From Bob Story: DA 2023/1382

1: Broadcrest's Waste Water Report marked boundaries that were 6 metres in favour of the 5 Portions.

2: This resulted in a distance from EMA (absorption pit) being wrongly put at 11 meters from boundary of 3 Portions.

3: Broadcrest amended the report, to correct boundary positions in 3 and 5 Portions.

4. This resulted in a change in distance from 11 metres to 6.2 meters.

5: Location of House Plan on Broadcrest plan Appendix 1 is out of position from current Leplastrier drawings and 5 meters.

6: Neither the Broadcrest's or Leplastrier's plans have dimensions that location the house position to the boundaries of 3 and 6 Portions.

7: By scaling (not good practice) the distance from the EMA to 3 Portions, resulted in a figure of 5.4 meters.

8: EMA is drawn between 2 existing sandstone walls that which meant there was finally an accurate point of reference from which to take accurate measurements and positively locate the pit.

9: There is a surveyor's peg on the nor'eastern rear corner of 3 Portions and 5 Portions which is an inarguable datum point.

10: From site measurements, the distance from the EMA is therefore able to be correctly measured at 4.8 meters.

11: The fall in level from the EMA to 3 Portions boundary, is approximately 3 meters. This is not level land as claimed, but instead steeply sloping.

12: The minimum distance from EMA to site to as stated in Table 2.17 is 6 meters for a level site and 12 meters for a downward sloping site.

13: There can be no justification for the 4.8 measurement for the EMA site to 3 Portions boundary, to be approved.

14: The long term seepage or failure in the pressurized pipe system would not adversely affect 5 Portions. All the sewerage effluent would flow down to 3 Portions.

15: The EMA will be in full shadow from the house for 9 months of the year.

16: If there is any doubt about the unacceptable location of the EMA, we assume that a site inspection would be made by the appropriate council officer.