Sent: 26/01/2020 3:42:50 PM

Subject: Submission re DA2019/1436 Construction of two two storey dwellings with

detatched Granny Flat on two existing

Stan Walters <stanwalters7947@gmail.com> 2:11 PM (1 hour ago)

to council

Concerns and Reasons for each concern expressed

- (A) Inaccuracies in the submitted DA's depiction of the boundary fence and buildings. [I] The depiction of the boundary paling fencing is of a straight-line boundary of the paling fence between Lot 8 97 Waterview Street and 101 Watervielw Street. In reality there are 5 panels of the paling fence's NE which require realignment for this to become an accurate depiction of an otherwise deflection from a straight line of some 15 degrees (my measurement). This seems to be easily rectified by following a string line with replacement fencing.
- [ii] The same fencing ie delineating nos 97 and 101boundary is depicted **on the survey submitted lot plans showing** proposed and existing residences as paralleling both buildings. This depiction is erroneous. The residence on 101 Waterview Street having been built in, or soon after 1945 has a skewed siting to the boundaries of the allotment and diverges from the surveyed boundary by 12 to 15 degrees. This would seem to be of little consequence were it not for
- B. The distance off of the Granny Flat's NE wall alignment to the boundary fence is shown as 1.04 m but because of the skewed alignment of my existing residence the same boundary to the rear SE corner of the residence at 101 Waterview Street is 90 mm thus the distance between the Granny Flat and the 101 Warerview residence is 1.94 m which seems to encroach on what seems to be a council requirement of a minimum distance between residential buildings. Adjustment should be easily effected by a lateral shift of the Lot 8 Granny Flat to allow the council dictated minimum space at least between the proposed and existing residences. This suggest realignment of the Granny Flat could lead to the third objection I have in that
- C, **The set back of the Granny Flat's NE wall** to the boundary **is substantially less** than that of the two storey residence which fronts the footprint made by the two proposed residences. I can only assume that the proposed applications of both buildings on Lot 8 conform to Council's minimum but suggest that the slight lateral relocation of the Granny Flat could be easily done to comply with Council's minimum requirement and simultaneously bring about a less confronting ambience imposed by the current DA.
- D, The slope of the building site for the Granny Flat is shown as flat + or 100mm. This has been achieved by the current owners of two dubious earthmoving events. Essentially the first was by using earthmoving plant to substantially alter the site in relation to significant tree root removal and installing a substantial subterranean agricultural pipe drainage net which debouches at or towards the building site's paling fences. the second major earthwork was undertaken when a substantial private pool was excavated and constructed. This volume of substratum added to the original distribution and topped with topsoil, However to my knowledge no council-approved retaining walls were constructed and the entire backfill seems to be retained to a depth of 800 to 1 metre depth by a fence that now provides, less than adequately, the privacy that was so fundamentally and desperately sought by the owner prior to the paling fences' construction. As such the now ageing palings, other than the random offcuts of cladding (fibro??), are all that serve to retain a potentially mobile metre depth of inadequately drained soil.
- E, The ugly, and no doubt illegally sited, garden shed which the current owner considers as occupying what he previously claimed to be his back yard (ie to the north od his existing two

storey building **must be removed**. It is sited adjacent to the front brick fence of the existing property at its NW corner.

Robert S. Walters 101 Waterview Street, Mona Vale 2103