

Assessment Against Schedule 1 of SEPP 64

| Item | Criteria | Assessment |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| 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? | Yes, the proposal is consistent with the existing and future rural and low density character of the area. |
| | 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 area. |
| 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 proposal does not detract from the amenity or visual quality of any special areas. The site is not located within or immediately adjacent to any special area. |
| 3. Views and vistas | Does the proposal obscure or compromise important views? | No, the proposal does not obscure or obstruct any important views. |
| | Does the proposal dominate the skyline and reduce the quality of vistas? | No, the proposal will not affect the skyline. The proposed signage is low in scale being no higher than one storey in height. |
| | Does the proposal respect the viewing rights of other advertisers? | Yes, the proposal constitutes typical school identification signage and will not impinge upon the 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? | Yes, the scale and proportion of the proposal is appropriate to the Croobyar streetscape and setting along the urban edge of Milton. |
| | Does the proposal contribute to the visual interest of the streetscape, setting or landscape? | Yes, the proposal provides for simple, well-designed signage that will add to the visual interest of the area. |

Assessment Against Schedule 1 of SEPP 64

| Item | Criteria | Assessment |
|--|---|---|
| | Does the proposal reduce clutter by rationalising and simplifying existing advertising? | Existing signage at the site includes separate signs for the pre-school and high school. The proposed signage will provide for a single sign, thereby rationalizing and simplifying the existing signage. |
| | Does the proposal screen unsightliness? | The proposal is for school identification purposes and is not being used for screening. |
| | Does the proposal protrude above buildings, structures or tree canopies in the area or locality? | No, the proposed signage does not protrude above buildings or the tree canopy. |
| | Does the proposal require ongoing vegetation management? | No, the proposal does not require ongoing vegetation management. |
| 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? | Yes, the proposal is for school identification signage that has been designed to be compatible with the scale of the site and proposed buildings. |
| | Does the proposal respect important features of the site or building, or both? | Yes, the proposed signage will not adversely affect any important features of the site or proposed buildings. |
| | Does the proposal show innovation and imagination in its relationship to the site or building, or both? | The proposal is for standard school identification signage. |
| 6 Associated devices and logos with advertisements | 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? | Safety devices are considered unnecessary. |

Assessment Against Schedule 1 of SEPP 64

| Item | Criteria | Assessment |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| and advertising structures | | |
| 7 Illumination | Would illumination result in unacceptable glare? | No, the proposed LED-illuminated signs would not result in unacceptable glare. |
| | Would illumination affect safety for pedestrians, vehicles or aircraft? | No, the illumination is minor and would not cause any safety concerns. |
| | Would illumination detract from the amenity of any residence or other form of accommodation? | No, the illumination is minor and would not detract from the amenity of any nearby residences or the approved residential apartments on the site. |
| | Can the intensity of the illumination be adjusted, if necessary? | Adjustment is considered unnecessary. |
| | Is the illumination subject to a curfew? | No curfew is proposed. |
| 8. Safety | Would the proposal reduce the safety for any public road? | No, the proposal would not affect public road safety. |
| | Would the proposal reduce the safety for pedestrians or bicyclists? | No, the proposal would not reduce pedestrian/bicyclist safety. |
| | Would the proposal reduce the safety for pedestrians, particularly children, by obscuring sightlines from public areas? | No, the proposal would not obscure sightlines from public areas. |