

COMPLIANCE TABLE: STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICY NO. 64 – ADVERTISING AND SIGNAGE

Schedule 1 Assessment against signage for a Place of Public Worship.

The proposed development seeks approval for four signs within the development. These are:

- Large cross on the north western elevation of the proposed building that is 18m high and 8m wide. This cross protrudes above the height of the building.
- Small cross on the north eastern elevation of the proposed building that is 7m high and 4m wide
- Carpark entry sign that provides directional signage off view street on dwarf concrete wall. The wall 9m long and nominally 1.5m high and text height nominally 300mm high by 7m long and includes a small metal cross 1.8m high x 400mm wide.
- Building Sign on Northern Elevation identifying 'New Hope Anglican Ministry Centre Stanhope' that is 1.2m high, 39m long.

SEPP 64 Criterion	Comments
Character of the area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the proposal compatible with the existing or desired future character of the area or locality in which it is proposed? ▪ Is the proposal consistent with a particular theme for outdoor advertising in the area or locality? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The site is located within the 2(a) Residential zone. The proposed signage is not considered out of character with the local area, a Place of Public Worship is permissible with consent within the zone. The proposed signage is consistent with surrounding signage, including that of the Stanhope Gardens Shopping Centre and is not inconsistent with outdoor advertising in the area or locality.
Special Areas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the proposal detract from the amenity or visual quality of any environmentally sensitive areas, heritage areas, natural or other conservation areas, open space areas, waterways, rural landscapes or residential areas? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposed signage will not detract from any sensitive activity/site in the area as it is considered simplistic and appropriately located on the proposed development.
Views and Vistas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the proposal obscure or compromise important views? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposed signage will not obscure or compromise views as 2 of the 3 signs do not project above the proposed building and the proposed cross projecting above the building height is considered to not compromise important views.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the proposal dominate the skyline and reduce the quality of vistas? ▪ Does the proposal respect the viewing rights of other advertisers? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The signage will not dominate the skyline or reduce the quality of vistas as where signage projects above the building height, signage is simplistic. ▪ The proposed signage will not obscure or detract from other proposed signage.
<p>Streetscape, setting or landscape</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the scale, proportion and form of the proposal appropriate for the streetscape, setting or landscape? ▪ Does the proposal contribute to the visual interest of the streetscape, setting or landscape? ▪ Does the proposal reduce clutter by rationalising and simplifying existing advertising? ▪ Does the proposal screen unsightliness? ▪ Does the proposal protrude above buildings, structures or tree canopies in the area or locality? ▪ Does the proposal require ongoing vegetation management? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes, the signage is considered to be in proportion to the scale of development on the site and is consistent with the existing signage within the area. ▪ The signs will assist in the public being able to identify the activity effectively. ▪ The proposed signage is considered to be relatively simplistic. ▪ The signage is wholly within the subject site and is located on a proposed building. ▪ Whilst the proposed signage is greater than the proposed building height, the signage has a maximum height of 18m. However, the given the location of the sign, adjacent to the exiting shopping centre and adequately separated from adjoining neighbours fronting the location of the site from Stanhope Parkway, as well as the use of the site as a place of public worship, the height of the sign is considered satisfactory. ▪ No vegetation planting is proposed in relation to the proposed signage.
<p>Site and building</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the proposal compatible with the scale, proportion and other characteristics of the site or building, or both, on which the proposed signage is to be located? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes, the signage is considered to be in proportion to the building to which it relates. The proposed building is to be used as a Place of Public Worship. Overall, the proposed signage is considered to be consistent with the scale of the proposed

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the proposal respect important features of the site or building, or both? ▪ Does the proposal show innovation and imagination in its relationship to the site or building, or both? 	<p>development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes, the proposal respects the architectural elements of the existing building. ▪ The signs are considered an appropriate response to the proposed activity on site and form an integral part of the use of the site as a Place of Public Worship.
<p>Illumination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would illumination result in unacceptable glare? ▪ Would illumination affect safety for pedestrians, vehicles or aircraft? ▪ Would illumination detract from the amenity of any residence or other form of accommodation? ▪ Can the intensity of the illumination be adjusted, if necessary? ▪ Is the illumination subject to a curfew? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Illumination of the signage is consistent with the lighting strategy for the Ministry Centre. Appropriate conditions of consent have been included respect to illumination of signage and spillage of light to address amenity concerns of surrounding residential area. This is consistent with illuminated signage in the surrounding residential area.
<p>Safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would the proposal reduce the safety for any public road? ▪ Would the proposal reduce the safety for pedestrians or bicyclists? ▪ Would the proposal reduce the safety for pedestrians, particularly children, by obscuring sightlines from public areas? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is considered that the signage will not reduce the safety for people within the public domain. ▪ The concurrence of the Roads and Maritime Services has been granted subject to conditions regarding the required sight lines to pedestrians and other vehicles within the development not to be compromised by landscaping, signage, fencing or display materials. This will be included in any consent granted.