

---

**From:** dominic alecci  
**Sent:** 25/06/2025 1:39:19 PM  
**To:** Council Northernbeaches Mailbox  
**Subject:** TRIMMED: DA2024/1303  
**Attachments:** DA Complaint.docx;

To: Adam Croft.

Dear Mr Croft, the Attachment is my objection to the subject DA.

Regards,  
Dominic Alecci



25 May 2025

Dominic Alecci  
737 Warringah Rd  
Forestville NSW 2087  
Mob: [REDACTED]  
Em [REDACTED]

Adam Croft  
Planning & Development Assessor  
Northern Beaches Council

Dear Mr Croft,

**RE: My objections to the revised Development Application (DA) re Forestville RSL (FRSL):**  
**DA2024/1303: 20-22 Melwood Avenue:**

1. Just like the 2 previous rejected DAs, the revised DA is destructive and repugnant, as follows:

- (1) To the local environment.
- (2) To our young children, to our young parents, to our young people generally, and to the entire massive young family demographic of Forestville and Killarney Heights.
- (3) To the future viability and existence of the FRSL club.

Therefore, please consider all my previous, and still pertinent, objections (dated 13/11/24, as showing on the Council's web page in '*Application Documents*').

2. I also would like the following qualifying objections about the revised DA to be considered:

- **The DA is still a repugnant over-development of Forestville's idyllic central site:**

Once again, the DA proposes a suburb dominating monstrosity which is totally out of character for the area.

And, enclosed in that concrete monstrosity is (again) an inadequately small, poker machine prevalent, new RSL club.

- **Building No1.breaches height regulations and its footprint remains far too big:**

This is the first (to be built) and largest of the 4 proposed retirement buildings.

It will replace the current outdoor family alfresco and children's play space (ex-bowling greens) that currently draws most of the community's families to the club.

This building will also house the new small, single level club enclosed on its ground floor.

The developers and their consultants have again made every possible nonsense excuse to justify breaching height regulations for this building and, have attempted to support these appalling height breaches by erroneously quoting case law for exception approvals that are in environments which are totally different to the FRSL site.

Even if adhering to crucial height regulations, this hideous (Building No.1) over-development will still be the tallest structure in Forestville and will dominate all other structures in the area, which are mostly single level child facilities and single level residential homes.

IF EVER developers should be forced to comply STRICTLY with height regulations, it should be for this overdeveloped and ugly building, which will be an abomination of Forestville.

- **The developers have also arrogantly rejected vital recommendations made by Sydney's Design & Sustainability Advisory Panel (DSAP):**

- (1) The DA developers have rejected DSAP's recommendation that the footprint for Building No1 be substantially reduced. Clearly, its footprint is still far too big for the space and location it will dominate.
- (2) The developers have also rejected the major DSAP recommendation that, for environmental reasons, the new club should be '*stand-alone*' and separate from the retirement units - the developers should not be allowed to ignore this important environmental recommendation.

MOREOVER there is another vital reason why this DSAP '*club-stand-alone*' recommendation must not be ignored: BECAUSE, if the club is not '*stand-alone*', it can NEVER AGAIN be rebuilt, or be expanded, or be extended, or have any major structural work done to it - Not in 30 years' time, and not even in 130 years' time !!!

And, this will mean the inevitable end of the FRSL club, as a simple mathematical certainty (given the life-span of clubs and, the periodic structural changes which need to be made to them).

- (3) The developers have also rejected other major DSAP recommendations with paltry excuses such as, done "*where feasible*" - "*not economically viable... without significantly increasing the height of the residential pavilions on the northern portion of the site*" - "*considered to be contextually unacceptable*" - All nonsense excuses which condemn the DA being contemplated in the first place.

- **The small new club cannot accommodate the young family demographic of Forestville and Killarney Heights, which demands a large family entertainment venue that can cope with hundreds of parents and children at a time:**

Over recent years the needs of Forestville and Killarney Heights have changed to become orientated around young families/children.

And, these young families are the major uses of the FRSL club, which has become a popular and essential place for them to gather and socialise. In fact, the club is the only large family entertainment venue in the whole 2 suburbs.

YET, OBJECTIONABLY, the DA shows an approximate 80% reduction in the club's family designated areas. Even more objectionably, the DA shows a massive reciprocal increase in the club's poker machine ratio space.

The current club regularly accommodates 350-450 parents and children in its wonderful indoor and outdoor family designated areas. And, on special days (such as ANZAC Day), it can accommodate many hundreds more.

On the other hand, the revised DA shows that the new small enclosed club cannot even physically hold a small portion of these families in its tiny '*family designated areas*'

Where are all the community's families to go ?

- **The DA destroys the very essence of the community's massive, and still rapidly growing, young family/children demographic:**

Should be self-explanatory !!!

IT IS INEXCUSABLE to dump this unwanted retirement village 'SMACK IN THE MIDDLE' of the community's many adjacently surrounding (on all 4 sides) child facilities (including: the 'Poppy Park' children's playground; the memorial children's oval; the junior rugby club; the Girls Guide & Boy Scout hall; and, the Forestville Primary School Playground).

- **The DA's continual refusal to address its risk to the privacy, security and safety of the community's children in all the surrounding child facilities – as listed above:**

Club management and the developers have insisted that the retirement units must have windows and balconies looking into all these adjacently surrounding children's facilities, putting at risk the privacy, security & safety of these children for THE FIRST TIME EVER.

Club management says this risk to our children is acceptable because "*times change*" and new guidelines do not require that this risk be considered in the DA.

Club management also say such risks have been allowed elsewhere. BUT, this has been in busy, high-rise locations with hundreds of people constantly passing by. WHEREAS, the FRSL site is in a quiet/residential/low-rise/children-rich and somewhat secluded location, where the protection of our children cannot be equally assured.

This risk to the community's children MUST NOT BE ALLOWED!!! - no retirement window or balcony should be allowed to look into any surrounding child facility.

- **The DA's broken promise about dangerous unisex toilets and their further risk to our children and the vulnerable:**

And, to add to the safety risk to our children, and others, the DA shows club management has broken its promise (made at a forum 08 De'24) that the revised DA would have separate female and male toilets and, would not have dangerous unisex toilets.

BUT, the revised DA still shows that the club's current 12 female and male restrooms have been replaced with 2 (only) highly dangerous and objectionable unisex restrooms - and, only one of these dangerous restrooms is in a family designated area and, is supposed to cope with hundreds of parents and children.

[ Note: Currently many of the upstairs restrooms are used by parents.]

Management had every opportunity to honour its promise and put separate female and male toilets in the revised DA, but did not do so.

And, management must have always known that the small new club would never have the space to put in the required (at least) 2 separate female and 2 separate male restrooms in its '*family designated area*' - and, the DA should never have been pursued in the first place, for that very reason!!!

The danger and inadequacy of toilet facilities will drive every single family out of the club!!!

Why didn't the police addressed this dangerous matter in their report ?

- **The vital community need to keep the 2 bowling greens:**

To the further dismay of families, the DA shows there will be no more large outdoor green expanse (the bowling greens) where the community's parents now gather, dine and socialise while their children run around and play on the grass.

Importantly, this precious outdoor space is the club's main attraction for families.

One petition signer put it best when she reflected the opinion of the club's majority family component saying she would have "*zero interest*" in attending the club once this wonderful family space is gone.

Once these bowling greens are gone, they are GONE FOREVER!!!

And, who knows what the future holds. While the greens are still there, one of them may well be reutilised (for demographic needs) as a bowling green in the future or, both greens may be needed as an expansive family entertainment area for the community's massive growing young family demographic or, maybe even a mini golf course, etc., etc.

- **The DAs inadequate parking situation:**

The DA technically meets parking guidelines, even exceeds them. But, in practice, these guidelines are completely inappropriate for the FRSL location.

Whenever a complex of this type is built, the parking becomes a mess.

In the FRSL location the parking is already bad and an underground parking facility at FRSL will have the same problems that the nearby Coles underground parking facility has.

People will park in these facilities and catch the bus to work, and there will be no parking for club patrons.

Furthermore, the 55 units will most likely have 120 occupants, most of whom will have cars and many of whom will not be retirees (as this cannot be policed and, young people will be able to live there for months at a time).

The practical experience of any similar complex will affirm that only 86 parking spots and only 12 visitor parking spaces for the retirement village is highly inadequate - 110 parking spots and 50 visitors spots must be provided.

- **The DA allows retirement residents to determine club hours:**

Club management says that this will not happen and that residents will be subjected to a stipulation that they will be required to put up with the club's operational hours.

But, retirement residents, like all other Australian residents, cannot be contracted out of their right to a peaceful existence. The residents of Lavender Bay proved the legality of that edict when they complained and won against the operational hours of Luna Park, after moving into homes surrounding the Park.

And, denied by club management, but hidden in all the documentation, is the police report relating to the redevelopment, which stipulates that the new small club in the retirement village must be CLOSED BY 10:30 PM:

So much for future viability of the club !!!

- **The DA objectionably demolishes the War Memorial in front of the club and banishes it and all future revered services (such as ANZAC Day) to some undetermined non-club location:**

The reverence of the RSL ideal will be completely diminished to members and the community if the War Memorial does not continue to be visually and prominently displayed to members, and to the community, in front of the RSL club WHERE IT BELONGS.

Club management has claimed that the demolishment of the memorial in front of the club is necessary because RSL NSW has demanded that all such memorials be demolished and relocated onto public land - NOT TRUE - a completely false claim !!!

Furthermore, memorial services such as ANZAC Day at the FRSL club are legendary.

And, there is no other secured non-club location where memorial services can be held or, where they can maintain their current reverence.

Certainly, the adjacent Council carpark is unsuitable because it is completely full on ANZAC Day, as are the surrounding streets.

Council must give a stipulation that this carpark cannot be used for memorial reasons and an alternate secured place to hold services must be assured before the DA can proceed - otherwise all future legendary RSL services will be at jeopardy.

- **A large portion of the community and club membership does not want the DA to be approved and, management has little support for it:**

Over 1,050 people have signed the petition to stop this unwanted and unneeded redevelopment.

The majority of these signatures are from young family members.

As mentioned, over recent decades these young families have become the major demographic of Forestville and Killarney Heights and, are the major users of the Forestville RSL.

On the other hand, club management has never been able to prove that more than about 50-60 self-vested retirees want the redevelopment, along with the developers and their associates.

3. Please Council and DSAP, reject this abhorrent DA.

Regards,

Dominic Alecci

Long-time local resident & long-time member of FRSL