
From: DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au
Sent: 30/06/2022 10:19:14 AM
To: DA Submission Mailbox
Subject: Online Submission

30/06/2022

MRS Dena Oxborrow
136 Headland Road RD
North Curl Curl NSW 2099

RE: DA2022/0901 - 67 Quirk Street DEE WHY NSW 2099

Dena Oxborrow
136 Headland Road
North Curl Curl NSW 2099

To: Northern Beaches Council
PO Box 82
Manly NSW 1655

30 June 2022

Dear Mrs Young

DA 2022/0901 - 67 Quirk St, Dee Why

Thank you for your letter dated 15 June and the opportunity to make a submission.
Our submission relates to stormwater considerations.
We are the adjacent downstream neighbour.

1) Consideration of all available avenues regarding the stormwater

a) I do not believe that all avenues regarding the stormwater Drainage from low level properties have been exhaustively investigated and considered as outlined in the section 2.2 of Council's Stormwater Drainage from Low Level Properties Technical Specification.

Step 1: not available.

Step 2: Easement or use of on-site absorption system:

No serious attempts were made to find a formal drainage easement between the Owner of 67 Quirk St and us.

The option of an on-site absorption system did not seem to be considered.

Step 3: The use of charged line to drain roof runoff to the kerb and gutter system fronting the site or level spreader:

The use of a charged line to drain roof runoff to the kerb and gutter system did not seem to be considered.

The level spreader design, see comments below.

b) Council's engineering referral response agrees that the various stages for stormwater

drainage disposal assessment have not been considered and/or undertaken.

2) Proposed level spreader design

- a) All of the water run-off is proposed to be directed to the South end of 67 Quirk St, with minimal on-site detention, the result being that most of the stormwater from 67 Quirk St will flow fairly immediately to our property via the spreader proposed on stormwater plan D02.
- b) While there is a 'OSD basin' (on site detention) area marked on the stormwater plan D02, the system doesn't include much in the way of 'detention' tanks or pits, contrary to 'on-site detention' label. The stormwater plan D04 #1 (note there are two drawings labelled as D04) seems to show the only pits/tanks in that 'OSD basin area' as being the two vertical pits 450mm x 450mm and seemingly ~600mm deep. This seems to represent a 'detention' capacity in that area of less than a half cubic metre. Stormwater plan 1 claims OSD volume provided of 22,000l but it is unclear where this is located or what it comprises. Perhaps this includes rainwater tanks (which total 7500l, according to drawing D02), however in any event, those tanks are only collecting roof water, and roof space is not the majority of the rainfall catchment of the site. If the rainwater tanks are included in the OSD volume provided, they seem to have nothing to do with the 'OSD basin', since they are fed by the roof spaces, not by the OSD basin area, nor are they flowing to the OSD basin area in any meaningful way.
- c) A number of aspects of the stormwater plan seem to be conceptual only and/or 'to be assessed'. This leaves a lot of chance in achieving a competent outcome that does not adversely impact us. This is unacceptable.

3) Existing significant overland flow and nuisance flooding from 67 Quirk St. The proposed stormwater plans are worsening the adverse impact upon us by the proposed direction and concentration of the stormwater.

We are already experiencing significant overland flow, seepage and nuisance flooding from 67 Quirk St.

The proposed plans did not seem to address the existing drainage problems but even worsen the existing problems by reducing the available permeable spaces and bringing the stormwater around the granny flat and then disperse the stormwater with a 4m long level spreader, 3m away from our property.

However, the stormwater cannot be dispersed due to the existing retaining walls.

As a result, stormwater will build up behind the retaining boundary wall. The plans propose that the retaining boundary wall gets lowered so that the retaining wall can deal with the pressure of the trapped stormwater behind it. We are concerned that the boundary retaining wall could collapse and fall on us which is a health and safety concern.

We oppose to the lowering of the southern boundary retaining wall. We have privacy issues with 67 Quirk St looking into our bedrooms. Lowering this wall will make matters worse. In fact we would like that 1.5m to 2m high hedges are planted (from the existing ground level of approximately 58m AHD) along the southern boundary of 67 Quirk St to increase the privacy into our bedrooms.

The proposed plans do not fulfil the requirements of the Clause C4 "to reduce the risk of life and property from any flooding and groundwater damage."

4) DA application continued even that Council's Engineering Referral Response clearly states the DA application is unsupported.

Council's Engineering Referral Response clearly states that the proposal is unsupported due to assessments have not been undertaken and insufficient information has been provided.

We urge the council to reject this DA application in accordance with council's Engineering Referral Response and give the owner of 67 Quirk an opportunity to address the above-

mentioned issues and concerns.

Many thanks in advance for your consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Dena Oxborrow