
From: John Lawson
Sent: 10/02/2025 8:05:47 PM
To: Council Northernbeaches Mailbox
Cc: Phillip Lane
Subject: TRIMMED: Mod2024-0694 to DA2023-1023 - Submission re Arborists Report and Engineering Plans
Attachments: 250210 Additional Submission re Mod2024-0694 to DA2023-1023 - Concrete Retaining Wall .pdf;

Good afternoon – please see attached our Additional Submission re the referenced Application.

I could not upload via the portal so have forwarded via email- thank you

Kind regards

John Lawson

Project Manager

a: U30, 5 Ponderosa Pde, Warriewood NSW 2102

t: 02 9979 5670

w: [tecorp.com.au](https://www.tecorp.com.au)

tecorp

ARCHITECTURAL HOMES | REMEDIAL REPAIRS | COMMERCIAL WORKS



Disclaimer - This message and any attachments are confidential and may contain privileged information intended only for the use of the addressee named above. If you are not the intended recipient of this message you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this message is prohibited. If you have received this message in error please notify Tecorp Pty Ltd immediately by return email. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Tecorp Pty Ltd.

SECTION 455 MODIFICATIONS - Mod 2024/0694 (Submitted 02/01/2025)

ADDITIONAL SUBMISSION IN REGARD TO MODIFICATION OF DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION DA2023/1023 - 32 LOBLAY CRESCENT BILGOLA PLATEAU

Description: Alterations and additions to a dwelling house including retaining walls

ATTENTION: The assigned Town Planning Officer – Mr. Phil Lane

Please see the following information/ response to the Treeism Arborist Report response dated 24th January 2025 and the Engineering Plans provided by NTMA Consulting Rev. C dated 20-11-2025 re this Modification Application as detailed on the Councils website.

1. Alignment of Retaining Wall near Tree1 – I, and also the Applicants Arborist note that the proposed alignment as shown in the NTMA Engineering drawings do not agree with the approved DA plans of Jo Willmore Designs. There is NO 500mm offset around Tree 1 detailed to protect the tree roots as required as per the approved DA conditions.
2. I further note that within the Treeism report it states that the applicant has stated (obviously to Treeism) *“we can also put compressible material over any of the viburnum tree roots, to allow for movement underneath the concrete wall as well, something we couldn’t do with the sandstone.... Any lintel beams can be put in as required (Note in relation to the SRZ of Tree 1) but that is when we will need your (Project Arborist) input to advise what is necessary once it has been uncovered”*.

Unfortunately, I note that this is not stated for the Viburnum tree roots. I also note that NO Engineering details have been provided of any proposed lintel beams or what constitutes compressible materials – this should be detailed/ designed / stated if it is proposed as a method of protecting tree roots particularly after my last submission regarding an attempt to poison these trees.

3. I note from the Figure 1 referenced within the Arborist report (Sandstone Section B retaining wall) that a dish drain was/ is proposed at the rear of the sandstone block wall – I note that none is in existence and that the wall up to Chainage 14.7 has ALREADY BEEN CONSTRUCTED. I also note that the proposed concrete retaining wall also requires a dish drain to divert surface water but no design/ drawings exists as to how/ where the stormwater is collected and drained to.
4. I further note that Engineering Drawing Elevation and Section P1 from NTMA Consulting – Typ./ Retaining Wall RW Section, proposed the installation of a 90mm Agricultural drain line at the rear of the proposed concrete wall. The levels of this drainage line (as I previously highlighted in an earlier submission) WILL NOT allow for a connection to the existing internal drainage stormwater lines within the #32 property – it is too low. The only feasible way of draining this line is to construct a pump out pit with a pump within the same and an auto float switch. I note that no such pump out pit is proposed NOR are there any design of a drainage line extension or discharge location levels / detailed on the Engineering plans. We do not wish

this drainage line to discharge onto our property. This needs to be designed / planned PRIOR to any construction approval/ commencement.

5. The point above – Point 5 is extremely critical as the proposed Concrete retaining wall is not a cantilever type wall, but solely relies on gravity and the removal of any subsurface water as there is NO tie in/ bonding between the wall and the proposed road base footing. It is incumbent that this wall has the designed ag drain as well as the membrane protection AND the free draining backfill behind the wall in place/ constructed correctly or it will prove to have a lack of stability. IF this wall is approved it is incumbent that a series of inspections occur by the Design Engineer to ENSURE that the required design scopes/ procedures are implemented. I would point out the obvious in that any footing of the retaining wall cannot be placed on our property.

As a consequence of this and further to our earlier submissions we would request that in addition to the objections/ requirements in our earlier submissions the following additional items occur in the evaluation of this Modified DA submission.

1. ***We would request a Construction procedure / Methodology be provided to detail how the roots of the Viburnum tress will be least affected as per our previous comments re “intel beam and compressible materials”***
2. ***The proposed retaining wall alignment be relocated back from the property boundary on #32/ #34 by a minimum 500mm around the Tree in the corner (Tree 1) as per the original approved alignment – the 500mm setback already in place as per the DA conditions of the Bloodwood Gum tree - unlike the lodged Engineering plans.***
3. ***Enforcement of the provision that a Level 5 Arborist to be “on site” at all times whilst excavation is occurring to control any effects on the Viburnum trees / root structures & The Tree 1 Bloodwood tree – to confirm that tree roots are not affected and any “lintels beam/ compressible materials” as per the Applicants conversation with their Arborist have in fact been placed and further that the proposed Retaining Wall Section is actually constructed as designed. Regular mandated inspections by the Engineer to also confirm the construction/ design procedures are implemented.***
4. ***Design details re “intel beams and compressible materials” to tree root locations where required be provided before any approvals are in place.***
5. ***Drainage design of the ag drain to the rear of the retaining wall and collection of the designed dish drains including discharge locations be provided prior to any possible approval.***

Many thanks for your time in reading our additional submission and we would request that this be considered in your determination please.

Regards,

Helen Lawson

John Lawson B.E. Civil/ Project & WHS Manager/ Estimator

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'J. Lawson', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

34 Loblay Crescent, Bilgola Plateau