Sent: 4/05/2020 1:58:11 PM

Subject: Submission on DA2020/0285 11 Bungaloe Avenue, Balgowlah Heights

Attachments: Submission_DA20200285 .pdf;

Please find attached our Submission in response to DA2020/0285 for alternations and additions to a dwelling house including swimming pool at 11 Bungaloe Avenue, Balgowlah Heights .

Please feel free to contact us if you wish to discuss further.

Michael and Robyn Overall 13 Bungaloe Avenue Balgowalah Heights

Phone: 99482695; Mobiles: 0400500969 (Michael); 0405041728 (Robyn)

Emails: overmi10@bigpond.net.au (Michael); robyn.overall@sydney.edu.au (Robyn)

SUBMISSION ON DA2020/0285

Lot 29 DP 11280 11 Bungaloe Avenue, Balgowlah Hts Alterations and additions to dwelling house including swimming pool

Submission Date: 4 May 2020

Submission from Michael and Robyn Overall (13 Bungaloe Ave, Balgowlah Hts)

We, the occupants of 13 Bungaloe Avenue (Balgowlah Heights), strongly object to the DA proposal for 11 Bungaloe Avenue due to its impact on the infrastructure, landscaping, amenity and potential drainage flows onto and around our site.

Our main objections can be redressed by moving the development of the proposed retaining wall on the Northern side of the pool one metre away from our common boundary; foreshortening the need for the proposed Western side pool retaining wall by one metre away from our common boundary; & by the design & application of an appropriate Drainage Plan.

We contend that to not change the proposed location of the retaining walls, would make it impossible for the Development Applicant, Designer or Builder to comply with the recommendations in the Geotechnical Investigation, Council Guidelines and 'good engineering and building principles'. We contend that the inevitable damage to our property from the implementation of the current proposal would not be a result of a 'building accident'. Rather a direct result of a technical design flaw calling for the building of a wall flush with the boundary & the subsequent need to excavate behind it (to facilitate construction), the need for space to put in place new boundary fence postings & to put in place appropriate 'back of wall' drainage. All of which would have to take place on our property, impacting on our existing infrastructure.

One might perceive that it would be possible for us to compromise and minimise the impact of our objections to the proposed build on a 'make good' basis - if we had simple gardens, landscaping or lawns in place against our common boundary. This is not the case - our existing infrastructure is not that simple and it's location, which has been in place for 30 years, has not been fully taken into account by the DA, Plans, Geotechnical Investigation or Reports put to Council (as the proponents appear not have been aware of their existence).

Our specific objections relate to:

1) Positioning & location of the proposed retaining walls around the pool.

The DA calls for a swimming pool retaining wall along our adjoining boundary of up to 2 metres in height. The location of such a wall in such a position, by the designer's own admission, anticipates excavation and drainage works on our property. An absolute minimum of 30cm of excavation, based on any reasonable estimate of practicalities, would be required on our property to enable this to occur. Such excavation & drainage works would impact on gas and drainage pipes, several retaining walls, a garden brick stairway, paving, garden landscaping and other infrastructure on our property.

2) Failure to address technical & structural issues in the Design Plan for the retaining walls and garden boxes around the pool.

. Retaining Walls

By SPACE Landscapes Design's admission, the step-design and the positioning of the retaining wall fail to take into account the landfall and infrastructure on our property along the common boundary (with no surveying or site visit having been done on our property before submission of the plans). We have highlighted some of the problems in the DA plans to the owners and the design company - including circling issues on their plans & forwarding copies of same electronically with comments (see attachment). Issues include mismatching of landfalls and hence misspecification of the need for retaining wall above and below ground level. As the DA plans are vague & fail to take into account the landfall and infrastructure on our property, we have not been exhaustive in listing our specific objections and feel that we should not have to be. We would be happy to meet, discuss & highlight with Council Planners our objections on the DA plans at an agreed time, on or offsite.

. Garden Boxes

Similarly, the plans for the pool-side garden boxes fail to take into account landfall and infrastructure differences between the two sites and therefore mis-specify walling and drainage requirements.

3) Under-estimation of drainage issues, Lack of a proposed Drainage Plan & Lack of proposed on-site space along the Northern Boundary (11 Bungaloe Avenue side) for implementation of any Drainage Plans developed at a later date.

We are surprised to note that the DA application describes drainage issues as 'minor'-especially as the plans call for a new double garage, 45 cubic meters of excavation, installation of retaining walls, consideration of 'back wall drainage', drainage of above ground garden beds, pool overflow & existing run-off issues. All of which will be expected to flow into the existing drainage system.

- . The DA as planned, implies the placement of "back of wall" drainage systems on our property as a result of the proposed placement of the N-side pool retaining wall flush with the boundary.
- . the DA as planned, without an appropriate 'back of wall' drainage system would allow pooling of water behind the W-side retaining wall with potential side-ways run-off.

On all accounts, we call for the specification and implementation of an appropriate Drainage Plan.

4) Failure to allow sufficient on-site space for the appropriate maintenance of a boundary fence, operating as a common pool fence between 2 swimming pools.

We call for the provision of sufficient on-site space for the appropriate maintenance of the proposed 2-sided paling fence, from the applicant's side. We believe that the proposed 2-metre direct drop, flush below the proposed new 2 metre fence, does not allow for this.

5) Lack of shower guard to protect common boundary fence.

We call for a shower guard to be installed, adjacent to the proposed outdoor shower, to protect the common boundary fence from water damage.

6) Mitigation of the impact of floodlighting.

We call for the instillation of any proposed, external lights as down lights, in order to limit the floodlighting of our back yard and rear rooms. [There have been similar issues arising from the use of flood lights on the neighbour's existing garage.]

7) Amenity impact of the DA on a proposed development of a double garage on-site 13 Bungaloe Ave.

For some time now we have been anticipating placing a double garage on our block, 1 to 2 meters in from our southern boundary, with a similar aspect to the one proposed for 11 Bungaloe Avenue. We feel that it would be inappropriate if the implementation of the neighbour's proposal limited the amenity of our block and precluded us from doing a similar garage development to theirs because of the positioning of the pool and it's retaining walls so close to our boundary.

8) Excavation near the boundary fence

We note that at point 13, the Geotechnical Investigation calls for "the N common boundary fence to be braced before excavations commence'. This would be a next to meaningless act as the existing DA would require excavation of the fence's foundations in order to place the N pool retaining wall where proposed.

9) Impact of vibrations

We note that the Geotechnical Investigation does not take into account the impact of excavation vibrations on our existing retaining walls, infrastructure and paving in close proximity to the boundary. We call for the vibration impact to be mitigated by moving the requirement for the proposed excavation of up to 4 metres deep, one metre away from our common boundary.

We contend that the DA calls for development activity too tightly bound to site perimeters, thereby preventing the implementation of appropriate protective/boundary infrastructures on-site.

We call for

- . the DA plans to be amended to require the shifting of the proposed location of the North and Western poolside retaining walls;
- . the DA plans to specify exactly how far away from our common boundary each wall should be located in order to limit the planned impact of the DA on our site and it's amenity; and . a Drainage Plan be developed and implemented.

Yours sincerely,

Michael and Robyn Overall

Phone: 99482695. Mobiles: 0400500969 (Michael), 0405041728 (Robyn)

Emails: overmi10@bigpond.net.au; robyn.overall@sydney.edu.au

ATTACHMENT

Email and annotated plans sent to Jason Elboz Planner SPACE Landscape Designs

Subject: Comments on Proposed 11 Bungaloe Avenue Development

Date: Thursday, 16 April 2020 at 8:37:36 pm Australian Eastern Standard Time

From: Robyn Overall

To: jason@spacedesigns.com.au

CC: michael overall

Attachments: Annotated_plans.pdf

Hi Jason

Following our phone call yesterday, here are our concerns in email form with annotated plans as you requested.

1) Retaining walls where there is a difference in the land levels on either side of the boundary Can you confirm that retaining walls will be installed at all points where there is a height difference between our land and that in the proposed development?

• For example, the SITE PLAN/SITE ANALYSIS, the DEMOLITION & CUT AND FILL PLAN (Top View & Northern Elevation – BB View), ELEVATION/SECTIONS (Northern Elevation -BB View) and LANDSCAPE PLAN AND SPECIFICATIONS do not show retaining walls against our property where there is a difference in land levels. We have marked these locations (1) and (2)in red on the attached plans.

2) Drainage

Please confirm that adequate drainage will be installed to minimize water flow onto our property as a result of the proposed development of 11 Bungaloe Avenue:

For example:

- Adequate arrangements will be put in place to mitigate changes in the water flow in response to the installation of the various retaining walls, the underground pool and surrounds and increase in paved surface.
- Planter box on north side of pool needs to be constructed and drained to avoid water damage to the boundary fence and flow onto our property. The current plan does not specify a planter box side wall against our boundary ((2) on plans).

3) Protection of the boundary fence from the outdoor shower

Please confirm that the boundary fence will be protected from water damage from the outdoor shower by the installation of an appropriate barrier and that the shower stand will not be attached to the fence.

4) Retaining wall adjacent to common boundary

- We are confirming our understanding, as per the plans, that the retaining wall will be built on the property of 11 Bungaloe Avenue.
- We are concerned about the possibility of pooling of water behind the proposed retaining walls. Will the retaining wall be porous?

5) Position of boundary fence

We, in discussion with Grant and Bronwyn, have yet to agree on the positioning of the boundary fence and the potential need for additional space for fence construction between the boundary and the adjacent retaining wall.

Looking forward to hearing your responses. By the way, the Council has granted a 2 week extension for submissions.

All the best Robyn and Michael Overall 13 Bungaloe Ave Balgowlah Heights







