
From: Bruce Davis [REDACTED]
Sent: 28/10/2024 8:03:14 PM
To: Council Northernbeaches Mailbox
Subject: TRIMMED: Development Application 2024/1216
Attachments: DA Comments v1.pdf;

Attention: Maxwell Duncan

Please find attached my submission for North Harbour Marina's Development Application.

Bruce Davis

Submission to DA 2024/1216

My father founded Davis Maina in 1946 and because I reached the end of my working life, I sold it to North Harbour Marina in 2023. Most of my life has been spent working and sailing in North Harbour. I have one of the strongest living attachments to the bay.

I would like to strongly object to North Harbours Marinas (NHM) DA because the Statement of Environmental Effects (SEE) doesn't address the issues that the application presents.

Super Yachts

The greatest single issue worrying me is berthing of 25 and 32 metre super yachts. It is difficult to appreciate their scale compared to our bay, the larger is more than twice the length of the marina's boatshed. Wall to wall the old shed is 15 metres or 50 feet as it was originally designed and built. The beam of these boats will be about one third their length or say 10 metres which is one metre wider than the old building. The building is one story, and the super yacht are generally multi story but my visualisation on this dimension is failing me.

My first suggestion is that the applicant supplies an architecturally drawn three-dimensional view of the marina with super yachts as seen from the shoreline and residences so the community can gauge their impact.

The SEE only mentions once the proposed 32 and 25 metre berths and goes on to discuss the bulk of the building and floating marina which is of no great concern to the locals. According the SEE guidelines, "Any visual analysis shall consider the impact of the largest motor vessel(s) capable of being berthed at the marina".

As a second suggestion I recommend that the SEE be rewritten, in line with the guidelines to include references to super yachts and a justification for their inclusion.

Navigation channel

The mooring field is very crowded but as manager of Davis Marina for 42 years I only received one complaint about the lack of a channel. I think my clients knew it was tight, but they didn't want to deny others of the fun of mucking around in boats and accepted the situation. Now I appreciate how our boating community looks after each other.

Also, in 42 years I am not aware of any dangerous incidents. Sure, there have been some minor knocks and bangs but nothing serious and no injuries. This brings me to another question; is there any need for a navigation channel? The answer is **no** unless we have super yachts.

The price of providing a super channel is enormous. We need to relinquish 9 commercial moorings and move 4 private moorings. The DA claims there is no net loss because there will be 9 new berths. However, the berths will cost more to rent, say 2 or 3 times more and the lost moorings are considered as nursery moorings because they are often occupied by young families starting their time in boating.

Nine new berths

Nine new berths sounds good, but they don't comply with the Marina Standard of Australia. In fact, I believe they would be unusable and so no real net gain to the community. The standard says that fairways need to be 1.5 times wider than the length of the largest boat moored and preferably 1.75 times the boat length.

The width of the fairway channel is the distance from the back of the boat on one arm to the back of the boat on the next arm. From my experience, using narrow fairways with a ratio of about 1.5 is very difficult, you simply don't have enough manoeuvring room. This proposal is for a fairway with a ratio much less than 1.5 and the SEE should detail the ratio, but it doesn't. My next suggestion is that the SEE be rewritten so it compares some of the principal dimensions such as fairway widths against the Australian standard.

Demolition of the soft stand and the proposed new berths

I support the demolition of the soft stand because it's too old. We always wanted to have berths in this area but respected the opinion of the Department of Primary Industry who informed us that they didn't want motorised boats going in and out of these berths because of the seagrass beds. We opted to use the area for motorless yachts. The SEE hasn't commented on this issue, perhaps it should.

Slipway / dinghy storage

I am not opposed to improving dinghy storage but don't see how these dinghies are going to be launched or retrieved. There isn't a pontoon. Also, it's not obvious how this part of the proposal could be financially viable because they take up a lot of space and people don't want to pay that much.

Kayaks are a better proposition because they pack more densely, and people are prepared to pay more. Manly Yacht Club has a proposal to take over the old scout hall and provide courtesy dinghies, work berth, pick up drops off and a tender service. Courtesy dinghies pack well because the dinghies aren't individually owned, and you just take the next one off the stack.

It's worth contemplating the best use of this land given the unlikely long-term future it has as a dinghy storage area. It's possible that the applicant might return in a few years with another proposal.

Hazards

Fire is listed as a major hazard, and I agree with this. However, for me as the marina owner for many years I regarded east coast lows as the biggest hazard. They can whip up very strong winds, waves and storm surge. Climate change is super charging these lows, and we don't know exactly what will happen in the future. This proposal envisages super yachts to 32 metres being moored to existing piles designed for boats to 14 metres. Super yachts don't just need twice as many piles rather they need very big piles and those who might approve this DA should expect many more and bigger piles once the construction certificate has been approved. It would be best to have these details considered as early as possible.

Plan of Management

I am very familiar with this plan because I wrote it in 2008 in preparation for lodging a development application for the new marina and when built the plan was superseded. It should be noted that I didn't give permission for it to be used in this latest application.

This plan is for a fixed pile marina but at present a floating marina is in place. A quarter of the plan describes how to use the slipway, but the slipway is to be discontinued. It refers to nine staff, all are no longer employed at the site, and one is dead. It refers to a dinghy pontoon that no longer exists and a preferred contract scheme that has been scrapped. It refers to the soft stand which has been discontinued and mobile pump out equipment that has been replaced by a new fixed system.

I estimate that only about 20% of the plan is relevant to the future operation. I suggest that a new Plan of Management be written.

Costing

Based on quotations for other projects I am involved with for Manly Yacht Club the rough cost of building a deck for dinghy storage is about \$4k per m². Using this rate NHM's proposed dinghy deck 18 x 19 m would cost \$1,368,000. There are additional cost such as removing the old slipway, relocating moorings, driving new piles and new marina floats. Surely this is going to be a multi-million-dollar project. Yet in their application to council, they state the cost at \$257,500. Perhaps council could give them the opportunity to revise this figure.

Unique status

Those having to assess the merits of this proposal will need to consider if the SEE, being so riddled with errors, can be judged properly. If they decide to continue then they will need to consider the unique status North Harbour has as both an environmental zone and the backdrop to the world renown Spit to Manly Walk. Is the environment tough enough to withstand the propeller thrust from a super yacht's powerful engine, its noise and shading. Will the shoreline tapestry as viewed from one of the world's greatest walks be replaced with a wall of white.

Other issues

The EOI says the marina is in the local government area, but I am told by council officials that most of it is not. The LGA only extends down to MHWM. The EOI sometimes says the development is below MHWM and at other places it says it's both below and above MHWM. The latter is correct. The survey plan says the slipway cradle has a concrete deck, it doesn't. The dinghy storage is going to be built on existing piles, but there aren't any rather the slipway rests on sleepers and these are unsuitable for a deck. The proposal says the outdoor seating won't be used after sunset, suggesting there is indoor seating, but there isn't any indoor seating shown on the plans.

I keep on thinking this application has been cobbled together without much thought. It is such a pity that so many people have spent so much time writing objections when they could have done something more rewarding. Perhaps the council should send it back to Addenbrook and ask them to resubmit when they have sorted out their facts. Proposals need to be fact checked before they are submitted or put out for public comment.

Yours Sincerely

Bruce Davis

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Bruce Davis.

32 Beach St Curl Curl NSW