



TS/RL
15270
22 May 2015

Mr Alan Stone
General Manager
Penrith City Council
601 High Street
PENRITH NSW 2750

Dear Sir

**ERECTION OF TEMPORARY SIGNAGE
JORDAN SPRINGS (WESTERN PRECINCT), ST MARYS**

JBA has prepared this Statement of Environmental Effects (SEE) on behalf of Maryland Development Company in support of a Development Application (DA) for the erection of temporary business identification signage within the Western Precinct (known as Jordan Springs), St Marys.

This report describes the site, its environs, the proposed development, and provides an assessment of the proposal in terms of the relevant matters for consideration under Section 79C(1) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979* (The Act). It should be read in conjunction with the appended signage information.

1.0 BACKGROUND

As the wider St Marys site is located across two local government areas (Blacktown and Penrith), the State Government decided that a Regional Environmental Plan should be prepared to guide and control future development of the land. Technical investigations into the environmental values and development capability of the land were commenced in 1994, and Sydney Regional Environmental Plan No. 30 – St Marys (SREP 30) was subsequently gazetted in January 2001. SREP 30 is the main statutory planning framework document for the St Marys site. It contains planning principles, objectives and provisions to control development.

Following the gazettal of Amendment No. 2 of SREP 30 in February 2009, the Western Precinct is entirely zoned Urban. Land zoned Urban is intended to accommodate primarily residential uses, with limited non-residential uses such as local retail and commercial uses. Under Amendment No.2 the previous 28ha Employment Zone in the Western Precinct was relocated into a consolidated Employment Zone in the Central Precinct.

SREP 30 requires individual Precinct Plans to be prepared for each precinct. The Western Precinct Plan was adopted by Penrith City Council in 23 March 2009 and applies to all land within the Western Precinct. The Plan provides the urban structure and detailed guidance for future development on the Western Precinct.



Figure 1 – St Marys site and precincts

1.1 Development Status of Jordan Springs

Jordan Springs is currently partially developed, with the majority of the Western Precinct works either approved or under assessment. The most recent and relevant Development Applications include:

- Village 5 – DA14/0935 – Approved, determined 17/12/2014
- Village 3A – DA11/0511 – Approved, determined 22/08/2011
- Village 3B – DA11/0512 – Approved, determined 26/08/2011

The purpose of the proposed signage is for the marketing of approved future facilities and infrastructure at Jordan Springs in association with the sale of development in proximity to these facilities. The signs will display sales information in relation to the above villages, including services to be provided as part of the Jordan Springs development (e.g. development of recreational areas).

2.0 SITE LOCATION AND CONTEXT

2.1 Jordan Springs

Jordan Springs is part of a 1,545Ha area known as St Marys, located approximately 45km west of the Sydney CBD, and 5km north-east of the Penrith City Centre. The St Marys site has been rezoned for a variety of uses, and comprises six development precincts, as shown in **Figure 1**. The proposed signage is located within the 'Western Precinct', which is now known as Jordan Springs.

Jordan Springs is bounded by Ninth Avenue and rural residential development in the suburb of Llandilo to the north, The Northern Road and residential development in Cranebrook to the west, and land zoned for Regional Park to the south and east. The Western Precinct has a total area of approximately 229 ha, including an existing education establishment (Xavier College) in the north-western portion of the Western Precinct fronting Ninth Avenue.

The site is owned by St Marys Land Limited and is being jointly developed by ComLand Limited and Lend Lease Development Pty Limited through their Joint Venture company, Maryland Development Company.

2.2 Proposed Signage Sites

North-Western Sign (Sign 1)

The first proposed sign will be located on the corner of Greenwood Parkway and Alinta Promenade. The legal description of this corner site is Lot 24 in DP1194338.

South-Eastern Sign (Sign 2)

The second proposed sign will be located on the corner of Greenwood Parkway and Lakeside Parade. The legal description of this corner site is Lot 3997 in DP1179646.

The indicative location of the proposed signs has been provided at **Figure 2**.

Both signs will be located within St Marys Land Limited owned land.



Figure 2 – Aerial photo of the signage locations within the context of Jordan Springs

3.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

This DA seeks approval for the erection of two temporary signs, which have been described in detail at **Table 1** below. Additional information regarding the signage has been appended to this SEE.

Table 1 – Schedule of proposed signs

Sign No.	Signage Type	Number of Faces	Face Width	Face Height	Face Area
Sign 1	V-board	2 (north and east)	4800mm	2400mm	11.52m ²
Sign 2	V-board	2 (south and west)	4800mm	2400mm	11.52m ²

4.0 ASSESSMENT OF PLANNING ISSUES

The following is our assessment of the environmental effects of the proposed development. The assessment includes only those matters under Section 79C(1) of the EP&A Act that are relevant to the proposal.

4.1 Relevant Environmental Planning Instruments and Controls

State Environmental Planning Policy No. 64 – Advertising and Signage (SEPP 64)

SEPP 64 applies to all signage that under an environmental planning instrument can be displayed with or without development consent and is visible from any public place or public reserve.

The proposed signage is categorised as ‘business identification signage’ under the provisions of SEPP 64. A ‘business identification sign’ is defined under SEPP 64 as a sign:

- (a) *that indicates:*
 - (i) *the name of the person, and*
 - (ii) *the business carried on by the person, at the premises or place at which the sign is displayed, and*
 - (b) *that may include the address of the premises or place and a logo or other symbol that identifies the business,*
- but that does not include any advertising relating to a person who does not carry on business at that place or premises.*

The signage is consistent with the above definition, in that it relates only to the business carried out on the site by Lend Lease (i.e., the selling of houses and delivery of associated community infrastructure in Jordan Springs). The signage does not include any advertising relating to a person who does not carry on business at the premises or place. As a result, under Clause 9, Part 3 of SEPP 64 which relates to advertising signage does not apply.

Pursuant to Clause 8 of SEPP 64, Council must not grant consent to the DA unless it is satisfied that the proposed business identification signage is consistent with the objectives under Clause 3 of SEPP 64, and the assessment criteria in Schedule 1 of the Policy.

Clause 3 states the aims and objectives of SEPP 64 which are:

- (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 advertisements.*
- (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 proposed business identification signage is consistent with the objectives of the SEPP as it:

- is temporary signage that is generally compatible with the amenity and visual character of the area in that it is the type of signage consistent with a business of new residential estates;
- it effectively communicates the new development at Jordan Springs in appropriate locations throughout the development that are of minimal impact; and
- it will be of a high quality design and finish and made of durable materials.

Schedule 1 of SEPP 64 contains a range of assessment criteria which are matters for consideration by the consent authority in assessing applications incorporating signage. The compatibility of the proposed development against the assessment criteria is set out in **Table 2**.

Table 2 – Assessment Criteria under Schedule 1 of SEPP 64

Assessment Criteria	Comments	Compliance
1 Character of the area		
Is the proposal compatible with the existing or desired future character of the area or locality in which it is proposed to be located?	The proposal is for temporary signage which will play an important role in achieving the continued sales and marketing of Jordan Springs. The proposal is therefore consistent with the desired future character of the area.	Y
Is the proposal consistent with a particular theme for outdoor advertising in the area or locality?	The proposal is consistent with type of signs used to promote new residential development in the locality.	Y
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?	The location of the signs is in existing or future urban development. The signs are temporary in nature, and will not detract from the surrounding environment or any environmentally sensitive areas.	Y
3 Views and vistas		
Does the proposal obscure or compromise important views?	The proposal does not obscure or compromise any important views.	Y
Does the proposal dominate the skyline and reduce the quality of vistas?	The proposal has been designed to ensure that it will not dominate the skyline or hinder the quality of vistas.	Y
Does the proposal respect the viewing rights of other advertisers?	The proposal does not impede upon any other signs in the vicinity of the development.	Y
4 Streetscape, setting or landscape		
Is the scale, proportion and form of the proposal appropriate for the streetscape, setting or landscape?	The scale, proportion and form of the signage is appropriate considering the setting of each site.	Y
Does the proposal contribute to the visual interest of the streetscape, setting or landscape?	The proposed signs will contribute to the visual interest of the existing commercial and retail streetscape.	Y
Does the proposal reduce clutter by rationalising and simplifying existing advertising?	There is no existing signage within the visual catchment of any of the proposed locations.	Y
Does the proposal screen unsightliness?	N/A	N/A
Does the proposal protrude above buildings, structures or tree canopies in the area or locality?	No, the signs do not protrude above any buildings, structures or tree canopies.	Y
Does the proposal require ongoing vegetation management?	The signage works are temporary in nature, and do not require ongoing vegetation management.	N/A
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 proposed graphics and signs are compatible with the scale and proportion of the development, and consistent with Jordan Springs branding and advertising throughout the site.	Y
Does the proposal respect important features of the site or building, or both?	The signs will not detract from any important features of the site.	Y
Does the proposal show innovation and imagination in its relationship to the site or building, or both?	The signs have been specifically designed to complement and promote the future character of the locality.	Y

Assessment Criteria	Comments	Compliance
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?	The proposed signage will not have any devices, platforms, or lighting devices.	Y
7 Illumination		
Would illumination result in unacceptable glare? Would illumination affect safety for pedestrians, vehicles or aircraft?	The proposed signs will not be illuminated.	N/A
Would illumination detract from the amenity of any residence or other form of accommodation?	The proposed signs will not be illuminated.	N/A
Can the intensity of the illumination be adjusted, if necessary? Is the illumination subject to a curfew?	The proposed signs will not be illuminated.	N/A
8 Safety		
Would the proposal reduce safety for any public road?	The location and scale of the proposed signs have been determined so as to not reduce safety for users of public roads (see Section 3.2).	Y
Would the proposal reduce safety for pedestrians/cyclists?	The location and scale of the proposed signs do not pose any adverse impacts on pedestrian or cyclist safety.	Y
Would the proposal reduce safety for pedestrians, particularly children, by obscuring sightlines from public areas?	The proposed signs will not obscure sightlines from public areas.	Y

Sydney Regional Environmental Plan No. 30 – St Marys

The site is zoned Urban under SREP 30. Advertising is permissible with development consent in the Urban zone. The signage is consistent with the relevant objectives of this zone as it is associated with the future development of the Precinct. Despite not relating to the project specifically, the proposal is also not inconsistent with any of the general performance objectives contained in Part 5 of SREP 30.

St Marys Western Precinct Plan 2009

The Precinct Plan provides planning guidance on the future character of the Precinct. The Plan does not provide any specific objectives or controls relating to temporary signage. The proposed signage is not inconsistent with any of the objectives or controls contained within the Precinct Plan.

4.2 Road Safety

The proposed signs will not have any adverse impacts on road safety. The location of the signs will not block or obstruct the sightlines of drivers or distract drivers at critical decision points. The content of the sign relates to the future development of Jordan Springs, and will not be of a distracting nature.

4.3 Visual impact and views

The location of the proposed temporary signs will not interfere with any important views or have any adverse visual impact on the streetscape.

4.4 Site Suitability and Public Interest

The sites selected for the proposed signs are suitable because:

- the proposed use is permissible within the Urban zone;
- the signs are positioned at suitable locations within Jordan Springs for the purpose of advertising future development stages; and
- the signs will not have adverse impacts on the surrounding area.

The signage will play an important role in the continued sales and marketing of the new suburb of Jordan Springs. It is in the public interest to see the orderly sale and occupation of the new suburb to provide activation and passive surveillance, and ensure a strong sense of community.

5.0 CONCLUSION

The proposed signage is appropriate and will have no adverse impacts in that:

- the signs have been designed in accordance with, and comply with the relevant requirements of SEPP 64;
- the signs are temporary in nature, and will be dismantled in the future once they are no longer required;
- the signs will be of a high design quality and finish; and
- the signs will play an important role in the continued sales and marketing of Jordan Springs.

In light of the merits of the proposal and in the absence of any significant adverse environmental, social or economic impacts, we recommend that the application be approved subject to standard conditions of consent. Should you have any queries about this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me on 9956 6962 or rlockart@jbaurban.com.au.

Yours faithfully



Rebecca Lockart
Urban Planner