
Sent: 26/03/2024 6:11:58 PM
Subject: DA2024/0190 - 32 Golf Ave Mona Vale

The General Manager

Northern Beaches Council
PO Box 82
MANLY NSW 1655

Attention Mr A Croft
Principal Planner

Re: DA 2024/0190 - 32 Golf Avenue, Mona Vale

I am the owner of the adjoining Unit 4 at No. 28-30 Golf Avenue, Mona Vale. I thank the Council for its notification of this application. The Owners at 28-30 Golf Avenue have had no notice or discussion with the applicant, his architects or any other consultants associated with the application. To that extent, it comes as a bit of a shock. I have viewed the plans and other documents as per the Council webpage and would like to record my objection to the application for the following reasons:

1. Dwelling Density.

Control B2.5 of Pittwater 21 DCP as is applicable to this application requires that medium density housing must not be carried out unless the street frontage is greater than or equal to one third of the length of the longest site boundary. The subject site does not satisfy this control as the frontage represents only 28% of the length of the side boundary. The applicable aim of this control is to ensure development does not impact on adjoining residential development. In this instance the application proposes the demolition of all the current site improvements being 4 adjoining town houses whose relationship to the development at 28-30 Golf Avenue is well established and harmonious, particularly given the living areas of both accommodations are at ground level.

This application proposes a two storey RFB with unit 3 proposing a floor level of RL 23.09 setback 4.5m from the soon side boundary to my strata plan entitlement. The site survey detail provided with the DA does not identify a ground floor or existing ground level for my unit, but Section DD (DA202) indicates this floor level is 4.2m above the ground floor of my unit. Unit 3 provides for a series of glass windows (FN 05 DA300) to the living room and bedroom 4 directly opposite my north facing courtyard and doorway/windows entry into my family sitting room. Further, the application proposes an enormous 23 sq.m balcony featuring an outdoor kitchen BBQ area directly adjacent to my common boundary, which breaches the side boundary envelope control. These elements change the established relationship and are intrusive and unreasonable. They give rise to privacy concerns and aural and acoustic concerns associated with the proximity of the proposed building and visual/privacy issues given the direct line of sight provided for by the windows as detailed. Given the established nature of my unit, there is no way I can "design out" the impact of what is proposed and to that extent I object to the detail as proposed.

2. Garbage Room and Main Pedestrian Entry Detail.

The application proposes a walled pedestrian entry and garbage room enclosure on a nil setback to Golf Avenue. The details of the drawings do not confirm the actual height of this structure, but the southwest elevation drawing indicates a height exceeding the first-floor level of unit 3 and extending beyond the balustrade level of this unit (estimate 4.5m). This detail proposed by the application on a narrow site is inconsistent with the character assessment of Pittwater 21 DCP (part D9.1) and with the front building line standard (Part 9.6) in that they are wholly coated within the front building line for the locality (10m) and are inconsistent with the established character of development adjacent to and as established within the vicinity of the site. Effectively, the proposal eliminates any deep soil area for landscaping within the front building line and is contrary to the established building details of the adjoining developments. The provision of a garbage room could be readily accommodated within the basement as proposed and would replicate the arrangement of other developments within the immediate vicinity of this site. As proposed, the extension of the barmy forward of the building line and the proposed garbage room are in breach of the front building line standard as part 9.6 of Pittwater 21 DCP. The opportunity for deep soil landscaping within the front setback is effectively eliminated by the development as proposed and is not consistent with the character of the street as established by the adjoining developments.

3. Quantum of Excavation

As a general principle of environmental sustainability, the quantum of excavation should be minimised. Part B8 of Pittwater 21 DCP reinforces this outcome. This application does not comply with these objectives and outcomes sought by the policy. Rather the basement details as proposed seek to maximise the quantum of excavation by extending the basement into both the front and rear boundary setback simply to provide for extended storage areas associated with three of the proposed six units. Further, the application proposes a second level of basement simply to provide for a strata plan meeting room and a battery storage room, all of which could be readily provided within the area of the first level of basement as proposed. These details do not conform to the outcomes required by the Council DCP and as an adjacent owner, our objective would be to reduce and minimise both the disturbance and possible impacts arising from the excavation as proposed. The proposal is excessive and inconsistent with the standards and outcomes of the applicable DCP.

Yours sincerely

Paul Stead