
Sent: 24/01/2020 1:19:58 PM
Subject: Online Submission

24/01/2020

MR Antony Fletcher
1 Mallowa RD
Duffys Forest NSW 2084
tdsfletcher@gmail.com

RE: DA2019/1378 - 79 Kumarna Street DUFFYS FOREST NSW 2084

Antony and Dominique Fletcher
1 Mallowa Road
Duffys Forest

Northern Beaches Council

RE Da 2019/1378 - 79 Kumarna Street Duffys Forest

We object to various aspects of the development planned at 79 Kumara St as listed below

1. The location of the sewerage treatment system is in very close proximity to our Northern boundary.

We are concerned about additional waterlogging and contaminated runoff draining onto our property and in particular our vegetable gardens. Already in times of heavy rain the paddocks on our northern boundary become waterlogged due to shallow nature of the soil and presence of underground water streams. For the last 8 years we have managed our property on a rotating/resting paddock system following the Regenerative Agriculture philosophy. No pesticides, herbicides or chemical fertilisers or contaminants have been used. The result has been an abundance of biodiversity in our grasses, less weeds, and native trees and bushes are growing back. Extra run off from the AWTS will potentially disrupt this property management method.

The AWTS and associated Absorption Disposal Bed is located 12.5 metres from our boundary and any overflows etc will drain directly down slope into our property. Any mechanical and electrical failures or overloading failures of the system will directly impact our property.

With this in mind we suggest locating the AWTS and Absorption Disposal Bed on the northern side of the proposed new dwelling and swimming pool near the proposed Absorption Disposal Bed for the swimming pool. In this location any drainage overflows will discharge onto the large lower horse paddocks to the north and the stables and arena effluent will not need to be pumped to the AWTS. (see attached report by Paul Carrick and Associates).

2. The location and height of the very large equestrian arena and stables complex. This structure is 102metres long by 22metres wide. The height of the roof appears to be 7.4metres but its height above natural ground level is not indicated on the plans. It is located 10 metres from our and the neighbours boundaries on two sides. It will be visually very intrusive. We suggest that it be relocated further away from the neighbouring properties and that all the mature trees in that area be retained as screening.

3. We are also concerned about being visually overlooked by the new house and garage. To this end we suggest that council request the preservation of existing mature trees and the planting of privacy screening vegetation along our common boundary.

4. We have been considering putting in a bore to supplement our water supply during periods of droughts and for bushfire defence. Our bore water consultant has suggested that the best location is in the paddock immediately adjacent to and downslope from the proposed AWTs and Absorption Disposal Bed. Consequently the proposed AWTs and Disposal Bed could potentially be a contamination source for our bore water supply as defined by the Water Sharing Plan for the Greater Metropolitan Region Ground Water Sources 2011.

Yours faithfully

Dominique and Tony Fletcher

See attached Waste Water report from Paul Carrick & Associates Pty. Ltd.

PAUL CARRICK
& ASSOCIATES PTY LTD

Building Designers
ABN 14 003 635 907
Mobile 04122 41514
PO Box 117 Seaforth NSW 2092
Email pcadesign@ozemail.com.au

21.12.2019

The Manager
Northern Beaches Council

Re DA 2019 / 1378.79
79 Kumarna Street, Duffys Forest
New dwelling
Objection from 1 Mallowa Road

The owners of 1 Mallowa Road, Dominique and Anthony Fletcher, have asked me to act on their behalf in relation to this proposed development, located on their northern rear boundary.

We have viewed the plans and object to the placement of the AWT System located 12.5m from the properties southern boundary.

We seek to have this AWTs and Absorption Disposal Bed relocated to the northern side of the proposed dwelling and swimming pool near the proposed Absorption Disposal Trench for the swimming pool.

The observations in supporting a northern placement are -

1. The AWTs and Absorption Disposal Bed sit on top of a ridge with a slope downhill between 1 in 8 to 1 in 10 approx. and soil type consistent throughout. The applicant Waste Water Management Report 1.10 "Site Constraints" states that "sampling for effluent design purposes implies a relatively consistent soil profile across the development precinct".
2. The land to the north is approx. 80m wide by 40m deep sloping downhill
3. The land to the south is approx. 50m wide by 12.5m deep sloping downhill
4. A plant located on the north side would mean treated effluent discharge would absorb wholly within the pertaining property without effecting neighbouring properties.
5. The northern paddocks or absorption area abut a public road and not neighbouring residences.
6. The discharge from the stables and arena would flow directly into the relocated AWTs and not need to be pumped with a 2m lift as the proposed plan.
7. Any breakdown, rupture or escape would mean flow away from the southern residences and a 'fail safe' scenario.
8. Any noise from pumps or blowers or any odour or aerosol contaminants in breakdown mode would be located further away from residences.
9. In the event of a breakdown a plant located in the northern front of the residence would be more likely observed and thus repaired.
10. A resultant breakdown would more likely be noticed and repaired if catchment was wholly within the property
11. This plant relies on electrical and mechanical supply and service and is not infallible.

Common causes of failure are -

Power disruption/or backup generator failure
Stormwater ingress
Low load resulting in stagnation and low treatment
Poor service and maintenance
Breakdown of plant - UV, pumps and blowers

There are no second-tier standby units.

12. Location of the AWTs and Absorption Disposal Bed on the southern boundary precludes my client from installing a bore water supply in future if required (Schedule 1A of the "Water Sharing Plan for the Greater Metropolitan Region Ground Water Services 2011) as it would be regarded as a contaminant source.

Conclusion

As plant failure can cause overflow of untreated blackwater, we object to the location of the AWTs and Absorption Disposal Bed on the southern boundary. We ask that AWT, UV treatment and Absorption Disposal Bed be located on the north side so all discharge remains wholly within the property and does not effect neighbouring properties.

Regards

Paul Carrick