
From: DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au
Sent: 4/12/2022 10:25:12 AM
To: DA Submission Mailbox
Subject: Online Submission

04/12/2022

MRS Hazel Sellin
- 1A Eileen ST
North Balgowlah NSW 2093
[REDACTED]

RE: DA2022/1896 - 47 Woodbine Street NORTH BALGOWLAH NSW 2093

Thank you for providing the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed development at 47 Woodbine Street, North Balgowlah.

I reside at 1A Eileen Street, on the southern boundary of the proposed development.

This letter details my objections to the proposed development.

The proposal lacks adequate details to make an assessment, contains non-compliances with relevant codes, and has a number of adverse impacts on my property. I object to the proposed development for the following reasons.

1. The proposed carport is located on the southern boundary and does not comply with the minimum 900mm side setback requirement.
2. The proposed location of the carport will have a negative impact on my property in terms of solar access and ventilation due to the height of the carport and proximity to the boundary.
3. The proposed placement of the carport is close to the boundary and creates a 1.5 metre height difference from the floor of the carport to my garden. As an indication of the level of risk, AS2890.1(2004) states that safety barriers should be provided where the drop exceeds 0.6 metres. As there is no indication of a safety barrier, and no detail as to whether the fire rated wall is either crash rated or would not create a falling debris hazard itself if struck, the positioning creates an unacceptable risk from an errant vehicle to my property and myself in my garden or the living room and kitchen adjacent to the common boundary.
4. There is reference to a fire-rated wall to be built along the southern boundary but there is a lack of detail with regard to location, alignment and height in relation to the existing fencing. Construction of a solid fire-rated wall on this boundary would significantly impact solar access and ventilation onto my property. I also note that as per DCP 4.1.6.1 b) ii) that carports must be open on both sides as well as the front. I also note that walls built on a boundary must not exceed 35% of the length of that boundary as per CI 4.1.4.3 b) iv).
5. The relocation of the car space towards the boundary, addition of material to raise the ground level of the boundary, and construction of a fire rated wall would create additional loads on the ground. There is no indication whether or not the geotechnical effects of this have been

assessed. I am concerned that the retaining wall at the boundary has not been adequately structural designed, and that the additional loading could adversely affect a lower level retaining wall within my property leading to premature or catastrophic failure.

6. There is no indication that storm-water run off has been assessed. The proposed development appears to allow runoff beneath the structure across bare earth. That could result in soil erosion with sediment carrying into drains within the property, into my property and the stormwater system. There is no indication whether the over land flow paths will be altered.

7. It appears that bare earth beneath the structure could be blown by prevailing winds, creating dust in the surrounding area. There is no indication that dust would be suppressed or contained.

8. The proposed absorption pit is placed where it would likely increase seepage into my property, taking away amenity and potentially creating health risks associated with mould and similar. It could also prematurely degrade a timber retaining wall in my property from accelerated rot.

9. The drawings do not satisfactorily overlay the existing building onto the proposed development making it difficult for neighbours to appreciate the visual and spatial impact of the new house.

I look forward to receiving your advice on your determination of the development application.

Kind Regards,
Hazel Sellin