
From: Pam Davis
Sent: 13/03/2025 1:36:45 PM
To: Council Northernbeaches Mailbox
Subject: TRIMMED: Attention: Maxwell Duncan- Submission re DA2024/1216
Attachments: DA objection Letter _amended plans.pdf;

Please find attached my submission to the amended plans for DA2024/1216.
Pam Davis

13th March 2025

Pam Davis

PO Box 684

Freshwater NSW 2096

Mr Maxwell Duncan

Northern Beaches Council

Sent by email to: council@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au

Dear Sir,

Re: Development Application DA2024/1216 - Gourlay Ave Balgowlah Amended Plans

I write to confirm my objection to this DA as stated in my previous letter dated 29th October 2024 as the amended plans do not adequately address a number of key issues raised.

1. Navigation Channel in North Harbour

An increase in the number of berths at the marina does not require a navigation channel as long as the boats accessing the marina are within the existing 15m or less length. For those of us with moorings in North Harbour, we still need to navigate the mooring field to access our own moorings. A navigation channel will be of little benefit in providing safer access to our moorings, and so of little benefit to the majority of users in North Harbour. Neither will it be of much benefit to Marine Rescue in cases of emergencies as the marina no longer provides a pick up and drop off pontoon for such use.

The justification of a navigational channel required for safety must be assessed on how unsafe North Harbour actually is for the boating public. Boating incidents must be reported to NSW Maritime, these data must be considered before any decision is taken. The Maritime should also conduct a proper survey of all the local boating community to assess the pros and cons of any channel. For example, the mooring area is a 4 knot zone, but many power boats exceed this limit to get to the head of the bay. Providing them with a clearer runway will no doubt encourage speeding and this will certainly be unsafe for passive water craft such as paddle boarders as well as swimmers.

The only real benefit of such a channel is to allow access to the marina for larger vessels. It is noted that the T-Heads on the both the east and west marina are still be able to accommodate larger vessels. Clearly the navigation channel suggested by the applicant is intended for commercial purposes and not for general safety.

It is unacceptable for the new commercial operators of the marina, who have very limited experience of boating in North Harbour to dictate how North Harbour should be managed based on their own commercial needs.

The applicant has claimed that berths are more sort after than moorings and this justifies the loss of 10 moorings in North Harbour. While this might reflect their experience, possibly due to their increased costs and decreased services, it is not an indicator of the general boating demand in North Harbour. Access to moorings is essential to encourage new boat owners who start with smaller boats and gradually increase in size as their skills improve. It should be noted that the waiting list for a

mooring in North Harbour is still long and no doubt a lot longer than the commercial marina's waiting list for a marina berth. The government has a responsibility to support boating access for all.

2. Dinghy Deck

The applicant has noted that as there is access to the beach on the west and east side of the marina, this is suitable access to the water from the proposed dinghy storage deck. What they have neglected to state is that the beach on the western side is only accessible if you carry your craft from the deck, onto the road, passed the back of the marina building and down a small ramp. The beach on the eastern side is similarly inaccessible as the water craft need to be carried over the timber walkway and down a set of stairs to the beach. This is not water access.

The size of the intended deck is way bigger than would be required to store 72 dinghies. Coupled with the fact that this deck will be unpopular with local boaties due to lack of water access, it is obvious that the intention is to use the deck for another purpose once the dinghy storage idea has failed. If the applicant was genuine in providing a storage deck for dinghies and kayaks, they should provide a ramp and pontoon on the water, and this should be made a condition of approval of any such deck.

The proposal for the deck needs to be independently assessed to confirm the applicant has provided correct information on whether there are sufficient piles already in place on which to build a deck as the old slipway was not built on piles.

3. Toilets

The amended application has highlighted the fact that the marina does have toilets. They have overlooked the issue that the 1960's era toilets (one female, one male and no accessible toilet) were already noted as being inadequate in 2008. With an additional café holding 20 people, the question is whether these facilities are adequate and do they meet today's standards.

4. Overall Development Cost

The amended application has supported the overall development cost of \$257,500 based on a cost from Bellingham Marine, and the use of existing structures. Bellingham Marine only supply the pontoons and their costs would not include costs of construction. The applicant clearly has disregarded the cost to demolish the softstand and slipways, and the cost of construction to put the new pontoons in place. They have also clearly overlooked the cost of the dinghy storage deck, as to build such a deck the cost is more likely to be closer to or over \$1 million in its own right, based on estimate costings for similar decking in other locations in the area.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] In light of the above and other submissions highlighting other reasons for objection, the council must reject the proposal.

Yours sincerely

Pam Davis