

---

**From:** DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au  
**Sent:** 28/05/2025 5:05:50 PM  
**To:** DA Submission Mailbox  
**Subject:** Online Submission

28/05/2025

MR John McKellar  
11 / 24 - 26 Golf AVE  
Mona Vale NSW 2103  
[REDACTED]

**RE: DA2025/0447 - 2 / 32 Golf Avenue MONA VALE NSW 2103**

**COUNCIL OBJECTION 32 GOLF AVE MONA VALE - DA No 2025-0447**

Following a review of the above DA for this site its apparent there has recently been an approval for the site for 6 apartments. The new DA now request approval for 11 apartments. The previous approval whilst not ideal given the size of the site, generally fitted into the area and the adjoining properties in respect of height and building mass.

This new DA has taken the proposed development to a new level and would be more appropriate for a substantially larger site to provide for a sensible outcome.

Whilst I understand the State Government is endeavouring to increase the housing supply by way of amendments to the State Planning requirements this amended DA would not appear to achieve this objective. The value of these upmarket apartments will likely be between \$3.5M and \$6M, obviously placing them well out of reach for the average family. I also note the indicated construction cost of circa \$7.5m noted on the DA. Considering the site constraints, deep excavation, complicated services resulting from the layout, shoring of adjoining properties and high-end finishes I would suggest the likely construction cost to be in the order of two and a half to three times the nominated value in my opinion.

There are a number of specific issues causing concern which include but not limited to the following:

**BUILDING HEIGHT AND BULK.**

The land width is less than 20m wide which is typical for a domestic block that would normally allow for a two storey house. To approve a building that is 4 storeys above ground and two levels below ground on such a block seems almost ridiculous in a residential environment such as Golf Ave. It reminds me a little of building in Vietnam where it is common that houses are one room wide and up to 4 storeys high, which I understand is due to land taxes being calculated on frontage width.

In addition to the height on such a narrow block the risk of overshadowing adjoining properties will be high, particularly in winter.

**DEEP EXCAVATION**

The depth of the excavation is a concern which could easily affect the adjoining properties if a

properly engineered and installed shoring system is not installed. If such a system was reliant on ground anchors being installed under the existing neighbours this would also be problematic and considered unacceptable. Detailed engineering should be provided. The geotechnical report highlights the need for a detailed review would be required to establish appropriate solutions.

## PARKING

To virtually triple the population living on this site currently and double the previous approved DA, will be adding a major impost onto the street parking for two reasons.

1. The lower carpark is only accessible via a car lift. This will result in residence parking cars in the street on many occasions throughout the day as the complexity of using the car lift several times a day will significantly reduce the likelihood of cars being parked in the basement. Particularly if several car trips per day are required.

2. The fact that there are only 2 visitor parking spots seems at odds with the increased occupation of the site. Furthermore, the fact that the visitor parking is on the lower level will result in these spots unlikely to be used by visitors due to the complexity of access.

The combination of street parking for the Golf Club, Mona Social, the B1 bus passengers and summertime beach goers, places a heavy burden on finding parking in the street on most days. The new development would exacerbate this further.

In addition to this, the carparks being 6 meters underground will likely require an exhaust system to run for extended periods with the outlet being at roof level. This is a potential ongoing noise source for the adjoining owners.

## ROOF TOP SWIMMING POOL & OUTDOOR AREA

Noise and privacy issues will be a concern given that the occupants and their visitors will be able to occupy the roof area, in addition to potential noise transmission from the pool to the apartments under it.

## EXISTING SERVICES

The impost of the additional dwellings will also add an additional load to the existing services, particularly water which has already suffered a pressure drop imposed by Sydney Water due to the mains pipe condition.

In summary it would seem that this DA is endeavouring to capitalise on the State Governments amended planning options without consideration for actual the circumstances. Whilst this technically may be within a zone nominated for amended requirements, it clearly does not comply with the surrounding areas overall vista. I'm sure the State Government did not intend for developments to be approved for all locations within a designated area. There would be more appropriate locations in the local area to achieve a much better outcome and we rely on the Council to protect the local environment for its residents by applying the necessary controls to development applications.

The proposed development is inconsistent with the surrounding area and the consequences of introducing such an intrusive development in Golf Ave I consider completely inappropriate.