

## **ATTACHMENT G**

### **STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING POLICY NO. 64 (ADVERTISING AND SIGNAGE) ASSESSMENT**

#### **1. Application of SEPP 64**

State Environmental Planning Policy No. 64 ("SEPP 64") applies to all signage that is visible from any public place or public reserve, for which development consent is required.

#### **2. Objectives of SEPP 64**

The objectives of SEPP 64 are:-

*"3(1) (a) to ensure that signage (including advertising)*  
*(i) is compatible with the desired amenity and visual character of*  
*an area, and*  
*(ii) provides effective communication in suitable locations, and*  
*(iii) is of high quality design and finish, and*  
*(b) to regulate signage (but not content) under Part 4 of the Act, and*  
*(c) to provide time limited consents for the display of certain*  
*advertisement, and*  
*(d) to regulate the display of advertisements in transport corridors,*  
*and*  
*(e) to ensure that public benefits may be derived from advertising in*  
*and adjacent to transport corridors."*

The proposal is consistent with the objectives of SEPP 64 in that:

- the type of matters set out in 3(1)(a) are addressed in the following analysis, and a high level of compliance has been demonstrated;
- in accordance with 3(1)(b), development consent under Part 4 of the Act is sought;
- the type of signs proposed are not affected by the time limited consents mentioned in 3(1)(c); and
- the proposed development is not considered an advertisement.

#### **3. Part 3 Considerations**

The proposed signage would most appropriately be defined as "Building Identification Signage" for the purposes of SEPP 64. The signs will not display an "Advertisement" and do not comprise "Advertising Structures" for the purposes of the SEPP. Part 3 of the SEPP is therefore not a relevant consideration.

#### **4. Schedule 1 Considerations**

Clause 8 of SEPP 64 provides that consent must not be granted to signage unless the proposal has been assessed against the criteria in Schedule 1 of SEPP 64. These criteria are discussed below in relation to the proposed signage.

SEPP 64 Criteria	Comment
<p><b>4.1 Character of the Area</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>is the proposal compatible with the existing or desired future character of the area or locality in which it is proposed to be located?</i></li> <li><i>is the proposal consistent with a particular theme for outdoor advertising in the area or locality?</i></li> </ul>	<p>Yes. The signage is of an appropriate size and has been located opposite the park to ensure that it does not detract from the residential character of the area, yet it still identifies the Residential Aged Care Facility (RACF).</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>
<p><b>4.2 Special Areas</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>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?</i></li> </ul>	<p>No. The sign has a limited visual catchment which excludes the areas described above.</p>
<p><b>4.3 Views and Vistas</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>does the proposal obscure or compromise important views?; and does the proposal dominate the skyline and reduce the quality of vistas?;</i></li> </ul>	<p>No. The signs are to be affixed to entry walls at the entrance to the car park (one on each side of the driveway).</p>
<p><b>4.4 Streetscape, Setting and Landscape</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>is the scale, proportion and form of the proposal appropriate for the streetscape, setting or landscape?</i></li> <li><i>does the proposal contribute to the visual interest of the streetscape, setting or landscape?</i></li> <li><i>does the proposal reduce clutter by rationalising and simplifying existing advertising?</i></li> <li><i>does the proposal screen unsightliness?</i></li> <li><i>does the proposal protrude above buildings, structures or tree canopies in the area or locality?</i></li> <li><i>does the proposal require ongoing vegetation management?</i></li> </ul>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Not applicable.</p> <p>Not applicable.</p> <p>No.</p> <p>No.</p>

<p><b>4.5 Site and Building</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>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?</i></li> <li><i>does the proposal respect important features of the site or building, or both?</i></li> <li><i>does the proposal show innovation and imagination in its relationship to the site or building, or both?</i></li> </ul>	<p>Yes. The signs are modest in size but will identify the name of each stage of the RACF.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Not applicable in the circumstances of the case.</p>
<p><b>4.6 Associated devices and logos with advertisements and advertising structures</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Have any safety devices, platforms, lighting devices or logos been designed as an integral part of the signage or structure on which it is to be displayed?</i></li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable</p>
<p><b>4.7 Illumination</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Would illumination result in unacceptable glare?</i></li> <li><i>Would illumination affect safety for pedestrians, vehicles or aircraft?</i></li> <li><i>Would illumination detract from the amenity of any residence or other form of accommodation?</i></li> <li><i>Can the intensity of the illumination be adjusted, if necessary?</i></li> <li><i>Is the illumination subject to a curfew?</i></li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable</p>
<p><b>4.8 Safety</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Would the proposal reduce the safety for any public road?;</i></li> <li><i>Would the proposal reduce the safety for pedestrians or bicyclists?; and</i></li> <li><i>Would the proposal reduce the safety for pedestrians, particularly children, by obscuring sightlines from public areas.</i></li> </ul>	<p>No</p>