

**David Mehan MP** STATE MEMBER FOR THE ENTRANCE

## REF: 495/24/cw

8 January 2025

Ms Lucinda Craig Senior Planning Officer Department of Planning

Via email: Lucinda.craig@dpie.nsw.gov.au and submitted on portal

Dear Ms Craig,

## Re: Application Mingara Recreation Club Seniors Housing, Tumbi Umbi (SSD No: SSD-63475709)

I write to oppose the Mingara Recreation Club Senior Housing proposal (SSD-63475709) which represents a gross overdevelopment of the site in its current form. The comments below represent my assessment informed by the many members of the community who have contacted me regarding the proposal.

I note that while senior housing may be permitted (with consent) on land zoned RE2 (Private Recreation), the net effect of the proposed development taken together with existing usages and including a proposal for an early learning centre on the land, would restrict to an unacceptable amount the actual land available "for private open space or recreational purposes" across the site and adjoining lands.

The proposal hasn't identified how it might comply in some way with the objects of the zoning, notwithstanding the proposal is permitted (with consent).

As to the actual building proposed I note the following:

- The proposed heights of building 1 to 4 are out of character for the area.
- The proposed coverage of the development crowds out in an unacceptable way the Athletics Field, limiting access to the facility which is used by most local schools as a regional sporting facility.
- Loss of parking which currently occurs on the land to be occupied by the proposed development is not accounted for in the proposal and cannot be easily accommodated within the existing club parking area.

Additionally, there is no provision for bus and coach access to the athletics field to drop/pick up and park for coaches who have travelled a long distance. This needs to be a consideration.

Whilst extra seniors housing is a worthwhile proposition for the area, the loss of limited land for private recreation makes the proposal in its current form incompatible with the land use and it should be rejected.

Yours sincerely,

jdHeba

**David Mehan** Member for The Entrance