

Tessa Morris
117 Leo Drive
Narrawallee NSW

October 9, 2017

NARRAWLLEE RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION

Application Number: MP 06_0267 MOD 2

Objection to proposal

Dear Sir /Madam

Firstly congratulations in presenting an almost indecipherable means of lodging an application protest online. For a lay person not involved in the day to day business of the NSW Planning and Environment it is virtually impossible to 1. Understand what is being presented and 2. Find the relevant form to protest online. Well done as I am sure this is the first stage in making sure no protest voices are heard!

I first of all question why a period of only 3 weeks was give to lodge a protest co-inciding nicely with the of the School holidays (possibly in hopes that many people were away?)

What is being presented here is clearly a land grab a money making land grab exercise for the proponent (Mr Graham Beasley on behalf of Rygate and West Ulladulla) in cahoots with council who want an easy life.

The reserve small southern most reserve (4,051msq) in question in question -was originally to be a bush reserve to preserve some integrity in this awful land slash (scrubbing I believe is the technical term) which has decimated every living thing in its path leaving not a tree or bush (significant, hollow or not as quoted in your documentation) in its wake. It was then deemed not needed as an 'active reserve' as what meagre play equipment that may have been put there for public used was deemed too close to the existing pathetic swing set on the reserve already on Leo Drive. I see from the plans you do propose just such a dismal recreational outlet as a box ticker for the proposal.

How convenient for you all to deem that this new ghastly housing estate doesn't need any more active space - for walking dogs or play areas for children but it is far more important that more money be made by the company who own the land? Does too much open land (cleared on any vestige of its bush) make you nervous or is far more important that everyone can hear their neighbours toilet flush while you cram in as many blocks as you can, cutting down every single tree in your path. The resultant overcrowding of cars people and pets is not taken into consideration but you think that making a walkway so everyone can access the pathetic swing set and bare open

playground fronted by a major road (Leo Drive) by a walkway is far better for young children wishing to play. Is it any wonder that this reserve is NEVER used?

I very much doubt that any 'hollow or significant' trees would be left as NOT ONE has been left on the land already cleared. What can be done once they are cut down? Once gone they are gone. I quote from the Ian Dollery email Dated Monday February 13 a line that proves that a cleared reserve is so much more convenient for council *'the other 2 reserves could then be cleared to make them a far more usable form for council'*. Is it not local the inhabitants (human and animal) who we should think about and not the convenience of council? I quote again *'in this regard the playground equipment could be added to the Northern reserve and this reserve basically cleared to provide some active recreation'*.

As for the largest reserve, it is to be mostly cleared. Can someone define the difference between *basically* and *mostly* or is there nothing. Does just cut it all down and leave bare earth provide a more apt description. Can you define *basically cleared*. Does it mean cleared like everywhere else without a tree in site so *'some active recreation could take place'* (quote). **What defines some active recreation and why should it be done without shade.** There is mention of croquet Courts. Gosh – that's a popular sport in this day and age. NOT. Or were they chosen as they are easier for council to mow? Are the trees pictured in your plan of the proposed Croquet Court original and able to provide shade or will you be cutting them down and planting some slow growing shrubs as you have in stages 1 & 2?

How about considering a bush and active reserve to encourage people to actually enjoy the outside space or once again **is it easier just to cut down every tree flog more lots.** *'Large reserves are more cost effective to maintain'* Ian Dollery says in his email of April 5 on the same subject. So it appears it does come down to cost every time – not community well being or preservation of any vestige of the original beautiful bush land

Destroying native habitat, slashing the bush, creating convenient Croquet Court reserves for council to mow and allowing capacity of Stage 3 to increase by 22 blocks to simply net a profit of some five million dollars to the proponent is hardly in the best interest of anyone but the proponent.

I strongly object to this proposal.

I beg you - don't turn Narrawallee into the giant housing estate that Ulladulla has become.

Kind regards

Tessa Morris

tessaannemorris@hotmail.com

0416 755 037