



## Joint Regional Planning Panels

Mary-Lynne Taylor  
Chair  
Sydney West Joint Regional Planning Panel  
GPO Box 39  
SYDNEY NSW 2001

18 October 2013

Dear Ms Taylor

### Addendum to Crown DA Summary Report -correction

I write to make a correction to the Crown DA Summary Report which was sent to the Sydney West Joint Regional Planning Panel (regional panel) on 17 October 2013. Table 1 within the report contains an error in the fourth row under 'Proponent Response'.

The error is highlighted below in red with the correct wording in black. This follows on from a correction that Architectus asked to make to their 'Proponent Response to Council Assessment Report' which is listed as an attachment to the Crown DA Summary Report. The correction is attached to this letter and is highlighted for you to note.

Council identified issue	Proponent Response
Council considers the DA results in unacceptable impacts on the visual continuity of the Parklands when viewed from the M7 Motorway and bike path.	<p><i>The proposed signs are situated along the edge of the road corridor and therefore <u>do not</u> visually form part of the highway infrastructure. Nor do they fragment the continuity of the parklands corridor.</i></p> <p>The proposed signs are situated along the edge of the road corridor and therefore visually form part of the highway infrastructure. They do not fragment the continuity of the parklands corridor.</p>

Should you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind Regards,

Dean Hosking  
Planning Officer  
Regional Panels Secretariat

### Regional Panels Secretariat

23-33 Bridge Street Sydney NSW 2000 | GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001 | T 02 9228 2060 | F 02 9228 2066 | [www.jrpp.nsw.gov.au](http://www.jrpp.nsw.gov.au)

## APPENDIX A

JRPP Assessment Report – Provision	Response
<b>Western Sydney Parklands Act 2006</b> (P.9) "several of the structures interrupt view corridors from the Motorway across the rural landscape."	The 'Landscape Character – Visual Containment' and 'Landscape Character' figures in Section 7 of the Supplementary Visual Impact Assessment demonstrate that are only restricted visual catchments from the M7 motorway into the parklands.
(pp. 9-10) "the proposal is inconsistent with the other functions of the Trust including Cl.2 (e) – „protect or enhance the cultural of historical heritage of the Parklands"	The land on which the signs are situated and surrounding the signs are not subject to a heritage item and nor are located in the vicinity of a heritage item.
<b>State Environmental Planning Policy (Western Sydney Parklands) 2009</b> <b>Clause 12 – Matters for consideration</b> (pp. 10-11) "The proposal is considered to be inconsistent with the Aims of the SEPP, specifically (f) „maintain the rural character of the Parklands"	The only landscape that could be described as a rural landscape within the visual catchment of the signs is Site 4, which is a grazing landscape. However this visual catchment is crossed by high voltage power lines, water tower and the like.
(pp. 10-11) "The proposal is considered to be inconsistent with the Aims of the SEPP, specifically (e) „protect or enhance the cultural and historical heritage of the Parklands"	The land on which the signs are situated and surrounding the signs are not subject to a heritage item and nor are located in the vicinity of a heritage item.
(p.11) "The proposal is considered to be inconsistent with the Aims of the SEPP, specifically (g) facilitate public access to, and use and enjoyment of the Parklands".	The signs are situated to the edge of the parklands and visually form part of the highway infrastructure. The view shed of the signs from the M7 motorway is very limited due to topography and trees. The situation of the signs is not nearby any public trails except for a bike path along the M7 motorway which is part of the road corridor and not the parklands.
(p.12) "It is considered that the proposed structures would result in unacceptable impacts on the visual continuity of the Parklands when viewed from the M7 Motorway and bike path. Refer to assessment for detailed discussion."	The proposed signs are situated along the edge of the road corridor and therefore visually form part of the highway infrastructure. They do not fragment the continuity of the parklands corridor.
(p.13) "Site 4 is adjacent to a rural-residential property and it is considered that this structure would result in an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of the property including visual amenity from the interruption of existing views, impacts from the illumination of the sign and associated impacts during construction and maintenance. This resident has also raised significant objections to the application."	There would be only minor visual impact of Sign 4 on the existing residence due to the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• intervening distance and trees which will at least partially obscure the view of the sign;</li> <li>• signage content and illumination is situated to the other side of the sign away from the residence;</li> <li>• the signage structure will be painted in a receding colour;</li> <li>• prevailing outlook to transmission line and highway infrastructure.</li> </ul>
<b>Clause 16 Signage</b> "The Western Sydney Parklands Design Manual outlines the vision for the Parklands and its relationship to infrastructure planning, design, and implementation. The Design Manual does not specify any standards/requirements other than for	Although the Design Manual does not contain provisions for advertising signage, this does not mean that the proposal is inconsistent with the Manual and therefore does not meet Clause 16. An absence of relevant criteria is not grounds for non-compliance. And