



**BEECROFT
CHELTENHAM**
CIVIC TRUST INC
the voice of our community

The General Manager
Hornsby Shire Council

Attention James Farrington

Dear Sir

Section 96 DA/320/2015/A, 88 Malton Rd Beecroft

The Trust apologises for this late submission. We request that our comments are fully considered in the development approval process.

The Trust understands there are two issues that require resolution; the protection of the Blackbutt and the Rural Fire Service requirements .

1. Council, the owner of the Blackbutt and related vegetation in the road reserve, is requested to take a conservative position over how the young Blackbutt and the native plants should be protected. There has already been a significant loss of native vegetation in the road reserve as evidenced by the dead trees, so it is paramount that Council protect what is remaining. The Trust is concerned that 150 mm of no fines gravel under the concrete drive may not be adequate over time, as the tree grows. Further negotiations on this matter may be required.
2. The Trust understands that the Court is only focused on matters related to the front of the property and the road reserve. However the Trust strongly argues there is a clear nexus between the northern end and the southern end of the driveway. There is little benefit in addressing the northern section of the driveway if the rear of the driveway cannot function as it is intended to. See point 3 below.
3. The Trust believes there is ambiguity over the Rural Fire Service requirements. The original DA320/2015 showed a hydrant located at the northern end of the driveway and therefore no need for a fire truck to use the access driveway. The bushfire report, by G Swain dated March 2015, accompanying DA320/2015 stated that the turning bays at the southern end of the access were designed for cars only. In the sec96 DA320/2015A the fire hydrant at the northern end of the driveway is not shown on the latest plans. It would appear that the hydrant has been removed and there now is a requirement for a fire truck to use the access driveway. If this is so, and the SEE prepared by M Benson dated September 2017 indicates this, it would appear that a fire truck would be required to reverse out along the access driveway because the southern turning bays would be non-compliant for fire trucks. This requires clarification prior to the northern end of the driveway is approved. Also, if a heavy fire truck is required to use the access driveway then the integrity of the existing retaining walls supporting the total length of the access driveway should be checked by a qualified structural engineer and, if necessary, reconstructed to support a fire truck. If this is correct

then the impact of the reconstruction of the retaining wall is likely to also impact adversely on the adjoining vegetation. This must also be clarified. Records indicate that the RFS has not been requested to comment on the sec 96 application. The Trust requests that the sec 96 application be referred to the RFS for comment. The Trust has not commented on the construction certificate for the southern section of the driveway because we could not locate it on Council's website.

4. The young trees planted in the front yard of the subject property were no doubt part of a previous condition of consent. The possible loss of any of these trees associated with this consent must be fully addressed, including possible replacement and positioning.

Regards,
Ross Walker
President
Beecroft Cheltenham Civic Trust

29 May 2018