



New South Wales Government
Independent Planning Commission

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

RE: GLEBE ISLAND SILOS - PART 4 SIGNAGE DA PROJECT
(DA-21/13182)

PUBLIC MEETING

COMMISSION PANEL: PROF. RICHARD MACKAY AM (Chair)
 DR PETER WILLIAMS

LOCATION: VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE

DATE: 9.00AM, WEDNESDAY, 17 AUGUST 2022

TRANSCRIBED AND RECORDED BY APT TRANSCRIPTIONS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Presentation	Page No.
OPENING STATEMENT	3
IAN STEPHENSON, THE GLEBE SOCIETY	4
JOHN SERGEANT, GLEBE POINT RESIDENT	6
SOPHIA SCARPELLINO, GLEBE POINT RESIDENT	7
JUDY CASHMORE, SAVE OUR BAYS INC	9
BELINDA BARNETT, EYE DRIVE SYDNEY PTY LTD.....	14
CAMERON SARGENT, DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT	15
CLOSING STATEMENT	17

PROF. MACKAY: Well, good morning and welcome to the Independent Planning Commission's electronic public meeting for the application for the Glebe Island Silos Part 4 Signage DA Project, that is DA21/13182. I'm Professor Richard Mackay and I'm the Chair of this Independent Planning Commission Panel and joining me is my fellow Commissioner Dr Peter Williams. Before we begin I would like to acknowledge that I'm speaking to you from Gadigal land and I acknowledge the traditional owners of all the Country from which we virtually meet today and pay my respects to their Elders past and present and to the Elders from other communities who may be participating today.

10

The applicant, Eye Drive Sydney Pty Limited, is seeking approval for the ongoing use of two existing advertising signs on the Glebe Island Silos. I note the Department, in its assessment report, has recommended approval subject to conditions. The Minister for Planning has asked the Commission to determine this application within eight weeks of receiving the final whole-of-government assessment report from the Department. In line with regulations introduced in response to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic we have moved this public meeting online with registered speakers provided the opportunity to present to the panel via telephone or video conference.

20 In the interests of openness and transparency we are live-streaming proceedings on the Commission's website. A full transcript of today's meeting will also be published on the Commission's website in the next few days. The Commission is the consent authority for this state significant development application because more than 50 unique public objections were received. This public meeting forms one part of the Commission's process. We have also undertaken site inspections, both during the day and at night and have met with the Department, the applicant, Inner West Council and the City of Sydney Council and transcripts of all of these meetings and the site inspection notes have been published on our website.

30 The Commissioners have also read and considered every public submission with the benefit of being able to locate the address of each submission in relation to the advertising signs on the Glebe Island Silos. After the public meeting we may convene with relevant stakeholders if clarification or additional information is required on matters raised. Following the public meeting we will endeavour to determine the development application as soon as possible, noting that there may be a delay if we find that additional information is needed. Written submissions on this matter will be accepted by the Commission up to 5.00pm Eastern Standard Time on Wednesday, 24 August, 2022 and you can make a submission using the "have your say" portal on our website or by email or by post. While interested individuals and groups may make
40 any submission they consider appropriate, the Commission is particularly assisted by submissions that are responsive to the Department's assessment and recommendations.

Now, before we get underway, I would like to outline how today's public meeting will run. We will first hear from our registered speakers and then from representatives of the Applicant who is in attendance. The Department of Planning and Environment will then be available as the final speaker to clarify any matters raised during the meeting and to answer any questions that have been raised and while we'll endeavour to stick to our published schedule, this will be dependent on the registered speakers being ready to present at their allocated time and there has been some minor shuffling this morning to accommodate the availability of one speaker.

10

I will introduce each speaker when it's their turn to present to the panel. Everyone has nominated in advance for how long they propose to speak and a bell will sound when a speaker has one minute remaining. A second bell will sound when a speaker's time has expired. If you have a copy of your speaking notes or any additional material to support your presentation it would be appreciated if you would provide a copy to the Commission. Please note that any information given to us may be made public and is likely to be published on our website. The Commission's privacy statement governs our approach to managing your information and our privacy statement is also available on our website. Thank you. So it is now time to call our first speaker and our first

20

speaker is Mr Ian Stephenson from The Glebe Society. Mr Stephenson.

<IAN STEPHENSON, THE GLEBE SOCIETY

MR STEPHENSON: Good morning and thank you for the opportunity to address the panel. The society has over 400 members and is one of Sydney's largest resident groups. We're concerned about the impact of the lighting the advertising signage has on Glebe Point. The advertising on top of the silos is very large, being over 1,170 square metres. It is currently floodlit from dusk to 1.00am. Parts of Glebe Point are a little over 400 metres from the sign. Because parts of Glebe Point are on the direct

30

access to the principal elevation of the advertising it is one of the most directly affected of the adjoining neighbourhoods.

The nature of the development, that is illumination, which spreads over a large geographical area means that both the City of Sydney, the LGA for Glebe Point, and Inner West Council, the LGA for Balmain, Lilyfield and Annandale are affected. The supporting documentation for the DA includes an assessment of the visual impact of the lighting on Glebe Point. It finds that the visual sensitivity is high to moderate, visual magnitude is high to moderate and visual impact rating is high to moderate. The Statement of Environmental Effects notes that high means the visual impact on these viewers is significant and would typically require amelioration at the site

40

planning stage.

10 The report is subject to the caveat that measurements have only been taken on public land. This makes it a tokenistic rather than a systematic analysis. Having determined that the impact is high and significant and requires amelioration further measurements should've been taken from the most affected residences. The current DA recognises the deleterious impact of the lighting on neighbouring residential areas by requiring that the lights be turned off at 1.00am. Why has 1.00am been selected? What is the rationale? Is it based on the assumption that all affected residents of Glebe Point go to bed at 1.00am? There are other planning regulations which are designed to protect the amenity of residents in their homes during the common hours of repose. A relevant example relates to the use of air conditioners and water pump heaters which must be turned off at 10.00pm.

20 With the lighting of the advertising on the Glebe Island Silos a similar principle should apply, which is that after 10.00pm the lighting should not be intruding into people's homes in Glebe Point. Therefore, as a minimum, the DA should be subject to the condition that the lights only operate from dusk to 10.00pm. State Environmental Planning Policy number 64, Advertising and Signage, Schedule 1, includes in its assessment criteria that there be analysis as to whether the proposed signage is compatible with the existing or desired future character of the area or locality in which it is to be located.

30 As the visual impact study established, the effect of the signage extends beyond Glebe Island to Glebe Point, the applicant should've assessed whether the proposal is compatible with the Glebe Point Heritage Conversation Area. The application fails to do this. The proposed hours for the lighting of the signs are excessive. The associated light pollution reduces the quality of life in Glebe Point. We agree with Sydney City Council's submission that the sign was only approved for a limited time and should not be renewed. However, we note that the application recognises the impact on parts of Glebe Point is high and this requires mitigation.

The previous requirement that the lights be turned off at 1.00am is unbalanced, having more regard to the need of the applicant than the neighbours who are affected by light pollution. We recommend that as a minimum the impact of the lights should be mitigated by making it a condition of approval that they be turned off at 10.00pm each night. Thank you.

40 PROF. MACKAY: Thank you, Mr Stephenson. I have no questions arising from that submission. Dr Williams?

DR WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you, Richard. Mr Stephenson, you mentioned the curfew. Currently it's 1.00am, the proposal is for an 11.00pm curfew perhaps as an alternative if consent was to be granted. What would your views be between, say, 10.00 or 11.00pm curfew hour?

MR STEPHENSON: Well, it should be 10.00pm, it should be in line with similar rules about impact on people's homes at night when they're trying to sleep.

DR WILLIAMS: Okay. Thank you.

10

PROF. MACKAY: Thank you, Dr Williams. Thank you, Mr Stephenson. And I think we shall now move to our second speaker and presentation. So I'd hand to Mr John Sergeant. Mr Sergeant.

<JOHN SERGEANT, GLEBE POINT RESIDENT

MR SERGEANT: Good morning and thank you for the opportunity to address the panel. Mr Stephenson referred to residents of Glebe Point, I am one such. I live in a heritage-listed dwelling on Glebe Point which looks directly across at the silos. We've recently spent many millions of dollars, I'm sorry to say, restoring it to its former glory. It has verandas on three levels that look across the water at the silos and, therefore, at the advertising. The silos themselves are a heritage-listed item and I think if the Commission was considering an application to put a large illuminate billboard on a heritage-listed item of any sort, anywhere in the state it would be refused out of hand.

20

It was only during the temporary suspension of all critical faculties during the Olympics that various strange things were allowed to happen that ordinarily wouldn't be permitted. This is one such. It has an impact on the silos themselves, on various heritage-listed properties such as the one in which my family and I live but also on the heritage conservation area, as Mr Stephenson has pointed out. So if this was a new application I have every confidence that it wouldn't even get to the Commission, it would simply be rejected as laughable. I don't think a curfew of any duration is the solution for a large advertising installation on a heritage item.

30

I want to talk about the impact of it in terms other than lighting. I have a career in marketing and the purpose of illuminated signage is to have impact. If the impact could be eliminated there would be no point in having the signage. That is its raison d'être. Okay. So for my family and I if we are to enjoy the amenity of our house and the area in which we and many others live we have to be subjected to advertisements

40

for betting, for beer, and most egregious of all, for Kyle Sandilands while we gaze across the water at a listed heritage item.

Okay. So I want to distinguish between the impact of lighting itself and the impact of messages and also the impact on the heritage item. I don't think this is a development capable of approval, let alone of mitigation and, therefore, I can't see that there is a sensible arrangement under which a large piece of advertising should be placed on a heritage item. If it were Parliament House or the Opera House or Pymont Bridge or the White Bay Power Station and this were a new application it would be refused out of hand and I think that there should be no extension to what was in the first place a piece of reckless insanity. That is all I want to say, thank you.

PROF. MACKAY: Mr Sergeant, thank you. I've just got one quick question and then I'll check with Commissioner Williams. Could I just check, Mr Sergeant, when you and your family acquired your residence please?

MR SERGEANT: We acquired the residence in 2011 and the burden of your question is that was it already there? Yes, it was there but it was understood to be temporary as, indeed, were a number of other Olympic-related temporary developments in the White Bay and Blackwattle Bay areas, one of which has sadly magically become permanent. I think it's important that this one doesn't as well.

PROF. MACKAY: Thank you for that clarification. Commissioner Williams?

DR WILLIAMS: No, thanks. Thanks, Richard. No, thank you.

PROF. MACKAY: Well, thank you, Mr Sergeant. Thank you also for sticking to your nominated time and we shall - - -

MR SERGEANT: The Commission may wish to be aware of the spelling of my name which it seems to have – what's the word? There are two Sergeants on this call and my spelling is different from Cameron's.

PROF. MACKAY: Thank you. Noted. We shall now move to our third speaker and that is Sophia Scarpellino. I hope I've pronounced your surname correctly. Over to you, Ms Scarpellino.

<SOPHIA SCARPELLINO, GLEBE POINT RESIDENT

MS SCARPELLINO: Thank you very much to the Commission for having me here today. I am too a resident of Glebe and I think I live quite close to John. I live in the

apartments that are directly across from the silos and I just wanted to say that I do agree with Mr Stephenson's comments and John's comments and particularly about the advertisement coming directly into my home, like waking up every day and looking at the ad itself. But my comments are my apartment is about one of 500 directly across from the billboard and a sign directly faces into my and my community's living rooms and bedroom windows.

10 When I look out of my windows to the beautiful Blackwattle Bay and the lush greenery of the foreshore and the parks and the surrounding area the billboard dominates the space. It takes away from the beautiful views, character and charm that we are so lucky to have in these suburbs. I'd just like to share with you a photo as well. How do I do that? Can you see that?

PROF. MACKAY: Yes, we can, thank you.

20 MS SCARPELLINO: Yeah. So this is a photo taken from my apartment window, from my living room. So you can see at night the illumination of the sign is really bright and apparently this billboard used to be one of the largest in the Southern Hemisphere and it really does dominate the night sky. As you can see the lighting is not in keeping with the area around it and at night the night pollution is so bright that even with the blinds down in my bedroom I have to wear an eye mask so that I can block out that light and to your question, Dr Williams, earlier, I go to bed between 8.30 and 9 o'clock. So, you know, if we were going to turn off the lights it would be much earlier but to the point that the billboard should not be there to begin with.

30 I ask the Commission to please consider the impacts that I have described on the thousands of residents which live across from this sign that comes in to their homes every day. Thank you very much for your time, I really do appreciate it. Oh, and I did want to say as well that I have lived in my home for six years but my home belongs to my father-in-law who bought it in 1970 off the plan. So our family has been living there since 1970. Thank you very much.

PROF. MACKAY: Ms Scarpellino, thank you for the submission, thank you for sharing the photograph which the Commission will publish on its website. Could I just check with you, that photograph is taken using a normal camera, an iPhone or similar, not using a telephoto lens?

40 MS SCARPELLINO: No, it's taken using my Samsung Note 8 and I didn't do anything to enhance it, I didn't zoom in or anything like that. It's just literally the photo straight from my apartment.

PROF. MACKAY: Thank you, Ms Scarpellino, it's helpful to have that clarified. Commissioner Williams, have you got any questions?

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you, Richard. I'm sorry, Ms Scarpellino, just to clarify. Sorry, what time of night, was this quite late at night I gather with - there's no other lighting I can see at all in the background. It's very much in the foreground.

MS SCARPELLINO: Yes. So that's just the view. So I look out over the bay, so the bay starts where all the water is and then the lights are only the bridge, as you can see,
10 and the boats in front, the boatshed and then the billboard. They're the only lights that are ever there.

DR WILLIAMS: Right. There's no other lights you can see in the background at all beyond that?

MS SCARPELLINO: No, no, no because I look directly out over the bay, yeah.

DR WILLIAMS: Okay. Great. Thank you very much, Ms Scarpellino. Thank you.

20 MS SCARPELLINO: Yeah. No worries. Thank you.

PROF. MACKAY: Thank you, Ms Scarpellino, and as I mentioned in my introductory statement the Commission has inspected the site, has had the benefit of being able to be aware of the location of each objection and both Commissioners have inspected from Glebe Point at night. So look, thank you for that presentation and submission and I think that then takes us onto our next and final community presenter Ms Judy Cashmore. Ms Cashmore, are you there please?

<JUDY CASHMORE, SAVE OUR BAYS INC

30

MS CASHMORE: Yes, I am. Thank you for the opportunity. I'd like to acknowledge that I'm speaking from the people of the - Gadigal people of the Eora nation and Gadigal Country and pay my respects to the Elders past, present and emerging. I'd like to share my screen with a Power Point that I will now start and I just need to make sure that – can you see that screen now?

PROF. MACKAY: No, Ms Cashmore, we still have you on screen.

MS CASHMORE: Let me just (not transcribable). I will (not transcribable) This
40 should be working. Hang on.

PROF. MACKAY: We can – you’ve submitted your presentation, I understand, to the Commission’s office so are we able to show it? I’m just looking at our technical crew here. I gather we can show it and you will see what we see.

MS CASHMORE: Okay. Yeah, I do have one extra slide that I put in but I can send that to you later. Okay. That’s fine.

PROF. MACKAY: So could I check, are you seeing what the Commission is now seeing which is a cover slide?

10

MS CASHMORE: Yes, I can. Thank you.

PROF. MACKAY: Well, if you want to instruct we’ll observe your presentation and listen.

20

MS CASHMORE: Okay. So I’m representing Save our Bays and I’d like to say that I support and agree with all of the points that the three other speakers have made. They are entirely in line with my - our thinking. If I could go to the next slide please. I’d like to address three main issues that were in our submission as well and that goes to the unattractive, dominating impact and the impact of residents and also the park views, so it’s not just those who live here. We have a foreshore, Glebe foreshore and parks that are used by a lot of people and this is an important aspect and hasn’t really been considered, I don’t think, in the submissions.

30

The second is the lack of public or community benefit and the third is the wasted opportunity to do something much more attractive for community benefit. The temporary signage has been on the silos, as pointed out, for about 30 years now. Meant to be temporary, it certainly isn’t. Next slide please. So just going briefly to what I think are inaccurate and flawed visual-impact assessment statements and also the Department of Planning’s, we consider to be poorly-based conclusions. The Department considers that visual impacts are acceptable.

40

Basically it boils down to the fact that they’ve been there for a while so we should be used to it, nothing has changed much since the previous application, that the scale is compatible. I think some of the photos show that it’s not compatible with the context and the area and, lastly the overall, that it doesn’t result in any significant visual impact in existing residential properties given the separation distance of approximately 500 to 800 metres. It also doesn’t take account of the numbers of people who are living there. If we could go to the next slide please.

If you look at where all the test sites were what's really significant about that is that there were no test sites in the areas that were raised but if you look to the left of that bottom yellow one around Annandale there are a number there that they are so much further away. So the areas that were most impacted are the ones that have the least tests and the least visual-impact assessment. Next slide please.

I'd just like to point out that the photo on the left is the one that was put in the visual-impact statement. Now, that – if you look at it from the naked eye from the same spot, and that's where also at the bottom of Glebe Point Road a lot of residents are living here, the impact with the naked eye looks like the right-hand one. That's taken with, again, a Samsung camera, photo, phone camera and that's an equivalent to the naked-eye look. If you go to the next one please.

We look at night-time, the one on the left was in the impact statement and the one on the right is again much more equivalent to a daytime view and this is closer to the one that Ms Scarpellino also showed. Next slide please. So what exactly is the level of public benefit that we're meant to be gaining and that the Department is apparently satisfied with? They say that it provides sufficient public benefits to the local community, including heritage conservation improvements and local community services. I think that's very questionable. What exactly is the public benefit that we get for \$127,000 per year and what's the monitoring that is actually spent for any benefit? I think it's very minimal and it's poorly targeted. It's notable that it's the Inner West Council that doesn't object because they get \$127,000 a year but it's not – they're not the ones who are directly affected and living directly opposite, or the park views. Next slide please.

I did have another slide here. What I wanted to say first up is that I think that the idea of reducing the curfew to 11.00 is better than 1.00am but I actually agree with the previous speakers that it's still not sufficient. Why is it that the Anzac Bridge light which at least is an attractive architectural feature gets turned off much, much earlier than the lights on this imposing and distracting lighting marketing? Next slide please. And again, the one that we're seeing at the moment is actually less offensive than what – as indicated by Mr Sergeant – that it's not about betting or gambling or so on but it's the least egregious of the ones that we see. If we look at the next one as well please.

That's closer to what we get most of the time. Sometimes it's red and white. Often where it's a very white and red background it's really a distracting and unattractive and it also gives much more light but is that as good as it gets? Is that the community benefit that we're getting from this 127,000? So what I'm arguing is that we're not getting sufficient public benefit, that it doesn't in any way pay off against the impact on residents, park users and what exactly is the benefit for those who are driving

across the bridge? Because I can tell you when I drive across it I never look at it so I'm not sure what the market value is but I think it's a wasted opportunity. If we could go the last slide and finish on this point. There should be one more slide.

10 It's a very wasted opportunity that we've got a facile, unattractive advertising that doesn't represent Sydney or who we are to the rest of the world and to those who are coming in as tourists, in particular. The suggestion that the Department of Planning seem to have understood it was about replacing it with silo art like in the country, I think the point is that it is about replacing the advertising parapet with something like public art. I don't claim to speak for the Aboriginal community although I have spoken to people that I know, other Aboriginal academics and so on, but this seems to be very timely to celebrate Aboriginal heritage and Aboriginal art. It would be a great thing for us to do, very timely with the voice and a time for the New South Wales Government to contribute to what is now a national campaign by our Commonwealth Government. So that's my main points. Thank you for the opportunity to present them.

20 PROF. MACKAY: Ms Cashmore, thank you very much and noting that you had added a slide to your presentation, if you would like to send the amended presentation to the Commission we would very happily have regard to that and would, of course, publish it on the Commission's website. I just have a couple of quick questions for clarification. In terms of the Save our Bays group what's the membership of that group please, Ms Cashmore?

MS CASHMORE: Actually I'd have to talk to our member at the moment. It's a small group, it's nothing like The Glebe Society but it is one that is talking to the broad range of issues around the Rozelle and Blackwattle Bay areas. So we're putting in more submissions.

30 MR SERGEANT: The membership is going to go up by one, Judy.

MS CASHMORE: Thank you, John.

PROF. MACKAY: Thank you. And could I also just clarify, you mentioned when you showed an initial pair of photograph that the one - the resident photo on the right was taken with a Samsung camera but it did rather seem to me that some of the subsequent photographs where the silos filled the screen, were they also taken with the Samsung camera?

40 MS CASHMORE: They were taken with the same - it's just my Samsung Note 20 phone. The way I did that was I actually put it up to the silos and compared it,

because obviously when you put it through a phone – and I think that’s what happens when these visual-impact statements or assessment photos are taken. They actually, if you look at what it looks like with the naked eye versus what was in those visual assessment photos they don’t bear any resemblance to each other. They look so much further away and that was also the case with some of the issues around the super yacht marina 250 metres away. They looked as though they were, you know, kilometres away but they were actually, it’s actually very close.

10 PROF. MACKAY: Thank you for that clarification. Commissioner Williams, have you got any - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you. Thank you. Just one. Thanks, Ms Cashmore, for that presentation. Just I think a related question from Commissioner Mackay was, just the geographical extent of the membership of Save our Bays? So what sort of suburbs do the members represent or reside in?

MS CASHMORE: It goes go Annandale through to mostly around Glebe.

20 DR WILLIAMS: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you. Thanks, Commissioner.

PROF. MACKAY: Ms Cashmore, thank you and again if you’d like to send your presentation we’d be happy to receive that.

MS CASHMORE: Thank you.

PROF. MACKAY: Thank you for your time this morning.

MS CASHMORE: I will, thank you.

30 PROF. MACKAY: That now concludes the presentations from community members. We do have online representatives from the Applicant and I understand that there are a number of people available perhaps to be coordinated by Belinda Barnett. Ms Barnett, if you’re there the Applicant is invited to respond to anything that has been presented this morning and particularly to answer any questions or provide clarification. There were some comments made by Mr Stephenson from The Glebe Society about the choice of vantage points, public versus private areas and there were some comments made by Ms Cashmore from Save our Bays about the selection of vantage points and I think it would help the Commission if there could be some comment about those matters but we would be pleased to hear whatever the Applicant might like to put
40 before the Commission in response to the presentations this morning. Thank you.

<BELINDA BARNETT, EYE DRIVE SYDNEY PTY LTD

MS BARNETT: Thank you, Commissioners. Before I begin I'd also like to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land on which we meet, the Gadigals of the Eora nation and I pay my respects their Elders past, present and emerging. In terms of the questions you've just asked, Commissioners, we did have the group JSA visual-impact assessment peer-reviewed by Urbis with a second detailed impact assessment submitted as part of our response to submissions and within that document they, Urbis addressed the vantage points identified in the submissions. I'm not sure
10 whether the speakers have had the benefit of looking at that document.

Also just in respect to the comment from the Glebe Society concerning the, addressing the Glebe Conservation Area. Again our heritage consultant, NBRs, was asked to as part of the response to submissions to address that specific requirement and we submitted additional information which indicated that the level of impact was acceptable.

PROF. MACKAY: Thank you, Ms Barnett, for those clarifications. Is there anything else that the Applicant would like to put before the Commission by way of response to
20 this morning's presentations?

MS BARNETT: I might divert to Dr Brunton.

DR BRUNTON: Commissioners, just one very brief point. My name is Nick Brunton. Just on the lighting and the luminance of the sign. The brightness of the sign is about 17 per cent of the maximum allowable under the Australian Standard AS4282 and the Transport Outdoor Advertising and Signage Guidelines. The reports from the lighting consultant also show that the light spill to affected residents was calculated to be less than 0.4 per cent of the maximum of 25 lux. The recorded light
30 spill is less than 0.1 lux. The lighting consultant advised us that this is significantly less than the illumination resulting from a full moon. So while it's appreciated that the residents can see the sign, measurements indicate that the light spill is very, very low and well below the maximum allowable under the Australian Standard. Thank you, Commissioners.

PROF. MACKAY: Thank you, Dr Brunton. Now, could I just check with Commissioner Williams, if you have any questions please.

DR WILLIAMS: Just one question thanks, Commissioner. There was a bit of
40 comment this morning from the community presenters about potential time for turning

off the lights, curfews and so on. Does the Applicant have a view on potential – if consent was granted in terms of the duration of a curfew that might be imposed?

MS BARNETT: Commissioners, up until, I guess, the 2018 consent the lighting on the silos operated 24 hours. The 2018 consent introduced a curfew to 1.00am and it was my understanding that what the 1.00am curfew was, it came about at that time to actually coincide with the lighting curfew of the Anzac Bridge. In putting forward this application and again in response to the submissions that have been made by the community we have put forward a suggestion for an 11.00pm curfew and on that basis
10 it is the applicant's preference to maintain an 11.00pm curfew. Also having consideration to the results that Dr Brunton has just shared regarding the levels of compliance that the existing illumination has with the relevant Standards.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you. Thanks, Richard. Thank you very much.

PROF. MACKAY: All right. Thank you, Ms Barnett, and thank you, Dr Brunton. I have no further questions so it just remains to thank the Applicant for being available today to respond to matters raised in the community submissions. So thank you for that. So our final slot this morning is for the Department. The Commissioner has had
20 the benefit of the Department's assessment report and met with officers from the Department recently and a transcript of that meeting is available on the Commission's website but we are joined this morning, I think, by Cameron Sargent and Lucinda Craig and I'd like to provide an opportunity for the Department to clarify or respond to any of the matters raised during the community submissions this morning. Thank you.

<CAMERON SARGENT, DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT

MR SARGENT: Good morning. Look, firstly, I'd like to thank the IPC for the
30 opportunity today to attend the meeting. Look, I think the presentations were quite detailed and I think Belinda's, the Applicant's, response to some of those issues have addressed some of those or clarified. I think in respect of lighting the Department – obviously we did consider what the potential lighting impacts were and we were presented with information so that lighting levels would be substantially below or would comply with relevant Australian Standards for the guideline. I think to look at it more broadly we also have to acknowledge that the site is within an important port urban setting. The port operates 24 hours a day, seven days a week. There are uses that are ongoing, including new uses such as a concrete batching plant which is adjacent to the site, that has been given approval to operate 24 hours a day, seven days
40 a week.

We've got the lighting levels of the Anzac Bridge, we've got the lighting of the silos themselves and I noticed during some of those photos that were taken that a lot of the lighting that was, or the illumination that you could see, was actually of the silos. This application relates to the lighting of the signs, not the silos. So I think for the Commission to look at it more broadly we need to consider, notwithstanding the fact that the lighting levels comply, but we are talking about a very well-lit urban environment that does operate and has approval to operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

10 PROF. MACKAY: Thank you, Mr Sargent. Is there anything else from the Department, please?

MR SARGENT: Look, I think having considered the issues raised in the submissions as well as what the Applicant sought, obviously the Department did not support the 10-year duration of the signs. So the Department considered that a three-year period was more appropriate and there were a number of reasons for that. The first reason was because it is consistent with the relevant DCPs, that's the Glebe Island White Bay DCP as well as the advertising DCP, the Glebe Island Advertising DCP. But we also looked at it from a strategic context point of view and it was very important that we
20 looked at what the future redevelopment potential of the Bays West area was.

Recently there is a stage-1 rezoning package that commenced exhibition this week. It's on exhibition until, I believe, early September and that earmarks – I guess that is the first stage of part of a precinct that is proposed to deliver 4,950 new jobs, new homes, offices, cafes, social infrastructure, the rejuvenation of the White Bay Power Station as well as public and open space. So in this context the Department did not consider the 10-year timeframe was appropriate because we – as part of the rezoning package as well as the master plan the new Metro Station is earmarked for completion and operation by 2030 which is only eight years away.
30

So the Department considered that a three-year limit would not result in any potential conflicts with the future redevelopment of the precinct as the consent would cease five years prior to the opening of the Metro and it would also ensure that any signage would be compatible with the transitioning character of Bays West. Thank you.

PROF. MACKAY: Thank you, Mr Sargent, and thank you again for the Department's assessment report and for our recent meeting. I have no further questions. Commissioner Williams?

40 DR WILLIAMS: No, thank you, Commissioner. Thank you.

PROF. MACKAY: Well, look, it then falls to me to thank all those who have participated in today's public meeting. That brings us to the end of the public meeting into the Glebe Island Silos Part 4 Signage DA Project DA21/13182. Thank you to everyone who has participated in this important process. Dr Peter Williams, I appreciate your input particularly. I'd just like to remind all who are online that you still have time to have your say on this application. The Commission has not yet made its determination and to do so you can simply click on the "have your say" portal on the website or submit a submission via email or via mail. The deadline for written comments is 5.00pm Australian Eastern Standard Time next Wednesday, 24 August, 2022.

In the interests of openness and transparency we will be making a full transcript of this public meeting available on our website in the next few days. At the time of the determination the Commission will publish its statement of reasons for decision which will outline how the panel took the community's views into consideration as part of its decision-making process. So finally a quick thank you for our technical crew, to the Commission staff and particularly to my fellow Commissioner Dr Peter Williams. I'd like to thank everybody who's been involved in making today's meeting possible. Thank you for tuning in and being involved. From all of us here at the Commission, enjoy the rest of your day. Good morning and I declare the meeting closed.

MEETING CONCLUDED

[9.44am]