



Bonny Hills Progress Association INC.

PO Box 44

Bonny Hills 2445

bhpa@bonnyhills.org.au

The General Manager

Port Macquarie-Hastings Council

PO Box 84

Port Macquarie NSW 2444

CC Ben Roberts

Re: DA for Seniors Housing Lot 2 Beach St DP 1091253

Dear Sir,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on DA 10.2017.1046.001, relating to a Seniors Housing development of 78 apartments on Lot 2 Beach Street, Bonny Hills.

The Bonny Hills Progress Association (BHPA) strongly objects to the proposed development.

The reasons for objection are detailed below.

Background

The following points are made with this background in mind:

- Lot 2 is zoned Rural and was recently cleared of old growth timber to improve productivity of the area for goat farming.
- The proponent has since 'realised' that it is not viable for rural production and will be more viable for residential development.
- Council has under consideration a proposal to rezone Lot 2 as partly E2 and partly R1.

That rezoning proposal has been strongly supported by BHPA following a major community backlash to the recent clearing of old growth timber on Lot 2 which was of high conservation value as koala and wildlife habitat and was part of a wildlife corridor along Saltwater Creek from the coastal vegetation strip to inland forest.

Grounds for objection to the Development Application (DA)

1. Community reaction

- There has been considerable concern expressed by the community about this DA on BHPA's FaceBook page with **over 5297 people 'reached' (as at 14/01/2018) - the largest number ever seen on this site.**

Many concerns have been posted, examples being:

"Totally inappropriate development for the area. Will destroy the amenity of the area if it goes ahead"

"Bonny Hills does not have the infrastructure for a project like this. Ridiculous"

"I DO NOT want to see these apartments built in Bonny Hills. This should be protected land -----There is not enough infrastructure in Bonny Hills to support such a rapid rise in population. It also sets a dangerous precedent for the image and feel of Bonny Hills.
PLEASE DO NOT APPROVE THIS DEVELOPMENT"

In a nutshell the main reasons for concern are that:

- **the proposed development is of such an intensive nature that it is totally out of sync with the village character of Bonny Hills, and**
- **it is to be located in a pristine area close to a waterway, wildlife corridor and Rainbow Beach Reserve.**
- **Bonny Hills infrastructure is inadequate to deal with such a development**

Indications are that Council will receive numerous submissions from residents objecting to the proposed development.

- At two recent meetings held by Council in Bonny Hills in 2017, (which were aimed at canvassing community views and inputs regarding Bonny Hills' future development), residents' aspirations were for sensitively planned development melded with the natural environment. The type of development proposed here is the antithesis of the expressed Vision.
 - That view aligns with the Community's previously agreed Vision for Bonny Hills which was re-endorsed at the above meetings viz:

The community's clear Vision for Bonny Hills is to conserve our surrounding natural environment and wildlife, maintain our village character, promote safe roads, ensure clean water and sustain our community's quality of lifestyle by ensuring well-planned and environmentally sensitive development.

- Council's Draft Urban Growth Management Strategy 2017–2036 (UGMS), recently on public exhibition, recognises the community's strong position on this, with future planning to conform with the Vision:

Viz on page 53 of volume 2 of the UGMS -

“Apartment living in Lake Cathie & Bonny Hills

Apartment living is only appropriate near the proposed village centres in the urban release area of Rainbow Beach.”

In summary we do not object to residential development per se BUT 78 dwellings on the proposed R1 zoned land (subject to the rezoning application currently being considered by Council) is clearly an over development of the site and is of a density that is unprecedented in the area.

2. Lack of compliance

- **These works are not permitted by the Site Compatibility Certificate.**
The proposed development encroaches beyond the boundaries of the proposed R1 land which is inconsistent with the Site Compatibility Certificate, Schedules 2 and 3, stipulated by the NSW Department of Planning and Environment. Plans show a proposed future residential development, internal pathways, parking bays and on-site water detention within the proposed E2 land.

3. Additional concerns

The above makes it abundantly clear that the proposed development is incompatible with the Bonny Hills community's aspirations, Council's UGMS, and the Site Compatibility Certificate. It should also be noted that there are a number of other issues which appear inadequately considered in the proposal:

- Immediate revegetation of the cleared E2 zone is essential with the aim of bringing it back to its former condition over time. In our view any developer should be asked to contribute to replanting and a vegetation management plan be incorporated as a condition of any future residential development.
- It is not clear whether the proposed development makes sufficient allowance for preservation of the 40m Vegetation Riparian Zone plus whatever Asset Protection Zone is required by the fire authorities. The APZ must not intrude into the VRZ.
- The low-lying nature of the land, particularly on the western side of Beach Street, gives rise to serious concerns about flooding under the likely scenario of east coast low weather patterns involving heavy down pours with large run-off events, tidal surges, and overlaying this, climate change induced sea level

rise. The nature of the currently proposed development with partly sunken car parking adds to these concerns.

- We understand that under state legislation there is a requirement for public transport to be available for senior residents within 400m of such a development.
 - Bus stops on Ocean Drive appear further away than 400m which could mean that transport in the form of a mini bus or similar must be made available as part of any seniors development.
- Likely traffic and parking impacts on adjacent residents, the Big 4 Caravan Park and Rainbow Beach Reserve along Beach Street would be substantial and must be considered. Currently there are 78 double garages incorporated in the development.
- Similarly access onto Ocean Drive at both ends of Beach Street and at the intersection with Rodley Street must be considered with a view to determining the extent of upgrading or alterations that will need to be made.
- Pathways interconnecting with existing pathways and/or facilities as well as lighting along Beach Street would be required.

Presently both are totally inadequate and would be found seriously wanting with an additional 78 residences in place. As part of this a pedestrian passageway on the eastern side of the Saltwater Creek bridge should be installed as this is where most people walk to and from Rainbow Beach.

If you would like to discuss these objections further, we will be only too happy to oblige.

Yours sincerely,



Phil Hafey

BHPA Secretary

14 January 2018