

CHINDERAH DISTRICTS RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION INCORPORATED.

Mr Michael Doyle

Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure.

Dear Mr Doyle,

Re: Application No. MP 08_0194 Mod15 with the

The members of the Chinderah Districts Residents Association Inc., wish to make a submission by email, as the Department's portal could not be negotiated, and this as the case with the SSD of Uniting's Redevelopment at Kingscliff in May this year.

There are a number of issues we wish to comment on, and they are addressed as follows.

1 This application (see subject above) we are led to believe, was refused by your department in mid April, 2016. Yet the applicant not only seeks a second hearing, but has the temerity to request a dropping of the crucial noise management conditions! This service station is on a **local road in a rural area**, yet this developer seeks conditions applicable to a service station on a highway, choosing to ignore the rural environment. More importantlt the amenity of all the residents whose homes are only the width of the roadway away from this proposed development.

2 We firmly believe that the MOD 3 is simply overkill when one takes into account that approximately 10 km away to the north, on the M1 is the BP all night service station at Chinderah. A few kilometres from this 24 hour service station is the 24 hour service station at Melaleuca, which is also on the M, as well as a service in Kingscliff on Kingscliff Street, and the 24 hour Chinderah service station on Chinderah Bay Road, which was formerly the Pacific Highway. To the south of this development proposal is the service station, drinks, fruit and vegetable market at Hastings Point on the north side of the village, and a mere few metres further south in Ha is situated on a local road, not the M1, stings Point is another service station. Both are on the local Tweed Coast Road, and thus are not operating 24 hours a day. Just how many service stations does this small area need to have? There are , as I have just pointed out more than 'end of trip facilitito this site alsoes' in close proximity to the proposed service station.

3 This service station site is on a local road, not on the M1. Even when operating on restricted hours, it will cause undue, totally unnecessary impacts on the nearby residents, Cudgen Creek is nearby also. Local fauna will also be negatively impacted.

4 The applicant's request to delete the noise limits conditions only emphasises the callous disregard , to the northfor the existing amenity of the location.

5 The applicant's request to allow illuminated signage, coupled with the added request to increase in the operation of food and drink premises is also unnecessary, for as I have pointed out in para 2, we have legitimate, properly authorised service station facilities nearby to the north, to the south, to the east and to the west.

Our Association also wishes to ask the Department why only 14 days exhibition of this proposal? Five days were lost by the late receipt by post of your letter to the residents notifying them of this proposal. As we have had problems with negotiating the planning portal in the very recent past (may 2024) we would request an alternative method, that is by email, so that those of us wishing to lodge submissions, can do so without being sorely tested when attempting to access the portal.

We would further request that development proposals such as this one ie those that require State Planning considerations be exhibited for longer than 14 days if such DA's are exhibited over the Christmas period. For, you must surely be aware as we are, that many residents take Chriustmas leave and so are unable to submit their concerns.

We thank you in anticipation of your consideration of our submission.

Yours sincerely,

Felicia Cecil