

---

**Sent:** 25/01/2022 11:00:19 AM  
**Subject:** DA2021-2463  
**Attachments:** Huang re DA2021-2463.docx;

To whom it may concern

RE: DA2021-2463  
173A SEAFORTH CRES, SEAFORTH NSW 2092

Submission Attached

CANDICE HUANG and RYAN KING

24 January 2022

Candice Huang and Ryan King

177 Seaforth Cr, Seaforth

**Re DA No. 2021/2463**

173A Seaforth Cr, Seaforth

Dear Sir/Madam,

My brother and I own the adjoining property beside the Hill property

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 Study is built against our boundary with the gutter overhanging in our property. We note that this existing room is in an extremely dilapidated state and fails to meet minimum building requirements in regard to footings, structural integrity and pest proofing so we assume it would need to be demolished and rebuilt to meet current regulations. Now would be the time to remove it completely. (We also note that the Study 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 house less than 900mm from our boundary with the roof almost in our property (aside from the Study room which currently overhangs and we would expect to be completely removed). We feel the new house should maintain the existing house footprint on the east side. Noting there is more than 4 to 7 metres on the west side so why not move the extension to cover some of that area allowing compliance on east and west side boundaries. Considering the 6.5m wall height the minimum setback distance from our boundary required is 2.15m, not 1.5m and not less than 900mm as proposed

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 clause P2.3.1, and certainly a level up from proposed timber construction.

The ridge height will be higher than the existing roof by 2.1m and will exceed the 8.5m maximum allowed by more than 1.6m. The building height needs to comply with the appropriate LEP requirements.

We are unable to see any report for landscaping to soften the development and provide some privacy to our property. Are there any trees at risk? Presently there is some low-level landscaping provided on our property but considering this cover is mostly Oleander it will be removed in due course due to safety concerns. This will fully expose the new development hard against our boundary

Parking does not appear to have been considered. A 4-bedroom house surely needs more than 1 car space. 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 car spaces

As submitted and without considerable review we do not accept this proposal.

Yours faithfully,

Candice Huang and Ryan King