



Design + Sustainability Advisory Panel Meeting Report – Date 26 June 2025

Item 2 – DA2025/0573 – 94 Park Street MONA VALE

PANEL COMMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

General

The subject site is located in the R2 Low Density Residential zone and the proposed development is lodged pursuant to *Chapter 2 Affordable Housing* and *Chapter 6 Low and Mid Rise Housing* of *SEPP (Housing) 2021*.

The proposal is generally compliant with height and FSR. The Panel has considered the character of the area and as required by the overarching principles set out in *SEPP (Housing) 2021 Chapter 1 Section 3 Principles of Policy* and *Chapter 2 Section 20 (3)* "...must not be granted to development under this division unless the consent authority has considered whether the design of the residential development is compatible with—

(a) *the desirable elements of the character of the local area, or*

(b) *for precincts undergoing transition—the desired future character of the precinct."*

These recommendations have regard to the aim of increased housing density, and change in built form as the area transitions over time.

The Panel generally supports the proposed massing and general arrangement of built form in its context.

The Panel does not support the current configuration of apartment entry for the North Building.

Strategic context, urban context: surrounding area character

The site has been identified in the Low and Mid Rise Housing Policy as a 'Low and Mid Rise Outer Housing Area' and is therefore to be considered as an area identified for change. Development needs to be compatible with the desired future character. The desirable elements of character in this area are the sloping topography with views to the northwest over the golf course to the Bayview escarpment and the generous street front setbacks which in the immediate vicinity are in the order of 10m. The DCP permits a 6.5m setback or the established building line.

The North building setbacks (5.94m to 6.63m) are considered satisfactory. The South building setbacks are 7.14m to Park Street and 2.93m to balconies in Kumari Place. The Panel has taken into consideration that corner lots in certain circumstances can justify reduced setbacks on one of the two frontages, however we have formed the view that due to the moderately sloping street front at the corner with Park Street that the degree of reduced setback to Kunari Place is not in accordance with the desired character of the area in the context of higher densities proposed in the future and the scale of built form proposed at the corner.

Pittwater 21 Development Control Plan (DCP), the Mona Vale Locality (D9) outlines specific objectives for street front setbacks as part of its desired future character. These objectives such as "*Provide space for landscaping and deep soil planting to soften the built form and enhance visual amenity*" and "*Maintain a consistent and attractive streetscape that reflects the coastal village character of Mona Vale*" do not preclude the achievement of higher densities in the future and respond to the requirements of the overarching principles of the *SEPP (Housing) 2021 Chapter 1 Section 3* and *Chapter 2 Section 20(3)*.

Recommendations

1. Increase the street setback of the South Building to 4.5m to provide additional space for landscaping and deep soil planting. Retain the generous balcony street frontage. To offset the loss of floor area the Panel would support a reduction of the Park Street front to approximately 6.5m.



2. Ensure the swimming pool does not project into the 4.5m front setback of the street frontage to Kunari Place.

Scale, built form and articulation

The Panel commends the use of stepped building forms which responds to topography and result in a sensitive lower scale interface with the existing single housing context to the south.

The Panel supports provision of generous space between buildings which results in the retention of amenity to the rear garden of the adjacent property at 92 Park Street and responds to the desired future character of the area deliver larger buildings that are compatible with the existing context

Recommendations

No further recommendations

Access, vehicular movement and car parking

The North Building does not have a direct entry from the street which is not in accordance with ADG 3G-1 design guidance. Access through the communal pool area is not supported. The ADG notes that design of building entries and their integration with the building and landscape design contributes to the identity of the building and the character of the streetscape.

The access to the South Building is encumbered by a substation and fire infrastructure. In addition, the sight lines from the entry gate is into the discharge point of the fire stair. The entry path needs to be re designed to create a sense of arrival, be generous and comfortable to use, to have well designed landscaping planting, and accommodate mailbox infrastructure, it currently feels like a service entry.

The lift entrance in the South Building is located a position that will spatially conflict between those arriving and those waiting for a lift

Recommendations

3. Provide a clearly identifiable entry for each building from the street that does not require passage through the central communal pool area.
4. Consider direct access from Kunari Place for the North Building, or alternatively consider a well-designed landscaped mews, or
5. Given there is a 6m wide landscaped area to work with on the southern boundary, consideration should be given to developing a lush landscaped and well-lit pedestrian entry spine that is clearly identifiable from the street and connects both entries without requiring access through buildings or communal pool areas.
6. Consider providing a lobby vestibule and covered awnings to building entries to provide space at lift entries and to enable apartment entries to be clearly seen and identified from the public street

Landscape

The following detailed comments are made to seek further improvements to the current scheme.

The large mass of the apartments on the street frontages and only small trees proposed planting of (namely *Tristania laurina* & *Magnolia* "Teddy bear") would lead to an outcome that does not fit into the landscaped character of the area and will not mitigate the built form of the development.

Conversely planting of two Port Jackson Figs in front of the pool whilst being endemic have the potential to grow to a huge size (20x15M) blocking both views and light. We would anticipate the removal of these over time so a more suitable species should be selected.

Consider the potential for planting large endemic canopy trees with clean trunks and higher canopies to mitigate the built form of the development whilst maintaining both views and light.



The current design relies too much on tiered planters to green the building. Whilst these are desirable in combination with the recommended tree planting; they should be planned and designed to be on the community title and maintained externally from abseil points to ensure failure of plants does not occur. Likewise species selection should provide more variety to minimise mass diebacks and include some hardy endemic species eg. *Carpobrotus*.

The large pool is commended but suggest greater screening from the street with more filtered views to the sunbathing areas so residents have privacy and to the wet edge and signage so they appear less as a public resort facility and more a private enclave. Likewise remove the main walkway through the pool zone for both safety and privacy concerns.

Look at providing 2 separate entries to each block without compromising the current generous open space.

We question the need for 2 extra plunge pools with the extra cost and maintenance burden for residents who all have access to the common pool.

Likewise Bicycle parking limited to 9 bikes to 27 units (1 bike per 3 units) would in our opinion lead to residents storing bikes on terraces with all the associated inconvenience.

Given the huge uptake of e-bikes especially fat tyred bikes by teenagers on the beach suburbs we would recommend a rethink on storage for these and recharging safely.

Recommendations

7. Review the *Tristaniopsis laurina* / Magnolia” Teddy bear”) selections and replace with large endemic trees with clean trunks and higher canopies
8. Review the Review Port Jackson fig selection adjacent the pool area to avoid long term maintenance issues
9. Built in planters to private balconies to be designed to be maintained on community title
10. Setback the pool a minimum 4.5m from the street to provide greater plant screening. Reconsider the use of a plunge pool
11. Provide separate entries to apartments that do not compromise communal open space
12. Reconsider storage arrangements for bicycles
13. Confirm tree canopy exceeds 15 % in accordance with the *Tree Canopy Guide for Low and Mid Rise Housing* by DPHI

Amenity

Apartment 207 is located in an excavated area of the site with an outlook to the external wall of the proposed gymnasium resulting in primary living spaces and terraces that do not have an acceptable outlook or view of the sky. The arrangement will impact access to natural ventilation and access to daylight.

Recommendations

14. Redesign or relocation of the gymnasium is required to ensure Apartment 207 has an acceptable outlook

Façade treatment/Aesthetics

External wall finishes were described as integral off white concrete and natural Off form concrete balconies. The Panel supports the use of natural and integral finishes rather that applied coatings and renders that require a paint finish.

Recommendations

No further recommendations



Sustainability

With the regulatory environment changing now – for efficiency, electrification, zero emissions and mandatory disclosure – these investments at this time will be worthwhile both for future residents and the developers' reputation, market position and marketability of the project.

The Panel notes and commends the good natural ventilation to all apartments. Additional work to address the following issues is advised.

Recommendations

15. While the average NatHERS is 7.5 stars, Unit 205 (5.7), Unit 307 (5.8), Unit 403 (5.8) and Unit 503 (5.4) are below 6 stars which is not allowed. Additional work will be required to get them above 6 stars to increase natural comfort and reduce operational carbon. See next point.
16. Double glazing in thermally broken aluminium frames to all apartments to increase their thermal and acoustic performance is highly recommended.
17. Effective solar / weather shading needs to be included for all windows and doors on the top level.
18. Future focused developments to not have any gas. Consider an alternative system for hot water such as electric heat pumps.
19. Basement carparking is the most intensive embodied carbon in the project – its size should be kept to a minimum. Reconsider excess space such as wine cellar and overly large storage areas.
20. Consider how materials from the existing homes can be salvaged, upcycled, and/or recycled, starting within the project itself. Circular economy consideration of these assets can create a less damaging outcome from their demolition.
21. The provision of EV charging for cars and battery storage from PV system needs to be added to the drawings for the DA..

PANEL CONCLUSION

The Panel does not support the proposal in its current form. The primary concerns of street setbacks and building entry points need to be resolved.