

Personal Submission made by:

(Name withheld on request)

Tumbi Umbi NSW 2261

04 January 2025

Mingara Recreation Club Seniors Housing, Tumbi Umbi

Application Number

SSD-63475709

Assessment Type

State Significant Development

Development Type

Seniors Housing

Local Government Areas

Central Coast

I am opposed to any development on this site which plans for dwellings higher than 2 stories, much greater than the height which was approved and developed on the adjoining Glengara site for the Assisted Care Apartments building.

If the centre aligned buildings on the Mingara site plan were as tall as the Glengara Care Apartments (2 stories) then the dwellings surrounding these centre buildings should be no higher than standard villa height ie. the same height as the larger stand alone residences surrounding Mingara in Jaeger Road / Sandpiper Place, Hansens Road, Jabiru Road etc., ie. a ground floor and a top floor. These heights would blend in more with the surrounding suburban area and not cause the area to be viewed as an inner city area, which it is not nor could it ever be. And any 2 story buildings should be at the centre of the proposed development, replacing the developer proposed buildings of 6 or more stories.

This proposed development could never be approved as a Transport Oriented Development as it's parameters do not align with most of the guidelines of that TOD.

This site currently has a zoning of RE2 which is Private Recreation, zoned for "Open Space". In order for the proposed development to be approved the existing zoning has to be either ignored or changed to reclassify the area zoning to allow what is proposed. Currently the open RE2 area has uses of:

- dog walking and exercise

- kite flying
- all sorts of ball sports eg. golfing practice, soccer and other ball games
- trail bikes use this area occasionally (probably illegal, but better than on roads/footpaths or in sensitive vegetation areas)
- overflow parking for the Mingara Sports Ground (without affecting parking at the actual Club)
- Community Markets have successfully been held on this site
- bird-life such as ducks, plovers, ibis, magpies use this site, to name a few birds
- there are tortoises in the water course (eastern long-necked turtle (*Chelodina longicollis*) probably) and these tortoises are quite mobile and migratory. Residents here have often rescued these from internal roads and replaced them in the watercourse. A few years ago one was crushed and killed on the local roads, most probably by a delivery vehicle, most of which totally ignore the posted 15 Km/h speed limit signs..



This little critter was photographed on 16th Oct. 2019 before being returned to the watercourse.



This one was photographed on 15th. Oct. 2024 and was returned to the watercourse.

Additionally in the 8 years we have lived next to this area it has been obvious that the Rescue Helicopters often use this open area as a clear landing area when there is an emergency requiring a helicopter evacuation, particularly at night.

The Mingara “hotel” was approved and built under the existing RE2 zoning requirements, ie. the “hotel” must be integrated with the Mingara Club. The 5 story building actually presents a blighted viewpoint on the landscape no matter where you view it from. It is my understanding that Mingara originally wanted that “hotel” to be constructed in the existing Mingara Club car park, but that would not be allowed as the RE2 zoning does not allow a stand alone structure, it must be integrated with the existing Club, and rightly Central Coast Council denied the first development application.

So the proposed Mingara development under discussion here cannot be allowed under normal RE2 zoning requirements and the developer's only recourse is to claim construction rights under the NSW State Government State Significant Development approvals. This means a substantial departure from the existing zoning and actual land usages, and would make a radical difference to the existing tenor of the local area.

As for transport, the area is far from universally serviced by the local bus company with services being quite sparse. This means that for the vast majority of prospective residents their only transport recourse will be private vehicles. And for most potential residents this will mean continuing usage of internal combustion powered vehicles as I cannot see anywhere in the proposed development documents special provisions being made for Battery Electric Vehicle recharging solutions. This isn't going to help the State Government nor the Federal Government attain any emissions reductions goals.

The Environmental Impact Statement (Page 8 Impacts and Benefits) suggests that this proposed development will have "Enhanced aged care, health and well being services" when the reverse is actually true. The local Mingara Medical Centre (not related to Mingara Recreation Club) is at capacity and has currently closed its books to new patients. Indeed, at a meeting with Mingara Club executives and the Mingara development team in early 2024, they openly said that it was not their responsibility to prepare for or factor into development plans any enhancement or increase in doctors and healthcare etc. It was the community's responsibility, not Mingara's. That is a total abrogation of responsibility.

Also in that section of the EIS (Page 8) is a statement: "but located proximate to the amenity and services offered on the broader Mingara Recreation site." The EIS doesn't detail what the amenity and service(s) are that the Mingara "precinct" provides. Are there any except alcohol, gambling and food? (swimming centre, bowls club, gymnasium and sports oval are noted, but obviously not all are attractive to 55+ seniors)

The Appendix O Arboricultural Impact Assessment on page 7 Point 3.2.1 "Category A Trees to be lost" denotes that in a close cluster of the South West corner of the proposed development there are 54 High Category trees to be lost. This is apparently due to the design and quantity of villas on site, notably V8 and surrounds. It appears that this unnecessary removal of healthy trees is only to satisfy the development design.

For elucidation, Retire Australia construction had to realign the watercourse in Glengara Retirement Village as a planning requirement to construct villas designated "the Jaeger Road area", to the north of the watercourse, and Retire Australia was at that time instructed to hire aborists to plant a large number of trees of the same type proposed to be removed on Page 7 of the EIS. Several years later under resident pressure Glengara expressed concern about overgrowth in and along the water channel and made several applications for "culling" and trimming of the overgrowth to the NSW State Government department which oversees waterways. Those applications were refused and all trees had to be retained. Note that beyond the Glengara title boundaries that same watercourse runs through the proposed Mingara development.

And for this proposed Mingara development 54 healthy trees on the banks and land adjoining the watercourse are marked for removal to suit an expanded Mingara development. It seems inconsistent and illogical that these trees would be removed to suit the developers wishes when other existing overgrowth trees abutting the very same watercourse, albeit downstream on a different land title, cannot be trimmed or removed, even when requested by all the existing Glengara residents affected by these overgrowth trees.

Appendix TT - Clause 4.6 - Standards for RE2 - Nov 2024 states on Page 3 Local Feature/Feature/description/West that “The Glengara Retirement Village is located further west which comprising of one-to-two storey residential apartment accommodation and single-storey dwellings with pitched roofs”. This is not the case, there are no two storey residential apartments in Glengara Retirement Village known as the Jaeger Road Area, in the area West of the proposed Mingara development. All residences in the Jaeger Road area are single storey villas. Glengara Village has no two storey residences apart from the two storey Assisted Care Apartments building in the southern most region of the Hansen’s Road area of the village. (Noted that there is also the Glengara Retirement Village Country Club containing resident amenities and Retire Australia management staff, which is 2 stories, but does not contain any residences).

In addition to the above point when Retire Australia was developing plans for the Glengara “Jaeger Road area” (circa 2014) apparently they made application for a multi storey (3 storey) retirement living block on the western boundary of the Jaeger Road area. The local residents were able to successfully object the the extent of that development proposal and Retire Australia ultimately constructed all single storey villas in this area too. And this didn’t impact on the tone of the area as much as a multi storey development would have.

In conclusion I would like to express the general opinions of residents I have spoken to about this Mingara development proposal. It seems that the generalised view is that the proposed Mingara development will only detract from the tone of the area. Then there is the amount of construction noise that will be generated over a period of 2 to 3 years (guessing) during the construction. It has been bad enough while the Mingara “hotel” was constructed – the drone of the crane motor from 7am in the morning 6 days a week until 5 or so pm is very annoying. Then there’s the jack hammering, the concrete cutting saws, and the general noise levels associated with the construction. All of that noise will be magnified to some extent by the size of the proposed development.

It’s going to be a lot to put up with as most Glengara residents have moved here to live for some peace and quiet, free from urban noise and pollution. Quite a few have come from multi storey apartment buildings in Terrigal and The Entrance because of the difficulties of strata multi storey living.

Thank you for your patience if you have read this submission. It may be a little disjointed but I have tried to express some of the feelings myself and other residents have from a personal and unqualified point of view.