
From: Greg Coppin
Sent: 16/05/2025 6:56:27 PM
To: Council Northernbeaches Mailbox
Subject: TRIMMED: DA2025/0447 . 32 Golf Ave. Mona Vale
Attachments: 32 Golf ave Mona Vale DA objection.pdf;

Please find attached my objection to the proposed development application for the above noted address

regards

Greg Coppin
8/24-26 Golf Ave. Mona Vale 2103



15/05/2025

Greg Coppin

8/24-26 Golf Ave.

Mona Vale NSW 2103

Re: DA 2025/0447 . 32 Golf Ave. Mona Vale

I would like to register my objection to the proposed 4 storey Residential Flat Building development at the above noted address.

My objections include:

- 1. Omissions and inconsistencies within submitted architectural plans**
- 2. Non Compliance with relevant planning controls**
- 3. Inconsistency with outcomes outlined within relevant planning instruments**

Omissions and inconsistencies within submitted architectural plans

A review of the submitted architectural documentation highlights numerous omissions and inconsistencies that may obfuscate non compliances with planning controls.

The impact of this development upon adjoining properties and the neighbourhood may also be obscured by these omissions and inconsistencies.

Non resolution of many of these items during the DA process can, if approved, lead to compromises and required modification to the building bulk and form during the construction process. This may create further adverse impact.

Noted omissions and inconsistencies include:

Basement carparks:

- Lack of dimensions
- No sweep paths
- No information on car lift
- No adequate allowance for required plant and services (pump rooms, mech vent equipment, lift motor rooms, electrical meter rooms etc.)
- Visitor parking located in lower basement and only accessible by car lift.

Ground Floor Plan

- Lack of dimensions (incl. minimum disabled access reqs.)
- Lack of RL's for site and adjoining properties
- Proposed boundary setbacks for building not indicated
- Information on adjoining buildings at 28-30 Golf Ave. and 25-31 Darley St.. not provided

Level 1, 2 and 3 Plans

- Lack of dimensions (incl. minimum disabled access reqs.)
- No boundary setback dimensions for splayed wall elements, angled windows, stairwells and balconies (approx. 3.1m, 3.5m and 5.0m)
- No notation regarding privacy measures for all side boundary facing windows
- No information on privacy screens

Roof Terrace Level Plan

- Lack of dimensions (incl. minimum disabled access reqs.)
- Lack of dimensions for planters, pool area and pool for street building
- No RL's for roof terrace, parapets, pool deck, pool balustrade, and roof over balconies for street building
- No RL's for parapet of rear building
- No dimensions or RL's for extent and height of Solar Panel Installations on both buildings
- No indication or dimensions of any roof plant (pool equipment, exhaust ducts, fire service tanks etc)
- No screening of roof top plant and solar panel installation on rear building
- No roof access to rear building indicated

Upper Roof Level Plan

- Lack of dimensions for roof awning and boundary setbacks
- No RL's for roof awning or lift overrun parapet
- No dimensions or RL's for extent of Solar Panel Installation
- No information on the proposed roof awning
- No screening of solar panel installation

Long Sections AA and BB

- No Extent of Existing Ground Level (sect AA) or exist ground level RL's (sect AA + BB) indicated
- No RL's for basement carpark indicated
- No clearance heights for basement carpark indicated
- No gradients for basement carpark indicated
- No RL for solid roof over street building level 3 balcony
- No balcony setbacks indicated
- No Solar Panel Installations, rooftop ACU's or plant indicated on both buildings
- Extent of adjoining buildings to rear boundary not indicated
- Building side and rear boundary envelope control not indicated
- RL's for roof terrace awning or pool (sect BB) not indicated
- No screening of solar panel installation for rear building

Cross Sections

- No exist ground level RL's indicated
- No parapet RL's indicated
- Extent of information of adjoining buildings to side and rear boundaries very limited and inconsistent (no RL's or existing windows indicated)
- Building side boundary envelope control not indicated (except Sect. FF)
- No RL's for basement carpark indicated
- No balcony setbacks indicated
- No Solar Panel Installations, rooftop ACU's or plant (sect FF, GG, HH) indicated
- No RL's for roof terrace awning or pool and pool fence (sect DD + EE) indicated
- No screening of solar panel installation for rear building

Elevations

- No exist ground level RL's indicated
- No parapet RL's indicated
- Extent of information of adjoining buildings to side and rear boundaries very limited and inconsistent (no RL's or existing windows indicated)
- Building side and rear boundary envelope control not indicated
- No Solar Panel Installations. rooftop ACU's or plant indicated (so max. height of building not shown)
- No RL's for roof terrace awning, lift overrun or pool and pool fence indicated
- No screening of solar panel installation for rear building
- No prevention of overlooking, or privacy measures to upper level windows indicated on any elevation
- No prevention of overlooking, or privacy measures to lower level windows indicated on street building NW elevation and rear building NE elevation

Non Compliance with planning controls

There are numerous non compliances with both council and state regulations which collectively highlight that the proposed building is too large for the site.

Side and rear boundary building lines

Pittwater 21 DCP Boundary Setback control provides a formula for calculation of minimum required setbacks of new Residential Flat Buildings, based upon building height.

The DA submission notes a building height of 16.8m .

This height generates a minimum required side and rear boundary setback of 6.7m.

The proposed buildings do not comply with this requirement at either side or rear boundaries, with proposed setbacks ranging from 3.0m to 6.0m.

The resulting excessive building bulk and scale is clearly a non compliance that has an adverse impact upon adjoining properties and upon the streetscape in general

Building Envelope control

Exceedence of the Pittwater 21 DCP Building Envelope control at levels 2, 3 and roof terrace/roof pool level results in a building bulk and scale that exceeds council controls. This increased bulk exacerbates overlooking and privacy impacts on adjoining buildings and contributes to the lack of mid winter solar access to 34 Golf Ave.

This impact is further heightened by the proposed rooftop solar panel installations and screening to the rear building, and lift overrun level of the street building, that have not been adequately shown or described on any of the submitted plans, elevations or sections

Building Separation (Visual Privacy)

Building separation distances from the proposed building to buildings on adjoining sites, do not comply with The Apartment Design Guide requirements

The ADG requires, that distances from proposed habitable room windows and balconies to those of buildings on adjoining sites, be a minimum of 12m for the first 4 levels of any new development.

Separation distances between the proposed building windows and windows at 34 Golf Ave range from approx. 8.0 to 10.2m

This greatly impacts upon the privacy of adjoining dwellings

Solar access

The submitted view from the sun diagrams indicate that the NW façade of 34 Golf Ave. does not receive mid winter sun until approx. 10am.

By 11am this NW façade is beginning to be impacted by shadows cast from 32 Golf Ave.

By 12pm this NW façade is largely overshadowed.

Hence a significant percentage of the adjoining building apartments do not receive the minimum 2 hours mid winter solar access as is legislated

The extent of overshadowing will indeed be greater than is indicated, as the submitted view from the sun diagrams do not include the rooftop solar panel installations that are planned for both buildings

Accessibility

Accessibility non compliances, including all entry foyers, common area lobbies and corridors, lift access and stairs have been highlighted in the developers submitted access report.

It is important that these non compliances are resolved at the DA stage, and not during construction documentation, as suggested by the developers access consultant.

Numerous modifications to rectify these non compliances could require modification to the building bulk and form which could result in further impact on adjoining properties

Visitor Car Parking

Planning controls for this development require 4 visitor spaces be provided on site, and these spaces are to be accessible to visitors. The submitted basement carpark plans indicate only 2 visitor spaces and these are located on the lower level, which can only be accessed by car lift.

The submitted Statement of Environmental Effect suggests that this shortfall in visitor car spaces can be accommodated with on street parking in Golf Ave.

Apart from being non compliant, this suggestion would further exacerbate the lack of car parking in Golf Ave, which is greatly impacted by increased B1 bus commuter parking; beachgoers; Golfers from the adjacent Golf course; and ever increasing patron numbers at the recently opened Mona Social bar /restaurant and the upgraded and enlarged Golf clubhouse bar and café.

Extent and height of entry structure/ garbage room at street boundary

The extent and height of this structure, which sits well in front of the required street setback line will negatively impact upon the streetscape. With increased building bulk and reduced size of the landscaped buffer zone.

Potential Sub Station Kiosk

No allowance has been made for any potential substation, which authorities may require at the street frontage. Retro fitting such an installation could require modification to the form and siting of the proposed building

Inconsistency with outcomes outlined within relevant planning instruments

The recent NSW Government “Low to Medium Rise Housing Policy” has classified 32 Golf Ave as being within 800m walking distance of a nominated town centre with non discretionary development standards addressing allowable building height and FSR

However other council LEP and DCP controls and the ADG still apply .

The ADG at Parts 1B and 1C, addresses “Desired Future Character” in urban neighbourhoods

It states:

“Considerations for residential apartment development in these settings include overshadowing, amenity and privacy impacts between existing and future buildings”

and

“Where an area is planned to change, new development needs to address the desired future character at both the neighbourhood and street scales. In established areas new development should carefully respond to neighbouring development.”

I consider that the proposed development at 32 Golf Avenue fails to meet these desired outcomes