

30 October 2015



Beaumaris Conservation Society Inc.

Association Number A00348878
PO Box 7016
Beaumaris Victoria 3193
95895428, 0429176725
info@bcs.asn.au
www.bcs.asn.au

Ms Jennifer Trucchi
Environmental Sustainability & Open Space Policy Officer
Bayside City Council
PO Box 27
SANDRINGHAM VIC 3191

Dear Ms Trucchi,

Your email of 20 October 2015 asked Beaumaris Conservation Society Inc. to comment on the Ricketts Point Signage Design Style Guide document you attached to that email, with particular reference to its Sign D, the Ricketts Point Interpretive Sign, as detailed on its Pages 6 and 11.

BCS Inc. drew Bayside City Council's attention to concerns about foreshore signage alongside the Ricketts Point Marine Sanctuary in 2008 as part of its ongoing [Campaign 2008B](#), '*Reducing Beaumaris foreshore's over-abundance of signs*'. A [photo montage](#) shows the **190** signs there.

A major concern about the prolific signage on this small area of land is the very large number of signs and the lack of review and maintenance of them. A 7-page [file](#) details them, with photos of 190 signs. It shows 8 different authorities independently erected them, then largely forgot them. The two successive Councils put up most, but Parks Victoria was second in the number erected, with none of its prolific signs being present prior to the establishment of the Sanctuary in [2002](#).

The confusion and corporate amnesia about the signage would be publicly evident even in the heading of the new proposed Primary Sign A, Main Entry Wayfinding, which reads "RICKETTS POINT MARINE SANCTUARY", under the logo of Bayside City Council. The Council is not the management body for the Sanctuary, which is Parks Victoria. Below that is a list of 8 subjects that have predated the Marine Sanctuary and - except for the Dog Control Rules - have very little to do with the Sanctuary. Proper co-ordination with Parks Victoria should reduce clutter.

Half of those 8 subjects include directions to car parks that are not shown with their designations B17 or B18 as the case may be. The dimensions of the signs are unstated, so it is unclear whether the words "CAR PARK" would appear large enough to be read by a driver from within a car entering the area. If it could not be so read, it is unclear why non-drivers need to be directed to very obvious car parks. The signage is generally more elegant than the current poor signage.

BCS Inc. has annotated the Style Guide document with the annotations shown below, and at www.bcs.asn.au/2015-10-31_ricketts_point_signage_design_style_guide.pdf. It has noted at the top of the cover photo that signage imposed on that viewing point would be likely to have a very noticeable adverse effect on the scenic nature of that area, with 3 new signs proposed there.

Annotations on Page 1: The paddle-shaped polymer signs shown at the right are a good example of badly designed signage that should never have been imposed on the foreshore, and should certainly be replaced with less discordant signage, as is proposed.

The pair of separate, almost similar, signs side-by-side are a good example of very ugly signage.

The two supporting columns under the signs increase the blot on the landscape without providing any information at all.

Annotations on Page 5: Sign A differs from the Signs B, C and D in that it not only has the Bayside City Council logo on it, but it also flaunts the unnecessary extra characteristic of a **wavy** bottom edge, which is a distracting and discordant departure from the style of those other signs.

The logo alone should be sufficient self-promotion by the Council. The Council does not need to compete, in full public view, to retain its position as the Committee of Management of the foreshore. Advertising an image is unneeded.

The professed intention to keep signage to a minimum in this small, valued landscape should be implemented by dispensing with that gratuitous extra gimmick. The precedent of existing, cruder signage should not be followed.

The wording on Sign A uses the correct term **used by Bayside Council**, "TEA HOUSE", rather than the incorrect term, "CAFE", used on Page 12. The spelling, "CARPARK", as one word should follow the predominant Australian usage and be changed to "CAR PARK" (*it is hoped that a "CARPARK" is not being hinted at as being one of the Marine Sanctuary's features*).

It would be a good and consistent public safety measure to immediately follow the words, "CAR PARK", on the sign with the emergency reporting code for the car park in question, e.g. CAR PARK B17 or CAR PARK B18, as the case may be.

Where distances are quoted, the International Standard (**ISO 80000**) unit symbol for the metre is lower case "m", and not upper case "M" as shown. Also because the "m" symbol stands for a separate word, "metre", ISO 80000 specifies that it should be separated from the number by a space, viz. 500 m and not 500M as shown.

Annotations on Page 12: As stated above, the word, "CAFE", on the map should be replaced by the correct term, "TEA HOUSE", which is the term used on Sign A.

There should be no more static information placed on the Interpretive Sign D, nor on any other sign, but the need to add to or amend the signs during their lifetime should be catered for by depicting a **mobile phone tag** on each sign to direct interested viewers to a relevant master page on the Bayside City Council website. Such compact tags already appear on Bayside City Council signs in Donald MacDonald Reserve, and in Cheltenham Park.

That master page can direct viewers to relevant pages, which can be regularly revised by the Council at little cost, and can include videos and sound, as well as translations of information in languages other than English. The URL of the pages can easily be bookmarked by interested viewers for use elsewhere.

CONCLUSION: Beaumaris Conservation Society Inc. considers that Council should assess and make public the number of signs it proposes to remove from the part of the Sanctuary foreshore in the map on Page 12 - and the number of new signs to appear - and that the number of new signs should be substantially less than the number to be removed.

Yours faithfully,

Adrian Cerbasi
President, Beaumaris Conservation Society Inc.

cc: Bayside City councillors