Note' attributed to the requirement. This requirement does not appear to be associated with the 'must' mandatory requirement associated with this section of the TCOASG but is rather raised in the context of being a desirable outcome to achieve the mandatory requirement.

Given the bridge appears to be solely used by golf course users moving from one side of the course to the other this is not considered to be an issue of significant concern.



Figure 3.2: Signs are Higher than the Handrail Height (Source: Google Streetview)

Section 2.5.8 (Table 3) (m) – Sign Clearance

The sign appears to contain suitable clearance to the roadway and does not overhang to a height lower than the bridge structure itself.

Section 3.1 Road Safety Objectives (Table 4)

This section re-iterates the need to consider pedestrian / cycle safety on travelling on the bridge from a public safety perspective. The submission documents appear to focus on the roadway safety elements and there is little discussion surrounding the impacts that are likely to exist for bridge users from a passive surveillance perspective that may be introduced as a result of the signs.

As the bridge appears to cater for golf course users only this is considered to be of a low risk. Notwithstanding this, any future development application should address this requirement as contained within the TCOASG.

Section 4 – Public Benefit

The TCOASG requires the applicant to liaise with Council to determine the appropriate allocation of public benefit to be associated with the signage installation. It is expected that these discussions and agreements have taken place as part of the application and is separate from this independent assessment which is for the purpose of a planning proposal.

3.3 Bayside Development Control Plan 2022

The Bayside DCP2022 specifies the following in relation to advertising signs relevant to this application.

3.16.2 Illuminated and Animated Signage

Objective		Control	
O1.	To preserve the character of an area through high quality and appropriate illuminated signage.	C1.	Lighting intensity must not unreasonably impact on any residential properties adjoining the sign or that is within its locality.
O2.	To encourage the use of renewable energy sources to illuminate signage where possible.	C2.	Illuminated signage is to be switched off between 10pm and 6am daily, where the illuminated signage:
O3.	To ensure that illuminated signage does not adversely impact on the safety and security of pedestrians, motorists and the general public		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. has an advertising signage area larger than 1m² and/or b. is located adjacent to or in the vicinity of residential dwellings

The above control C2 highlights that the signs should be turned off between 10pm and 6am daily. Furthermore the “and/or” requirement needs to be clarified as it should be one or the other.

It is understood that these signs are well protected with vegetation and not located in close proximity to residential properties with direct views. Compliance with the DCP would be a matter for further consideration as part of any Development Application process. However, it is noted that these signs could operate 24hrs per day with little or no impact to surrounding residents, subject to further assessment and consideration by Council.

3.4 Road Safety Audit/s

The submitted road safety audits have consistently raised the following two issues with responses that suggest they are manageable:

- Conflict with Signals
- Driver Distraction

The traffic signals contain target boards that protect the visibility of the signal lanterns from background effects. Furthermore, the signage is located a sufficient distance away from the signalised intersection. The findings of the road safety audit in relation to its safe operations are supported.

Extensive information has been provided to support the notion that driver distraction effects as a result of the proposed signage is marginal at best. This view is supported. There are many road corridors with a wide range of roadside distractions that exist. This has been supported by evidence-based data as included within the submission. Furthermore, guidance has been provided within the TCOASG to ensure that potential impacts associated with the electronic signage do not act as a distraction to motorists (more specifically Table 3 of the TCOASG). Drivers also have a responsibility to adjust their driving behaviours to suit the road conditions.

3.5 Crash Analysis

The crash analysis suggests that there is little/no correlation between the existing signs and the recent crash history, noting there have only been 3 reported crashes over this section between 2016 and 2021 of which only one crash was near the sign.

This view is supported.

4 CONCLUSION

ABTT Consulting have been requested by Bayside Council to provide an independent review of the planning proposal for ROAD R8292F to enable signage as a permitted use.

The application has been assessed in accordance with the TCOASG. There are no issues identified of a traffic or transport nature that would preclude the approval of the Planning Proposal.

Notwithstanding this, any future development application would need to consider in greater detail the following matters:

- Development of an agreed vegetation management plan.
- That there are no tunnelling effects, passive surveillance or pedestrians' "views" related impacts associated with movements across the bridge, as a result of the signage elements in accordance with the requirements of the TCOASG.

In addition to the above, Bayside Council may need to consider further:

- Whether the DCP controls surrounding item 3.16.2 C2 regarding the permissibility of enabling signs to operate between 10pm and 6am are appropriate for this site.
- Confirm that the existing signs have been installed to include a 'fall arrest' system.

Kind Regards,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Adrian Bitzios'.

Adrian Bitzios

Director | B.Eng (Hons), MIEAUST, CPEng, NPER, LRSA, APEC Engineer, IntPE(Aus)

The logo for ABTT Consulting, featuring the letters 'ABTT' in a large, bold, blue font with a stylized swoosh above them, and the word 'CONSULTING' in a smaller, blue, sans-serif font below.

phone 0410 300 553 | email adrian@abttconsulting.com.au