

---

**Sent:** 26/08/2020 6:41:36 PM  
**Subject:** Online Submission

26/08/2020

MR Philippe Mady  
- 19 Spring RD  
North Curl Curl NSW 2099  
mady1234@bigpond.com

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

DA 2020/0661 (Lot 7356 DP 1167221) Hudson Parade, North Curl Curl -  
Construction of a Telecommunications Facility with associated equipment

I wish to make a submission to strongly oppose the Development Application 2020/0661 relating to the installation of an Optus Telecommunications Facility (Monopole) with associated equipment

1) Consistent and increasing opposition of the local community

After the remarkable opposition from the local community in 2015 and again in 2017 it is an issue of having to fight a development for the exact same reasons as in the past which led the Council to already reject similar developments.

In 2015 a DA to install mobile phone tower a was lodged by OPTUS for the installation of mobile phone tower. It was finally withdrawn after a significant opposition from the Community and an the initial unfavorable assessment from the Council.

In 2017 another DA was rejected by Council after a robust opposition from the community culminating at an impactful meeting with Council on 19th July 2017. Council subsequently issued a notice of determination on 27th July 2017 against the DA. Reasons for refusal included unacceptable impacts on the surrounding natural and built environment with significant negative social, environmental and visual impacts.

It is now the third attempt and the local community is really becoming a little tired. As a result the opposition of the community has been growing further compared to the robust opposition recorded in 2015 and 2017.

2) Optus coverage is "Great" on the area

I am an Optus customer and do not have any issue with coverage. As a matter of fact, OPTUS themselves advise on their website that their 3G/4G coverage around the Curl Curl lagoon is "Great". Please refer to

[optus.com.au/about/network/coverage](http://optus.com.au/about/network/coverage):

Outdoor coverage 3G/4G

- Voice and Text - Great
- Email - Great
- Internet - Great

### 3) Environmental impact

Telecommunication towers does not belong to public parks and reserves. The Lagoon is an area of environmental significance. It is a fragile riparian zone which has suffered a lot in the past and its rehabilitation is a very long process. It does not need any kind of new infrastructure.

### 4) Visual impacts

The visual impact of the structure with a total height of 25.7 meters would be inadequate in an area which has recently been rehabilitated through a significant re-vegetation effort.

### 5) Unsuitability of the site

The site is located in a previous landfill which was capped and used sport fields. The land should not be disturbed as construction works would uncover potential Acid Sulfate soils and potential asbestos.

### 6) Public health impacts

SSE provides a conclusion that Electronic Magnetic Energy (EME) radiofrequency do not have adverse health effects. However it does indicate whether it includes young children and teenagers. The proximity of the Curl Curl North public and the sport fields used by minors makes the proposed site inadequate and should motivate Council to strongly consider that a principle of precaution should prevail.

### 7) Co-location and precedent

There would be significant concerns that should the telecommunications facility be installed, other operators would seek to co-locate, build additional associated structures generating additional visual impacts and EME emissions.

### 8) Loss of control

Should the land be leased the local community would lose control over the land and ability to control future upgrades - potentially opening the door to more and larger antennas and more EMR which is unacceptable

### 9) Contradiction with the John Fisher Park Plan of Management and vision

The proposal deeply contradicts the vision of John Fisher Park. The Plan of Management states that: "John Fisher Park and Abbott Road land should be a

healthy, accessible open space that provides harmoniously for both active and passive recreation, which is well maintained and protected by responsible use and management".

The DA and its 25.7m tower and associated equipment does not comply with the Plan of Management and contradict its core objectives of "facilitating community education in relation to wetlands, and the community use of wetlands without compromising the ecological value of the wetlands".

Urbis' interpretation that a 25.7m telecommunications tower and associated equipment would not compromise the ecological value of the wetlands is simply staggering and disturbing.

I urge the Northern Beaches Council to listen to the local community, reject this development and move to prevent any such applications in John Fisher Park in the future.

Kind Regards.  
Philippe Mady