Kemp & Johnson Heritage Consultants

3 David Street Croydon NSW 2132 ABN 92 230 460 374 Ph M 0422 258 089 Email <u>kempchery@gmail.com</u>



2 November 23

PLANNING PROPOSAL HERITAGE REVIEW – PP202331 FOR BAYSIDE COUNCIL

This Planning Proposal Review has been written on behalf of Bayside Council to provide an independent heritage review of the Planning Proposal.

BACKGROUND

The subject of the Planning Proposal is digital LED signage on both sides of an existing pedestrian bridge over Wentworth Avenue, Eastlakes.

The pedestrian bridge and associated advertising signage for Eastlakes Golf Course was approved in 2006 through NSW Land & Environment Court appeal no. 11019 of 2006, with the original consent granted on 30 November 2006. Construction of the bridge was completed around 2007. A section 96 modification application was submitted to Bayside Council in 2016 to modify the approved signage on the bridge to digital LEP panels, which was approved by Council (which treated the signage as having existing use rights at the time) on 27 October 2016. LED panels were subsequently erected on both sides of the bridge as per this approval.

The ongoing consent for advertising signage on the bridge requires an amendment to the Bayside LEP prior to December 2025 for the signage to remain permissible on the bridge. The Planning Proposal and supporting reports as submitted include consideration of a potential new advertising sign so that the additional permitted land use may be permitted.

SITE LOCATION

The pedestrian bridge is located on Wentworth Road, Eastlakes, as shown in Figures 1 & 2 below. The bridge connects two sections of the golf course and is used by golfer pedestrians and golf buggies only. It is not open to the public but is viewed by the public from Wentworth Road.



Figure 1: (Left) Location map showing the location of bridge across Wentworth Road (marked with a blue "i" symbol) Source: NSW Land & Property Information Six Maps



Figure 2: (Left) Recent satellite view of (arrowed) Source: NSW Land & Property Information Six Maps

HERITAGE STATUS & SIGNIFICANCE

The bridge, constructed circa 2007, is not heritage listed and has been assessed in the proponent's Statement of Heritage Impact as not being of heritage significance. The signage is also not of heritage significance. The bridge, however, connects two portions of the State and LEP heritage listed Botany Water Reserves (owned by Sydney Water), leased for golf course use.

The Botany Water Reserves are listed as items of State heritage significance in the Botany LEP 2021 (as Item No. 1160), and are listed as State Heritage Register Item No. 01317, and are also listed on the Sydney Water S170 Register as listing no. 415101. Figure 3 below shows the listed area (as green area marked as Item 1160).

The Summary Statement of Significance in the SHR listing form is:

Botany Water Reserve holds considerable value for Sydney and NSW because it contains the only remaining major components - substantial layout and other important physical evidence from the 1850s through to the 1870s - of the unique water supply system that supported the expansion of the Sydney metropolis for most of the latter half of the 19th century, representing Sydney's third main water supply system since colonisation; and on account of the surviving remnants of the early 19th century industries associated with the prominent emancipist merchant Simeon Lord. The site includes land which, in 1855, was the subject of

the first resumptions for the purpose of a water supply system by a government in Australia. Part of the original 1850s sand-cast iron water supply pipe remains within the site representing a remnant of the State's oldest main.

This extant remnant of the water supply system also has high collective value as important evidence likewise remains of the two principal Sydney water supply systems (The Tank Stream and Busby's Bore) that predated the Botany system along with those superseding it (The Upper Canal and regional dam systems).

The open space areas encompassed by the item include two regionally rare and distinct remnant vegetation communities known as Sydney Freshwater Wetlands and Eastern Suburbs Banksia Scrub that are both potentially of State significance and are the subject of separate listings as an Endangered Ecological Community under the NSW Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995. The wetlands also have recognised regional ecological value as native animal habitat and movement corridors and may include animal species of conservation significance.

The item is of regional environmental importance as a major recharge source for the Sydney basin aquifer.

It likely holds special interest as a landmark cultural and recreational landscape for the regional community.

It also has regional importance on account of the substantial infrastructure it contains of the 1910s Southern and Western Suburbs Ocean Outfall Sewer System (SWSOOS No 1) - since augmented during 1936-1941 by SWSOOS No 2 - representing one of the first major separate sewers in Sydney as well as incorporating new ventilation technologies. This infrastructure includes use of the former Engine House chimney as a sewer vent, the viaduct to carry the vent pipe, Sewage Pumping Station No 38 of 1916 near the Engine House ruins and part of the SWSOOS Nos 1 and 2 mains. The overall SWSOOS network remains Sydney's largest sewer system.

Under the SHR Significance Criteria c) Aesthetic/Technical Significance the SHR listing form includes the following significance statement:

The site represents a substantial tract of greenspace with important landscape attributes - extensive areas of water, wetlands, plantings, archaeological features, dunes, remnant indigenous vegetation and fauna - providing notable scenery and, remarkably, within 6 km of the Sydney CBD.



Figure 3: Heritage item curtilage for the Botany Water Reserves, with the approximate location of the pedestrian bridge arrowed. Source: Botany LEP 2021 Heritage Map 011

DESCRIPTION

The bridge over Wentworth Avenue is shown in the photos below, which also show the context of the bridge within the Botany Water Reserves. These photos were taken by the author of this report on Thursday 28 September 2023, unless otherwise attributed.

As shown in these photos, the views south of the bridge are limited due to vegetation, however views north from the bridge of the heritage item context of the Botany Water Reserves are extensive.



Figure 4: The eastern side of the bridge from Wentworth Avenue



Figure 5: View of the western side of the bridge. Source: May 2022 Google Streetview



Figure 6: View looking north across the bridge from the southern side



Figure 7: View north across the Botany Water Reserve from the bridge



Figure 8: View north including bridge approaches.



Figure 9: View north-west from the bridge



Figure 10: Looking south across the bridge. The top of the signs on each side are visible in this photo.



Figure 11: Southern approach to the bridge

THE PROPOSAL

The Planning Proposal is to allow Digital LED advertising signs on both sides of the existing circa 2007 pedestrian bridge, as per the existing signage, as a permissible use under the Botany LEP 2021, via an amendment to the LEP.

HERITAGE REVIEW OF THE PLANNING PROPOSAL

Documentation

A Statement of Heritage Impact (HIS) prepared by Heritage 21 in May 2023 has been submitted with the Planning Proposal.

As outlined in the Significance section earlier, the significance of the Botany Water Reserves includes the landscaped open space areas, vegetation, and plantings, which (as mentioned under the Aesthetic/Technical significance criterion) includes "notable scenery". The HIS submitted does not assess the impact of the signage on views of the Reserves, simply noting that the bridge is located some distance from any significant structures within the Reserves. As the significance of the reserves not only relates to structures within the reserves but also to the landscaping, the HIS assessment of the heritage impacts of the signage on the bridge is inadequate as it does not take into the account the heritage listed context of the bridge and all its heritage values. Specifically, there is a need to assess whether the signage impacts on views of the reserves. The HIS clearly fails to do this. The photographs within the HIS are all of the bridge, not its context.

CONCLUSION

It is recommended that an amended Statement of Heritage Impact is requested from the proponent to assess the heritage impact of the signage attached to the bridge on the heritage item context, particularly on views of the Botany Water Reserves.

len

Chery Kemp, Principal Partner/Heritage Specialist Kemp & Johnson Heritage Consultants