

---

**From:** DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au  
**Sent:** 28/05/2025 10:31:56 AM  
**To:** DA Submission Mailbox  
**Subject:** Online Submission

28/05/2025

MS Jacqueline Clinton  
15 / 34 - 36 Golf AVE  
Mona Vale NSW 2103

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

Re: DA2025/0447 at 32 Golf Avenue Mona Vale NSW 2103

We are writing to formally object to the re-revised proposed development plan for 32 Golf Avenue Mona Vale due to significant concerns regarding overshadowing, amenity and privacy impacts and violates the Pittwater 21 Development Control Plan. Our townhouse directly borders the proposed development on the western side of our property. We had already submitted our concerns regarding overshadowing, amenity, and privacy impacts with the first application for 6 apartments in two 2-storey buildings DA2024/0190. This current application for 11 apartments over 5 stories (as a roof top pool has now been added) doubles the building height which will have a considerable impact on our property at 34 Golf Avenue.

#### Solar Access

One of our primary concerns is the loss of sunlight due to the overshadowing effects of the new structure. The submitted view from the sun diagrams indicate that the NW façade of 34 Golf Ave does not receive mid-winter sun until approximately 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 and will allow no sun into our courtyard and living area and the rest of the block at 34 Golf Ave. Our townhouse is opposite the highest point of the proposed apartments, affecting us even greater. The Pittwater 21 DCP states "The main private open space of each dwelling and the main private open space of any adjoining dwellings are to receive a minimum of 3 hours of sunlight between 9am and 3pm on June 21st." We will not receive the minimum levels of direct sunlight during the required six hour period on the winter solstice. Planning laws in NSW require new apartment buildings to limit overshadowing of neighbouring buildings. Our property has always benefited from ample natural light, which is essential for our daily living and overall well-being. In the last three weeks we have been monitoring solar access at our property, and we will be significantly comprised with this medium density five storey building looming over us encroaching right up to our boundary, blocking the sun affecting not only our enjoyment of our home but impacting the energy efficiency of our property.

#### Boundary

According to the Pittwater 21 Development Control Plan (DCP) Boundary Setback control, there is a formula for calculating the minimum required setbacks for new Residential Flat Buildings based on their height. The Development Application (DA) submission indicates a

building height of 16.8m. This height necessitates a minimum side and rear boundary setback of 6.7m. However, the proposed buildings do not meet this requirement at either the side or rear boundaries, with proposed setbacks ranging from 3.0m to 6.0m. In addition, the street frontage of 19.81m wide is not equal or greater to one third of the length 70.41m. The excessive bulk and scale of the building on one of the narrowest parcels of land in this street results in clear non-compliance and adversely affecting us as adjoining property owners.

### Privacy

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 and this will greatly impact our privacy. Additionally, the increased building height, density and the side boundary of only 3.5 metres will have broader implications for our privacy. With the addition of the pool and outdoor area on the rooftop the residents will be able to see into our home and courtyard into what should be our private space.

### Entrance and Stairwell

The proposed side entrance to the building is directly opposite our kitchen and dining area. The distance from the entry stairs to our boundary is 2 metres which is not in compliance with Pittwater 21 Development Control Plan. There are 7 stairs to enter the property so once they reach the top stair, they will be above our fence line and will be able to see into our kitchen and living area and in clear breach of our privacy. The plans also show no privacy screen for the stairwell leading up to the top of the building, and we are concerned of hearing occupants and visitors coming and going at all hours and the light from the entrance and stairwell shining into our home.

### Parking

The basement carpark plans only indicates 2 visitor spaces, this development requires 4 visitor spaces. This will increase traffic and parking on Golf Avenue which is already under significant pressure from increased traffic and parking demands due to the new Mona Social venue, the revamped Golf Club, beachgoers, and overflow parking for the B1 bus service.

### Air Condition Units

On plan DA106 Revision "A" it shows ACU zone on both buildings, eight (8) on the front (South) building and four (4) on the rear (north) building. Our concern is the ACU's when operational, will generate noise levels that could become quite disruptive and impact our comfort and peace at home.

### Loss of View

We work from home and the height of the proposed development will mean we lose sight of the current landscape from our office/bedrooms that overlooks the treetops and mountains which is good for our wellbeing during the day and positives for any potential financial gain if we were to sell. With the proposed instead of seeing landscape we would see the building.

### Noise, Dust/Debris Mitigation

We both work from home and will be continually disrupted from noise, excavation, building works for the duration of the build. Will the developer erect screening, to an adequate level, prior to commencing demolition and construction that will be maintained during construction right through to completion to minimize dust and debris entering 34 Golf Avenue.

## Conclusion

The location of this proposed development is also deeply concerning. Golf Avenue is a dead-end cul-de-sac surrounded predominantly by two storey homes and this development is completely out of character with the existing street. As residents who walk this street daily, we frequently observe cars driving down the hill to the cul-de-sac, circling multiple times in search of parking. This creates a safety hazard for the many walkers, families, and young children in the area.

The parking situation is exacerbated by the limited capacity of the B1 car park at the end of Golf Ave. As the starting point for the B1 route, residents from as far as Palm Beach rely on this service, leading to overflow parking along Golf Avenue. Our roads are already congested, and just a few weeks ago, a pedestrian was seriously injured crossing Barrenjoey Road near Golf Avenue. Public transport options remain limited, and no additional infrastructure is being provided to support the increased density this development and others would bring.

In conclusion, I urge the council to reject this proposed development plan in its current form due to the detrimental effects it will have on our solar access, privacy and amenity. It is vital that we prioritize the well-being of our community and maintain the character of our neighbourhood.

Thank you for considering our objections. I hope that the council will take these concerns extremely seriously.

Grahame and Jacqui Clinton