
Sent: 6/07/2020 10:46:05 PM
Subject: Online Submission

06/07/2020

MS Paula Cowan
36 Playfair RD
NORTH CURL CURL NSW NSW 2099
paulatracey@gmail.com

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

As a local resident, user of the park and adjacent community garden, user of the sports facilities within John Fisher Park, a parent of children at the local school and a member of the surf club from which this pole is visible, I strongly oppose this development. I urge Council to again listen to ratepayers when they loudly object to this development application.

In summary:

- The grounds for refusal for previous application haven't been substantially addressed and those issues of unacceptable impact on visual amenity and social impacts remain.
- There is no demonstrable community demand for the infrastructure, and in fact there is consistent and sustained community opposition to it.
- The economic advantage is not to the community but to the Telco, and it's simply not a strong enough reason to install a substantial piece of infrastructure in an open area of natural and environmental significance
- The site selection is merely one of the least worst options. It is not good design, not amenable to the area and is just one of convenience for the telco.
- The coverage gains achieved by this tower are modest at best and I have not been able to find information estimating the number of households who would benefit.

I refer to the supplied report: Statement of Environmental Effects report.

p.26 "Following the consultation with multiple stakeholders over the past 5 years, it's clear that Optus has taken a lot of time and effort to get to the stage to lodge a development application that we feel addresses all of the stakeholder and community feedback received to date. Given the levels of consultation for this location previously; Optus feel that lodging the development application and allowing it to go through the statutory notification process is the most appropriate step at this stage rather than any additional consultation and have thus sought to lodge this development application on this basis."

This is an arrogant attitude to take when there is clearly no demonstrable community demand for the infrastructure, and in fact there is consistent and sustained community opposition to it.

At the first round of community feedback, 122 of 166 respondents stated an objection to any telecommunications facility. From the last proposal, there were 139 submissions, 133 against and 6 in support along with a petition with 839 signatures opposing the development. How much clearer does the community have to be?

p. 24 "The feedback provided can be summarised as follows:

- 166 responses in total
- 25 ticked for Candidate A
- 9 ticked for Candidate B
- 6 supported either A or B
- 109 ticked for neither site
- 25 stated support for any telecommunications facility
- 122 stated an objection to any telecommunications facility

Negative feedback received related to perceived effects from EME and proximity to Curl Curl Public School (which is located 350m away from the proposed location of candidate A).

There [sic] following concerns were also raised:

- Visual impact - members of the community stated that the visual impact is unacceptable. Many community members are already unhappy with the existing flood light poles in John Fisher Park and consider any height increase to be unacceptable
- Environmental impact - members of the community informed Optus that they were involved in the cleaning up of the lagoon and that the proposal would ruin the natural environment. Option B has a large number of protected species nearby.
- Existing Optus coverage - some community members are existing Optus customers but are opposed to the proposed telecommunications facility, stating that there are no issues with Optus coverage in the area.
- Telstra/Vodafone coverage - members of the community stated that Telstra and Vodafone have good coverage and Optus should co-locate with them or do what they are doing to get coverage.
- Co-Location - members of the community are concerned that if the proposed telecommunications facility is installed, other carriers will seek to co-locate, increasing visual impact and EME emissions."

These issues have not been adequately addressed and merely reducing the height of the initially floated pole by 2.6m does not resolve any of these genuine grounds for opposition to the development. What remains is that a for-profit telecommunications company is seeking to stake a claim to open, natural parkland for economic benefit at the expense of community concern.

p.25 "These locations were subsequently investigated and details are provided in the site selection section of this report (E had previously been examined and was again discounted due to its potential visual impact on Curl Curl Beach and the coastline). A development application was lodged with Northern Beaches Council in April 2017 and was advertised in accordance with the Warringah Development Control Plan. This development application received 139 submissions, 133 against and 6 in support along with a petition with 839 signatures opposing the development. The objections were generally in regards to impacts from EME and impacts upon visual

amenity. This was determined at an independent assessment panel meeting and a notice of refusal was issued on 27th July 2019. This was assessed due to having unacceptable impacts with regard to the natural and built environments and the social impacts in the locality mainly in regards to its impact visually."

Curl Curl is a rare example of open space and undeveloped beachfront and it is not a blank canvas awaiting economic development. Residents seek out and value the natural beauty of the area - it's the very reason we live and stay here.

Site selection is still not optimal - it's just slightly less worse than other sites considered. Why should 'slightly less worse' be forced on a community that does not want this development?

Side-stepping community consultation is not good enough.

p.4, Figure 3 - coverage map. The number of residences whose coverage would move from 'poor' to 'good' is not outlined. Judging from the map provided, it could be close to 100. Estimating 30% of those being Optus customers, this oversized development would potentially be improving mobile coverage for 30 people? There is not a strong enough benefits case to be put for the environmental and social impact the community would bear.

The numbers simply don't stack up - either economically for the community nor for however one would quantify enjoyment of the local area. I strongly urge the committee to reject this application.