
Sent: 4/11/2019 4:37:24 PM
Subject: Objection re DA2019/1111 - 135 Seaforth Crescent, Seaforth
Attachments: 0030-A1219-ObjectionLetterBabcock 4.11.19.pdf;

Hi Adam

Please find attached objection to DA2019/1111 for above address.

Please call if you have any questions.

Regards

Charles Zhang

enc: 0030-A1219-ObjectionLetterBabcock 4.11.19.pdf

M H D P ARCHITECTS

Level 2, 271 Alfred Street North
NORTH SYDNEY NSW 2060

(t) 9955 5608

(f) 9955 5063

(e) architects@mhdpc.com.au

(w) www.mhdpc.com.au

Mark Hurcum : Reg. No. 5605

The contents of this email (including any attachments) are privileged, confidential and for use by the intended recipient only. If you receive this email in error, please notify us and remove it from your system. We have taken precautions to minimise the risk of transmitting software viruses but advise you to conduct your own checks. We do not accept any liability for loss or damage caused by software viruses.

04 November 2019

Mr A Croft
Northern Beaches Council
1 Belgrave Street
MANLY NSW 2095

Dear Adam

Re: Objection to DA2019/1111 – 135 Seaforth Crescent, Seaforth

We write on behalf of the owner of 141A and 141 Seaforth Crescent, Seaforth objecting most strongly to the above DA.

The proposed swimming pool and deck structures have considerable bulk and scale, privacy and environmental impact.

The side height envelope is clearly non-compliant. The assertion that “the landscape works will provide privacy” is delusional at best, with a structure over 6.5 metres over the ground and a setback of 1.5 metres the proposed hedge will not have enough room to establish and in any case would take years to grow into effect.

The submitted report states that “decks have screening to provide privacy for occupants that use the inclinor”. However, the pool and decks have no privacy screening to the north and west despite significant height and minimal setback. These proposed decks are higher out of the ground than would be the top level of a two to three storey house, as the eye height of an average person is a further 1.5m higher than the deck level. For such a development Council would require obscure or screened windows. The proposal allows overlooking from the structure and pool.

Manly DCP has a control requiring pools be built on or in ground and not more than 1m above natural ground level, with consideration given for elevated pools that do not detract from amenity or character of neighbourhoods, and with sufficient setbacks. With a height of 6.5m and 1.5m setback, the pool clearly does not comply with any of the controls.

The owners of this property have purchased a steep site and they have proposed this development to “ensure a high quality of user amenity” by ignoring the site constraints and impact on neighbours and environment.

Environmentally this proposal removes five trees and substantially alters the soft landscape area and runoff characteristics of a steep site. The large shadow cast will impact flora and fauna habitat. The species which will grow in this shade will be extremely limited.



The owners have a right to a pool but the design should respect the topography more. There are clearly better, more balanced design alternatives available. The pool should run laterally across the site with a longer stair for access so that the pool is only marginally out of the ground and commensurate with the setbacks allowing screening.

In summary the visual and privacy impacts created for adjoining neighbours is unacceptable and we ask that Council refuse this application or request a resubmission.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Charles Zhang".

CHARLES ZHANG