

## SYDNEY CENTRAL CITY PLANNING PANEL

### APPENDIX A

#### State Environmental Planning Policy 64 “Advertising and Signage”

Requirement	Yes	No	N/A	Comment
<b>Part 1 - Preliminary</b>				
<b>Clause 3(1)(a)(i) Aims, objectives</b>				
(1) This Policy aims:				
(a) to ensure that signage (including advertising):				
(i) is compatible with the desired amenity and visual character of an area, and	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The new sign situated on the western side of the grandstand is determined as complying with Clause 3(1)(a)(i), (ii) and (iii).
(ii) provides effective communication in suitable locations, and	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
(iii) is of high quality design and finish, and	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
(b) to regulate signage (but not content) under Part 4 of the Act, and	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
(c) to provide time-limited consents for the display of certain advertisements, and	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
(d) to regulate the display of advertisements in transport corridors, and	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
(e) to ensure that public benefits may be derived from advertising in and adjacent to transport corridors.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
(2) This Policy does not regulate the content of signage and does not require consent for a change in the content of signage.				Subclause (2) is noted.
<b>Part 2 - Signage Generally</b>				
<b>Clause 8 Granting of consent to signage</b>				
<i>A consent authority must not grant consent to an application to display signage unless:</i>				
(a) that signage is consistent with the objectives of the Policy at clause 3(1)(a)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The sign proposed is assessed as being consistent with objectives at Clause 3(1)(a) and the assessment criteria at Schedule 1.
(a) (b) that the signage satisfies the assessment criteria specified in Schedule 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Part 4 - Definitions</b>				<b>Building identification sign.</b>
<b>Schedule 1 Assessment Criteria</b>				
<b>Character of the area</b>				
<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>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The new sign is compatible to the locality.
<i>Is the proposal consistent with a particular theme for outdoor advertising in the area or locality?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The sign is situated within a parkland and provides the viewer the name of the park and grandstand being “Granville Park Grandstand”. The sign is satisfactory under this Part.
<b>Special Areas</b>				

## SYDNEY CENTRAL CITY PLANNING PANEL

Requirement	Yes	No	N/A	Comment
<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>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The building identification sign provides the name of the grandstand. The sign is appropriate for the locality and its position is acceptable. The sign is facing the car park to advise the viewer, the name of the park and grandstand.
<b>Views and vistas</b>				
<i>Does the proposal obscure or compromise important views?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The new sign does not obscure or compromise important views.
<i>Does the proposal dominate the skyline and reduce the quality of vistas?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The new sign does not dominate the skyline or adversely impact on vistas or views across the parkland.
<i>Does the proposal respect the viewing rights of other advertisers?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This will not apply to the development application as there are no advertisers on site.
<b>Streetscape, setting or landscape</b>				
<i>Is the scale, proportion and form of the proposal appropriate for the streetscape, setting or landscape?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The new building identification sign has an acceptable size which is not excessive in nature.
<i>Does the proposal contribute to the visual interest of the streetscape, setting or landscape?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Does the proposal reduce clutter by rationalising and simplifying existing advertising?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No clutter of signage is proposed. Only one sign is proposed which occupies an area of 3.65 square metres.
<i>Does the proposal screen unsightliness?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	There is no unsightliness to screen.
<i>Does the proposal protrude above buildings, structures or tree canopies in the area or locality?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The new sign does not protrude above the grandstand building.
<i>Does the proposal require ongoing vegetation management?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	There is no requirement to manage vegetation.
<b>Site and building</b>				
<i>Is the proposal compatible with the scale, proportion and other characteristics of the site or building, or both, on which proposed signage is to be located?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The proposed signage is compatible with the subject site's character, the building and locality.
<i>Does the proposal respect important features of the site or building, or both?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This is achieved.
<i>Does the proposal show innovation and imagination in its relationship to the site or building or both?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This is achieved.
<b>Associated devices and logos with advertisements and advertising structures</b>				
<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 displayed?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No safety devices are required.
<b>Illumination</b>				
<i>Would illumination result in unacceptable glare?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The sign is not illuminated.
<i>Would illumination affect safety for pedestrians, vehicles or aircraft?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Would illumination detract from the amenity of any residence or other form of accommodation?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Can the intensity of the illumination be adjusted, if necessary?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Is the illumination subject to a curfew?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

## SYDNEY CENTRAL CITY PLANNING PANEL

Requirement	Yes	No	N/A	Comment
<b>Safety</b>				
<i>Would the proposal reduce the safety for any public road?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The sign will not affect the safety of any road users.
<i>Would the proposal reduce the safety for pedestrians or bicyclists?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Would the proposal reduce the safety for pedestrians, particularly children, by obscuring sight lines from public areas?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The sign will not affect the safety of any pedestrians in the locality.

### Parramatta Local Environmental Plan 2011

<b>Is the development consistent with the aims of the LEP?</b>	The development application is consistent with the aims of the Parramatta Local Environmental Plan 2011.
<b>Is the development consistent with the Zone objectives?</b>	Not inconsistent.
<b>Clause 4.1 - Minimum Subdivision lot size.</b>	Not applicable to Woodville Park.
<b>Clause 4.3 - Maximum height of building.</b>	Not applicable to Woodville Park.
<b>Clause 4.4 - Floor space ratio (FSR).</b>	Not applicable to Woodville Park.
<b>Clause 5.10 - Heritage Conservation.</b>	The Park is not identified as containing heritage artefacts within the Parramatta Local Environmental Plan 2011.
<b>Clause 6.1 - Acid Sulphate Soils.</b>	<p>Most of Woodville Park is given a Class 5 rating for Acid Sulphate Soils. The north east portion of the park is given a rating of Class 4 for Acid Sulphate Soils.</p> <p>The development application does not include excavation work on any land affected by the Class 4 rating for acid sulphate soils.</p> <p>Surface based earthworks will be required to facilitate construction of the new grand stand however deep excavation work below 2 metres is not required.</p> <p>As such, it is considered that a detailed acid sulphate soils assessment is not required for this application.</p>
<b>Clause 6.2 - Earthworks.</b>	<p>Surface based earthworks will be required to facilitate construction of the new grand stand however deep excavation work is not occurring.</p> <p>Earthworks associated with the development are minor in extent.</p>
<b>Clause 6.3 - Flood Planning.</b>	<p>The southern and eastern section of the park is prone to flooding because Duck Creek passes underneath the park.</p> <p>The works are occurring outside the flood risk areas. A detailed flood study is not required.</p>
<b>Clause 6.4 - Biodiversity Protection.</b>	The clause does not apply to the development application because the site is not identified on the Biodiversity Map as having high biodiversity value.
<b>Clause 6.5 - Water Protection.</b>	The clause does not apply to the development application because the site is not identified on the Natural Resources Riparian Land and Waterways Map as having high value.

### Parramatta Development Control Plan 2011

Relevant Control	Compliance with Requirements	Consistency Objectives
<b>2.4 Site Considerations</b>		
<b>2.4.1 Views and Vistas</b>	Preserve views of significant topographical features.	Not applicable to this application.
		N/A.

## SYDNEY CENTRAL CITY PLANNING PANEL

	Refer to views and vistas in the Harris Park Heritage Conservation Area in Part 4.		
<b>2.4.2.1 Flooding</b>	Refer to section 2.4.2 of PDCP 2011 for detail controls for flood affected sites.	<p>The southern and eastern section of the park is prone to flooding because Duck Creek passes underneath the park.</p> <p>The construction works are occurring outside the flood risk areas of the park.</p> <p>A detailed flood study is not required for the development.</p>	N/A.
<b>2.4.2.2 Protection of Waterways</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Site adjoin a waterway?</li> <li>- Does the proposed landscaping comprise of local indigenous species?</li> </ul>	The work site does not adjoin a waterway.	N/A.
<b>2.4.2.3 Protection of Groundwater</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- any basement carpark proposed?</li> <li>- does the site require dewatering to facilitate this?</li> </ul>	No basement car park is proposed and no dewatering is required.	N/A.
<b>2.4.3.1 Soil Management</b>	Adequate erosion control measures?	An Erosion and Sediment Control Plan has been submitted with the development application to be incorporated into any consent issued.	Yes.
<b>2.4.3.2 Acid sulphate soils</b>	Development to ensure that sites with potential to contain acid sulphate soils are managed in a manner consistent with the provisions of the Parramatta Local Environmental Plan 2011.	<p>Most of Woodville Park is given a Class 5 rating for Acid Sulphate Soils. The north east portion of the park is given a rating of Class 4 for Acid Sulphate Soils.</p> <p>The development application does not include excavation work on any land affected by the Class 4 rating for acid sulphate soils.</p> <p>Surface based earthworks will be required to facilitate construction of the new grand stand however deep excavation work below 2 metres is not required.</p> <p>It is considered that a detailed acid sulphate soils assessment is not required.</p>	Yes
<b>2.4.3.3 Salinity</b>	Is the site identified as being of moderate or high salinity potential or of known salinity?	Salinity is not an issue for the purpose of this application and the site is not located within an area that is at risk of salinity.	Yes.
<b>2.4.4 Land Contamination</b>	Is the site identified as or likely to be contaminated?	The matter concerning land contamination is addressed under State Environmental Planning Policy 55 "Remediation of Land". A preliminary assessment report prepared by Douglass Partners and dated November 18 2018 has identified that the land is suitable	Yes.

## SYDNEY CENTRAL CITY PLANNING PANEL

		for the proposed development and the land is not impacted by any significant contamination issues.	
<b>2.4.5 Air Quality</b>	Appropriate controls been placed to ensure that the development does not contribute to increased air pollution?	Not applicable to this application.	N/A.
<b>2.4.6 Development on Sloping Land</b>	Does the design of the development appropriately respond to the slope of the site?	There are no significant site constraints identified and the site is not steeply sloping.	N/A.
<b>2.4.7 Biodiversity</b>	Is vegetation removal appropriate?	There are twenty one (21) trees to be removed as part of the development works. The trees to be removed vary in size and stature.  Council's landscape officers has assessed the removal of the trees and has determined that the removal is satisfactory subject to conditions. The recommendations of the Arborist report is required to be complied with and appropriate conditions are provided.	Yes
<b>2.4.7.2 Development abutting E2 and W1 zone</b>	Site adjoins land zoned E2 or W1?  If yes, does the development satisfy the design principles?	Not applicable.	N/A.
<b>2.4.8 Public Domain</b>	Building appropriately address the public domain? Appropriate passive surveillance opportunities? Appropriate public domain enhancements?	The new grandstand is considered as being compliant with the stated provisions.	Yes
<b>3.4.2 Access for people with disabilities</b>	The siting, design and construction of premises available to the public are to ensure an appropriate level of accessibility, so that all people can enter and use these premises. Access is to meet the requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act, 1992 (DDA), the relevant Australian Standards and the Building Code of Australia (BCA).	Equitable access is provided to and within the grand stand building. This includes the use of ramps (2 ramps proposed) and a lift access connecting the ground and first floor.	Yes.
<b>3.5.3 Aboriginal Cultural Heritage</b>	<b>Subpart P1 "Design Principles" states:</b>  <i>"Before lodging a development application for development that may have an impact on known or potential Aboriginal sites, Council's information on known Aboriginal sites and potential heritage sensitivity should be consulted. Refer to Appendix 11 for the Aboriginal Sensitivity map".</i>  <b>Subpart P4 "Design Principles" states:</b>  <i>"For properties identified as Medium Sensitivity or High Sensitivity an Aboriginal Heritage Assessment is required".</i>	A review of the Parramatta Local Environmental Plan 2011 identifies that the site is not listed as a heritage item in the Parramatta Local Environmental Plan 2011. An archaeological assessment report has been prepared by Niche Environment and Heritage and the matter has been referred to Council's Community Services (Capacity Building Officer) and the Community Participation Coordinator who have contacts with the local Aboriginal groups for comment.	Yes

## SYDNEY CENTRAL CITY PLANNING PANEL

		<p>ATSIC (Aboriginal and Torres Straight Islanders Commission Committee raised no significant objection to the development at the Panel Meeting of August 6 2019.</p> <p>The archaeological assessment report has been reviewed for clarity and the following conclusions are made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Aboriginal objects or deposits likely to contain Aboriginal objects have been identified following demolition work.</li> <li>• The soil profile is confirmed to be fill or highly disturbed topsoil overlying clay.</li> </ul> <p>This supports the conclusions of the Granville Park Stadium Aboriginal Objects Due Diligence Assessment dated 12 October 2018 in which the report concluded that there was low potential for Aboriginal objects to be present.</p>	
<p><b>Part 3.6</b> <b>Car parking rates for development</b></p>	<p>C34 - If a particular land use is not addressed in Table 3.6.2.1, where appropriate one of the following shall be conducted:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Car parking rates calculated based on the Roads and Maritime Services for Traffic Generating Development, or</li> <li>• A traffic and parking survey considering a similar land use in a similar location.</li> </ul>	<p>A car park rate is not specified for a recreation facility (Major).</p> <p>The plans are showing 127 car parking spaces within an existing and upgraded car park.</p> <p>A traffic report prepared by Northrop and dated April 2019 has been submitted. The report identifies that the Parramatta development control plan does not address car parking rates for such development.</p> <p>It is stated in the traffic report that the Holroyd Development Control Plan which cannot apply to the development does provide a car park requirement for such a development being:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GFA of assembly area of 1 per 10 square metres or 1 space per 6 seats whichever is greater.</li> </ul> <p>If the Holroyd provision was to be applied then:-</p>	<p>Yes</p>

## SYDNEY CENTRAL CITY PLANNING PANEL

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GFA of assembly area - 480 square metres - Requires 48 spaces.</li> <li>1 space per 6 seats (At 760 seats) - Requires 127 spaces.</li> </ul> <p>There would be an adequate supply of car parking provided because 127 car parking spaces are earmarked for the car park.</p> <p>Council's Traffic engineer has advised that the development application is satisfactory and no objection to the development exists on car parking numbers on site subject to conditions.</p>	
<b>5.4 Preservation of trees or vegetation</b>	<p><b>Trees to which the control applies:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any tree or palm - whether indigenous, endemic, exotic or introduced species with a height equal to or exceeding 5 metres.</li> <li>Any tree or mangrove vegetation located on public land, irrespective of size.</li> <li>Any tree or plant, irrespective of size: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>that is listed in a Register of Significant Trees; or</li> <li>that is or forms part of a heritage item, or that is within a heritage conservation area; or</li> <li>that is or forms part of an Aboriginal object, or that is within an Aboriginal place of heritage significance.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p><u>Controls</u></p> <p>C.1 A tree permit must be obtained before any tree works are carried out on a tree. An arboricultural report and other reports and information, may be required to be submitted as part of the Tree Permit assessment process.</p> <p>C.2 All tree works must be carried out in accordance with the WorkCover NSW Code of Practice: 'Amenity Tree Industry' - 1998.</p> <p>C.3 Trees removed as a consequence of approval by a tree permit may need to be replaced with a suitable canopy tree or trees in a suitable location on the site.</p>	<p>The development application proposes the removal of twenty one (21) trees on site affected by the works.</p> <p>An arboricultural report prepared by New Leaf Arboricultural Pty Ltd and dated 22 August 2019 identifies the need to remove nineteen (19) trees plus another two (2) trees (Total 21) however it is determined that the two trees to be transplanted will not survive following a transplant.</p> <p>As such, all twenty one (21) trees should be removed.</p> <p>All other trees are to be protected and retained.</p> <p>The report has been assessed by Council's Landscape Architect who has generally supported the arboricultural report although conditions are provided addressing tree removal from the site.</p>	Yes

## SYDNEY CENTRAL CITY PLANNING PANEL

<b>5.5 Signage</b>	Signs to comply with the relevant provisions of Part 5.5	The building identification sign facing the upgraded car park to the west is compliant with Part 5.5 and also compliant with the provisions of State Environmental Planning Policy 64 "Advertising and Signage".	Yes
<b>There are no further provisions that could apply to the development application.</b>			