

I object to this modification proposal because

8th August 2017

The developer within the huge parcel of land of Kings Forest has many options open to them and in all fairness should be coming back to the NSW department of planning with a modification that will increase Koala habitat especially in light of the Koalas officially endangered status in this critical colony. With the Kings Forest development Leda have practiced for many years hoping for protest fatigue from the community, and the Department of Planning for their own through modifications. The developer has the opportunity to make a difference in a positive way but continues to choose the path of making a on the land, the environment, the wildlife and the community. The developer has made a of the Planning process and government restrictions to be able once again to show for the very Shire and community within which they intend to work. The proposal should be rejected in its entirety.

The extensive community here in Kingscliff, Cabarita, Cudgen and surrounds within the Tweed Shire **do not want Development at any cost!** We do not want to lose our iconic wildlife and natural attractions for our community and the tourism economy of this area just because the Developer chooses to down more koala habitat in order to squeeze more house lots into a development and make more money. This community will be watching Sydney and the State Government to see that the government is looking and listening to NSW communities. The economy here is based largely on tourism, if the Government permits developers to build mini-cities and off our wildlife in the process the Government is not protecting us and our future economy. The community has an expectation that you will protect our endangered wildlife species and still be able to deliver housing for the people in an environmentally sustainable and acceptable manner not through from developers. The proposal should be rejected in its entirety.

This development cannot promise nor guarantee to improve this area economically, I challenge the department to confirm that the developer is restricted to who they employ to participate with this development. It is a well-known fact in this location that the developer will engage Qld workers, businesses and companies to the development of Kings Forest so let there be no s made by the developer that they will be creating jobs for NSW this is a The proposal should be rejected in its entirety.

Trying to reduce, eliminate, cut back and repeal green zones and wildlife habitat zones has a detrimental effect on both the wildlife and the humans that will live there. Within the KPOM to reduce the East West Corridor at any point from 100m down to 50m is a blatant attempt to ensure the Koalas **will not** be physically able to travel, for breeding purposes and for food. To **refuse** to plant **PRIMARY FOOD TREES** for Koalas is with all intents and purposes to ensure their demise. To refuse to plant primary food trees in compensation for habitat that will be destroyed through construction shows the of a Developer with no consideration for the community and the Environmental zone within which he will be working. The proposal should be rejected in its entirety

The NSW State Government must be consistent with environment policies across its different departments i.e. The NSW Department of Environment and Heritage and the NSW Department of Planning and Environment, the common denominator being the **Environment**. A determination by one department should not be overridden by another department. The Department of Environment & Heritage has spent millions of taxpayers' dollars in the last few years on the **SAVE THE SPECIES** campaign of which the Koala plays a large role. The Kings Forest Koala is an **officially endangered species**, it is a **threatened species** and also an **Iconic species**, therefore the Department of Planning must keep these important facts firmly in mind when decisions are being made on a grossly inadequate watered down K.P.O.M. which is now being proposed by the developer. This proposal is concocted by an environment company with an obvious lack of Koala Management expertise, employed by the developer to suggest that less than the original 2012 KPOM is adequate. In this instance we must be seeking the best outcome for the Koalas not the least expensive and restrictive outcome for the Developer. The proposal should be rejected in its entirety.

Leda was only granted approval for Kings Forest based on the well formulated KPOM 2012. To now assume after a few years have passed they can reduce, repeal, and cut back from that is an insult to the community and democracy and in particular the endangered Koala of Kings Forest. To reduce the capacity of the 2012 KPOM is unjustified, the Koala population is diminishing not increasing, the only modifications the Developer should be proposing is more habitat plantings and compensation plantings and wider corridors and more underpasses and fencing not a retraction of these important factors. The proposal should be rejected in its entirety.

To not include fencing for connecting roads within the development is another attempt by the Developer to place the officially endangered Kings Forest Koala in the line of fire of Vehicle strike and/or dog attack, the most common form of deaths for Koalas. Primary Food Trees for Koalas and Secondary Food Trees have no difference in cost to the Developer. Primary Food trees for Koalas and Secondary Food trees make an enormous difference to whether a Koala will live or die. Without the planting of more Primary Food trees within Cudgen Nature Reserve the Koalas will **STARVE**. The Developer has provided no purpose for refusing to plant Primary food trees and only considering planting Secondary food trees. The proposal should be rejected in its entirety.

The developer has promised the community in full page local paper advertising that they will plant primary food trees within the 27ha of Cudgen reserve, that they would protect the Koala and that we could trust them. Any attempt to modify the 2012 KPOM is a direct breach of trust and promises by the Developer towards the community. The department of Planning must do its utmost to represent the community and residents of NSW and only approve Development which is fair and just and not Development which is making a mockery of our planning laws that protect us and our wildlife. The proposal should be rejected in its entirety.

A precedence must be set by this Government that an Officially Endangered Koala colony is just that and any attempts by this developer to put it at risk will not be tolerated. For all the above reasons this proposal should be rejected in its entirety.

Maria Smart, 8 Seaside Drive Kingscliff NSW 2487.

Letter of the Week

CONGRATULATIONS

Barbara Fitzgibbon

You have won a double pass to the film of your choice, courtesy of

HOYTS
CINEMA
TWEED HEADS

Gold Coast-style development won't come to Kingscliff

Politicians who don't check statements offered by those who could appear to be promising votes for those statements, can look silly. (TVW page 5, 20/07/17)

Kingscliff hasn't been a village for years. It's a vibrant coastal town with a strong tourism sector. Yes, we've lost the intimacy of small community living and the immediate security that accompanies this, but we haven't lost the beauty of creek and beach. Nor should we have lost the friendliness of village life – the smile for visitors, the co-operation between residents, residents and business people and a combined wish by all to work together to enhance daily life.

Yet there are some whose nostalgia has become twisted, who appear to be getting a perverse pleasure from attempting to reproduce via scaremongering that period when all developers were summarily labeled "develop at any cost," when a majority of councilors were enamored of Gold Coast-style development, when Commissions of Inquiry found dodgy deals and business people were considered suspect.

Planning legislation has strengthened over the years. It curtails "slippery-slope" changes and ensures that all proposed quid pro quo DA agreements are "above-board." To suggest otherwise and to point the political finger is to mislead residents.

Barbara Fitzgibbon, Kingscliff
We object to four-storey plans

Please register our absolute rejection and objection to any increase in height for this development, which would enable four storey buildings to be built at the Kingscliff location (TVW July 20 page 5).

This would become a terrible precedent on the Tweed Coast, and would result in further future

developers to push for a four storey allowance, then five storey, then six storey and so on.

This would be completely against the special attraction of the Tweed Coast in comparison to the Gold Coast. This environment here is low impact from developers, being limited to three-storey height levels. That's why people continue to flock to the Tweed Coast.

Do not let developers mask their intentions by talking in so-called environmental terms, or "what's good for the community".

This community is happy with the current three-storey limits.

The TSC needs to maintain its compact with the people who live here, and have built their homes here because of the different lifestyle and the interaction with nature that the Tweed Coast environment provides in comparison with going North of the Tweed River.

We don't want another Gold Coast here, and we call upon the TSC to reject any developer proposals to increase height levels above three storeys.

Wynne and Marisa Henderson, Cabarita Beach

Kings Forest developer must keep promises

Many newcomers to the Tweed might not know the history of the Kings Forest development so far.

When the developer purchased the land at Kings Forest, it was well known to be the territory of the Tweed Shire's major koala colony. The land was purchased for approximately \$20 million, which was considered very cheap as it was doubtful that anything much could ever be built there. The developers spokesman said at the time "it might turn out to be a very expensive koala park". So they took a punt.

When the developer proposed a "mini city" on the land, with 4500 dwellings and little consideration for the resident remaining koalas, more people objected to this development than any other in the history of NSW, since Captain Cook landed.

Koala conservation groups such as Team Koala were formed to consult leading koala experts on the minimum standards needed to have any hope of keeping wild koalas on the Tweed.

The company and the community both submitted their thoughts to the State Government, who essentially operated as the "umpire".

The umpire backed the koala experts and the community, and the developer was given the immense privilege of constructing many thousands of dwellings on the condition that they spent a few

dollars on things like traffic calming devices and a 100-metre wildlife corridor and planting new trees.

The developer accepted that. Now, just before the bulldozers arrive, they have applied to break their commitments to the community and the koalas.

Fair suck of the sav guys. I know our local koala population might apparently mean little to a South African born billionaire, but they mean a lot to the people of this area. Please support Team Koala and their efforts to get developer to keep his promises on koala protection.

Lisa Townsend, Murwillumbah
No care for our Commonwealth Games mascot

The Commonwealth Games are upon us and the endangered koala has been made the official Games mascot. Meanwhile, the Tweed Shire Council 'development at any cost' faction led by the National Party Councillor Warren Polglase is quoted as saying "the region needed to do more before it missed an important opportunity" in relation to Government funding helping the Northern Rivers capitalise on the Games. Cr Polglase has for many years convinced his faction to vote for inappropriate development and ecological vandalism in the Tweed which in turn contributes to the very demise of our Games mascot, the endangered coastal koala.

Economic advance is not the same thing as human or environmental progress. We shouldn't have to continually fight with our Council and Government to protect our koalas and the environment, we should be able to live in a world where the environment doesn't need protecting.

Andrew Bennett, Murwillumbah
Don't rip up our railway

I was amazed to learn that there has been a huge sum of money allocated by the Government for the destruction of the rail line to allow for a rail trail to be built. Yes in order to change the railway line with its ballast and sleepers to a surface conducive for cyclists it will mean the destruction of a valuable piece of infrastructure which will be very difficult to replace in the future.

History shows us that rail trails are a novelty item suited for a small proportion of the population. The cycling fraternity has been very vocal to convince the government to favour their proposal. If other rail trails are anything to go by the rail trail will probably become a white elephant and the need for a commuter train will be on the radar.

The line covers over 100 kilometres. Even the Tour de France cyclists

would find that quite a Social cyclists would find that distance in a day of there be series of toilet for the small number of who will maintain these What about camp sites. A for emergencies such as or falls. Who will serve The Council which is strapped?

The line passes through private properties which compromised by element bikers and hikers who v trail. Who will police t stop horse riders using Once the trail is used by the wet season it will be for cycling except for the expensive trail bikes. maintain the track?

A recent event of Her was reported in the area for the rail trail. Cont from animals, in particular could be spread along t bicycles and pedestrian cross contamination of and the spread of disease a requirement to disclose visited a rural property when entering Australia. avoid spread of disease and animals. We are p farming industry at risk t such a conduit to allo potential spread of cont

If a similar amount of allocated to the construction light rail commuter service people of the region ther a positive spin off for the small towns along the Northern Rivers is a spectacular scenery which numerous visitors in the come. A light rail commu linking the Coolangatta our region eventually v boon to tourism and wor much needed infrastruc region for all, not just t fact similar commuter tr I have ridden on in Eur bicycles to be taken on t allow cyclists to explore.

Properly run, such a service would pay for commuter service could by private investors so a the impact on other Ge Services but the rail trac Government owned fore are many such preceden the world.

Should we miss this opportunity to link up our isolated they will die out eventually country people will not farm the area if they feel Older folk will benefit