INFORMATION RESPONSE

Please attach this document to the front of any information response to Council.

		OP Work 2411/2017 82-90 Mitre Street Craiglie; land described as Lot 901 on SP274759.
l/We:		
	Have provided all of the required information outlined in the Information Request (section 13.2(a) of the Development Assessment Rules).	
	Have provided part of the required information outlined in the Information Request and will provide some or all of the remaining required information by the last day to respond to the Information Request (section 13.2(a) of the Development Assessment Rules).	
X	Have provided part of the required information in the Information Request and do not intento supply any of the remaining required information outlined in the Information Request (section 13.2(b) of the Development Assessment Rules).	
	Do not intend to supply any of the information outlined in the Information Request (section 13.2(c) of the <i>Development Assessment Rules</i>).	
Regar	ds	
Applic	ant's Name:	P Walker
Signat	ure:	Marka
NO.	re.	8

I/We request that Council proceed with the assessment of the op works application

8 January 2018

Douglas Shire Council

ATTEN: Jenny Elphinstone

Your Ref: OP Work 2411/2017(D#836674)

RE: INFORMATION REQUEST

I accept items 2,3,4 and 5 requested can be provided.

However, item 1 is not possible.

In an honest attempt to achieve the DSC desired outcome to connect to council infrastructure I have attempted to do everything I possibly can to that end.

My engineer has come up with the plan for the connection despite the cost being restrictive.

Both Peter White and Neale Hodge have identified and are on record (your ref: #827506 letter of the 15/09/17) stating that the topography of the area is problematic.

Options for sewer connection to the Council infrastructure from the private sewer system being considered were discussed. Due to the land demographics, it was advised that the closest sewer line opposite the property in discussion is situated on private property, including the manhole access, and is not a feasible option particularly as there is a gully that would need to be traversed and engineering such a connection would be cost prohibitive. The alternative connection option that was proposed is to take the sewer line from the property in discussion to the nearby pump station (SPS 4M) which is situated near the neighbouring property, 72-80 Mitre Street (Lot 802 on C2253).

Using their rhetoric "The alternative connection option" referred to, irrespective of specific route is considerably more problematic in the extreme.

We have come up with the only feasible, viable and rational route for the line, given the existing topographical conditions.

In summary, the DSC should carefully reconsider the separation issue which is in fact engineered to AS3500 & FNQROC standards on the application, to achieve their desired outcome.

P Walker