

ITEM 3 – DA2024/0190 – 32 Golf Avenue MONA VALE

PANEL COMMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

General

No Pre-DA or pre-lodgement meeting was held in relation to this proposal

Strategic context, urban context: surrounding area character

Site is located near the crest of Golf Avenue, opposite Mona Vale Golf Club and in the context of predominantly Residential Flat Building and Multi-dwelling housing development. The location has good access to transport, shopping and recreational facilities.

The site is zoned R3 Medium Density and the proposed land use is permissible

Scale, built form and articulation

Proposal is generally in accordance with built form controls and is split into two separate two (2) storey structures above common basement. Highly articulated built form addresses Golf Parade with a protruding L1 balcony and recessed, yet still prominent undercroft and vehicular basement entry.

East and West elevations are reasonably well articulated, with angled windows, indents and 'feature' framing structures assisting to maintain privacy relationships between proposed residences and neighbouring development and common pathway.

In the front setback zone, a high demand is placed on the Golf Avenue interface, with a significant entry and bin store structure having been located at the South East corner, the driveway taking up most the western portion of the frontage and in between, a proposed Hydrant booster structure and private entry gate, all of which amass to restrict the potential for landscaped street interface.

Noting that efforts have been made to maintain existing vegetation along-side boundaries, site coverage is considerable and the stated landscape area of over 50% includes paved areas, areas above basement and significant areas upon roof structures. Paved and undercover private open spaces have not been provisioned for the majority of the dwellings proposed.

The Panel anticipates that residents may desire to have outdoor, paved, undercover spaces to enjoy, the latent provision of which threatens to undermine landscape area compliance and/or worsen privacy relationships between dwellings.

Recommendations

1. Further consideration should be given to street interface. Booster assembly should be positioned and enclosed such that appearance does not detract from the quality of the landscape and such that planting along street interface is maximised.
2. Provide well integrated paved and covered private open space for all dwellings to avoid future piecemeal approach to same.

Access, vehicular movement and car parking

Pedestrian access from street is gained via a communal entry structure and one private gate to Unit No.1. In the case of Unit No.5 and No.6, it is more than 40m further to the front doors of these units. Whilst this may serve as a nuisance on a rainy day, the point of address and delineation of private/public

realm is unambiguous. During the Panel session, the applicant stated an intention to provide parcel lockers within the entry structure, which would be supported if integrated well into the design.

Vehicular access is via a two – way ramp to a secure basement with provision for generous parking and storage allocations. Whilst the provision of quality storage space is supported, the storage spaces allocated appear to be intended for the provision of additional parking which is not supported. The Panel felt that the additional excavation and extent of basement structures are excessive, reducing potential for deep soil landscape.

Recommendations

3. Integrate parcel locker and mail boxes into entry structure
4. Reduce extent of basement to reduce excavation and increase deep soil
5. Explore potential to reduce width of driveway and increase landscape area across front setback zone.

Landscape

Landscape relies largely on retention of existing trees on site and on neighbours for canopy cover. This is commended, however tree management is critical.

Some dwellings have not been allocated external paved spaces. Ensure paved outdoor sitting spaces are provided of adequate size for the apartment to ensure small lawn areas are not removed and replaced with paving further reducing deep soil areas

Recommendations

6. Prepare a tree Protection Plan to manage building construction stage.
7. Redesign all outdoor spaces to include at least one outdoor sitting space of adequate size.

Amenity

Beyond the landscape issues covered above, amenity is generally well considered, however, the thickness of the plan and the large size of Unit No.1 and No. 2 results in some poor quality spaces. For instance, 'Bed 1' within Unit No.1 depends on obscure glass for privacy and would forego visual and acoustic privacy in the event a window was opened for fresh air. Likewise, the 'second living' of Unit No.2 suffers from the same. It is the opinion of the panel that Level 1 of the RFB is planned more considerately and offers far greater amenity, and that subtle variations of these plans would be far better suited to the ground floor as well.

The subterranean Body Corporate meeting room is not supported and if provision of the facility is required, it should be located where it offers a more positive experience.

The gap between the two proposed buildings is very narrow, although through careful placement of planting, fenestration and screening may assist to avoid immediate privacy concerns.

Recommendations

8. Consider altering the planning of units No.1 and No.2 so that they are similar in configuration to units No.3 and No.4 respectively, making sure to avoid creating habitable rooms that depend on obscure glazing for privacy.
9. Remove or relocate Body Corporate Meeting Room to avoid unnecessary excavation.

Façade treatment/Aesthetics

The highly articulated forms are proposed to be made from a practical palette of materials, further explained by the applicant during the Panel session to include high quality off form concrete. Several of

the finishes noted on the DA documentation refer to their “look” which may be read to insinuate faux finishes.

Recommendations

10. Provide more specific detail on finishes and materials
11. Promote finishes which will have inherent material characteristic and that will stand up to and compliment the marine environment. Avoid ‘faux’ finishes

Sustainability

The role of the Panel is to advise on ‘design (quality) and sustainability’ and is not confined to existing legislation or the approaches of the past.

Accordingly, the Panel believes it is appropriate and necessary for it to provide ‘forward-thinking advice’ to both proponents and to council staff involved in the assessment of development.

With the regulatory environment changing in the near future – for efficiency, electrification, zero emissions and mandatory disclosure – investments at this time will be worthwhile both for future residents and the developers’ reputation, market position and marketability of the proposal.

The Panel strongly supports and commends the 5kW of PV per unit that is proposed in addition to the PV for the communal area.

Recommendations

12. Consider relocating the on-site battery storage. Determine whether a battery could be efficiently located outside the building envelope at much reduced cost, but requiring further design to achieve a good fit with the landscape and surrounds.
13. Should the installation of the PV array breach the height limit in order to optimise performance it is the Panel’s view that this is a justifiable breach although it appears that this is achievable within the height limit.
14. Provide EV charging points for each unit (Min 15 amp) to suit level 1 charging.
15. The commitment to 5kW of PV per unit needs to be a condition of consent as it is not recognised or formalised on the BASIX certificate due to the inadequacies of the current BASIX online tool.

PANEL CONCLUSION

The Panel is supportive of many aspects of the proposal, however, significant improvements to several aspects of the scheme require refinement as detailed in the recommendations herewith.