Attachment 3 – State Environmental Planning Policy No 64 – Advertising and Signage

| SCHEDULE 1 – ASSESSMENT CRITERIA | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| Assessment Criteria | Comments | | |
| 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 proposed signage is compatible with the character of the locality, being within a business zone, with frontage to a classified road. | | |
| Is the proposal consistent with a particular theme for outdoor advertising in the area or locality? | There is no particular theme for outdoor advertising in the locality. | | |
| 2 Special areas | 2 Special areas | | |
| Does the proposal detract from the amenity or visual quality of any environmentally sensitive area, heritage area, natural or other conservation areas, open space areas, waterways, rural landscapes or residential areas? | The proposed signage does not detract from the amenity or visual quality of any environmentally sensitive, heritage, conservation, open space, or residential area. | | |
| 3 Views and vistas | | | |
| Does the proposal obscure or compromise important views? | The proposal does not obscure or compromise important views. | | |
| Does the proposal dominate the skyline and reduce the quality of vistas? | The proposed pylon signs extend above the roofline of the proposed buildings, as well as all surrounding structures and vegetation. Condition included in the draft determination to require deletion of the pylon sign at the corner of Woodpark Road and Betts Road. | | |
| Does the proposal respect the viewing rights of other advertisers? | The proposal does not affect the viewing rights of other advertisers. | | |
| 4 Streetscape, setting or landscape | | | |
| Is the scale, proportion and form of the proposal appropriate for the streetscape, setting or landscape? | Subject to compliance with the recommended conditions, the scale, proportion and form of the proposal is appropriate; given the streetscape setting. | | |
| Does the proposal contribute to the visual interest of the streetscape, setting or landscape? | Subject to compliance with the recommended conditions, the proposed signage will contribute to visual interest whilst maintaining an appropriate relationship with the buildings and landscaped areas. | | |
| Does the proposal reduce clutter by rationalising and simplifying existing advertising? | N/A | | |
| Does the proposal screen unsightliness? | N/A | | |
| Does the proposal protrude above buildings, structures or tree canopies in the area or locality? | The proposed pylon signs protrude above the line of the proposed buildings. Condition included in the draft determination to require deletion of the pylon sign at the corner of Woodpark Road and Betts Road. | | |
| Does the proposal require ongoing vegetation management? | The proposal does not require ongoing vegetation management. | | |
| 5 Site and building | T | | |
| Is the proposal compatible with the scale, proportion and other characteristics of the | The wall signage, as proposed, is incompatible with the scale of the buildings. Condition included in the draft | | |
| site or building, or both, on which the proposed signage is to be located? | determination to require that no lifestyle signage be installed on the street-facing elevations, and that the combined area of all wall signage on a particular elevation not comprise more than 10% of the elevation. | | |
| Does the proposal respect important features of the site or building, or both? | Subject to compliance with the recommended conditions, the proposed signage will not detract from important features of the buildings. | | |
| Does the proposal show innovation and imagination in its relationship to the site or building, or both? | The proposal does not show innovation or imagination in its relationship to the site or building. | | |

| 6 Associated devices and logos with advertisements and advertising structures | | |
|--|---|--|
| Have any safety devices, platforms, lighting or logos been designed as integral part of the signage or structure on which it is to be displayed? | Lighting and logos are integral to the proposed signage. | |
| 7 Illumination | | |
| Would illumination result in unacceptable glare? | The signage will be illuminated at an appropriate level in order to avoid unacceptable glare. Conditions included in the draft determination requiring compliance with relevant Australian Standards. | |
| Would illumination affect safety for | The illumination will not affect safety for pedestrians, | |
| pedestrians, vehicles or aircraft? | vehicles or aircraft. | |
| Would illumination detract from the amenity of any residence or other form of accommodation? | The illumination will not detract from the amenity of the neighbouring residential accommodation. | |
| Can the intensity of the illumination be | No, however, the illumination is not expected to create | |
| adjusted, if necessary? | any negative visual impacts or unacceptable glare. | |
| Is the illumination subject to a curfew? | The illumination is not subject to a curfew. | |
| 8 Safety | | |
| Would the proposal reduce the safety of any public road? | The proposed signage will not reduce road safety. | |
| Would the proposal reduce the safety for | The proposed signage will not reduce safety for | |
| pedestrians or bicyclists? | pedestrians or cyclists. | |
| Would the proposal reduce the safety for | The proposed signage will not obscure sightlines from | |
| pedestrians, particularly children, by | public areas. | |
| obscuring sightlines from public areas? | | |