

---

**From:** DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au  
**Sent:** 25/06/2025 9:05:50 AM  
**To:** DA Submission Mailbox  
**Subject:** TRIMMED: Online Submission

25/06/2025

MR Calvin Fawle  
12 / 34 - 36 Golf ST  
Mona Vale NSW 2103  
[REDACTED]

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

Response to Solar and Daylight Access Report - DA2025/0447

I have reviewed the Solar and Daylight Access report prepared by Walsh Architects for the proposed development at 32 Golf Avenue, and I raise the following serious concerns:

Non-compliance with Solar Access Design Criteria:

The development fails to comply with Design Criterion 1 of ADG Objective 4A-1, which requires that 70% of apartments receive a minimum of 2 hours direct sunlight to living rooms and private open spaces between 9am and 3pm at mid-winter.

The development achieves only 63.6%.

The shortfall is acknowledged in the report, but the authors attempt to justify it as a minor deviation. However, Design Criteria still represent the benchmark, and failure to meet them - especially at this early stage of widespread rezoning - sets a poor precedent.

Overshadowing of Neighbouring Properties (34-36 Golf Avenue):

The report claims 73.3% of dwellings in the adjoining property will still receive 3+ hours of sunlight to living and private open spaces. However:

The data used to assess my property at 12/34-36 Golf Avenue appears to be reconstructed from sales listings, and not based on internal plans or verified conditions.

It does not clearly acknowledge the loss of sunlight to all three bedrooms and living areas in our townhouse, as we directly face the proposed building.

The deep shadows cast from mid-morning to early afternoon during winter significantly reduce usable light and warmth in our living and private outdoor areas.

Lack of Site-Specific Sensitivity

The report assumes overshadowing is acceptable simply because the area is "undergoing change." This reasoning ignores:

The specific impacts on our property's amenity and privacy, which will be greatly reduced by the height and massing of this development.

The absence of any sun to our yard during key daylight hours due to the proximity of the four-storey structure.

#### Objective Misinterpretation

While the report correctly notes that strict compliance with the ADG criteria is not mandatory, it misuses this flexibility. The intended flexibility in design is not a justification for regular non-compliance, especially when the site is unreasonably impacting neighbouring amenity.

The development does not optimise solar access for adjacent residents.

Alternative design configurations (e.g. increased setbacks, massing shifts) could reduce overshadowing but were not pursued.

#### Insufficient Visual Transparency

Despite 29 pages of technical diagrams, the report provides no clear solar access diagrams specific to our townhouse at 34-36 Golf Avenue.

It is difficult for the public to verify which dwellings will be most affected.

We request independent peer review or clarification of how each affected dwelling/townhouse (including ours) was modelled and assessed.

#### Request:

I respectfully ask Council to consider the above points in detail and to require the proponent to amend the proposal to reduce overshadowing impacts - particularly to our property - through reduced height, improved setbacks, or massing changes. The development in its current form creates a substantial loss of solar access and fails to uphold the intent of Objective 3B-2 of the Apartment Design Guide.

Sincerely,

Calvin Fawle

12/34-36 Golf Avenue, Mona Vale