

Public Submission — Objection

Lorena Millett

101 Annam Rd Bayview 2104

3/6/26

Project: Opal Healthcare Bayview — SSD-77240466 **Location:** 36–42 Cabbage Tree Road, Bayview

I am a local resident, and I object to the proposed Opal Healthcare Bayview development. In my view, the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) does not meet the standard required for an assessment-ready submission under the Housing SEARs, and several key issues must be resolved before any determination is made.

1. Cross-title access, subdivision and legal enforceability The proposal relies on shared access, parking, and infrastructure across two separate land titles. The EIS does not clearly demonstrate that these arrangements will be legally enforceable, safe, or durable over the life of development. Emergency access, evacuation routes, and maintenance responsibilities must be proven and secured through instruments that bind future owners.

2. Excessive bulk and scale The development seeks Clause 4.6 variations to height and upper-level setback controls. Council’s pre-lodgment advice already identified the building as too large for the Bayview context. A compliant alternative and a reduced-scale option should be provided so the community and the Department can properly assess impacts on character, amenity, and streetscape.

3. Traffic, access safety and parking impacts The EIS does not adequately address driveway safety, sight distances, queueing, or conflicts with Aveo residents. The shared parking arrangement requires transparent modelling, peak-demand testing, and enforceable management. Waste service and emergency vehicle access must also be demonstrated safely.

4. Water management and storm resilience Stormwater, drainage, and major-storm overflow paths are not demonstrated to Council standards. Pump-out reliability, flood risk, and off-site impact controls must be clearly shown and conditioned before any construction certificate is issued.

5. Biodiversity, tree removal and construction impacts The proposal involves significant vegetation loss and potential impacts on local fauna. The EIS does not provide adequate verification, retention strategies, or enforceable construction-phase protections. A clear canopy-replacement trajectory and independent biodiversity monitoring are required.

6. Construction duration and neighborhood disruption The construction program is lengthy and may extend to three years once contingencies are included. This represents a major cumulative social impact for nearby residents. A detailed Construction Disruption Management Plan is needed, including workforce parking, traffic routes, monitoring, and complaint-response measures.

7. Engagement transparency The engagement summary in the EIS does not accurately reflect the concerns raised by residents, particularly regarding access safety, biodiversity, and construction impacts. A transparent issues-response table and evidence-based engagement record should be provided.

Request I request that the Department require the applicant to address these matters through a formal Request for Information (RFI) process and defer determination until the proposal is demonstrated to be safe, lawful, and compliant. If the applicant cannot provide this information to an assessment-ready standard, the application should be refused.