
Sent: 26/03/2024 11:21:42 AM
Subject: DA2024/0190 -32 Golf Ave Mona Vale

Attn: Adam Croft
Principal Planner

This submission is made by Ross and Colleen Fleming the owners of the adjoining Unit 9 at 28-30 Golf Ave. We object to the application on the basis that the proposed development is inconsistent with the outcomes and standards prescribed by the relevant Development Control Plan (Pittwater21 DCP) and results in an unacceptable impact to the current site improvements at No.28-30 Golf Ave particularly associated with the visual privacy and amenity of the established townhouses. The details of this objection are:

1. Site Density

The SOEE accompanying the DA concludes the density of the proposed development complies with the standards of clause 4.5 of Pittwater LEP 2014. However, this conclusion does not reference the provisions of Part B 2.5 of Pittwater 21 DCP in terms of the site frontage to depth ratio required for medium density development. The subject site fails to comply with that standard nor the objectives of the standard which are to encourage site amalgamations and to ensure development does not impact adversely upon adjoining residential development. The Crozier Geotechnical Consultants report dated 23rd February 2024 DA notes the current site improvements at 32 Golf Ave are between 33 and 38 years old and the improvements at 28-30 Golf Ave some 20-26 years old highlighting the long-established relationship of these adjoining developments across this common boundary. The SOEE simply omits any reference to the provisions Part B2.5 of the DCP and the constrained nature of the site and relies simply on a numeric calculation to conclude the density of development is compliant and therefore acceptable. It is not reasonable to dismiss the established relationship by simply observing the density of development complies with the maximum permitted by a generic density provision of the LEP. The provisions of the DCP are relevant. The subject site is isolated and constrained. Future development must have regard to the impacts proposed. The impacts are numerous and unreasonable reinforcing a conclusion that the density of development proposed does not satisfy the outcomes anticipated by provisions of the Council DCP.

2. Privacy

We question the accuracy of drawing DA204 Sections GG and HH. As noted by the Crozier report the site has a cross fall across its frontage from east to west but also a fall from the southeastern corner to the northwestern corner of 3.17m. Very limited data is provided in the application site survey in terms of site spot levels but the sections GG and HH despite being approximately 8m apart indicate an almost consistent boundary height and consistent floor level height to our dwelling. This is not correct and is obvious to a casual observer. Drawing DA102 accurately shows our floor plan and correctly notes a distinct difference in floor levels between our family/dining room and living room with separate and distinct courtyard areas appended to each of these spaces. The floorplan DA 102 omits the presence of a full height sliding doorway at the northeastern corner of our family/dining wall and incorrectly indicates this as solid wall. This is incorrect. The section drawings GG and HH incorrectly indicate our floor heights as being the same and are simply incorrect. In the absence of detailed spot levels along the common boundary I doubt the accuracy of Section HH and would question how the building height plane indicated could be correct. In any event the level of our dining room/family room and associated courtyard is some 1400mm lower than our living room and section HH is incorrect and misleading in its depiction of the relationship to our property.

The ground floor level of proposed Unit 5 (RL 18.80) is some 1.5m higher than the ground level at the common boundary adjacent to our dwelling and is roughly equivalent to the top of the existing boundary fence. It is not clear from the drawings or the landscape drawing whether this fence is to be retained or relaced? However, this relationship is distinctly different to that established between the existing dwellings across this boundary. The first floor of proposed unit 5 (RL 22.28) is approximately 5.2 above the level of our rear courtyard. This relationship provides a direct and unimpeded view from the windows of proposed bedrooms 2 and 3 of unit 5 across the common boundary into our courtyard spaces and the windows to our dining room. The same outcome is provided for from the windows of the proposed dining and living room. This is not an appropriate

relationship across the common boundary to maintain aural and visual privacy and the impact is unacceptable.

The finished ground floor level of units 5 and 6 contrasts with the floor levels of the adjacent units at 28 – 30, 24-26, 22 -24 and 18-22 Golf Ave which have all benched these rear apartments into the exiting ground level. It is unclear why this approach has not been adopted by the current proposal particularly given the very gentle grades proposed within driveway to the basement level. There is no justification for the rear units to sit some 800mm above existing ground level and the outcome results in units that dominate the privacy of their neighbouring units. The arrangement contrasts with the arrangement of units generally in this section of Golf Ave and results in a building that is dominant in a streetscape setting and more particularly to its adjacent development at 28-30 Golf Ave.

There is no indication on the drawings whether external clothes drying areas are proposed despite external access to laundries and no detail or explanation of why external rainwater tanks are proposed on the common boundary and not adjacent to the external wall of the building. There is no indication of the height of these tanks in relation to the boundary fences and no detail on how these tanks are to be connected to the stormwater system. These details should be clarified.

3. Basement

The quantum of excavation proposed by the basement is not explained by the details of the application. There is no explanation for the proposed additional floor of excavation to provide a body corporate meeting room and battery room. Where does the requirement for a body corporate meeting room to facilitate 6 apartments come from? It seems excessive and unnecessary. As adjoining owners our consideration is to minimise the quantum of excavation to minimise both the disturbance arising from construction and risk arising from this activity not to mention the principles of environmental sustainability. It is not enough to propose that because it can be done it should be done. What is proposed is contrary to the outcomes required by B8.1 of Pittwater 21 DCP that site disturbance be minimised.

Excavation into the front and rear building lines as proposed is contrary to D9.6 and D9.7 of Pittwater DCP 21 and to the outcome sought of providing for deep soils planting to enhance amenity between established residential sites. These breaches of the building lines are not consistent with the nature of development on adjoining sites and accordingly are inconsistent with the established character of the locality. The additional storage spaces associated with the excavation into these building lines is excessive and unnecessary.

4. Entry Detail and Waste Storage Room

The character of Golf Ave is established by a consistent and landscaped front building setback. This site is an infill site and is narrow in comparison to neighbouring development. The proposal provided for 11m of the 19m frontage to be developed by buildings, hard surfacing and driveway with a restricted planting regime caused by the intrusion of the basement beneath the front building setback. This outcome is inconsistent with the established streetscape and is objected to. The provision of a waste store room within the basement accessed via the driveway would be consistent with the arrangements on adjoining sites.

Ross and Colleen Fleming