

---

**From:** Calvin Fawle  
**Sent:** 2/06/2025 8:53:04 AM  
**To:** Council Northernbeaches Mailbox  
**Cc:** Kamila Fawle  
**Subject:** TRIMMED: Objection to DA2025/0447 – 32 Golf Avenue, Mona Vale

Dear Council,

I wish to lodge a formal objection to DA2025/0447 for the proposed construction of a four-storey residential apartment building at **32 Golf Avenue, Mona Vale**.

As a resident of **Townhouse 12 at 34–36 Golf Avenue**, my home directly adjoins the development on the north-east corner. I have serious concerns regarding **non-compliance with planning controls**, as well as significant adverse impacts on residential amenity, local environment, infrastructure, safety, and community character.

## **1. Loss of Solar Access (Pittwater DCP Control C1.2)**

The submitted shadow diagrams clearly indicate that our property will experience **significant overshadowing** during the winter solstice, with little to no sunlight access to our backyard and rear-facing rooms between **9:00am and 3:00pm**, breaching **Control C1.2 of the Pittwater DCP**.

The resulting lack of natural light will not only affect our **amenity and liveability** but also raises concerns about:

- \* **Mould growth** and internal dampness from insufficient passive drying
- \* **Increased energy costs** due to loss of passive solar heating
- \* **Mental and physical health impacts**, including anxiety and seasonal depression

These effects are real and well-documented, and significantly reduce the wellbeing of those affected — particularly our children, who will lose natural light in their bedrooms.

## **2. Misrepresentation of Town Centre Proximity Under the Housing SEPP**

The **Statement of Environmental Effects (page 19)** claims the site is within **391.73 metres** of the Mona Vale Town Centre — a figure derived from a **straight-line (radial) measurement**, not an actual walkable pedestrian route.

Under **Clause 175(3) of the Housing SEPP**, the 400m threshold must be calculated using a **walking path**, not direct line-of-sight.

Independent verification using both:

- \* **Google Earth walking route analysis**, and
- \* **The NSW Planning Portal's interactive distance tool**

confirms that the **walkable distance** from **32 Golf Avenue** to the **mapped edge** of the Mona Vale Town Centre is **beyond 400 metres**.

As a result:

- \* ·The site **does not qualify** for the increased development provisions of the “inner area”
- \* ·The proposal must instead comply with the more constrained controls applicable to the **400–800m outer area**, including stricter height, bulk, and amenity provisions
- \* ·The current DA is **not compliant** with the criteria that underpin the proposed height and scale and may warrant refusal or full redesign

This is a material planning error that undermines the validity of the DA and must be addressed.

### 3. Non-Compliance with DCP B2.5 – Site Frontage Control

The proposal **fails to meet minimum site frontage requirements**. The frontage is only 19.81 metres, while the site’s longest boundary exceeds 62 metres. Under **DCP B2.5**, the frontage must be at least one-third of the longest boundary. This clear non-compliance undermines the intent of medium-density site controls.

### 4. Loss of Privacy and Amenity

Upper-storey bedroom windows and **large uncovered entertaining balconies** face directly into **all three of our bedrooms**, including our **children’s**, and our **backyard**. No meaningful setbacks or screening are proposed.

These elements will:

- \* ·Cause **ongoing noise disturbances**
- \* ·Eliminate our **sense of privacy**
- \* ·Negatively impact our **sleep, daily routines, and personal wellbeing**

Additionally, the **rooftop recreation area** effectively functions as a **fifth storey**, further intensifying bulk, noise, and privacy conflicts.

### 5. Overdevelopment in a Congested Cul-de-Sac

Golf Avenue is a **dead-end street** already suffering from:

- \* ·Overflow parking from **Mona Vale Golf Club**
- \* ·Visitors to **Mona Social** and the beach
- \* ·**B-Line bus commuters**
- \* ·**Delivery vehicles unable to turn safely**

There have already been **multiple traffic incidents** along this narrow street. Adding a large development will:

- \* ·Increase the risk of **collisions and blockages**
- \* ·Delay **emergency vehicle access**
- \* ·Compromise **pedestrian safety**

This site is fundamentally **unsuitable** for high-density development from a traffic and safety standpoint.

## 6. Non-Compliance with Visitor Parking Standards

Only **2 visitor car spaces** are proposed for 11 apartments, despite the DCP requirement of **1 per 5 dwellings**, which necessitates **at least 3 spaces**. This adds further pressure to already oversubscribed street parking.

## 7. Flood Risk and Stormwater Management Failures

Our property lies at the **lowest natural point on Golf Avenue**. The loss of permeable ground from the proposed development will increase **stormwater runoff and pooling** into our yard.

There is **no onsite detention system proposed** and no analysis of the **increased flood risk** — despite this being a known low-lying, flood-prone area.

Further, Golf Avenue's stormwater system **discharges directly into the ocean**, meaning:

- \* ·Pollution and sediment from hard surfaces will flow untreated to the coastline
- \* ·The proposal **fails Clauses 15 and 16 of the Coastal Management SEPP**, which require protection of water quality and coastal enjoyment

## 8. Tree Impacts and TPZ Encroachments

The arborist report identifies that **two high-value trees located in our backyard** will face **Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) encroachments of up to 13%** as a result of excavation and site works associated with the proposed development.

These two trees are:

- \* ·**Tree 1**: A mature **native coastal tree** providing significant habitat and shade
- \* ·**Tree 2**: A large **native eucalypt** important for visual amenity and wildlife

Encroachments **exceeding 10%** (as outlined in **AS4970 – Protection of Trees on Development Sites**) are not considered “minor” and **require robust justification and compensatory measures** — none of which have been adequately provided in the plans.

This level of encroachment will:

- \* ·Compromise **tree stability and health**, potentially leading to long-term decline or death

- \* ·Reduce **canopy coverage and environmental benefits** in a neighbourhood already experiencing overdevelopment pressure
- \* ·Impact the **privacy and shade** that these trees provide to our property

Given the critical role these trees play in **biodiversity, climate mitigation, and local character**, these TPZ encroachments should not be approved without an independent assessment and strict protective measures.

## 9. Impact on Local Flora and Fauna

Golf Avenue supports **native wildlife corridors** that include:

- \* ·**Fruit bats**
- \* ·**Brush turkeys**
- \* ·**Ringtail possums**
- \* ·A variety of birdlife

The proposal provides **no fauna management plan**, nor any biodiversity offsets or green infrastructure. Local ecological health will be irreversibly degraded.

## 10. Failure to Deliver Affordability or Community Benefit

This development will deliver **luxury apartments**, with prices ranging from **\$4–9 million**, and offer **no affordable housing**, public space, or infrastructure improvements. It accelerates gentrification and pushes families and essential workers out of the area.

## 11. Visual Bulk and Streetscape Conflict (DCP C1.3 / LEP Clause 6.9)

The proposal is **out of scale** with its low-rise context. It provides no transitional height, no articulation, and no visual sympathy to adjoining dwellings. It breaches **DCP C1.3** and **LEP Clause 6.9**, which require development to respect neighbourhood character.

## 12. Precedent and Cumulative Impact

As the **first DA of its kind in Mona Vale** under the new Housing SEPP, this proposal will set a dangerous precedent. Approval will invite a wave of similar mid-rise developments without regard for infrastructure capacity or cumulative impact — a concern raised by Council in other rejected applications (e.g. Avalon, Narrabeen).

## 13. Public Interest and Procedural Fairness (EP&A Act 1979 – s4.15)

This application:

- \* ·Offers **no public benefit**

- \* ·Circumvents **meaningful community input**
- \* ·Raises serious concerns about **planning integrity**

It is **not in the public interest**, and should be rejected on those grounds under **Section 4.15 of the EP&A Act**.

## Conclusion

In light of these issues, I respectfully request that Northern Beaches Council **refuse DA2025/0447** on the grounds of:

- \* ·Breaches of solar access, parking, site frontage, privacy, flooding, and stormwater controls
- \* ·Misuse of Housing SEPP due to incorrect proximity measurement
- \* ·Visual bulk, amenity loss, and ecological damage
- \* ·Absence of public benefit or affordability
- \* ·Failure to meet environmental and safety obligations
- \* ·Lack of compatibility with character and neighbourhood
- \* ·Unsuitability of site for high-density development

Thank you for your time and consideration. I would welcome a site inspection or further engagement to demonstrate the real and lasting impact this proposal will have on our home and community.

Sincerely,

**Calvin & Kamila Fawle**

Townhouse 12

34–36 Golf Avenue, Mona Vale NSW 2103

