

---

**From:** Brendan Donohoe  
**Sent:** 19/12/2024 1:44:38 PM  
**To:** Council Northernbeaches Mailbox  
**Subject:** TRIMMED: DA2023/0998 Freshwater SLSC  
**Attachments:** Freshwater SLSC \_ Restaurant-FINAL 2024 (1).pdf; Freshwater SLSC \_ Restaurant-FINAL 2024 (1).docx;

To whom it may concern,  
Please find attached Surfrider Foundation OBJECTION to proposals for Freshwater SLSC.

--

**Brendan Donohoe**  
President Northern Beaches Branch  
Surfrider Foundation Australia  
Mob: [REDACTED]



## NORTHERN BEACHES BRANCH

December 2024 - Freshwater SLSC “Upgrade”

**Surfrider Foundation objects in the strongest possible terms** to the proposal outlined for the Freshwater SLSC.

Freshwater SLSC is a building in need of no major repair.

It is most certainly not in need of a 160 seat restaurant!

Surfrider is reliably informed that Manly SLSC is in urgent need of a major upgrade to satisfactorily undertake the core SLSC mission.

Manly SLSC **needs** every dollar NBC can muster and much more to ensure it provides essential service to a very busy beach frequented heavily by tourists who often have no experience with surf beaches.

NBC is cash strapped considering significant rate increases.

Manly SLSC **needs** better life saving facilities.

Freshwater **does not need** another restaurant, does **not need** a “Surf Museum” and most certainly does **not need** more pressure on an already oversubscribed carpark obviously created for beach users not the dining public.(despite the traffic report findings that a bus stop is located within a prescribed distance)

Surfrider has watched appalled as Avalon SLSC was overdeveloped, searched for and eventually found a food purveyor only to lose the restaurant a couple of years later indicating the “rivers of gold” that will flow from such half baked potential commercialisations may not provide the return on investment imagined.

The “consultation process” for the Mona Vale “food hall and SLSC” indicated support for a restaurant not surprisingly as a great deal of feedback came from the open day at the clubhouse where a lot of locals (who may well live within walking distance) have little need for the carpark.

Beach carparks are for **beach users**.

If NBC wishes to stack attractions at beaches it needs to commit to **commercial parking** (underground or multi-storey) **requirements** that would clearly make such projects as this unaffordable as terrible return on investment propositions.

Funds for SLSC “improvements” all come from the same source.

Priority must be given to life saving activities NOT fine dining opportunities (seemingly pursued enthusiastically by NBC for the lease income ?)

## **Surf Life Saving Clubs**

SLSCs exist in the privileged and highly prized but very vulnerable positions they do on the coast and were allowed for the

purpose of providing surf lifesaving activities.

These activities **do not include**

- 1.-raising money for council through commercial leases
- 2.-providing fine dining experiences with an (obscured) ocean view for the paying public
- 3.-serving alcohol to paying customers as a core business
- 4.-spending a fortune of public money developing plans that many regard as a repulsive commercialisation of public space
- 5.-developing commercial premises where **no other entity other than council/slsc** could possibly believe it would be acceptable
- 6.-proposing a huge new commercial development with no social license and no reasonable consultation befitting the obvious change of use of a public place

7.-proposing a huge new commercial development with sophisticated plans and studies that have been detailed to a point where the clear expectation is **approval**.

The expense of developing this proposal to date is considerable, estimated to be at least in the many tens of thousands of dollars, while at the same time SLSC's have the "charity hand out" suggesting there needs to be public support or "kids will drown".

8.-stacking a "massive change of use" new commercial attraction on an already stressed carpark designed to accommodate beach users **not diners**...surfers can't surf in restaurants so why must diners be provided ocean views?

9.-contemplating an extraordinarily expensive proposition using public money, land and building without so much of a disclosed hint of return on investment or cost/benefit analysis.

If Council/Club wish to develop **our** land and **our** buildings with **our** money into commercial premises and have been clearly

working towards this end since at least 2016/17, far more **early consultation** and **public input** is required before plans are “firmed up” to the extent we see here as the development of these plans comes at a huge public cost in both amenity and monetary terms.

There is **no need** for this development, no call for it apart from a select few in the Club and Council and yet considerable expense has already been incurred where so many more worthy coastal and other public works are required.

We’ve seen this scenario too many times now where some half baked idea, perhaps with private backers, proceeds to the point where the public expenditure developing the plans gives the project momentum that is very difficult to stop...**this project needs to be stopped.**

Where are the costings, the ROI figures, the cost/benefit analyses, who is paying who will

operate, how will lease money be used etc,  
etc,etc?

**It is after all our beach, our park, our carpark  
and our club**

Further, Surfrider calls on NBC to be far more forthcoming with the public, who will fund and maintain these vanity projects, well before the point where complex plans have been paid for and developed apparently for the benefit of **us, the public.**

Brendan Donohoe  
President  
Surfrider Foundation Australia  
Northern Beaches Branch

-





## NORTHERN BEACHES BRANCH

December 2024 - Freshwater SLSC “Upgrade”

**Surfrider Foundation objects in the strongest possible terms** to the proposal outlined for the Freshwater SLSC.

Freshwater SLSC is a building in need of no major repair.

It is most certainly not in need of a 160 seat restaurant!

Surfrider is reliably informed that Manly SLSC is in urgent need of a major upgrade to satisfactorily undertake the core SLSC mission.

Manly SLSC **needs** every dollar NBC can muster and much more to ensure it provides essential service to a very busy beach frequented heavily by tourists who often have no experience with surf beaches.

NBC is cash strapped considering significant rate increases.

Manly SLSC **needs** better life saving facilities.

Freshwater **does not need** another restaurant, does **not need** a “Surf Museum” and most certainly does **not need** more pressure on an already oversubscribed carpark obviously created for beach users not the dining public.(despite the traffic report findings that a bus stop is located within a prescribed distance)

Surfrider has watched appalled as Avalon SLSC was overdeveloped, searched for and eventually found a food purveyor only to lose the restaurant a couple of years later indicating the “rivers of gold” that will flow from such half baked potential commercialisations may not provide the return on investment imagined.

The “consultation process” for the Mona Vale “food hall and SLSC” indicated support for a restaurant not surprisingly as a great deal of feedback came from the open day at the clubhouse where a lot of locals (who may well live within walking distance) have little need for the carpark.

Beach carparks are for **beach users**.

If NBC wishes to stack attractions at beaches it needs to commit to **commercial parking** (underground or multi-storey) **requirements** that would clearly make such projects as this unaffordable as terrible return on investment propositions.

Funds for SLSC “improvements” all come from the same source.

Priority must be given to life saving activities NOT fine dining opportunities (seemingly pursued enthusiastically by NBC for the lease income ?)

## **Surf Life Saving Clubs**

SLSCs exist in the privileged and highly prized but very vulnerable positions they do on the coast and were allowed for the

purpose of providing surf lifesaving activities.

These activities **do not include**

- 1.-raising money for council through commercial leases
- 2.-providing fine dining experiences with an (obscured) ocean view for the paying public
- 3.-serving alcohol to paying customers as a core business
- 4.-spending a fortune of public money developing plans that many regard as a repulsive commercialisation of public space
- 5.-developing commercial premises where **no other entity other than council/slsc** could possibly believe it would be acceptable
- 6.-proposing a huge new commercial development with no social license and no reasonable consultation befitting the obvious change of use of a public place

7.-proposing a huge new commercial development with sophisticated plans and studies that have been detailed to a point where the clear expectation is **approval**.

The expense of developing this proposal to date is considerable, estimated to be at least in the many tens of thousands of dollars, while at the same time SLSC's have the "charity hand out" suggesting there needs to be public support or "kids will drown".

8.-stacking a "massive change of use" new commercial attraction on an already stressed carpark designed to accommodate beach users **not diners**...surfers can't surf in restaurants so why must diners be provided ocean views?

9.-contemplating an extraordinarily expensive proposition using public money, land and building without so much of a disclosed hint of return on investment or cost/benefit analysis.

If Council/Club wish to develop **our** land and **our** buildings with **our** money into commercial premises and have been clearly

working towards this end since at least 2016/17, far more **early consultation** and **public input** is required before plans are “firmed up” to the extent we see here as the development of these plans comes at a huge public cost in both amenity and monetary terms.

There is **no need** for this development, no call for it apart from a select few in the Club and Council and yet considerable expense has already been incurred where so many more worthy coastal and other public works are required.

We’ve seen this scenario too many times now where some half baked idea, perhaps with private backers, proceeds to the point where the public expenditure developing the plans gives the project momentum that is very difficult to stop...**this project needs to be stopped.**

Where are the costings, the ROI figures, the cost/benefit analyses, who is paying who will

operate, how will lease money be used etc,  
etc,etc?

**It is after all our beach, our park, our carpark  
and our club**

Further, Surfrider calls on NBC to be far more forthcoming with the public, who will fund and maintain these vanity projects, well before the point where complex plans have been paid for and developed apparently for the benefit of **us, the public.**

Brendan Donohoe  
President  
Surfrider Foundation Australia  
Northern Beaches Branch

-