
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 18/03/2025 9:44:12 AM
To: Council Northernbeaches Mailbox
Subject: TRIMMED: Opposition to Development Application DA2024/1216 - North Harbour Marina - V2
Attachments: DA2024-1216-NorthHarbourMarinaObjection_RW_18Mar2025.docx;

Dear Maxwell Duncan,

Please find attached my objection letter to DA2024/1216.

[REDACTED]

Kind regards,

Richard Westgarth
[REDACTED]

TO:

Maxwell Duncan

Northern Beaches Council

council@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au

Subject: Opposition to Development Application DA2024/1216 - North Harbour Marina

Dear Mr. Duncan,

We continue to strongly object to DA2024/1216, based on our previous submissions, despite slight changes was made to the application by North Harbour Marina.

Our reasons for objection are

Increased Traffic and Parking Issues: The opening of another kiosk will exacerbate existing problems, as there are already kiosks in the area.

Removal of Slipway: This is the last slipway available to serve the community.

Removal of Private Moorings: These moorings often require a wait of 10 or more years. North Harbour Marina should recognise they do not own these.

Removal of Safe Swing Moorings: These moorings are safer for sailors in rough weather compared to berths and enhance the harbour's beauty. Complaints about "ugly sailboats" are nonexistent, while many criticise the diesel-smelling yachts North Harbour Marina aims to attract.

Concrete Base for Large Structures: Disguised as dinghy storage, this is unnecessary. Previously, a cheap dinghy service was available, which North Harbour Marina removed to focus on their own interests.

No Need for a Channel: There was never a channel before, and there is no need for one now. We sail in the bay weekly and see no reason for more space unless accommodating motor super-yachts.

Change in Clientele: Likely shift from sailors to power-yacht owners. Financially, it makes sense to attract those who buy power-yacht to impress rather than sailboats for sport. These owners prefer berths over swing moorings.

If approved, North Harbour Marina's changes would irreversibly worsen the bay for everyone. This cannot proceed.

Concerns regarding the dubious sudden support from aligned individuals

Additionally, we suspect fake, templated (AI-generated?) submissions, potentially orchestrated by Addenbrooke, the owner of North Harbour Marina. All these submissions exhibit mechanical patterns of

- Mention full support
- Claim that removing swing moorings increases safety
- Assert that a kiosk is needed
- Support for dinghy and kayak storage

These responses appear artificial, likely from "aligned individuals," rather than genuine local opinions.

Some submissions seems to be poorly reworded copies of each other, such as by

- Nathan Poulos
- Matthew Barakat
- Renuma Pasha
- Aaron Senes
- Craig Martin
- Darren Vaux (submitted as Empire Marinas Group).

The mechanical, non-natural, non-human written submissions by agents representing the company raises the question of the process took place behind the scenes to gather a sudden community support for the development that had overwhelmingly negative responses before.

Notably, Michael Joyce from R Marine Sydney didn't even replace the template text given by North Harbour Marina, revealing the lack of genuine effort, despite saying "supporting" the project. His submission reads like this (quoting): *As a resident of [Insert Street Name] near North Harbour Marina...*

One might pose the question, what motivated these new submissions, such as the R Marine Sydney (from Rozelle) and Empire Marinas Group (North Turramurra) to suddenly express strong support for a development well outside of their interests area?

Is it possible that Addenbrooke, the owner of North Harbour Marina and also the owner of Rose Bay, Point Piper, Koolewong, and Mosman Bay Marina have extensive connections and resources to orchestrate such a sudden, albeit mechanical, support from the "community"?

One can only hope that the council will be able to connect the dots and see through the plot that is trying to turn our natural gem into a private money-machine.

As none of these newfound strong-supporters submitted anything previously, we urge the council to disregard these mechanical, artificial submissions and listen to the genuine disapproval from the community, fearing corporate overreach into our environment.

My previous objections are still valid, submitted as:

Dear Mr. Duncan,

This response strongly opposes the proposed extension to the North Harbour Marina. While the application attempts to portray the project as beneficial, it fails to address critical concerns about its environmental, social, and economic impacts on the local community and the future of this cherished public space. **Crucially, the proposal fails to adequately consider the severe, undoable, and permanent consequences of these changes, which will have lasting negative impacts on generations to come.**

Environmental Concerns:

Impact on biodiversity: The extension would significantly disrupt the delicate ecosystem of the harbour. Increased boat traffic and the loss of swing moorings will negatively impact the area's rich biodiversity, including rays, seals, dolphins, birds, and marine life crucial to the harbour's health. These impacts are permanent and will not reverse.

Increased wash and disturbance: The construction of additional berths will inevitably lead to increased wash in the small bay, disturbing marine life and potentially causing damage to smaller boats and watercraft. This undoable change will permanently alter the delicate balance of the bay's ecosystem.

Threat to swimmers and paddlers: Increased boat activity will make the bay less safe for swimmers and paddlers, who currently enjoy its serene waters. This undoable change will permanently diminish the recreational value of the harbour for everyone, now and in the future.

Community and social concerns:

Loss of affordable moorings: The removal of swing moorings, particularly private ones, will exacerbate the existing shortage of affordable moorings in Sydney Harbour. This will lock out young families and aspiring sailors, hindering the accessibility of sailing for future generations. This permanent change will create a barrier to entry for new sailors and further entrench existing inequalities in access to this recreational activity.

Fundamental changes to a serene bay: The extension represents a significant shift in the character of North Harbour, transforming a quiet and tranquil bay into a more commercial and potentially crowded space. This irreversible change is incompatible with the long-term community interest in preserving the bay's unique serenity and natural beauty.

Impact on fishing: The increased boat traffic and the likely increase in pollution will negatively affect fishing activities, which are enjoyed by many local residents. This permanent change will deprive future generations of the opportunity to enjoy this traditional activity in a pristine environment.

Economic and Governance Concerns:

Misuse of public land: As the leaseholder of public land, the marina operator has a responsibility to serve the public interest. The extension prioritises the needs of the wealthy and overlooks the broader community needs. It resembles a theme park for the ultra-rich rather than a public amenity. This permanent change will further erode the principle of public access and enjoyment of shared resources.

Disingenuous café proposal: The claim that a late-night café will benefit walkers on the Manly to The Spit track is disingenuous. This is likely a ploy to disguise a bar or pub, which would further disrupt the character of the area. This irreversible change will introduce noise and light pollution, disrupting the peace and tranquillity of the area.

Lack of community consultation: The application fails to demonstrate any meaningful engagement with the local community. The community's concerns about the project have been ignored, highlighting a lack of transparency and accountability. This lack of consultation sets a dangerous precedent for future development projects, undermining community trust and participation.

Unmaintained Facilities: The application overlooks the fact that the marina has been poorly maintained since its acquisition in 2023. This raises concerns about the operator's commitment to the long-term care of the site and its ability to manage the proposed expansion responsibly. This raises serious concerns about the permanent impact of the extension on the environment and the sustainability of the marina itself.

Parking made worse: The application misleadingly claims that the proposed extension will not increase parking demand, attempting to downplay the already strained parking situation in the area. However, the reality is that the increased boat traffic and the influx of café patrons will inevitably lead to a worsening parking situation, making it even more difficult for residents and visitors to find parking spaces during peak periods. This will further exacerbate the existing congestion and negatively impact the overall experience of this public space.

Specific Concerns about the Proposal:

"Dinghy storage": The construction of a large deck for a dinghy storage facility is atypical and suggests a potential for future development beyond just dinghy storage. This likely represents a decoy for future expansion plans, as a restaurant, offices, or even accommodation can be placed on such a large area. This raises serious concerns about the permanent impact on the visual character of the area and the potential for further encroachment on public space.

Expansion of water lease area: The application fails to adequately explain a critical detail: the proposed extension of the south arm would result in inner berths protruding beyond the current water lease area. This crucial information, only visible in the "Plans - Marina 11/09/2024" document, raises significant concerns about potential safety, environmental, and legal ramifications. The applicant's omission of this detail in the main application suggests a deliberate attempt to downplay the scope and potential consequences of the project.

Unsafe Berths: Berths are inherently more dangerous to approach than swing moorings, especially in rough conditions. This poses a significant risk to sailors returning from long trips, who will be more likely to experience incidents with the proposed extension. This permanent increase in risk could lead to accidents and injuries, impacting the safety of the entire area.

Ugly Backdrop: The extension will create an unpleasant backdrop for the beautiful Manly to The Spit walk, detracting from the scenic views and the natural character of the area. This permanent change will significantly diminish the aesthetic appeal of the area, impacting its recreational value for future generations.

Relocation of private swing moorings for a channel: First of all, a channel is not required and has not been required in the bay. There are no safety concerns for the relatively small boats currently using the bay. The relocation of private moorings after decades of waiting time is unfair and disregards the efforts of those who have invested in their boats and their place in the community. This permanent change will unfairly displace those who have been waiting for years to secure private moorings.

Liquor License: The inclusion of a liquor license is incompatible with the spirit of sailing and the community's expectation of a peaceful and tranquil environment. This permanent change will transform the area into a more commercial and potentially disruptive space, incompatible with the existing character and enjoyment of the bay.

Untruthful Statements: The applicant's dishonest statements in the Manly Observer about the need for a navigation channel and the alleged support from locals are misleading and lack any credible evidence. These deceptive tactics undermine the applicant's credibility and demonstrate a lack of respect for the community.

Conclusion:

The North Harbour Marina Extension proposal is fundamentally flawed and is not in the best interest of the community. The council, acting as the representative of the community, cannot endorse a project that prioritises private gain over public good, environmental sustainability, and the long-term well-being of the area. **The severe, undoable, and permanent consequences of these changes must be fully considered before any approval is granted.** This proposal is a blatant attempt by a wealthy family to extract more money from other wealthy families while sacrificing valuable public resources and services. The council must reject this proposal and instead prioritise initiatives that truly benefit the community, protect our natural heritage, and ensure the accessibility for all.

Richard Westgarth