

Re: Planning Proposal (RZ/14/2021; PP-2022-199) & SSD for Trinity Point (SSD-27028161)

I strongly object to this Planning Proposal & SSD on the following grounds:

1. Height of buildings
2. Light pollution
3. Sustainability - relating to solar panels and water, and
4. Lack of developer commitment.

Height of Buildings:

The backdrop to the development, from my house in Summerland Point is the ridgeline between Bonnells Bay and Windermere Park. This area of ridgeline has an average elevation of 30-35m with a small area reaching 40m. Consequently, the development would be highly visible above the ridge. The proposed height change would compete with, not complement the “natural surrounding (Morisset) hills” (wording taken from Trinity Point advertising) and conflict with the LEP* 7.6.3.b

If Council(s) want to enhance/maintain the natural environment and not compete with it, then they should not allow buildings to exceed the average elevation of surrounding hills (LEP* 7.6.3.b) as they are one of the many features that makeup “the areas greatest quality – Lake Macquarie” (wording taken from Trinity Point advertising.)

Light pollution & environmental impact:

- 1) There is no reference to any study regarding the impact of night lighting from these 42m tall lake side buildings. These buildings are very close to the foreshore and will be highly visible at night to many suburbs around the lake.
- 2) There is also no reference to any study regarding the impact of lighting effecting the "circadian rhythm" of marine life and the animals in the surrounding hills/mountains. Refer to <https://futurism.com/the-effects-of-light-pollution-on-the-environment>. Fishing in the lake has already slowed over the past few years, these additional environmental interferences will only make it less enjoyable for the fishing fraternity and appear to conflict with LEP* 7.6.3.c.ii.

Further study/investigation and design alteration are required.

Sustainability in relation to solar panels and water.

Trinity Point advertising states “The feature green roofs are covered with plants and couple with layers of solar panels”, or “six soft hill shaped buildings covered with green roofs, solar panels and more”.

Environmental Impact documents also loosely state how the development will be sustainable but it is very difficult to envisage how solar panels are going to be put on curved roof tops and still maintain the visual effect they are proposing.

It is equally difficult to envisage how all the greenery that is to adorn the balconies etc are going to be maintained in this often hot, dry climate where water restrictions frequently apply. Resulting in an image of dried brown foliage masking the green background of the Morisset Hills and Watagan Mountain range. (This is not Singapore with high humidity and rainfall where such buildings look beautiful.)

Further investigation and clarification are required.

Lack of Commitment by the Johnson Property Group.

The previous approval for the Trinity Point Development included tourism and residential buildings 12 – 15m in height. Suddenly these are no longer viable and require changes. The developer has not proven lack of viability. Who is to say that when it comes time to build “six soft hill shaped buildings” they don’t say that these are no longer viable and require change.

The proposal shows and discusses beautiful landscaping and greenery adorned buildings in their application but makes no commitment to this. In fact, the developer makes the following statement on page 22 of the EIS;

4.2.1 Reference Scheme and Building Envelopes

The envelopes (for approval) are ‘loose fit’ and have been designed to allow tolerance for mechanical plant/services and other elements of the buildings that may be modified through design development. Given that the current application seeks concept approval for land uses and building envelopes, more detailed information on matters such as façade design, materials, finishes, colours, and signage will be included in future development applications.

This paragraph shows no commitment to the design but allows plenty of opportunity for open ended change. This is not acceptable.

The current proposal limits the top of the accommodation floors to approximately RL 33m with a further 8m height dedicated to the architectural roof. If the RL41m height is approved, with no commitment to the current design, it is only a minor change to add three stories increasing the high of accommodation levels to 42m.

No, these proposed changes, as stated, should not be permitted as 1) they appear to conflict with LEP* 7.16.2.a, b, c, e, 7.16.3.a, c, d, e, g and 2) Lake Macquarie’s beauty should not be spoilt to meet the “concept/loose fit” desires of developers. Lake Macquarie is a pristine environment with moderate development on its foreshores, lets keep it that way.

Another issue I object to is the area zoned as “Take Off and Landing” for the Helipad. It appears to extend excessively to the east, encroaching on Summerland Point’s water boundary i.e., within 400-500m of the shoreline. With increased air traffic over time coupled with the frequent westerly winds experienced at Summerland Point it will undoubtedly cause noise issues. There is also no indication of how this will affect water crafts that use this part of the lake. Sailing Clubs, recreational fisher persons, speed boats with/without skiers, jet skis and kayakers all use this area regularly. I find it hard to believe that this issue was addressed with the general public in the original proposal. This issue is potentially very dangerous and needs discussion with the public, especially as it appears to conflict with the LEP* 7.6.3.d and 7.6.3.e.

Other points of concern that need to be noted & addressed are:

Many Summerland Point and Gwandalan residents use the foreshore, from the Summerland Point boat ramp right around to Sandy Beach, on a regular basis and yet none of these residents, outside the “Effective Visual Catchment” were informed of this proposal and the consequences it could have on the enjoyment of their recreational activities. This should be addressed properly/more comprehensively.

The Trinity Point development, somewhat like Summerland Point with the Crangan Bay development, does not appear to refer to traffic congestion. There is only 1 major road into Bonnells Bay / Morisset Park area, which already causes traffic congestion right back to the M1. Council(s)

really need to address this issue as it actually very dangerous when there is a fire in the area, as we experienced here at Summerland Point/Gwandalan in 2013. An alternative route(s) should be insisted upon during the planning stage.

There appears to be inconsistencies between documents given in the Planning Proposal and the SSD in regard to height of buildings i.e., 42m from what? Inferred in some places as from ground level, elsewhere stated as from sea level and in other places just stated as maximum height. Whatever height is decided upon it needs to be clarified and uniformly used in all documents and correspondence.

Notification of this exhibition was late and the time frame inadequate especially considering the time of year (Christmas Holiday Season). We only received notification via our mail box, addressed to "The Resident" on the 17th November, 1 day prior to start of exhibition. We received another notification via our PO box, addressed to us personally one week after the start of exhibition. The general public should be given another 4 weeks to review/respond to this exhibition. For us personally this was our first ever notification regarding the Trinity Point Project and yet we have resided in Summerland Point since 2013.

As the SSD is only "The **concept** application (that) does not seek approval for building construction or works. If approved, further development application(s) DA(s) would be required for detailed building design and construction." And is therefore really only seeking "concept approval for six building envelopes up to eight storeys high (maximum 42m), a maximum gross floor area of 42,675m² and indicative land uses" noted. The SSD with its excessive number of attached documents (49 docs, 4,956 pages) is a very obvious case of "Smoke Screening" people with unnecessary "concept" or "indicative" related information causing confusion and leading people to believe that it is 1) already a fait accompli or 2) too big an issue to address, especially at this time of year. That is the feedback I have received.

On a personal note: When my husband and I were planning our retirement which included moving to the coast we looked at the Trinity Point development but decided against it for 2 reasons; 1) we did not like the idea of 4 story buildings being plonked in front of us and right on the foreshore; and 2) we did not like being dictated to what façade design, materials, finishes, colours and even mail box we could have/use. And now they expect residents to accept this 'loose fit'. I feel very very sorry for the Trinity Point residents. There is little to no commitment from the developers but it is expected of the residents.