

1) FLOOD CONCERNS

Though the Tweed Shire experienced devastating floods in February 2022 the Uniting Development is to be constructed on **Flood Prone land**. In Feb 22 many of us living adjacent to the Development were very close to having our houses flooded. If the rain had continued overnight for just a few short hours the water which was already over our roads and on our footpaths **(see Photo No 6 attached)** would have entered our homes. Now, whenever we have heavy rain it is not uncommon for us to become fearful of another flood, that we will not be so lucky again and that water will enter our homes. The “Basin” of the Uniting Development which is adjacent to their current carpark, is 3.7 -4m deep behind us and backs onto the rear of houses in Lorien Way, Blue Jay Circuit and Drift Court. **(see attached photos 1-5)** Uniting plan to fill the “Basin” and build several of the 4 storey buildings on this land.

My property is in Lorien Way and was built to 3.5m AHD. Uniting have indicated **they will raise their land to 3.8m AHD including the “Basin”**. That means that their land will be slightly higher than mine and there is the possibility that some of their runoff could enter my property, particularly in the event of a flood.

EIS P 98: “Uniting Kingscliff indicate as part of their Flood Mitigation plan all roof and surface area runoff will be directed to stormwater inlet structures/pits and conveyed into 5 Water Detention Tanks, which will be discharged to the **existing legal point of discharge from the site, being under the adjacent property (Kingscliff Beach Village) towards Blue Jay Circuit**. However, EIS P108 states It “will be separated from the local drainage system until the downstream end where they will combine prior to discharge,” but it is not specified where. The second Consultation documents in June 2023 stated “across the Development to the existing downstream public drainage network”, which is Blue Jay Circuit. **Consultants at each of the presentations to residents, indicated to me and others that once the water leaves the Uniting site, it is not their concern. THE COUNCIL DRAINAGE SYSTEM DIDN'T COPE DURING THE FEB 2022 FLOOD when for the first time ever, we had water on our footpaths and over roads in Lorien Way and they will then have further discharge to contend with. THIS PLAN SEEMS TO BE GROSSLY INADEQUATE.**

Though Uniting have quoted the recent Tweed Council Flood Study, the flooding in Kingscliff was **missing from the study**. Tweed Shire residents were requested to submit comments. This is still underway and will clearly need to be updated.

P99 EIS: “The Feb 2022 flood is regarded as 1 in 100” but climate change will surely bring a rise in sea levels and lead to more frequent and worse floods! Though the EIS claims that the Uniting Kingscliff Development will reduce the risks of future flooding threats to our neighbouring homes, given Kingscliff’s history especially of the site’s “Basin” and surrounding Turnock St, which also fills like 2 dams, Uniting seems to have no conscience about potential flooding to our properties.

Consultants at the Ethos Urban presentations told me and other residents that “what happens once the water leaves the Development is not their concern”.

And what if there is heavy rain and potentially flooding during the construction period?
The outdoor space proposed for the Development appears to be minimal and with hard road covering will provide too little area to absorb rain runoff?

UNITING’S INTENTION TO RAISE THE LAND ON WHICH THE DEVELOPMENT WILL SIT, WILL POTENTIALLY INCREASE FLOODING INTO THE SURROUNDING AREA. WITH CLIMATE CHANGE AND RISING OCEAN TEMPERATURES THIS WILL ONLY GET WORSE, NOT BETTER. WE ARE ALL VERY CONCERNED NOW, LET ALONE AFTER UNITING COVERS AND RAISES WHAT LITTLE GREEN SPACE THERE IS. FLOOD MUST BE AVOIDED NOT JUST MANAGED. **(See attached Basin Photos 1-5)**

2) ACCESS CONCERNS

Currently the only access to the site is via a narrow one lane driveway from Kingscliff Street. This runs into a busy roundabout on Kingscliff and Beach Streets.

When a previous development application for the same site was made to the Tweed Shire Council it was denied, as one stipulation was that there had to be 2 entrance/exits and Kingscliff Street Roundabout and the narrow laneway into the site was deemed unfit. Yet it appears that the Roundabout and narrowness of the laneway is now acceptable to Uniting Kingscliff.

Uniting Kingscliff purchased 4 very well built and in good condition Lorien Way properties for this reason and **now intends to demolish them to make way for an entrance. Not only will this force the eviction of approximately 12 tenants but it will push most of the site's traffic onto Lorien Way.**

During Stage 1 of demolition and construction, the narrow lane into Kingscliff Street will have minimal use and most of the traffic including heavy contractors' vehicles will use the new Lorien Way access. During Stage 2 the Lorien Way entrance will be used for the newly built RAC and Buildings A,B and C. And so it begins.....

On completion Kingscliff Street access will only be for Service Trucks while all other traffic will use the Lorien Way entrance/exit. **Clearly the Lorien Way entrance/exit will bear the brunt of the traffic and introduce a great deal of traffic into Lorien Way and surrounding streets as far as Kingscliff Village and during the construction stage this will be especially horrendous for residents!!!**

(See Photos 7-10 attached)

3) TRAFFIC

EIS P156: The EIS describes both Kingscliff Street and Lorien Way as Local Roads (P 9 collector and local access roads) managed by the Tweed Shire Council. According to a Traffic employee at Tweed Shire Council **Kingscliff St is a Major Collector Road**, other Collector Roads being Turnock St, Wommin Bay Rd and Cudgen Rd. with Elrond Drive being the primary collector road or arterial road. **Lorien Way, a Minor Collector Road**, from Beach Street to Monarch Drive is **712m long and only 8m wide and is not a through road**. Whereas **Kingscliff St, a Major Collector Road is a through road**, 2.5 km from Wommin Bay Rd to the Seaview St roundabout/Kingscliff Village Shopping area and 11.5m wide. **It is therefore inappropriate to introduce so much additional traffic onto Lorien Way, a road which is not a through road.**

Even during construction of the Development, traffic into Lorien Way will be a problem.

“During **Stage 1** the **Lorien Way** entrance (EIS P194) “**will be established as the contractors' main site access.** Kingscliff St entrance will be maintained for Uniting staff, existing residents, guests and the existing Church.

During **Stage 2** **Access to newly built Buildings A,B,C and RAC will be provided via Lorien Way.** Access to the existing Church will be maintained via the Kingscliff St access which will be established as the contractors main site access for Stage 2.

The EIS P14 and 208: “justifies the site as having good access” but the Kingscliff Street Lane access is a narrow one lane road leading into a busy roundabout and 4 houses in Lorien Way will have to be **demolished to make way for the Lorien Way entrance/exit.** The new Lorien Way entrance/exit will be into a residential street and area of mostly single level low density housing with 5 dead end Streets accessing Lorien Way ie. Shore Place, Channel Place, Shore Place and Sandbank Place, close to the Uniting entrance/exit.

Many residents, old and young, regularly walk along Lorien Way, especially with their dogs, and children walk, play and ride bikes, as do adults. Also, many cars park on the footpath verge especially on the eastern side of Lorien Way, given the shared driveways. Regular buses add to the restriction of ease on Lorien Way. (It is to be noted that while buses are available most residents prefer the convenience of using their own cars. I for one have never used a bus.)

P158 EIS claims “The modeling results indicate the addition of the Uniting Kingscliff Development traffic would result in “no significant negative impact to the surrounding road network capacity” **It is already difficult to pass on Lorien Way when there is a car or bus coming in the opposite direction and we have to slow down to accommodate the other traffic.** Yet the EIS P 189 admits “that additional traffic generated by the development is identified as a risk and can cause adverse accessibility and noise as well as impacts to pedestrian safety.”

While the EIS claims “the proposed Development is not anticipated to impact on the service of local roads” **I find this impossible to believe given there will be 120 Aged Care beds (and visitors), care staff, 199 ILUs, with most likely one or even 2 cars owned by the occupants of the 2-3 bed units. and service vehicles traversing the site, with only Service Vehicles using the Kingscliff entrance/exit.**

At the first **Resident Consultation handled by Ethos Urban**, a Traffic Planner whispered to me “don’t worry over 60s won’t use their cars very often.” I was dumbfounded and told him that I am over 75yo and use my car every day, and that an 84 year old Kingscliff friend of mine uses her car every day and often more than once per day!

(See Photos 11-13 attached)

4) THE HEIGHT AND DENSITY OF THE DEVELOPMENT IS INCONSISTENT WITH THE AREA: It is far too dense and too high.

The immediate neighbourhood is mostly low density single storey homes, especially Lorien Way both eastern and western sides, Shore Place, Channel Place, Shoal Place and Sandbank Place, the Kingscliff Beach Village for over 50s in Blue Jay Circuit, and Beach Street south. Beach Street north has some 2 storey Units and Drift Court has a mix of single and double storey homes.

The Social Baseline Study EIS P188 states that the area is characterized by an older population. It also states that “most residential properties are characterized by couples without children and lone persons. but in Lorien Way there are several young families with children, also in Blue Jay Circuit and Drift Court.

The EIS refers to only Lorien Way eastern side, Beach St, Drift Court and Blue Jay Circuit, that is the properties immediately backing onto the proposed development but such a mega development will also affect residents living in houses in all the streets running off Lorien Way, especially those facing the Development ie the Western side of Lorien Way.

It is inappropriate to compare our area to Kingscliff Street which is in a different Tweed Shire Precinct and hence has different building height limits. **see photos of 3-4 level buildings on Kingscliff St included in the EIS.** The EIS P204 states “Uniting Kingscliff seeks to vary maximum permitted height controls” but the Tweed Shire Council height limit is **13.6m BEFORE FILL.** **(See attached photos 14-18 of Lorien Way and its offshoots + my diagram)**

The Uniting Kingscliff address of 24A Kingscliff Street is inappropriate as the Development is **landlocked** with no frontage onto Kingscliff Street and reached only by a **narrow single lane road from Kingscliff Street close to a busy roundabout.** **The Tweed Shire Council previously knocked back a Development Application for this site on that basis including the fact there was only one entrance. Now Uniting**

Kingscliff plan to create a second entrance by knocking down 4 perfectly sound houses and evicting approximately 12 tenants in the process.

At the **Sept 2022 Consultations** the buildings were for 235 ILU's + 120 RAC places with max 3x5 storeys, 4x4 storeys, 1x2 storeys with fill of 3.9AHD

At the **June 2023 Consultations** the buildings were for 211 ILUs +120 RAC incl 4 stories x 13.6m AHD reduced to 3.8AHD and reduced the fill to 3.8 AHD.

According to the **EIS, Uniting is now seeking the following:**

Building A: is 7.6m, Building B is 16.75m, Building C is 16.32m, the RAC building is 15.85m, Building F is 14.35m, and D/E is 14.15m. However, given the Tweed Shire Council limit for R1 medium density buildings is **13.6m BEFORE FILL** all but Building A, (classed as R2 Low Density Residential with a limit of 9m) exceed the limit and that is not even considering that there will be fill of 3-3.8m, meaning that Building B will be 20.55m above the existing ground level.

The EIS CLAIMS: P204 The EIS claims they have reduced the total number of buildings from 8 to 7. But looking at the Stage 1 and Stage 2 proposal maps, the number of ILUs has only been reduced by 12 and it would appear simply that 2 buildings have become 1.

It also claims that "the design of the proposed development reflects a bulk and scale that is consistent to the vision for the area" **but this is currently being reviewed. A recent study, the Tweed Growth and Management Draft Options Paper asked for residents of the Tweed Area to submit their responses. Those comments are still being considered and after discussion, amendments to height and density will likely be made to the document. It is noted also that there was no change intended to existing built on areas of low density housing.**

There are many further claims: The EIS P101,102,127,128 states that "the built form of the Uniting Development... sits well with its surroundings", "enhances amenity for residents as well as adjoining neighbours" and "is a contextual fit which shows respect for the neighbours' amenity", "the site is now a better fit..reflective of the current and planned built form of Kingscliff and the Development "will have a "better look and feel..a compact **urban** form."

EIS P26 states that the Development is on "**land that is free of significant constraint**" but it is landlocked, with a narrow single lane access to Kingscliff Street approached from a busy roundabout, and what will become the main entrance/exit created in Lorien Way by knocking down 4 housings which were well built and currently in good condition.

RESIDENTS DISAGREE WITH ALL THESE CLAIMS AND FEEL INSULTED BY THEM. AN "URBAN FORM" WOULD BE INAPPROPRIATE FOR A COASTAL TOWN AND NEIGHBOURS WILL BE SEVERELY AFFECTED BY A DEVELOPMENT WHICH IS ENTIRELY OUT OF CONTEXT AND OVERBEARING. IT IS A MEGASTRUCTURE NOT AT ALL APPROPRIATE FOR THE AREA OR CONSIDERATE OF NEIGHBOURS. IT IS WIDELY FELT THAT THIS IS ONLY A MONEY MAKING VENTURE. HOW CAN UNITING MAKE SUCH CLAIMS WHEN IT IS CURRENTLY SURROUNDED BY MOSTLY SINGLE LEVEL HOMES. KINGSCLIFF HAS ALWAYS BEEN VERY AVERSE TO HEIGHT CHANGES AND MOST DEFINITELY DON'T WANT TO BECOME LIKE THE GOLD COAST LET ALONE BRISBANE, SYDNEY OR MELBOURNE. NEW RESIDENTS COME HERE TO ESCAPE CITIES, FOR THE MORE OPEN SPACE AND RELAXED LIFESTYLE. NOT ONLY IS THE UNITING DEVELOPMENT SEEKING HEIGHT CHANGES BUT THE DENSITY OF THE DEVELOPMENT IS GROSSLY INAPPROPRIATE AND OPPRESSIVE.

(See photo from Appendix S -13.2- Appendix A. 3d Model supplied by Plus Architecture"attached)

5) BUILDINGS ; Additional to comments in (4) (1) Height and Density of the Development

Surely the greater need is for “the aged” and not for “the wealthy” who will be able to purchase the ILUs. The RAC with 120 places/single rooms, will only have an additional 8 places. Yet the ILUs will have 199 Units including 41 X 3 bedroom units. It is likely these will be costly and will be sold to people from the cities, wealthy retirees with the ready cash to buy such Units, and not to residents of the Tweed Shire.

P127/8: The EIS states “the delivery of ILUs will promote the opportunity for Seniors “to age in place.” But what of those current residents in the surrounding streets who will be affected by this development? Are we not entitled to “age in place in our own homes? The Government has previously encouraged the elderly to remain in their homes and offers appropriate support for this.

The site is landlocked with residential neighbours on all sides. **LORIEN WAY IS A LOW DENSITY AREA AND MY SINGLE LEVEL HOME WILL BE SWAMPED BY THIS GROSS OVERDEVELOPMENT.** P101 The EIS states that “detrimental view losses do not occur for adjoining land”. **I am more concerned about but the imposing view ADDITIONS of a megastructure which will tower over us.**

Building B will have a height of 16.75m, Building C of 16.32m, the RAC of 15.85m, Building F of 14.35m, and D & E 14.15m. Though Building A is proposed to be 7.6m, it appears to include “substantial” 1st floor balconies on the side which will overlook 37 & 35 Lorien Way. This will seriously detract from their privacy, especially given they have only narrow side areas for their personal use, the other side of both houses looking directly onto their driveways. Most of the houses in Lorien Way East side are single level and on the western side, all are single level.

Given the Tweed Shire Council limit for R1 medium density buildings is **13.6m BEFORE FILL** all but Building A, (classed as R2 Low Density Residential with a limit of 9m) exceed the limit and that is not even considering that there will be fill of 3-3.8m, meaning that Building B will be 20.55m above the existing ground level. These buildings will be intrusive and overbearing. A mega development is not welcome by me or other residents.

The EIS P146 states that the Development “is not out of character with the broader area” but the immediate area is mostly low density single level buildings, especially in Lorien Way, Kingscliff Beach Village in Blue Jay Circuit, Shore Place, Channel Place, Shoal Place and Sandbank Place while Drift Court and the northern end of Beach Street have a mix of single and double storey buildings.

The second proposal to residents at the Consultation Sessions in June 2023 included 211 ILUs and 120 Aged Care Places. A Consultant claimed to residents that Uniting Kingscliff “has agreed to comply with the Tweed Council’s Building Height Limit of 13.6m. ($13.6 + 3.8 = 17.4\text{m}$ after fill) but According to the EIS, Uniting is now seeking to increase the height of all but Building A.

Building A: is 7.6m, Building B is 16.75m, Building C is 16.32m, the RAC building is 15.85m, Building F is 14.35m, and D/E is 14.15m. However, given the Tweed Shire Council limit for R1 medium density buildings is **13.6m BEFORE FILL** all but BUILDING A, (classed as R2 Low Density Residential with a limit of 9m) exceed the limit and that is not even considering that there will be fill of 3-3.8m, meaning that Building B will be 20.55m above the existing ground level. These will be higher than the previous proposal regardless of the Consultants hearing our concerns.

The recent **Tweed Draft Options Paper** referred to in their application by Uniting Kingscliff - P63 identifies that “Housing supply must be achieved without creating problems for existing residences” and further “there should be no adverse impacts on any surrounding community.”

BUT THIS DEVELOPMENT WILL HAVE A HUGE IMPACT FOR NOT JUST ADJACENT AND NEARBY RESIDENTS BUT FOR ALL OF KINGSCLIFF.

Though **P131 Urban Design Response** claims “the proposed development is addressed through careful consideration to the transition between the surrounding low density built forms and proposed buildings” and will “mitigate privacy concerns for neighbours” **this has by no means been achieved and the Development remains a very dense and inappropriately high and intrusive overdevelopment.**
(See photos 13-17 and diagram 18 attached)

6. BUILDING A

Building A is to be built during Stage 1 after the removal of 4 single level houses which currently pose no threat to neighbours’ privacy. According to the plans Building A (see Appendix B) will have a second storey with large balconies of at least 6m, overlooking No 35 & 37 Lorien Way, whose occupants value their very narrow private outdoor space. What they have is on the side which will face the new Building A. On their other side is a driveway, being a battleaxe block, and offers them no space there for personal activities. They are very concerned about their loss of privacy and as their neighbour so am I. Contrary to what the EIS states, **P105** “this is comparable to other 2 storey apartment buildings in the locality” but this is not the case elsewhere in most of Lorien Way. The EIS P133 claims “Building A which addresses Lorien Way, is 2 stories, matching the building typologies seen along the street frontage. **This is incorrect as the vast majority of houses in Lorien Way between Beach Street and Blue Jay Circuit are single level houses, and contrary to P102 this shows no**” respect for neighbour’s amenity.”

(See attached Photo 20)

7) CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

I am very concerned about the vibrations and potential damage from earthworks and construction activities to my property and others.

The noise and dust during construction, are also of great concern to not only the immediate surrounding residents, but also to all those in surrounding streets. **As an asthmatic, this is of double concern to me.**

There will also be **traffic impacts**. EIS P194 states “Following demolition of the Lorien Way residences the **Lorien Way** lots will be established as **the main contractors’ site access** for the remainder of **Stage 1**. Kingscliff Street access will be maintained for Uniting staff, existing residents, guest and the existing church.” Stage 2: “Access to Buildings A,B,C and the RAC will be provided via Lorien Way for the duration of Stage 2 construction works. Access to the Uniting Church will be maintained via the Kingscliff St access which will be established as the contractors’ main site access for Stage 2.”

Though the Development claims there will be fencing and protection measures to “ manage dust, **noise**, vibration, traffic and visual impacts”, it has been shown with other developments that **dust especially, carries a long way** eg the new Tweed Valley Hospital caused dust which carried to properties at least 1km and more away. **Noise carries** and construction is to take place **Monday to Friday 7am-6pm and Saturday 8am-1pm** meaning **we will be robbed of the peace and quiet we normally enjoy**. This is why people are attracted to Kingscliff.

This is currently stated to take place **over 4** years but construction is historically extended to cater for the many usual holdups and delays.

8) LOSS OF AMENITY

Even though Uniting claim to have done a Wind Assessment the sheer mass of the proposed buildings will undoubtedly block some or all of the **breezes** we currently receive. I will have Building B immediately behind me. It is impossible to believe such a mass will not limit our sea breezes.

I am not looking forward to having problems with **unknown visitors parking** on my footpath, as other residents will have, and will have to compete with the **additional traffic** produced by the Uniting Development. The **noise** created by the additional traffic will also be an issue.

The buildings immediately adjacent to the Development will have the large new Buildings immediately behind them and in the case of Building A in Lorient Way, they will lose their **privacy** to the 2 story building beside them. They will be **almost completely enclosed** and will no doubt **feel claustrophobic as I will by the magnitude of the Development**. These buildings will dominate our skyline and will be a very **unwelcome “new view”**. The whole Development will **tower over us** in a depressing manner. It will even prevent **my views of the beautiful blue sky and sunsets (Photo 21 attached)** from my Living Room, one bedroom, my side garden area and driveway.

Shore Place, Channel Place, Shoal Place and other surrounding streets will look directly onto the new Development. **Three houses on the western side of Lorient Way will look straight onto the new Lorient Way Driveway and will have car headlights shining straight into their living rooms**. These are neighbours almost opposite me.

Why must the entrances have **“illuminated signs”? That will only further create a sense of domination of the site over the surrounding area**. This will detract from the Kingscliff and Lorient Way **streetscape** and will only emphasise the megastructure which will dominate the area.

The EIS justifies the Development by saying that it “provides a sense of place **consistent** with the Kingscliff area.” I have no idea what this even means!

9) UNDERGROUND (MAIN) ELECTRICITY SUPPLY AND SUBSTATIONS

On 15th January 2024, ADP Consulting Pty Ltd advised residents adjacent to the Uniting Kingscliff site that he was employed by Uniting Kingscliff as a consultant “under the Electricity Supply Act 1995 and State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007”.. “to meet the power supply needs of a new development, namely Uniting Kingscliff. That included a substation to be erected on the Development behind houses in Lorient Way, but **when I advised them the land is classed as Flood Prone he advised me that the “design work requires compliance to the supply authority standards which state substations are not to be located in 1:100 year flood prone areas.”** The flood we experienced in February 2022 was classed as a 1:100 year flood which affected our area and caused “the Basin” to fill with water which almost flooded our properties.

EIS P 109 states” it is proposed to install 2 x 15100 KVA padmont substations adjacent to the new RAC Building to service the proposed development.”

10) PRESENTATIONS TO RESIDENTS

In the EIS P117 - Consultation Outcomes Report it states that “the purpose of the consultations was to foster trusted relationships.” **This was not successful and many residents were very upset by the Consultants attitudes and treatment of them. The EIS P 188 claims: “Significant community engagements” took place, but residents feel “the most sensitive feedback from the stakeholders has been ignored.**

I found the presentations to very big city oriented. It is claimed in the EIS P64 that Uniting Kingscliff through the Presentations “sought to collaborate with immediate residents”. But most of the representatives were not local and knew or understood nothing about the area or Kingscliff itself. Many of us found them to be condescending and uninterested in our views. There was a very negative attitude to **older residents** and the consultants claimed in the EIS that we were unwilling to embrace change. This is a gross misrepresentation of older residents in the area. Most simply want to “age gracefully” themselves, which is the ethos of the Uniting Development! Many older residents are still active in the community. While we may not be physically as capable as we once were we are still mentally able. **Surrounding homes include those owned by the elderly, families with children, retirees and those still in the work force are also represented.**

At the **Second round of Presentation in 2023 the organization of the meetings was a schemozzle.** The first lot of letters were delivered to only some of the immediate neighbours in Lorien Way so a second delivery took place later very close to the dates of the presentations. The dates in the second round of advices were incorrect and as a result many immediate residents missed the Presentation. They were not happy as this Development will have a huge impact on their lives. Also we had no access to the updated plans prior to the meeting (as for the first Presentation in 2022) so were unable to **familiarize ourselves with plans and formulate questions before the meetings. There was not time to view and think about all the issues on the spot, and we went away with too many additional questions.** Their responses to us were also contradictory. Many questions about the same issues received different responses. It also became clear to many of us that **where the water goes after it leaves the site was of no concern to them. One consultant even tried to distract me with talk of a major football match that night! I was there for more serious business and was offended. It seems it was all trivial to him!**

One Consultant claimed “water from the proposed water tanks will be directed to the Council Drainage System in Blue Jay Circuit. Land north and south of Turnock Street, which has Zombie Development approvals and also fills with water after heavy rain or floods, is almost adjacent to Blue Jay Circuit where the water from the site will be discharged. The Consultant had no knowledge of “Zombie Development approvals” and replied “Well Gales can’t go ahead”. He was not at all interested in the implications for the site. Having notified the Sydney consulting group of this concern I received a letter of acknowledgement stating “ Thank you for your information on the Zombie planning approval. This is a matter for the Tweed Council”. However it is relevant to the Development’s plans! This lack of interest in local information and the ignoring of any responsibility has been a constant attitude and is of great concern.

A “stakeholder meeting” which took place in Lorien Way after the second presentation, with Uniting King’s Project Manager was very disappointing as the 6 neighbours, including me, all found John to be uninterested in our concerns. He was just there to convince us about the Uniting Kingscliff Development.

11) FINAL COMMENTS

Many of the pictures and descriptions in the EIS and Appendixes are very selective eg. P56 Figure 23: Kingscliff Street entrance is actually just a narrow single lane. Overall there is not a good representation of Lorien Way. P27 is an insufficient description of Lorien Way: “comprising of 2 stories” - there are only 2 double storey properties between Beach Street and Blue Jay Circuit on both sides of the street. There are many other discrepancies. I am enclosing my own photos and a diagram to offset these.