

18 January 2018

Ms Teresa Gizzi
Social and Other Infrastructure Assessments
Priority Projects
Department of Planning and Environment
PO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2000

Dear Ms Gizzi,

**Chau Chak Wing Museum - The University of Sydney (SSD 7894) –
SEPP 64 Assessment**

I refer to your email of 12 January 2018 in which you request that an assessment be prepared of the subject development proposal against the provisions of *State Environmental Planning Policy No. 64 – Advertising and Signage* (SEPP 64).

The proposed development seeks consent, among other matters, for a building identification sign described in the development application documentation as follows:

A 'Chau Chak Wing Museum' building identification sign is proposed on the reconstituted stone wall at the forecourt entry on Ground Level. The sign has been designed to integrate into the building form and will serve to identify the building to pedestrians and motorists.

The sign will comprise:

A museum name sign in black metal lettering 225mm in height with a total length of 5381mm, and

The University Crest and lettering cast into the concrete 120mm high with a total length of 3383mm.

The proposed sign is as illustrated on the Signage Plan (JPW-DA-A-5000) which forms part of the Architectural Plan set.

The proposed sign is a building identification sign and does not form advertising signage. However as specified by clause 6, SEPP 64 applies to all signage that:

- (a) can be displayed with or without development consent under another environmental planning instrument that applies to the signage, and*
- (b) is visible from any public place or public reserve, except as provided by this Policy.*

The Policy does not apply however to signage that is exempt development. The proposed signage is exempt development under Schedule 1 of *State Environmental Planning Policy (Educational Establishments and Child Care Facilities) 2017* (Education SEPP) which provides that identification signage (not including roof-top signs or commercial advertising or signs associated with the use of road infrastructure (including signs associated with level crossings) is exempt as long as it meets the following criteria:

- Surface area must not exceed 8m².*
- Must be located wholly within property boundary or be attached to existing boundary fence and not projecting more than 100mm from fence.*
- Obtrusive effects of outdoor lighting must be controlled in accordance with AS 4282–1997, Control of the obtrusive effects of outdoor lighting.*

- *Distance between ground level (existing) and bottom edge of sign must not be more than 6m.*
- *Must not involve electronic signage or moving displays.*

The proposed signage meets this criteria as well as the general criteria for exempt development specified in Clause 17 and 18 of the SEPP. Specifically the sign meets the requirement of clause 17(e) which states that if a sign is likely to affect a State or local heritage item or a heritage conservation area it must involve no more than minimal impact on the heritage significant of the item or area and be in accordance with any applicable heritage conservation management plan. The proposed sign will not result in any impact on the heritage significance of the University of Sydney Heritage Conservation Area nor nearby heritage items. It is also consistent with the University of Sydney Grounds Conservation Management Plan (2014). It is therefore considered to be exempt development in accordance with the Education SEPP.

Notwithstanding the above, the Department has requested an assessment of the proposed signage against SEPP 64. Accordingly the follow assessment is provided for consideration.

Clause 8 of the SEPP provides that a consent authority must not grant development consent to an application to display signage unless it is satisfied:

- (a) that the signage is consistent with the objectives of this Policy as set out in clause 3 (1) (a), and*
- (b) that the signage the subject of the application satisfies the assessment criteria specified in Schedule 1.*

The proposed signage is consistent with the objectives of SEPP 64 as set out in Table 1 below:

Table 1: Consistency with SEPP 64 Objectives

Objective	Consistency
(a) to ensure that signage (including advertising):	
(i) is compatible with the desired amenity and visual character of an area, and	Yes – the proposed sign has been designed to integrate with the built form, visual character of the immediate and wider University precinct and to enhance the experience of Museum visitors. It will have minimal visual impact and will not be visible from significant areas including the surrounding public domain, Victoria Park or neighbouring non University lands including the Arundel Street residential precinct.
(ii) provides effective communication in suitable locations, and	Yes – the proposed sign will effectively communicate the name of the building to Museum visitors.
(iii) is of high design and finish, and	Yes – the proposed materials and finishes are high quality, low maintenance and fit for purpose.
(b) to regulate signage (but not content) under Part 4 of the Act, and	Yes – consent required.
(c) to provide time-limited consents for the display of certain advertisements, and	Not applicable – the proposed sign does not comprise advertising.
(d) to regulate the display of advertisements in transport corridors, and	Not applicable – the proposed sign does not comprise advertising.
(e) to ensure that public benefits may be derived from advertising in and adjacent to transport corridors.	Not applicable – the proposed sign does not comprise advertising.

In addition an assessment has been undertaken of the proposed sign against the criteria in Schedule 1 of the SEPP (refer Attachment 1). The proposal is consistent with all relevant matters.

There are no other provisions contained in SEPP 64 relevant to the subject application.

Having regard to the above it is considered that the proposed Chau Chak Wing Museum business identification sign is consistent with all relevant provision of SEPP 64, is appropriate in terms of form, location and content and that it should therefore be approved by the Department.

Should you require any further information or wish to discuss this matter further please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'H. Miler', with a large, stylized loop at the end.

Helena Miler
Director

ATTACHMENT 1

SEPP 64 TABLE OF COMPLIANCE

**State Environmental Planning Policy No. 64 – Advertising and Signage
Assessment Criteria**

1. Character of the area	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compatibility with existing or desired future character of area? 	<p>The proposed sign is to be affixed to the wall of the building adjacent to the entry forecourt and will be compatible with the future character of the area. It comprises a low key business identification signage only in the form of: (1) finished stainless steel lettering fixed into concrete; and (2) the University crest and lettering cast into the concrete only. The proposed signage will form an attractive understated high quality element which will provide information to visitors regarding the building name only. Further it is consistent with the architecture of the building and with the character of the immediate and wider University precinct.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistency with a particular theme for outdoor advertising in area? 	<p>Not applicable – the proposed sign does not comprise outdoor advertising.</p>
2. Special areas	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does proposal detract from amenity or visual quality of any environmental sensitive areas, heritage areas, natural or other conservation areas, open space areas, waterways, rural landscapes or residential areas? 	<p>No - The proposed building identification sign is consistent with the character of the University precinct and will not detract from the amenity or visual quality of the area. It is appropriate to its function, has been designed to be sympathetic to the architectural quality of the host building and will not impact on any sensitive heritage or other areas.</p>
3. View and Vistas	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the proposal obscure or compromise important views? 	<p>No – the proposed building identification signage is to be affixed to the wall of the building adjacent to the entry forecourt and will not impact on any views.</p> <p>Notably the proposed building identification sign will have limited visual impact, given its location at the Museum entrance, and will not be visible from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Any surrounding public domain b) Victoria Park, or c) Any surrounding non University land uses included the Arundel Street residential precinct.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the proposal dominate the skyline and reduce the quality of vistas? 	No – the proposed signage is to be affixed to the wall of the building adjacent to the entry forecourt and will not impact on the skyline or any views or vistas.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the proposal respect the viewing rights of other advertisers? 	Not applicable – the proposed sign does not comprise outdoor advertising and does not impact on any viewing rights being wholly located on the building wall adjacent to the building entry forecourt.
4. Streetscape, setting or landscape	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the scale, proportion and form of the proposal appropriate for the streetscape, setting or landscape? 	Yes – the proposed sign is consistent with the host building, its purpose as a building identification sign and with its setting. It is to be affixed to the wall of the building adjacent to the entry forecourt and will be compatible with the future character of the area and the landscape setting. The sign will form an attractive high quality element which complements the new Chau Chak Wing Museum building and which will provide information to visitors regarding the building name only. The proposed sign is consistent with the architecture of the building and with the wider character of the University precinct.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the proposal contribute to the visual interest of the streetscape, setting or landscape? 	Yes – the proposed sign will complement the new Chau Chak Wing Museum and will contribute to the built form and its setting. The signage will enhance the experience of visitors to the museum by providing information. Further the materials and finishes used are of a high quality, low maintenance and appropriate to their outdoor location. It will also provide an additional layer of visual interest in the locality.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does proposal reduce clutter by rationalising and simplifying existing advertising? 	Not applicable – the sign is to be affixed to the new Chau Chak Wing Museum and does not form advertising.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the proposal screen unsightliness? 	No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the proposal protrude above buildings, structures or tree canopies in the area or locality? 	No
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the proposal require ongoing vegetation management? 	No

5. Site and building	
<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 signage is to be located? 	Yes – the proposed sign is entirely consistent with the host building and its setting.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the proposal respect important features of the site or building or both? 	Yes – as noted above the proposed sign forms building identification signage only and is located adjacent to the entry forecourt providing information to Museum visitors. It is to be affixed to a blank wall and will not obscure any building features or elements.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the proposal show innovation and imagination in its relationship to the site or building or both? 	Yes – the proposed sign is attractive and appropriate to its function. The sign will provide information to visitors thereby enhancing their experience.
6. Associated devices and logos with advertisements and advertising structures	Not applicable
7. Illumination	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would illumination result in unacceptable glare? 	Not applicable – The proposed sign is not proposed to be illuminated other than by ambient building lighting.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would illumination affect safety for pedestrians, vehicles or aircraft? 	Not applicable
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would illumination detract from the amenity of any residence or other form of accommodation? 	Not applicable
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can the intensity of the illumination be adjusted? 	Not applicable
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the illumination subject to a curfew? 	Not applicable
8. Safety	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would the proposal reduce the safety for any public road? 	No – the proposed sign it to be affixed to the building wall and will not have any impact on road safety.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would the proposal reduce the safety for pedestrian or bicyclists? 	No – the proposed sign it to be affixed to the building wall and will not have any impact on the safety of pedestrians or cyclists.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would the proposal reduce the safety for pedestrians, particularly children, by obscuring sightlines from public areas? 	No – the proposed sign will not have any impact on sightlines.