



*statement of environmental effects*



## **SIGNAGE**

PITTWATER RSL  
80 MONA VALE ROAD  
MONA VALE NSW 2103

**May 2023**

### **Disclaimer**

This report has been prepared on the basis of information available at the date of publication. Whilst attempts have been made to ensure the accuracy of the information in this document, Northern Beaches Planning accepts no responsibility or liability for any errors, omissions or resultant consequences including any loss or damage arising from reliance on information in this publication or referenced in this publication. Reproduction of this report (or part thereof) is not permitted without prior permission from Northern Beaches Planning.

## *introduction*

---

This statement of environmental effects has been prepared by Northern Beaches Planning on behalf of Fremont to accompany the lodgement of a development application for new signage at Pittwater RSL (**site**).

This statement is informed and accompanied by:

- Boundary and Detail Survey by Urban Surveying
- Site Survey by AAM Hatch Pty Ltd
- Signage Detail Plans by Fremont

## *site details*

---

The site comprises three separate lots:

- Lot 52 in DP 1237461, commonly referred to as 80 Mona Vale Road,
- Lot 51 in DP 1237461, commonly referred to as 80 Mona Vale Road, and
- Lot 27 in DP 5055, commonly referred to as 22 Jubilee Avenue.

The site is bound by three roads, with Mona Vale Road to the north and north-east, Foley Street to the south-east and Jubilee Avenue to the south. The site comprises a multi-storey building (the primary club building), an attached multi-storey carpark, three bowling greens, three futsal courts, a single dwelling house and at-grade parking.

Vehicular access is gained via existing driveways to both Foley Street and Jubilee Avenue, with pedestrian access available from all three street frontages.

Surrounding development is varied with respect to land use, density and character, with low density residential development on the opposite side of Mona Vale Road, low and medium density residential development on the opposite side of Foley Street, horse paddocks on the opposite side of Jubilee Avenue and industrial development on adjacent land to the west.

An aerial image of the site and its surrounds is provided in Figure 1 on the following page, with images of the existing streetscape and location of the proposed signage in Figures 2 - 5.





Figure 1 – Aerial image with site bordered in yellow  
Source: Nearmap



Figure 2 – The site as seen from Mon. Vale Road from the west  
Source: NBP





**Figure 3 – The site as seen from Mona Vale Road from the east**  
Source: NBP



**Figure 4 – The location of the proposed entrance sign**  
Source: NBP



**Figure 5 – The location of the proposed exit sign**  
Source: NBP

## *proposed development*

---

The application seeks consent for signage, as depicted in the Signage Detail Plans by Fremont, and as described as follows:

- 1 x pylon sign with illuminated letters and LED screen to both sides (SG-01) presenting to Mona Vale Road
- 1 x freestanding sign (SG-02) at vehicular entrance on Foley Street
- 1 x freestanding sign (SG-03) at vehicular exit on Foley Street

The signage is ancillary to the primary use of the site for the purpose of a registered club, being Pittwater RSL.

## *legislation, plans and policies*

---

The following relevant state and local policies are applicable to the proposed development:

- Environmental Planning and Assessment Act (**EP&A Act**)
- Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2021 (**EP&A Regulation**)
- State Environmental Planning Policy (Industry and Employment) 2021
- Pittwater Local Environmental Plan 2014 (**PLEP 2014**):
  - Land Zoning Map: SP2 Classified Road, R2 Low Density Residential & SP4 Enterprise
  - Height of Buildings Map: 8.5m and 11m
  - Additional Permitted Uses Map: Area 9
  - Acid Sulfate Soils Map: Class 5
  - Lot Size Map: 550m<sup>2</sup>
- Pittwater 21 Development Control Plan (**P21 DCP**)

## *environmental planning and assessment act*

---

The matters prescribed by section 4.15(1) of the EP&A Act are considered, as follows:

Clause	Provision	Comment
(a)	<p><i>the provisions of—</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>i. any environmental planning instrument, and</i></li><li><i>ii. any proposed instrument that is or has been the subject of public consultation under this Act and that has been notified to the consent authority (unless the Planning Secretary has notified the consent authority that the making of the proposed instrument has been deferred indefinitely or has not been approved), and</i></li><li><i>iii. any development control plan, and</i></li><li><i>iv. any planning agreement that has been entered into under section 7.4, or any draft planning agreement that a developer has offered to enter into under section 7.4, and</i></li><li><i>v. the regulations (to the extent that they prescribe matters for the purposes of this paragraph),</i></li></ul> <p><i>that apply to the land to which the development application relates,</i></p>	The relevant provisions of PLEP 2014, all relevant SEPPs, and P21 DCP have been considered and addressed in this statement.
(b)	<p><i>the likely impacts of that development, including environmental impacts on both the natural and built environments, and social and economic impacts in the locality,</i></p>	The likely impacts of the proposed development have been addressed with respect to relevant plans and policies in this statement. The proposed development will not result in any unacceptable impacts upon the natural or built environment, or any social or economic impacts in the locality.
(c)	<p><i>the suitability of the site for the development,</i></p>	The subject site is suitable for the proposed development.
(d)	<p><i>any submissions made in accordance with this Act or the regulations,</i></p>	The application will be notified to all potentially affected properties, with any submissions received to be considered by Council.
(e)	<p><i>the public interest.</i></p>	The proposed development is in the public interest, in so far as it is consistent with the objectives and outcomes of PLEP 2014 and P21 DCP.

## *state environmental planning policy (industry and employment)*

---

### **Chapter 3 Advertising and signage**

The application seeks consent for signage and the provisions of Chapter 3 of SEPP (Industry and Employment) are applicable to the proposed development. The consent authority can be satisfied that the proposed signage is consistent with the aims of Chapter 3 of this policy, as follows:

- a) *to ensure that signage (including advertising)—*
- i. is compatible with the desired amenity and visual character of an area, and*
  - ii. provides effective communication in suitable locations, and*
  - iii. is of high quality design and finish, and*

Comment: The proposed signage is suitably responsive to the context of the site, with varied signage in response to the differing characters of the streetscapes. The freestanding pylon sign is contextually appropriate with regard to its location along Mona Vale Road and when seen in context with adjacent and nearby business development, including Hungry Jacks and KFC to the west. Furthermore, the scale of the sign is appropriate with regard to the scale of the RSL itself.

The signage at the driveway entrance and exit is directional signage, of a scale that is more responsive to the local nature of Foley Street. All proposed signage is of superior quality and is to be finished to high standard.

- b) *to regulate signage (but not content) under Part 4 of the Act, and*

Comment: The proposed signage is designed in accordance with relevant regulations and Council policy.

- c) *to provide time-limited consents for the display of certain advertisements, and*

Comment: A condition of consent may be imposed to limit the duration of any consent issued for signage, where necessary.

- d) *to regulate the display of advertisements in transport corridors, and*

Comment: The proposed free-standing pylon sign is appropriately responsive to Mona Vale Road.

- e) *to ensure that public benefits may be derived from advertising in and adjacent to transport corridors.*

Comment: Not applicable – relevant only to signage pursuant to clause 3.16 and 3.22 of this policy.



Further, Council can be satisfied that the proposed signage is acceptable in terms of its impacts and that the criteria specified in Schedule 5 of this policy has been considered, as follows:

Criteria	Comment
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 proposed signage is appropriately responsive to the differing streetscape contexts and the size and scale of the club itself.  The proposal will replace pre-existing signage that was removed to accommodate the recent road widening works.
Is the proposal consistent with a particular theme for outdoor advertising in the area or locality?	Yes, the proposed signage is consistent with other signage in the locality, including that which previously existed at the site and that to the west associated with Hungry Jacks and KFC.
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?	No, the proposed signage is not within the vicinity of any environmentally sensitive areas, heritage areas, natural or other conservation areas, open space areas, waterways, or rural landscapes.  The site is located opposite residential properties to the north and east, however sufficient spatial separation is afforded by the roadways and surrounding landscaping.
Does the proposal obscure or compromise important views?	No.
Does the proposal dominate the skyline and reduce the quality of vistas?	No.
Does the proposal respect the viewing rights of other advertisers?	Yes, the signage is maintained within the curtilage of the site and does not impinge on adjoining sites.
Is the scale, proportion and form of the proposal appropriate for the streetscape, setting or landscape?	Yes, the proposed signage respects the form and scale of the RSL and its setting.
Does the proposal contribute to the visual interest of the streetscape, setting or landscape?	Yes, the proposed development provides high quality signage.
Does the proposal reduce clutter by rationalising and simplifying existing advertising?	Yes, the proposed signage is appropriately limited to avoid visual clutter.
Does the proposal screen unsightliness?	No, the premises are not unsightly.
Does the proposal protrude above buildings, structures or tree canopies in the area or locality?	No.
Does the proposal require ongoing vegetation management?	No.

Criteria	Comment
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.
Does the proposal respect important features of the site or building, or both?	Yes.
Does the proposal show innovation and imagination in its relationship to the site or building, or both?	Yes.
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?	Yes.
Would illumination result in unacceptable glare?	No.
Would illumination affect safety for pedestrians, vehicles or aircraft?	No.
Would illumination detract from the amenity of any residence or other form of accommodation?	No.
Can the intensity of the illumination be adjusted, if necessary?	No.
Is the illumination subject to a curfew?	No.
Would the proposal reduce the safety for any public road?	No.
Would the proposal reduce the safety for pedestrians or bicyclists?	No.

The proposed signage is considered to be acceptable in light of the assessment criteria of Chapter 3 of SEPP (Industry and Employment).

## *local environmental plan*

---

The site is identified on the Land Application Map of PLEP 2014 and the provisions of this policy are applicable in relation to the site and the proposed development. The relevant provisions of PLEP 2011 are considered, as follows:

Clause	Standard	Proposal	Compliance
2.5 Additional permitted uses for particular land			Yes
Zone R2 Low Density Residential, SP2 Classified Road & Zone SP4 Enterprise			Yes See discussion
4.3 Height of buildings	8.5m - 11m	2.0m - 8.5m	Yes
7.1 Acid sulfate soils			N/A
7.2 Earthworks			N/A

### **Permissibility**

The site is subject to three different zones under the provisions of PLEP 2014, being R2 Low Density Residential, SP2 Infrastructure and SP4 Enterprise, however the proposed signage is limited to those parts of the site zoned R2 and SP2. The site is used for the purpose of a registered club, being Pittwater RSL. The use of the site for the purpose of a registered club is prohibited under the Land Use Table of PLEP 2014.

However, the R2 and SP2 zoned portions of the site are identified within Area 9 on the Additional Permitted Uses Map of PLEP 2014. Pursuant to clause 2.5 and Schedule 1 of PLEP 2014, development for the purpose of a registered club is permitted on the land. In accordance with the provisions of clause 2.5(2) of PLEP 2014, the clause has effect despite anything to the contrary in the Land Use Table or other provision of this plan.

The proposed signage is appropriately characterised as being ancillary to the registered club and is also permissible with consent.



## development control plan

P21 DCP is applicable to the site and the proposed development. The relevant provisions of P21 DCP are considered, as follows:

Clause	Control	Proposal	Compliance
A1.7 Considerations before consent is granted	Have regard for the matters for consideration under section 4.15 of the EP&A Act.	The matters for consideration prescribed by section 4.15 of the EP&A Act have been considered (above).	Yes
A4.14 Warriewood Locality			Yes
B1.3 Heritage Conservation – General			Yes
B1.4 Aboriginal Heritage			Yes
B3.6 Contaminated Land and Potentially Contaminated Land			Yes
B8.1 Construction and Demolition – Excavation and Fill			Yes
B8.3 Construction and Demolition – Waste Minimisation			Yes
C2.11 Signage	<b>Freestanding signs</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. shall not have a signage area greater than 4.5sq m;</li> <li>ii. shall not project beyond the boundary of the premises;</li> <li>iii. shall not extend beyond the height of the built form within whose context it sits; and</li> <li>iv. shall not be illuminated.</li> </ul>	The proposed driveway entry and exit signs each have a total area of less than 1m <sup>2</sup> each, do not project beyond the boundaries of the premises, do not extend beyond the height of the RSL building and are not illuminated.	Yes
	<b>Pylon signs</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. shall not be less than 2.6m above ground;</li> </ul>	The proposed pylon sign is not less than 2.6m above ground, the signage area does not exceed 4.5m <sup>2</sup> , the sign does not project	Yes

Clause	Control	Proposal	Compliance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. shall not have a signage area greater than 4.5sq m;</li> <li>iii. shall not project beyond the boundary of the premises; and</li> <li>iv. shall not extend beyond the height of the built form within whose context it sits.</li> </ul>	<p>beyond the boundaries of the site and does not extend beyond the height of the RSL building.</p> <p>Note: The signage area is distinguishable from the area of the structure as a whole.</p> <p>The proposed signage is compatible with the desired character of the locality, does not impact upon any items of heritage significance, does not result in visual clutter and is of high quality design. Council can be satisfied that the proposal is consistent with the outcomes of this control.</p>	
D14.7 Front Building Line	<p>SP2 zoned land adjoining Mona Vale Road: 30m</p> <p>R2 zoned land: 6.5m</p>	<p>The front building line control is not applicable in relation to registered clubs.</p> <p>Furthermore, compliance with the front setbacks prescribed in relation to the subject site would defeat the purpose of the proposed development, specifically wayfinding and business identification.</p>	N/A

## *conclusion*

---

The proposal is a well resolved and considered design solution for the site, which has appropriate regard for the form and function of the existing RSL and the character of the locality. The proposal will not result in any unreasonable impacts upon adjoining properties or the surrounding urban environment and appropriately reflects the desired character of the locality.

Overall, the application warrants Council's support.



**Rebecca Englund**

B Arch Studies | M Plan | MPIA

**Director | Northern Beaches Planning**