

OBJECTION TO SSD-47105958 - UNITING KINGSCLIFF REDEVELOPMENT

Address: 24A Kingscliff Street, Kingscliff NSW 2487; 27 - 33 Lorien Way, Kingscliff NSW 2487

- I object to the bulk, scale and height of this development. The impact that this development as proposed will have on the character and context of the low density residential precinct and the fabric, amenity and liveability of residents and indeed the wider Kingscliff community is almost beyond comprehension.

The bulk, scale and height of this development runs completely counter to the defined present and future character of the West Kingscliff Precinct as is clearly and unambiguously enshrined in our community's highly consultative local planning frameworks.

It is deeply concerning to me that the development application has sought to 'cherry pick' local planning documents (and indeed draft documents which have not been ratified and subject to community input ie Draft Growth Management and Housing Strategy) to push the case for such a gross overdevelopment and has completely ignored the intent of the planning frameworks themselves.

The conclusion reached in the application's EIS that the KLP Character Statement for the West Kingscliff Precinct justifies the application's increase in building heights and densities beyond the maximum allowable is particularly concerning. The Character Statement is unambiguously referring to greenfield sites (mentioned a number of times in this statement) which are further west from the proponent's 'brownfield' site, which, as per the Statement, is surrounded by buildings of '*...low density residential character, consisting predominately of single and two-storey buildings...*' The Character Statement is again unambiguous in defining future objectives for development of this precinct as to '*...facilitate the development of low density housing within the existing residential precinct.*'

There can be no argument about the character and context of this precinct, nor the future development objectives. The development as proposed is at complete odds and incompatible with the character and context of this part of the West Kingscliff Precinct. At best this is a misinterpretation by the proponent and at worst a deliberate reinvention in order to achieve their own ends with this gross overdevelopment.

- I object to the impact that this gross overdevelopment will have in this low density, one and two storey residential precinct on local infrastructure, particularly road and traffic. This has flow-on effects to the wider Kingscliff community.

It beggars belief that a development of this magnitude (and clearly identified as a 'traffic generating project') has its ingress and egress (including during the proposed 4 years of construction) a suburban, residential street – Lorien Way and **I strongly object to this.** Lorien Way and those surrounding are exemplars of the road network described in the

KLP Character Statement for the West Kingscliff Precinct, in that there is one connector road in the whole precinct (Elrond Drive), with the rest being '*...local streets, many of which are dead end cul de sacs.*' This limited, residential, local street network is not built or intended for the traffic that such a large scale 'traffic generating' development will have. The fabric, amenity and liveability of local and surrounding residents will be severely compromised as a result of this impact. Again, this gross overdevelopment is in completely the wrong place.

- I object to the proposed building heights (of up to 16.75m) of this development.

16.75m is well above the site zoning max of 13.6m, in itself of concern when taken in context of the residential precinct of the site. The proposed building heights are completely incompatible with the context and character of not only the surrounding built environment and low rise neighbourhood, but Kingscliff itself, where maximum heights are enshrined in our local planning frameworks at 13.6m and exist only along Marine Parade, Pearl Street and some parts of Kingscliff Street.

I also note that the SEPP in relation to seniors/aged care sets a maximum building height of 9.5m. This would appear to me that the proposed building heights are not compliant with this SEPP, which is interesting given that the proponent is calling this a 'seniors housing development'.

Additionally, the assertions made in the application that current buildings in Kingscliff are exemplars of what can be applied in this development have been taken completely out of the character and context of where these 'exemplar' buildings exist and then the character and context of the proposed development site.

In this regard, the building referred in the application located at 176 Marine Parade as an example of how a four storey (13.6m) building (with the fourth floor set back) can fit in the proposed development and surrounds is actually located in a 13.6m built environment. This location bears no relevance to the land locked site of the proposed development, which is surrounded on all sides by low density, one and two storey residential buildings.

It's also noted that the proponent references the set-back fourth floor of 176 Marine Parade as an exemplar of their own built form design, yet the proposed buildings, as provided in the application, are in one built form from ground to top fourth floor, with no set back.

The referenced building at 176 Marine Parade (60m from the site) also has an outlook over a road (Marine Parade) and the Kingscliff foreshore public reserve. It and neighbouring 13.6m buildings do not loom over surrounding resident's homes as will be the case in the proposed development, creating severe negative impact on character, fabric, amenity and liveability.

It is disingenuous of the proponent to put the 176 Marine Parade building forward as an example to support their development, when in fact it bears no relevance to the actual built environment and character and context of the development site and the surrounding low-rise, single and double storey surrounds.

I also note the application references a lift overrun on a new apartment development located in Murphy's Road, Kingscliff, approved by Council in 2023, as an example of Council showing some flexibility towards building heights beyond the 13.6 maximum allowed. This is just laughable.

Council ultimately and reluctantly agreed to this slight overrun as it was located in the centre of the building and completely unseen (unless you were actually on the roof itself!), with no impact at all on the built environment. Again, a laughable attempt at justifying the application's push for exceeding the maximum building heights for Kingscliff as is defined in our local planning frameworks.

- I object to the flood mitigation strategies provided in this application. This site forms part of the Kingscliff flood plain and along with other flood plain development sites to the south and north- west of this site, was completely inundated (including the proponent's existing facility) during the traumatic flood events of early 2022. This total combined flood water contributed to flooding in residential streets to the east and west of the development, the Turnock Street precinct (including the shopping centre) of West Kingscliff and to the unprecedented flooding in North Kingscliff (3 streets to the north of the site).

Since these flood events, there have been strong and consistent calls to halt/pause flood plain development until at least the findings of the respective flood inquiries and other revisions to flood data have been addressed and policies developed and enshrined in State and local planning frameworks for these sites. While our community is still waiting for direction in this critical area, we are now dealing with this proposed development which will add at least 3.8 metres of fill to the site and then (given the proposed gross bulk and scale of the development itself) a significant amount of hard surface.

The water generated by this development from any significant event will simply need to go somewhere. The proponent's response is the provision of detention tanks with a 'one-way' valve. There is absolutely no guarantee that this will work in a major event and no mention in this application of mitigating the impact to the surrounding residential areas. In fact, during one of the consultation meetings I attended, the proponent's response to this question and the water flowing from their site was to clearly say – 'once the water leaves our site, that's Council's problem'. This alarming response and the application's inadequate addressing of the local impact from site generated stormwater

is completely unsatisfactory to me as a local resident. There is a significant chance that this development as proposed will exacerbate the flooding experienced in 2022.

In regards to the application's evacuation procedures for the residents of the proposed development, there is absolutely no consideration of the unnecessary strain that would be placed on stretched community resources from having to evacuate and manage such a large group.

Again, the application's approach to flood mitigation is completely unsatisfactory to me.

Conclusion

I am a Kingscliff resident who lives in proximity to the proposed development and is also deeply involved in community activities, contributing for some years (as do other members of the community) to our highly consultative local planning frameworks. It is almost beyond comprehension that an organisation with such goodwill as Uniting would seek to step all over character and growth defining local planning frameworks to push 'what they want' for this speculative residential development. What is particularly galling to me is that Uniting are hiding this gross residential property development under the guise of 'seniors housing and 'aged care'.

It is now apparent to me through nearly two years of engagement with Uniting in this process that they, despite their regular public exclamations of 'love' for the Kingscliff community, have absolutely no compunction in wrecking the character of this community to achieve the highest yield from this property development.

My personal experience of Uniting's approach from day one of the consultation process and their initial presentation, of what was obviously an 'ambit' proposal completely unacceptable to the community, was one of 'smugness'. The attitude was 'we'll listen to you, but really we can do this because it's a State Significant Development and covered under the aged care/seniors SEPP'.

Uniting knew from feedback received from day one of their 'tick-a-box' consultation process that the community were fully expecting and welcoming of a seniors and aged care development on this site. One which would provide genuine seniors housing and increased residential aged care beds, but without compromising the character and context of the surrounding precinct, nor trample all over planning frameworks which define Kingscliff. However, two years down the track and Uniting has largely chosen to ignore community feedback and have produced in this application what is no more than a large scale property development, masquerading as seniors housing and aged care.

As a member of this community, it actually saddens me that an opportunity has been lost here and that myself and our community have been put through nearly two years of lip service when the intent all along has been to deliver this gross overdevelopment.

Local residents surrounding the site itself, a number of whom are friends, have been put through nearly two years of unnecessary trauma and angst.

Uniting still have a chance to remedy this though. They clearly know what the community wants and expects in relation to the genuine provision of seniors housing and aged care. This site could certainly accommodate this in a more modest development that is compatible with the character of the low density neighbourhood, the surrounding precinct and Kingscliff.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide an objection to this development. Please let me know if you have any queries or require further information.

Peter Newton