



From: Lawrence McIntosh
 Sent: Friday, 16 June 2017 9:06 AM
 To: [Redacted]
 Subject: Fwd: Public advertising regulation consultation.

Dear Annemieke,


I was very disappointed to learn that the ACT is considering revisiting the billboard and public advertising regulations. A couple of points for you to consider in the review:

- **Visual amenity** I regularly visit Sydney and find that the sheer visual clutter is a very distinct contrast to Canberra. Its subtle the way that this kind of thing can affect the human mind.
- **Financial flows:** This kind of advertising is generally un-targeted and as such ends of being most used by large national or international brands. Increased purchases from ACT residents to these companies represents a flow of money away from the ACT. This financial flow will likely be larger than the flow of money into the ACT due to the advertising revenue (otherwise why would the advertising company buy ads?)
- **Mental health:** The portrayal of people in such advertising usually includes unrealistic or photoshopped bodies that do contribute to in to a general narrative in our society about 'buying more stuff' to be 'better', 'prettier', 'stronger', more 'stylish' etc. Ultimately this is detrimental to mental health, especially in children and teenagers

Its interesting that this is being revisited now, with the light rail under construction. There is a well known business model employed by companise such as JCDecaux and Adshel in funding public transport infrastructure partially through ad revenue. I can therefore understand if the review is driven by a desire to support the light rail, however I do note that the business cases published make no mention of the necessity for this revenue so I can only assume the financial viability of the Light rail is not dependant on the ad revenue (It would be a worry if it was!)

Canberra is renowned for its public art - why not use the rail corridor to showcase this, as a further tourist attraction (with the corresponding tourist expenditure that this brings), as oppose to littering it with visual noise.

Kind regards
 Lawrence McIntosh

 A.C.T. LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE OFFICE	
SUBMISSION NUMBER	28
DATE AUTH'D FOR PUBLICATION	27/6/17