
Sent: 13/10/2020 7:17:46 PM

Subject: DA2020/0661 - 7356/1167221 Huston Parade NORTH CURL CURL NSW
2099

Attachments: Chris Thomas submission to planning panel 14oct 2020.docx;

Dear Carly

Please find attached a copy of my submission to the Local Planning Panel for Wednesday 14 October 2020.

Regards

Chris Thomas

13 October 2020

Dear Sirs

**DA2020/0661 - 7356/1167221 Huston Parade NORTH CURL CURL NSW 2099
Proposed Construction of Telecommunications Facility with Associated Equipment
Submission to Northern Beaches Local Planning Panel**

I wish to respond to aspects of the Assessment Report for this development application.

I find it quite frustrating that despite the overwhelming opposition to this proposal, responsibility has been thrown back upon the local community to provide acceptable arguments to show why this application should not be approved, when Optus itself hasn't actually supplied adequate evidence of a need for this in the first place.

Optus claims 'poor network coverage in the North Curl Curl area, particularly around Curl Curl Beach and the properties on the southern side of Curl Curl Lagoon', and yet there are only 14 submissions supporting the proposal.

Optus claims that 'Coverage issues have been detected since our first planning application in 2016 and recent reviews show that customer numbers and usage are increasing year on year - which will further degrade the issue' (Urbis letter 13 October 2020). Interesting then that submissions in favour of the proposed tower have receded since 2015, from 15% then to 4.3% in the 2017 DA, and 3.6% for this DA.

Comparing the coverage maps in Figures 2 and 3 of the SEE, there appears to be little or no difference to the Curl Curl Beach areas at all if the proposal is approved.

The current application includes inconsistencies in information provided, insufficient data, and reasons of little merit to seriously consider the validity of this proposal. To claim that the installation of this tower 'is particularly important as a safety issue in proximity to Curl Curl Beach, Curl Curl Lagoon and the sports fields' is erroneous. Emergency calls can be carried on any mobile network even if your provider does not have sufficient coverage. We are not in a remote area for covering emergencies!

Inconsistencies in information are not limited to the documentation, where we have differing figures for antennas, remote radio units, and even the dimensions of the ancillary equipment. Inconsistencies are also prevalent in the consideration of alternative site options. In the details given for Candidate C, the reason for consideration included the fact of it 'being at least 25 metres away from the nearest residence.' In the very next paragraph the site is rejected on the grounds that 'The site was considered to be too close to existing residences (within 25 metres)!'

Alternative sites are ruled out on Visual Impact grounds and yet the proposal site is not, despite having been rejected on these grounds in 2017. The Assessor has even rejected the recommendation of refusal from Council's Urban Design Officer.

In response to the submissions in favour, the Assessor simply states 'The lack of service in the Curl Curl area is noted.' 14 submissions from 11 households against 376 objections is not a clarification of any level of lack of service in the area.

Chris Thomas
9/43 Adams Street, Curl Curl NSW 2096

Of the 11 residences 7 are north of Curl Curl Lagoon and 4 to the south. In consideration of the individual locations and stated needs, these submissions do not provide any sufficient argument for the construction of this tower and its resultant detrimental impact upon the much wider community. Stated reasons for supporting the proposal include a need for 5G (this is not a 5G proposal), wanting to close a landline service, and the inconvenience of having 'my home internet and mobile phone through different providers'.

The majority of the submissions to the north are surrounded by residences occupied by objectors to this proposal who presumably have no issue with current coverage. Properties are next door to each other, back to back, and either side of the road. There is at least one submission already considerably closer to the existing telecommunications facility at 224 Headland Road, which surely would benefit from improvement to that facility rather than expecting service from a new facility further away and in a valley.

A similar situation of proximity to objectors exists for at least two of the pro submissions on the south side, however the residences at Tanderra Place and Beach Street are down at the southern end of Curl Curl Beach and do not look to gain any benefit from the proposal at all. Certainly the premise by Optus that this installation would also provide 'the capacity lost with the removal of the McKillop Park facility' is laughable. Surely a better proposition would be to co-locate with existing rooftop antennas at 73 Evans Street, Freshwater?

In the matter of Impacts on the local community, and consultation, the Assessor comments 'The community consultation process by Optus and the notification process by Council have been undertaken accordingly to relevant requirements.' This is not correct.

Optus has failed to carry out appropriate Public Consultation for this Development Application under the NSW Telecommunications Facilities Guideline Including Broadband 2010. There is no record of a 'Community Consultation Plan, and the SEE simply states that consultation has taken place 'with multiple stakeholders over the past 5 years' and that the application 'addresses all the stakeholder and community feedback received to date.' This is not correct.

There has been no community consultation as part of this DA process. If Optus really does want to make the effort to sit down with community stakeholder bodies it may well find other solutions that are more acceptable to all.

The Assessor has ignored that this application totally fails Principle 1 of the same guideline; 'A telecommunications facility is to be designed and sited to minimise visual impact'.

The proposal does not comply with Section 4.15(1) (b) of the EP&A Act, 'due to an inappropriate visual impact, being of greater height and scale than the surrounding light poles within the sporting field.'

SEPP Coastal Management 2018 - Consideration (k) - I disagree with the Assessor's comment. The proposal is NOT of an 'acceptable bulk and scale for the location', and certainly does nothing to protect and improve 'the natural scenic quality of the surrounding area'.

Chris Thomas
9/43 Adams Street, Curl Curl NSW 2096

It is also worth noting that within the alternative sites Optus says it considered, Candidate C was ruled out due to the fact that the proposal 'would cause prominent visual impact to a wider area, which is not considered acceptable or compliant with Council policies contained within the Warringah Local Environment Plan 2011 or the NSW Telecommunications Facilities Guideline in regards to Principle 1 - Visual Impact.' Why was this argument not also considered relevant to the proposal site?

I would just like to finish by responding to comments regarding Co-location in Urbis's letter of 13 October 2020. Whilst I acknowledge the comment that any co-location 'may require pole strengthening, or a further pole swap out and thus another development application', the very approval of the proposal before you will set a precedent for other Telcos to submit similar development applications. Council's ability to refuse such applications and the resultant further impact upon the park will be severely limited when there is a previous approval as a precedential argument for any applicant.

The impact upon Plateau Park is clearly then a reasonable argument for refusing this application, amongst the other matters previously noted

Chris Thomas

John Fisher Park Community Group