

**Attachment F – State Environmental Planning Policy 64 Advertising and Signage (SEPP 64)**

SEPP 64 applies to all signage that under an Environmental Planning Instrument (EPI) can be displayed with or without development consent and is visible from any public place or public reserve.

The development proposes a total of eight (8) signs comprising three primary signage types for building identification (SC1 x 3, SC2 x 3 and SC3 x 1), and one (1) digital signage board. This is consistent with the exhibition scheme (refer to Section 3.11 of the exhibited EIS).

However, in response to City of Sydney comments, the digital signage board has been amended to reduce its size approximately 25% from 2m x 4m to 1.5m x 3.5m. The sign will use digital technology to display ephemeral school information, on a display area of 5.25m<sup>2</sup>.

Details of signage types, their location as well as perspective drawings of signage relative to the building in its surrounding context can be found in the revised Architectural plans at **Attachment B**. The relevant plans are as follows:

- DA-B69-00-00
- DA-B69-02-01
- DA-B69-XX-01
- DA-B69-XX-02
- DA-B69-XX-03

Under clause 8 of SEPP 64, consent must not be granted for any signage application unless the proposal is consistent with the objectives of the SEPP and with the assessment criteria in Schedule 1. The table below demonstrates the consistency of the proposed signage with these assessment criteria.

An assessment of the proposed signage against the criteria in Schedule 1 has revealed that the proposal meets the objectives of SEPP 64, particularly in that signage is compatible with the desired amenity and visual character of an area, provides effective communication in a suitable location and is of high-quality finish and design.

| Assessment Criteria   | Comments  | Compliance |
|---|---|------------|
| <b>1. Character of the Area</b>   |   |            |
| Is the proposal compatible with the existing or desired future character of the area or locality in which it is proposed to be located? | <p>The immediate context of the site is characterised by adaptive reuse of heritage buildings to the south, residential flat buildings and shop top housing developments to the north and west and recreation to the east.</p> <p>Notably, the LED screen is to be located on the northern façade of the building (Zetland Avenue) adjacent to the main pedestrian entry. It should be noted that a mixed-use development was approved north of the development site on the opposite side of Zetland Avenue.</p> <p>Importantly, Council granted approval for 5 retail tenancies on the ground floor of the Zetland Avenue frontage of the development. The B4 zoning of this site permits the full range of commercial premises that can operate from these tenancies.</p> <p>Although a Signage Strategy was conditioned for this development, it is not unreasonable to expect signage to be erected for each tenancy. Therefore, it is considered that Zetland Avenue, compared to surrounding streets will have a more active retail frontage.</p> <p>Review of the Green Square DCP has revealed that each of these tenancies will be able to accommodate both an under-awning sign as well as top hamper sign with</p> | Yes        |

|   |   |     |
|---|---|-----|
|   | <p>potential for illumination, resulting in at least 10 signs at least opposite of the development site.</p> <p>Compared to the other frontages of the site which have a more residential character, Zetland Avenue is the location to accommodate a digital signage board. The reduced size of the size to a total area of 5.25m<sup>2</sup> (reduced from 8m<sup>2</sup>) will ensure that its presence does not detract from the desired future character of the area.</p> <p>All other signs will be cast into the coloured concrete structure of the building, in sizes and positions that ensures it complements the overall building design.</p> |     |
| Is the proposal consistent with a particular theme for outdoor advertising in the area or locality? | <p>No discernible themes exist for outdoor advertising in the area as the area is still in transition.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, digital signage boards are standard for conduct of the operation of the school as well as the community facility.</p> <p>The presence of retail tenancies opposite the site on Zetland Avenue will provide a streetscape that will not detract from the visual quality along this main road corridor.</p>  | Yes |

## 2 Special areas

|   |  |     |
|---|--|-----|
| 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? | <p>The digital sign is strategically located along Zetland Avenue towards the centre of the building. Therefore, the signage will be directed away from heritage items to the south and there will be limited visibility from further north of the mixed-use development at 811 Elizabeth Street (refer to viewpoints in Section 6.6 of the exhibited EIS).</p> <p>All other signs are cast into the concrete building façade and are well proportioned and located so that they do not dominate the façade. The signage is thus integrated with the building design and conceived regarding the heritage characteristics of the RSSH site.</p> <p>In this regard, the proposal would not detract from the amenity or visual quality of any special areas.</p> | Yes |
|---|--|-----|

## 3 Views and vistas

|  |   |     |
|--|---|-----|
| Does the proposal obscure or compromise important views? | <p>No views or vistas would be impacted by the proposed signage. Perusal of Council's DCP has not revealed any important views from public places within the vicinity of the proposed development.</p> <p>In terms of historically significant views to/from the site, existing significant views largely relate to the visibility of the key heritage buildings of the site as appreciated from the Joynton Avenue streetscape.</p> <p>Important views mainly relate to those towards the site from the south/south-east. However, many of the signs, and most notably the digital signage board, are located on elevations not observed from south/south-east.</p> <p>The only other impact to consider is how key heritage buildings of the site is appreciated from the corner of</p> | Yes |
|--|---|-----|

|  |   |     |
|--|---|-----|
|  | <p>Joynton Avenue and the newly proposed Zetland Avenue.</p> <p>The only sign that can be seen from this aspect is a SC1 and SC2 sign on the western façade of the new building. Refer to Figure 17 in the EIS for this aspect. These signs are cast into the concrete and do not compromise these views.</p> <p>Regarding the digital signage board, this sign is not easily observed from this view given its location and size relative to the viewing position. Also, as you move north, the sign becomes obscured by neighbouring Meriton development.</p> <p>The opposite is the case for views to and from the heritage conservation areas on Portman Street to the north of the Meriton development. Refer to Page 74 of the Architectural Design Report at <b>Attachment C</b> which shows the views to the building from the heritage conservation area to the north.</p> <p>In this case, the proposed development is obscured by Meriton development along Portman Street until it is observable from a considerable distance away due to the road alignment. However, as can be seen in this image, signage is unlikely to be perceptible from this distance.</p> <p>In this regard, the proposed signage does not compromise or obstruct any important views in the vicinity of the proposed development, particularly those that are historically significant.</p> |     |
| Does the proposal dominate the skyline and reduce the quality of vistas?                                 | The proposed signs would not dominate the skyline and would not impact the quality of any views or vistas as they are set lower than the building roofline.   | Yes |
| Does the proposal respect the viewing rights of other advertisers?                                       | Proposed signs would not impact on existing views experienced by others or existing advertising rights.   | Yes |
| <b>4 Streetscape, setting or landscape</b>   |   |     |
| Is the scale, proportion and form of the proposal appropriate for the streetscape, setting or landscape? | The signs would complement the building design and contribute to the visual interest of the streetscape. The digital signage board is appropriate in scale and its setting opposite retail tenancies will ensure that it is appropriate for the streetscape.  | Yes |
| Does the proposal contribute to the visual interest of the streetscape, setting or landscape?            | The proposed scale and design of the signs are appropriate for the streetscape and setting within which it is proposed.   | Yes |
| Does the proposal reduce clutter by rationalising and simplifying existing advertising?                  | The signs are simple in design and visually separated from each other, thereby avoiding visual clutter within the streetscape.  | Yes |
| Does the proposal screen unsightliness?  | Not applicable.   | N/A |
| Does the proposal protrude above buildings, structures or  | The signs would sit well below the height of adjoining buildings and trees.   | Yes |

|  |   |     |
|--|---|-----|
| tree canopies in the area or locality?                   |   |     |
| Does the proposal require ongoing vegetation management? | No vegetation management is required by the proposed signs. | Yes |

### 5 Site and building

|   |   |     |
|---|---|-----|
| 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? | The signs are of appropriate scale and proportion to proposed built form and are considered to be relatively understated in the highly urbanised context of the site.   | Yes |
| Does the proposal respect important features of the site or building, or both?  | The digital signage board is appropriately located at the entrance and would not detract from any other important features of the site. All other signs are strategically located and well-proportioned so as not to result in any visual clutter that would not detract from the design of the building or from its surrounding context.   | Yes |
| Does the proposal show innovation and imagination in its relationship to the site or building, or both?   | The Project Architects developed a motif for the proposed development (refer to Page 5 of the Architectural Design Report). This motif represents the project's interconnection with the community. The motif for the project will constitute the SC2 sign that is located on the eastern, southern and western façade of the new building. | Yes |

### 6 Associated devices and logos with advertisements and advertising structures

|   |   |     |
|---|---|-----|
| 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? | Lighting is designed as an integral part of the Zetland Avenue digital signage board. Content will be static and is intended to change on a weekly basis. | Yes |
|---|---|-----|

### 7 Illumination

|  |  |     |
|--|--|-----|
| Would illumination result in unacceptable glare?   | The lighting level of the digital sign would be controlled to ensure there would be no unacceptable glare. It is anticipated that a condition be imposed on any consent requiring compliance with AS/NZS 4282:2019, Control of the obtrusive effects of outdoor lighting. Notwithstanding, it is proposed that the hours of operation of the digital sign would be limited. Refer further below for details. | Yes |
| Would illumination affect safety for pedestrians, vehicles or aircraft?                      | No. Refer response above.  | Yes |
| Would illumination detract from the amenity of any residence or other form of accommodation? | No. Refer response above.  | Yes |
| Can the intensity of the illumination be adjusted, if necessary?                             | The intensity of the digital sign can be adjusted if required.   | Yes |

|   |   |     |
|---|---|-----|
| Is the illumination subject to a curfew?  | The hours of operation of the sign would be limited to between 6:00am-10:00pm seven days per week. This would limit amenity impacts to adjoining residential use. These hours are detailed in the Operational Plan at Attachment E. | Yes |
| <b>8 Safety</b>   |   |     |
| Would the proposal reduce safety for pedestrians, particularly children, by obscuring sightlines from public areas? | No. Extensive views of the footpath and entrance area would still be available.   | Yes |
| Would the proposal reduce safety for any public road?   | The design and location of the proposed signage would not impact on safety of any public road.  | Yes |