
Sent: 26/08/2020 8:40:44 PM
Subject: Online Submission

26/08/2020

MR Stephen Brickwood
- 25 Blackwood RD
North Curl Curl NSW 2099
sbrickwood@hotmail.com

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

I object strongly to this DA2020/0661

The council has been very clumsy in handling this matter.

It makes me very angry.

It is a gambit attack on this community, that has on many previous been strongly rejected by the community and the council.

I have worked on these parklands and many others in the community have for decades, trees planted, weeds removed, playing fields developed and used by myself and my children and grandson.

I have been hurt by this renewed proposed development. The council committed not to have any more construction in in the park.

I worked to have the Mayor elected to council when he promised no more development. I handed out how to vote pamphlets at the voting booth.

I came here as a youth in 1963 and it was a Sydney tip. Yes, a tip for Sydney, and garbage piled up in city streets when the tip closed during an industrial strike by council workers. It was a large tip and operated for years, nearly 30 years. All industrial development was to be west of Harbord Rd.

The park was promised to the nearby residence and community in general to have no development. In fact, extreme and convoluted lengths were taken to build the netball building on old road alignments, as marked on land title maps.

When the council allowed the light poles and baseball nets they did it without a DA process.

Extremely strong objections were made at the time by many people, as they could set a PRECEDENT for building in the riparian zone and broke council's commitment to the community not to build in the park and a latter commitment NOT TO BUILD IN THE RIPARIAN ZONE.

The commitment NOT TO BUILD IN THE RIPARIAN ZONE has been reflected in the past with the rejection of a number of DA proposals and the way the netball courts were laid out to avoid the riparian zone.

This new proposal 'piggy backs' on the council's PRECEDENT setting works and will creat a new PRECEDENT of larger and additional construction in the riparian zone.

I further object to the deceptive nature of this DA proposal, which is similar to many other previous attempts to build the same, all were rejected by the council and community.

The 'expert consultant' has not been fully open about the proposed DA. Co Location of additional telecoms is 'part and parcel' this DA and is not disclosed openly to the community and council.

Co location is not a choice for the council in the future,

Co location is a fact of law now and must be considered as part of the DA now.

Co location means all other telcos (5 or more) can locate their own equipment in this area as an absolute right under law. The first telco can not object to the following telcos. It can not

refuse access, only give access and then collect rent monies from the use of its structure. The geography of this area weighs in on the decision to choose this site.

Other factors and sites would be available. But this installation may give this site absolute dominance in all future telcos decisions.

RADIATION LEVELS MASSIVELY INCREASE WITH EACH NEW TELCO CO LOCATING. MANY FOLD.

So 2G radiation, 3G radiation, 4G radiation, 5G radiation from each telco, and up to 5 telcos. That is 20 sources of radiation in the middle of the park and close to a Primary school and homes.

THIS INSTALLATION CREATES THE PRECEDENCE by its NEW HIGHER ELEVATION AND NEW LOCATION that must be followed by all competing telcos. The council will not have any control if it does not reject this DA.

The council is at a unique point in time, and must defend its community's strong wishes, it must reject this deceptive proposal.

The pole is the minimum height and so the others will need to be above these proposed antennas to not block each other's antennas. **THE HEIGHT WILL BE MUCH HIGHER than this proposal.**

The **BASE STATION** (air conditioned and 3mx2mx3m high) will need to be in its own compound (9mx9m) with razor wire on top of a 3m chain wire fence. **EACH NEW TELCO WILL NEED THEIR OWN COMPOUNDS**, each with their own air-conditioned base station and compound for security from vandalism.

2G, 3G, and 4G are old technologies, and are to be superseded by 5G technology, which will be many smaller antennas, located closer to the many customers. This proposed installation is not necessary.

Current service is a strong feature of this telco company's advertising. And so is not necessary. This location is closer to the new government public school, North Curl Curl, much closer than a previous rejected proposal. Many parents are outraged at this situation.

These fields, at the base of this new tower, are crowded by young children on sports days every week. And many parents and grandparents will be angered by this gross development.

To add what many are saying:

1. The development does not comply with the Plan of Management for John Fisher Park.
2. This is a sensitive environmental area.
3. The case has not been made to warrant a new phone tower on public land.
4. The development will be over 25m high and the "associated equipment" which means a larger infrastructure impact.
5. All other telcos will be able to **CO LOCATE** additional base stations and increase the tower height, a 5 FOLD LARGER installation and a 5 FOLD INCREASE in radiation.

For example of a developed site; **PHOTO: Collaroy Plateau mobile phone tower** referred to in the report quoted. This is not low impact. The proposal is on the banks of a sensitive coastal lagoon in a wonderful parkland of playing fields. It will stand out like 'dogs balls'