## Attachment K – State Environmental Planning Policy (Industry and Employment) 2021 - Schedule 5 Assessment criteria

| Matters for consideration   | Comment  |  |
|---|--|--|
| 1 Character of the area   |  |  |
|   | (medium density residential). This type of signage is not typically seen in a residential zone such as this. However the use and therefore the signage associated with the use is permissible as identified in the Concept Approval and the signage is compatible with the desired future character of the area in accordance with the Concept Approval. |  |
| outdoor advertising in the area or locality?  | is consistent with signage erected at other facilities in general locality including the Marina facilities and the Town Centre to the west.  |  |
| 2 Special areas   |  |  |
|   | detract from the amenity or visual quality   |  |
| 3 Views and vistas  |  |  |
|   | obscure or compromise any important<br>views as the signage will be seen in the<br>context of the proposed building.   |  |
| <ul> <li>Does the proposal dominate the skyline and reduce<br/>the quality of vistas?</li> </ul>                      | The proposed signage is not considered to dominate the skyline with all proposed signage envelopes lower than the proposed building. The pylon sign will be 1.7 metres high.   |  |
| <ul> <li>Does the proposal respect the viewing rights of other<br/>advertisers?</li> </ul>                            |  |  |
| 4 Streetscape, setting or landscape   |  |  |
|   | be appropriate for the desired future<br>character of the locality as identified in<br>the Concept Approval.   |  |
| <ul> <li>Does the proposal contribute to the visual interest of<br/>the streetscape, setting or landscape?</li> </ul> | to the visual interest of the streetscape and marina.  |  |
| <ul> <li>Does the proposal reduce clutter by rationalising and<br/>simplifying existing advertising?</li> </ul>       | The proposal does not appear cluttered<br>and is of an appropriate size and scale<br>for the site.   |  |
| Does the proposal screen unsightliness?   | The proposed signage does not screen unsightliness.  |  |
| structures or tree canopies in the area or locality?  | The proposed signage does not protrude above the surrounding buildings and structures.   |  |
| management?   | The proposal does not require ongoing vegetation management.   |  |
| 5 Site and building   |  |  |

| <ul> <li>Is the proposal compatible with the scale, proportion</li> </ul>     | The proposal is not inconsistent with the |
|---|---|
| and other characteristics of the site or building, or both, on                | scale, proportion and other               |
| which the proposed signage is to be located?                                  | characteristics of the site.              |
| <ul> <li>Does the proposal respect important features of the</li> </ul>       | The proposed signage will be ancillary to |
| site or building, or both?  | the use of the site and as such is        |
| one or building, or botter  | compatible with the site.                 |
| Does the proposal show innovation and imagination                             |   |
| in its relationship to the site or building, or both?                         | suitable for the site and area. Whilst it |
| in its relationship to the site of building, or both?                         | could not be described as particularly    |
|   | ,   |
|   | innovative or imaginative it does have a  |
|   | suitable relationship to the proposed     |
|   | building.                                 |
| 6 Associated devices and logos with advertisements and advertising structures |   |
| <ul> <li>Have any safety devices, platforms, lighting devices</li> </ul>      | No safety devices or platforms form part  |
| or logos been designed as an integral part of the signage or                  | of the proposal.                          |
| structure on which it is to be displayed?                                     |   |
| 7 Illumination  |   |
| <ul> <li>Would illumination result in unacceptable glare?</li> </ul>          | The signage is not proposed to be         |
| <ul> <li>Would illumination affect safety for pedestrians,</li> </ul>         | illuminated.                              |
| vehicles or aircraft?   |   |
| Would illumination detract from the amenity of any                            |   |
| residence or other form of accommodation?                                     |   |
|   |   |
| • Can the intensity of the illumination be adjusted, if                       |   |
| necessary?  |   |
| Is the illumination subject to a curfew?                                      |   |
| 8 Safety  |   |
| <ul> <li>Would the proposal reduce the safety for any public</li> </ul>       |   |
| road?   | increase risks to public safety.          |
| <ul> <li>Would the proposal reduce the safety for pedestrians</li> </ul>      | The proposal is not expected to reduce    |
| or bicyclists?  | the safety for any pedestrians or         |
| <b>1</b>  | bicyclists.                               |
| <ul> <li>Would the proposal reduce the safety for pedestrians,</li> </ul>     |   |
| particularly children, by obscuring sightlines from public                    | the safety for any pedestrians and does   |
| areas?  | not obscure any sightlines.               |
| u1000:  | sassars arry signamios.                   |