

OBJECTION to DA 57958/2020----Proposed TELSTRA 5G TOWER

From Robert and Kerrie Coull

85 Steyne Road Saratoga.

We write as long term residents of Saratoga since 1974 and express our strong objection to the current proposal for the reasons outlined below.

In submitting our objection, it must be said that we have no objection to upgrades to telecommunication infrastructure, however, such works and facilities must properly address environmental, and planning factors as well as the amenity.

It is clear this proposal falls well short in this regard.

ISSUES: -

The proposal does not comply with the Gosford DCP 2013, Part 2 Scenic Quality and Character—

The tower is a significant structure which is totally at odds with the scenic character of nearby dwellings and tree canopy. Indeed, its location on the rise near the entry and exit road to Saratoga, Davistown will result in the tower being the most dominant visual feature of the area. The location is grossly inappropriate.

The proposal does not comply with the intent of Gosford LEP 2014-Land Use –

The proposal is not consistent with the objectives of land zoned R2 Low Density Residential. In this regard it does not satisfy Clause 115(3) of the SEPP with respect to site selection, design and construction.

The proposal size and location is totally incompatible with the objectives of the zone. It is out of character with the built and natural landscape. It is out of character with the streetscape. It does not best serve the needs of the community. It will undoubtedly have and an adverse effect on the amenity.

The proposal does not comply with the SEPP Infrastructure—

The proposal does not comply with Clause C2(g), as it does not in any way demonstrate good design outcomes.

It does not comply with Clause C115(3) *regarding site selection, design, and construction*. The site is totally inappropriate based on proximity to low density residential uses. It contrasts with the heavily landscaped nature of the area. Its height is totally out of scale with its surrounds. It will undoubtedly have a negative impact on local amenity. Its height, design and location are a visual abomination particularly when viewed from the north and south (which I believe has not been addressed in the submission)

The proposal does not adequately address the “Non-Conforming” nature of the proposal.

The submission has no regard for the non-conforming nature of the proposal. Presumably because it simply does not fit within the low-density nature of the area and its gross contrast to what would fit within the area and not have severe amenity impacts.

The proposal does not comply with Gosford LEP 2014—Height—

The proposal significantly exceeds the height limit of 8.5m. It is certainly not high quality urban form, and is incompatible with the nearby built and natural landscaped environment. It will have significant visual impact, particularly when viewed from north and south where its location on the low ridge will frame it against the sky.

The proposal does not comply with NSW Telecommunication Guidelines-Visual Impact.

This document headlines facilities should minimise visual impact. The proposal is the contradiction of this requirement as it is doubted a more prominent location could be found. This proposal is an insult to the visual amenity.

The NSW Guidelines document further requires the proposal be *sympathetic to scale of adjacent buildings*. Considering most neighbouring buildings are 4-6 metres in height, no reasonable person could suggest 26.8-meter tower satisfies this requirement.

The submission does not adequately address the need.

It is claimed the proposal is to improve mobile reception, however as a user of Telstra mobile since the very first devices became available on the Central Coast I have never experienced mobile phone difficulties anywhere in Saratoga/Davistown. If I were to speculate, the proposal is located at the terminus for the fibre network for Saratoga “the node” and the copper network in the area is very poor, unreliable and overloaded. So perhaps the proposal is to save costs in replacing copper with a proposed reliance on 5g.

The submission states alternatives were examined, but no supporting documentation was offered.

The Council should reject the proposal on several grounds, but open the door for discussion with the community on options.

Best Regards
RJ and KR Coull