

From: DYPXCPWEB@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au
Sent: 5/10/2021 10:47 PM
To: "DA Submission Mailbox" <DASubmission@northernbeaches.nsw.gov.au>
Subject: Online Submission

05/10/2021

MR Max and Sheryn von Schwerin
75 Wimbledon Avenue ST
Narrabeen NSW 2101
[REDACTED]

RE: DA2021/1612 - 1 Clarke Street NARRABEEN NSW 2101

Please accept the following as a formal objection to DA 2021/1621 for the Seawall Clarke to Mactier Streets.

We have lived, worked and interacted on a daily basis with the Northern Beaches, specifically the area of beach that is subject to this above DA.

During all our years living at Narrabeen it has been the natural beauty of the beach area and the natural processes of the ocean that has continually held us captive.

I am now absolutely staggered that Council would destroy the visual amenity of this beautiful stretch of beach and in fact the entire open bay from Long Reef to North Narrabeen.

It is my understanding that under environmental legislation Council should have adequately undertaken public consultation, not simply consulted those whose property values will benefit. This raises significant questions of propriety.

As the damage to this particular section of beach is the result of natural processes, Council should not use rate payers funds to hold up property values, which should be determined by market forces, not Council investing rate payers funds. Neither Council, or State Government, can be held responsible for the natural erosional and depositional natural processes that impact on this particular section of the coastal area.

How was the design of the Seawall selected and has Council evaluated the consequences of the failure of the Seawall integrity due to future erosion and the natural forces of the ocean?

Finally, has Council determined the ongoing issues and costs associated with maintenance, repair and removal should the Seawall fail?

Doesn't the EP&A Act (1979) demand the protection of visual amenity of our natural resources? This would further suggest the Northern Beaches Council has again contravened the Act., thereby making this an issue for the Land and Environment Court: misappropriating rate payers funds; failure to undertake adequate public consultation; and wilful destruction of the visual amenity of a natural asset.