

Objections are as follows DA 59063 / 2020.

Mooring pole

NSW Maritime may licence the use of mooring poles, but Crescent Cove is a drainage canal owned by Central Coast Council. Placing a structure on Council's land without permission (the requirement for development consent is irrelevant) is trespass.

Application for jetty and pontoon

The Gosford Local Environmental Plan 2014

(<https://plan.s.centralcoast.nsw.gov.au/Pages/Plan/Book.aspx?exhibit=GCCPLANAug2014>)

[Gosford City Council Planning Documents](#)

Part 8 Additional local provisions—Gosford City Centre. Schedule 1 Additional permitted uses. Schedule 2 Exempt development

plan.s.centralcoast.nsw.gov.au

), to which Cade refers, prescribes:

3.16.2 Purpose of Chapter

(b) provide detailed requirements for the development of water recreation structures within the canals of St Huberts Island.

3.16.8 Objectives of development in canals of St Huberts Island

The objectives of development in the canals of St Huberts Island are as follows:

1. (a) To provide private water recreation structures for boats within the canals of St Huberts Island.
2. (b) To ensure that the water recreation structures will not result in difficulty of physical manoeuvring of vessels within the canals.
3. (c) To ensure that the number and location of water recreation structures will not adversely affect the visual amenity of the neighbourhood.
4. (d) To ensure the water recreation structures will not result in visibly unattractive concentrations or locations of vessels.

3.16.10 Management Principles for Water Recreation Structures for Canals on St Huberts Island

(a) Pontoons and walkways shall be shared structures at a ratio of one (1) pontoon per two (2) adjoining premises considered on their merits and may not be permitted at premises of narrow frontage of less than nine (9) metres or near to canal corners or ends.

(d) Council, as the canal landowner, may refuse to authorise submission of a development application that does not generally comply with the provisions of this Chapter.

(i) A mooring will be relinquished and removed upon installation of a pontoon in accordance with this Chapter.

3.16.12 Development Criteria for Pontoon and Associated Walkways for Canals on St Huberts Island

(b) Length of vessels shall not exceed ten (10) metres or the waterfrontage of the property, whichever is the lesser.

(g) Walkways to provide access to the floating pontoons shall:

1. (iv) be constructed at right angles to the shoreline.

The underlining is my emphasis. The present application breaches each of these provisions, or requires strict conditions to be imposed.

Additional Points Of Objections & Breaches

1. Upon discussions with RMS regarding DA 59063/2020, they viewed their marine maps and saw the area and 3 boat ramps in such close proximity, and stated that the area is 'too cramped' for any additional facilities such walkways or pontoons. In view of this, have now commenced their own investigation and will seek advice from their Maritime Safety Officers in that area with regards to The pylon location and Proposed pontoon & Walkway DA.
2. In discussion with Clarke & Dowdle Surveyors Associates have checked there records and plans they also agreed the pylon or mooring pole appears to be completely 'in front' our property.
3. Given this proposed structure will be directly on the beach behind our property, and given how far from the pontoon/walkway we as 'water users' will legally have to stay away to anchor or moor our own boats & watercraft, this DA is a major concern to us as we often have our beach full of our own water craft in summer, as the **water is for everyone to share**. By approving this DA, this will give the applicants **water privileges** over other water users. We have been there for over the past 20 years in fact since 1997, and now potential will be unable to moor our boat behind our own property. You can see the potential issue when everyone wants to be moored in close proximity and very limited water space there is in the DA's proposed area. I say "let them have a smaller proposed pontoon/walkway that resides completely in their own area and does not impact neighbours".
4. The mooring pole was erected in the past 12 months, it is now under investigation by RMS maritime personnel and potential may ultimately have to be removed. The pole's position is too far out into the channel and represents a navigation risk. The pole should be removed all together OR relocated in applicants' own area closer to their own properties & boat ramps with proper council DA approval. The pole should NOT be encroaching across the neighbouring properties as observed by 2 of Gosford Council's DA Planners on 18/9/2020 and also agreed by Clarke & Dowdley in writing on 23/9/2020.
5. There are 3 boat ramps cramped together in very close proximity, all competing for the same water space, so by adding the proposed structure straight in the middle of 2 of the 3 ramps , it suddenly makes the whole area even more cramped. This makes the proposed structure completely unpractical on many levels robbing water space from others who wish to share the space in the cramped area . This is totally unfair to the immediate neighbours, who need the space when boats may require mooring.

6. If it remains, and the jetty is approved, the positioning of the mooring pole is too close to the proposed pontoon to allow boats to be moored and navigate at the end of the pontoon. This will mean boats will be permanently moored on either side of the pontoon, including to the north west in front of our property. At the very least prohibition of permanent/regular mooring of boats on our side of the pontoon and/or removal of the mooring pole should be a condition of approval of the jetty. Also the pontoon should have to be positioned with its long sides at right angles to the gangway. This point will be brought with the RMS maritime safety officer in due course.
-