

---

**From:** DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au  
**Sent:** 25/11/2022 9:40:08 AM  
**To:** DA Submission Mailbox  
**Subject:** TRIMMED: Online Submission

25/11/2022

MR Ryan King  
177 - 179B Seaforth CRES  
Seaforth NSW 2092  
[REDACTED]

**RE: DA2022/1848 - 173 A Seaforth Crescent SEAFORTH NSW 2092**

25 November 2022  
Candice Huang and Ryan King  
177 Seaforth Cr, Seaforth

Northern Beaches Council  
Manly NSW 1655

Re DA No. 2022/1848 Letter of Objection  
173A Seaforth Cr, Seaforth

Dear Sir/Madam,

My brother and I own the adjoining property beside the Hill property on the east side being 177 Seaforth Cr. We note the earlier DA2021/2463 was withdrawn and replaced with the current DA2022/1848

We have major concerns after reviewing the drawings and reading the environmental report for what appears to be a majority rebuild of the existing house

A serious issue for us is the closeness to our property without consideration to minimum separation distances. On the south-east end of the house the room noted Laundry is built against our boundary with the gutter overhanging in our property. No approval has been requested or given for this encroachment. We note that this existing room is in an extremely dilapidated state and fails to meet minimum building requirements with regard to footings, structural integrity and pest proofing so we assume it would need to be demolished and rebuild to meet current regulations. We also assume that this was originally illegally built. Now would be the time to remove it completely. (We also note that the Laundry and Rumpus amazingly encroach on the southern boundary into the adjoining property 173 by what looks to be nearly a metre. How could a new development encroach on a neighbour's land without permission?) The proposal places the majority of the proposed house at 900mm from our boundary with the roof overhang close to our property. Noting there is more than 4 to 7 metres on the west side why not move the extension to cover some of that area allowing near compliance on east and west side boundaries. Considering the approx 7m worst case wall height the minimum setback distance from our boundary required is 2.3m and not 900mm as proposed. When reading the SEE report by Vaughan Milligan Development Consulting it states the wall height "approx

4.5m". Is this an attempt to mislead council and neighbours when the actual wall height is from 4.5m up to 7m. We also bring attention to the reports statement on Compliance "Yes - on merit". Could the author or property owner explain to us on what merit this acceptability has been based upon.

Since our block is designated within a fire zone this house presents a major fire risk to us. The drawings do not show fireproofing to minimum fire rating and being so close to and on our boundary it would need to be constructed in accordance with BCA, and certainly a level up from proposed timber construction.

We note and appreciate the reduction in overall build height although we raise concerns about the validity of the methodology used with on-site RL's to achieve the on-drawing stated height of 8.5m

We are unable to see any report for landscaping to soften the development and provide some privacy to our property. The future approved development for our site allows for the removal of existing side shrubs which will fully expose the proposed on-boundary development

Parking does not appear to have been considered. A 4-bedroom house surely needs more than 1 car space as is currently provided. With street parking limited and on a dangerous corner including a bus stop zone we feel any redevelopment proposal should provide at least 2 off-street parking spaces

As submitted and without considerable review in the placement of the proposed building along with required off street parking we do not accept this proposal in its current form.

Yours faithfully,  
Candice Huang and Ryan King