



**From:**

**Basin Villages Forum [BVF] - Community Consultative Body [CCB]**

**Basin Villages Forum Committee**

**August 27 2025**

C/o Vice President Christopher Grounds

email: [solum306@gmail.com](mailto:solum306@gmail.com)

Mobile: 0401 137158

**Submission Concerning**

**Application: SSD-69683218**

**SOUTHERN CROSS COMMUNITY HOUSING [SCCH]**

**Proposed Development at Crowea Rd, St Georges Basin 2540**

(Lots 8, 9, and 10 of Approved Subdivision (SF 9847) related to parent Lots 68 & 69 DP 25550 and Lot 4 DP 785956)

Prepared for Southern Cross Community Housing

**22.07.25 by** Beam Planning Pty Ltd | ABN 78 674 643 095 |

[beamplanning.com.au](http://beamplanning.com.au)

**BASIN VILLAGES FORUM [BVF]** is a “Community Consultative Body” [CCB] that operates under the auspices of the Shoalhaven City Council and their CCB Policy. BVF represents the interest and concerns of the community of St Georges Basin [SGB] [Refer Map 5.3] and its various urban villages and semi-rural residents. These include the larger villages of SGB and Sanctuary Point and smaller villages of Basin View, Old Erowal Bay, Erowal Bay and Wrights Beach. These are essentially coastal locations. The CCB meets every month February to November and considers a range of community related matters and issues, some of which the CCB will become involved in such as the subject of this submission.

# Content

## Introduction and Recommendation

- 1.0 Assumptions and Objectives
  - 2.0 Public Consultation & Community Engagement
  - 3.0 Housing and Use Density
  - 4.0 Height of Buildings
  - 5.0 Character
  - 6.0 Capacity of Social Infrastructure
  - 7.0 Boarding House Management
  - 8.0 Traffic and Parking
  - 9.0 Water and Sediment Discharge During Construction
  - 10.0 Planning Decisions Precedents
- Appendix 1

## INTRODUCTION and RECOMMENDATION

BVF recognises that urban and peri-urban expansion will occur in SGB and that this is related to factors such as the attraction of a coastal locale and lifestyle, availability of vacant land, Local Environment Plan zoning, known demographic trends, demand for particular urban uses, principally residential, commercial and industrial plus developer proposals. BVF recognises that the SCCH Project is high value project [\$56 million] of a not-for-profit organization.

**However, BVF has concluded that the SCCH Project in its current form identified in the Environmental Impact Statement [EIS] cannot satisfy the demand for reasonable standards of urban village development compatible with acceptable urban village development, the character and appropriate future of St Georges Basin.**

**BVF considers there are significant elements of the Project proposal, which point to a necessary rejection. BVF references and acknowledges the 2022 State Regional Planning Panel determination of an adjacent site that was subject to a development proposal with the very same concerns.**

BVF has had and continues to have many experiences over many years now of development and development proposals in both SGB and other CCB villages round 'the Basin' that have caused substantial concern, controversy and campaigning for the community. [Refer Section 10.0] There are at least five current such proposals in the CCB area including this SCCH Project.

## **1.00 Assumptions & Objectives**

**1.10** The SCCH site is part of MU1 Mixed Use zone in the Shoalhaven Local Environmental Plan (LEP). This aims to provide opportunities for a variety of compatible land uses, primarily residential and commercial. It's designed to encourage a mix of uses, often around activity centres and transport hubs, supporting shop-top housing and mixed-use developments. This zone seeks to facilitate urban renewal and development while also considering the local character and amenity of the area.

**1.20** The Basin Villages Forum (BVF), which is Shoalhaven Council's 'Community Consultative Body' (CCB) for St Georges Basin and the associated villages and communities, contends that proposed development is primarily focused residential dwellings and does not provide sufficient commercial and retail space to allow for the future expansion of the village centre.

**1.30 The project is not located around a transport hub and is significantly distant from the Shoalhaven's major employment centres Nowra, Bomaderry and Ulladulla. Bus services of at least one per hour between 6am and 9pm Monday to Friday, which is a requirement for consideration as a residential State Significant Development, are not available.** Only 6 services run during this period at two-hourly intervals with a travel time to the Nowra CBD in excess of 1 hour.

**Source: Nowra Coaches Timetable**

<https://transportnsw.info/routes/details/sydney-and-surrounds-network/102x/58102-X>

**1.40** It does not facilitate urban renewal and development and fails to properly consider the local character and amenity of the area.

**1.50** It is not located around an activity centre or a transport hub and is significantly distant from the Shoalhaven's major employment centres Nowra, Bomaderry and Ulladulla.

**1.60** The EIS states that SCCH will develop an underutilised and vacant site formerly used for timber harvesting. The site is vacant as a result of previous proposals being abandoned, reportedly due to commercial considerations and it has never been used for timber harvesting.

**1.70** While the proposed development notionally increases housing supply and affordability within the Shoalhaven region (in line with State objectives), it appears to be driven more by the availability of the site than its suitability for purpose.

**1.80 Reductions in both height and density of buildings, which BVF would recommend, would ensure a lower project impact on local infrastructure and services and would also decrease the number of vehicles and volume traffic that would added to the village, particularly as this involved the IGA Supermarket and associated access.**

## **2.00 Public Consultation and Community Engagement**

**2.10** Public consultation consisted of two on-line sessions that were modestly publicised and difficult for many in the community to participate in due to a lack of technical ability and poor choice of times. Many of the small number of participants were clearly unfamiliar with the meeting software and found it difficult to engage in the conversation.

**2.20** Issues raised in these limited opportunities related to over-development linked to height and density, mix of tenure, traffic and parking impacts, provision of infrastructure, capacity of local services, reduced property values and concern with social and affordable housing.

**2.30** Initially information was hard to find and did not paint a clear picture of what was proposed. While many members of the community are able to navigate the SCC's on-line DA Tracking, they are either unaware of the Department of Planning's on-line system and/or find it difficult to use.

**2.40** The facility to engage with the proposal documentation is limited by the EIS being a 93 Page document of 8 Sections, 49 Figures 9 Tables and Appendices A to NN. This takes time for the community to reference consult and liaise with a view to a submission and with a Webinar format limits the ability of the community to respond. In that sense is it counter-productive to Community Engagement.

**2.50** BVF notes that the EIS acknowledges only "general support" for the development from the Aboriginal community and no specific support from local communities in the SGB village areas.

## **3.00 Housing and Use Density**

**3.10** Low density is the typical density of housing in St Georges Basin. Most dwellings are single storey and there are currently no buildings that exceed two-storeys. The majority are located on 500-600sqm lots that provide the opportunity for traditional family lifestyle and the space to park at least two cars plus a boat or caravan.

**3.20** Densities generally are 6 to 8 dwellings per hectare (dph) and no more than 15 dph with the exception of the IRT, Aveo and Rosedale seniors living complexes and the Basin Shores manufactured homes estate which have densities in the region of 20 dph. The density of the proposed SCCH development is 64 dph.

**3.30** BVF contends that the proposal is an excessively and unacceptably dense residential and living project [see project plan below] and fails to deliver sufficient open space to promote a healthy and enjoyable lifestyle. The so-called "Pocket Park" of 420 sq.metres is in every physical respect a considerable disrespect to possible future residents.

**3.40** Given the current and likely future availability of land within and close to the village the need to provide high density living is unwarranted and completely out of character in this location.

**3.50** BVF accepts that there is a need for affordable and accessible homes in the Shoalhaven but contend that the proposed ‘urban in-fill design’ is not appropriate in a rural village and that St Georges Basin, where homelessness is at least minimal and homes are some of the most affordable in NSW (median price 3 bedroom house \$735,000, lowest price \$520,000 [realestate.com.au](http://realestate.com.au)) is a low priority area for a development of this type.”



Figure 1 Site Masterplan  
Source: SPARC Development

#### 4.00 Height of Buildings

**4.10** The local community has clearly demonstrated on several occasions that it is opposed to any height of building (HOB) greater than 8.5m (two-storeys). There is a strong desire for building heights to remain below the tree canopy in order to preserve the character of the village.



SCCH Boarding house and apartments for Crowea Rd, St Georges Basin - View from the IGA car park

**4.21** Land on Anson St at the intersection with Crowea Rd, zoned R1 and MU1, adjacent to this site, was the subject of a Land & Environment Court (LEC) hearing for an application to construct 54 apartments in 2 four-storey buildings. The public LEC hearing held in St Georges Basin Country Club was attended by over 400 residents who were unanimous in their objection to the proposal.

**4.22** On 27/10/2017 the LEC approved an amended development application. As at 12/08/2025, nearly 8 years later, construction of these buildings has still not commenced which suggests that there is a lack of demand for this type of dwelling.

**4.23** Following the LEC decision Shoalhaven City Councillors voted in favour of a maximum HOB of 8.5m which now applies to the balance of the surrounding land.

**4.30** Land zoned MU1 on the western side of Crowea Rd has a HOB of 8m and land zoned R2 to the east of the subject lot has a HOB of 8.5m.

**4.40** Only 14 of the 32 attached dwellings have a height of less than 8.5m. The residential flat building in precinct E has a height of 12.29m, the shop-top housing in precinct F has a height of 13.75m and the boarding house 12.1m.

**4.50** The proponent contention that “the exceedance is minor, site-specific, and justified by sufficient environmental planning grounds” is unacceptable. The proposed development will be substantially higher than any of the surrounding buildings and BVF contends that this neither “minor” nor “justified” and that the planning objectives can be achieved without the buildings exceeding two-storeys.

**4.60** BVF notes that SCCH states in the EIS that:

- *The market for new apartment product in the area is limited and unproven and*
- *Construction costs for apartments in the area are very high driven by new compliance legislation (Class 2) and limited contractors and consultants operating in the area.*
  
- *Construction costs for Residential Flat Buildings have become prohibitive mainly due to recent legislative compliance changes to Class 2 and 3 Buildings limiting the availability of certified Class 2 builders and consultants. A much more economical method is to Build Class 1 buildings through a mix of 2, 3 and 4 bedroom houses, as either small lot / zero lot line / terrace and/or townhouse arrangements (Attached Dwellings or Multi Dwelling Housing in planning terminology).*

**Given these high costs, the limited availability of contractors and consultants and the unproven market for residential flats, plus the community’s objection to buildings that exceed 8.5m and do not sit within the tree line, BVF contends that a solution could be found in a concept that does not exceed 8.5m. that has the potential to deliver reduced costs of construction, increased availability of contractors, lower density and increased areas of open space while making the development acceptable to the existing community.**

## 5.00 Character

**5.10** BVF is concerned that development will negatively impact the neighbourhood village character. Since European settlement began in St Georges Basin around 140 years ago, the village has remained a place of uncomplicated charm with simple buildings set in an informal landscape that includes tall and distinctive remnant trees and tree canopy.

**5.20** Project planning appears isolated and out of context with what may happen on vacant land north and south of the site. Concerns and problems would be exacerbated in the future of the village with development proposals out of step with a broader plan.

**5.30** The village comprises one and two storey dwellings and commercial premises in low density settings. Most are free standing, a small number are duplexes but there are no terraces and only a very small number of shop-top houses, all of which sit within the tree line. Currently there are no residential flats buildings in the village.



*The above Google Earth mapping illustrates the dominance of single storey residential buildings [#1] and where higher density residential [#2] exists it is all low elevation with both areas exhibiting some two storey elevation, referenced to an 8.5m HOB standard.*

**5.40** While dwellings with heights in excess of 8.5m and densities exceeding 60dph may not appear excessive in an urban setting, they inevitably look out of place in the village environment of St Georges Basin. BVF accepts that there is a need for social and affordable housing in the area but believe that SCCH could achieve the majority of the desired outcome without exceeding a height limit of 8.5 while providing more community open space within the development.

## **6.00 Capacity of Social Infrastructure**

**6.10** Upon completion the development as proposed would increase the population of St Georges Basin (3215 at the last census) by more than 200 people or 6%+ of whom an above average number will be NDIS recipients and 'Aging in Place'.

**6.20** This will impact the local medical services which are already overstretched. St Georges Basin Medical Centre, the only one in the village, has closed its books to new patients and existing patients are experiencing extended waiting times. Other services such as physiotherapy and dental are experiencing similar problems. If this development is to proceed BVF believes that SCCH have an obligation to provide enhanced medical services to meet the needs of the future population.

**6.30** Local schools and day care centres are in a similar position and SCCH will also need to consider the potential impacts.

## **7.00 Boarding House Management**

**7.10** A number of residents have expressed concerns about the potential for anti-social behaviour that might result from use of proposed social and affordable housing for emergency accommodation and/or housing for people recently released from corrective services.

**7.21** A similar development at Sanctuary Point was highly contentious in the community and remains so as many forms of anti-social behaviour persist and are unresolved at that location.

**7.22** A DA Proposal for a "Boarding House" in one of the villages of the BVF area was resoundingly rejected by residents and especially by the women of the area as expressed in their submissions.

**7.20** SCCH has stated that it has no intention to utilise the proposed housing for this purpose however, the BVF contends that specific conditions restricting any such use should be included in any approval.

## **8.00 Traffic & Parking**

**8.10** BVF is concerned that unless Cape Crescent is connected to Island Point Rd the traffic impacts on Anson St will be severe, especially during construction which is anticipated to take a considerable length of time. Added to this the Cooe Hotel has received consent to a Development Application to rebuild and extend the hotel, and a further SSD is in progress for 81 apartments on Anson St at the junction with Crowea Rd.



## 9.00 Water and Sediment Discharge during Construction

9.11 BVF notes there have been quite significant problems and thus community concerns with previous developments in this precinct with the management and control of polluting water flow and sediment discharge from a site during construction. Basin Villages Forum (BVF) referred concerns to Council and the state member for South Coast at that time for follow-up.

9.12 The actual SCCH site was also the subject of three major pollution events occurring November 2021, January 2022 and February 2023 after the site had been cleared for a development proposal that has never been actioned. A duplicate event had already occurred at the adjacent IGA site.

*The erosion and pollution impacts on the site below at the SCCH Precinct resulted in Council fines.*



**9.20** This has resulted in unacceptable pollution from sedimentation in nearby sensitive foreshore and the coastal lake, St Georges Basin. Shoalhaven City Council [SCC] is aware of this and were involved in BVF consultations at the time to manage and prevent this, which SCC did not achieve. Standards for the management of such runoff were known and supposedly confirmed but the pollution events still occurred but management has been ineffective. There is no reference to this known environmental risk in the EIS. It is the experience of BVF that such construction advances without any acknowledgement of the growing risk associated with more frequent and intense rain periods and in particular storm episodes, despite these being known and predicted by BOM. These have been predictable events.

**9.30** BVF would demand that given the history of pollution such an occurrence cannot be accepted again. This raises the issue of what standards will be applied, as revision was to occur after 2023 and who will bear the responsibility for such management given the 'State' control over this project.

**9.40** BVF understands new standards via a revision of the 2004 "Blue Book" were being developed for control of this problem and the EIS cannot be accepted without a specific reference and incorporation of these.

*Runoff and sediment in a previous pollution event adjacent to the SCCH site.*



## 10.0 PLANNING DECISION PRECEDENT [please also refer to Appendix 1]

10.10 BVF brings to attention key planning and development parallels between virtually adjacent sites of Anson Street Lots 1 and 6 and the SCCH Project site. Lot 6 is Zoned Residential R1 and Lot 1 Mixed Use MU1, as is the SCCH site.



10.20 Lot 6 Anson Street involved a DA, ultimately approved by the Land and Environment Court on the basis of SLEP Zoning alone in 2017-18. The land was inappropriately rezoned by a small group of councillors at the time of the 2014 Shoalhaven Local Environment Plan development. The error in this allowed greater building height and was later admitted in testimony and apology to a BVF meeting by one of the Councillors involved. This development involved major, extended community objection and action. The site was illegally cleared and remains unused and empty.

10.31 In May 2022 the Southern Regional Planning Panel [SRPP] handed down a determination to refuse an application, which was for mixed use residential flats and commercial use on Lots 1 and 6 DP 1082382 Anson Street SGB. This was for 13 buildings up to 13m in height for 380 apartments and 783 parking spaces. Lot 1, located on the corner of Anson St and Crowea Rd adjacent to the subject site, is a part of the MU1 zone (St Georges Basin village centre) as is the SCCH proposal. Reasons for the SRPP refusal are referenced in Appendix 1 and SRPP recognized 21 Community Concerns including being out of character and incompatible with the SGB Village character. **The SRPP considered the site not suitable for the proposal. [See Appendix 1]**

10.32 BVF contends that there are very strong, inescapable parallels between SRRP Anson Street rejection and the SCCH Project and the cautions and concerns catalogued in Sections 1.0 to 9.0 of this submission and the reasons for SRRP rejection of the Anson Street DA. As a community based submission **BVF includes and references the community concerns for the Anson Street proposal recognized by the SRPP in their documentation as 10.40.**

## **APPENDIX 1**

**re Lot 1 & 6 Anson Street St Georges Basin**

**Extract quoted from SRPP Letter of Advice Pages 1, 2 & 3 of 6**

### **DETERMINATION AND STATEMENT OF REASONS**

#### **SOUTHERN REGIONAL PLANNING PANEL**

Public meeting held at Nowra City admin building 4 May 2022, opened at 12:30pm and closed 1:32pm.

#### **MATTER DETERMINED**

**2017STH009 – Shoalhaven – RA17/1000 – Lots 1 & 6 DP 1082382 Anson Street, St Georges Basin – Concept.**

Development Application for a mixed-use development comprising residential flat buildings and commercial development. The DA sought approval for 13 buildings up to 13m in height providing for an estimated 88 x 2-bedroom apartments, 292 x 3-bedroom apartments, 2,233 square metres of commercial floor space and 783 parking spaces (as described in Schedule 1).

#### **PANEL CONSIDERATION AND DECISION**

The Panel considered: the matters listed at item 6, the material listed at item 7 and the material presented at meetings and briefings and the matters observed at site inspections listed at item 8 in Schedule 1.

#### **Development application**

The Panel determined to refuse the development application pursuant to section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.

The decision was unanimous.

#### **REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

The Panel generally agrees with the findings of Council's assessment report and has determined to refuse the application consistent with Council's reasons, subject to some minor changes to these reasons. The reasons for refusal are as follows.

1. When considered against the critical matters that must be assessed for the subject concept development application (s4.22 (5) of the EPA Act), the application failed to demonstrate that acceptable impacts and outcomes could be achieved in the following key areas:
  - a. Compliance with the respective environmental planning instruments applying to the site;
  - b. The visual compatibility of the development to surrounding development and neighbourhood character;
  - c. The impact of the development on surrounding properties and the public domain;
  - d. Social impacts of the development;
  - e. The streetscape and urban design issues relating to the building heights, footprints and separations, traffic, accessibility and safety; and
  - f. The shadow impacts of the development on the public domain and private properties.

2. Non-compliance with SEPP 65 in relation to the Design Quality Principles and Apartment Design Guide (s4.15 1)(a)(i) of the EPA Act). The Panel agreed that the Applicant had not demonstrated that future applications could comply with SEPP 65 specifically as follows:

DATE OF DETERMINATION Thursday, 19 May 2022

DATE OF PANEL DECISION Thursday, 12 May 2022

DATE OF PANEL MEETING Wednesday, 4 May 2022

PANEL MEMBERS Chris Wilson (Chair), Renata Brooks, Susan Budd

APOLOGIES None

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST None

a. The development does not meet the design quality principles per section 28(2)(b) of SEPP 65

1: Context and Neighbourhood Character Principle,

2: Built form and scale; Principle

3: Density; Principle

4: Sustainability; Principle

5: Landscape; Principle

6: Amenity, Principle

7: Safety, Principle

8: Housing Diversity and social interaction and Principle

9: Aesthetics); and

b. The development fails to satisfy the preconditions of clause 30(2)(a) and (b) of SEPP 65, in that the development does not demonstrate that adequate regard has been given to:

i. the design quality principles; and

ii. the objectives specified in the Apartment Design Guide for the relevant design criteria

(3A-1 Site Analysis; 3B-1 and 3B-2 – Orientation; 3C-1 and 3C-2 Public Domain

Interface, 3D-3 Communal and Public Open Space, 3E-1 Deep Soil Zones, 3F-1 Visual

Privacy, 3G-1 and 3G-2 Pedestrian Access and Entries, 3H-1 Vehicle Access, 3J-4 Bicycle

and Car Parking, 4A-1, 4A-2 and 4A-3 Solar and Daylight Access, 4B-1 and 4B-2 Natural

Ventilation, 4C-1 and 4C-2 Ceiling Heights, 4E-1 Private Open Space and Balconies, 4D-1

and 4D-2 Apartment Size and Layout, 4H-1 Acoustic Privacy, 4K-1 and 4K-2 Apartment

Mix, 4L-1 and 4L-2 Ground Floor Apartments and 4W-1 Waste Management).

3. The proposed concept development application proposes a development which will be unable to comply with the maximum building height standard under clause 4.3 of SLEP 2014.

4. The proposed development does not meet the objectives of the SLEP 2014 B4 Mixed Use and R1 General Residential zones (s4.15(1)(a)(i) of the EPA Act).

5. The proposed development is not consistent with the objectives of SLEP 2014 clause 7.20 Development in the Jervis Bay Region as it is considered the development will have a detrimental impact on the locality and will not contribute positively to the natural and cultural values of the Jervis Bay Region (s4.15(1)(a)(i) of the EPA Act).

6. The proposed development is inconsistent with the Objectives, Performance Criteria and Acceptable Solutions as they relate to the following provisions of Chapter N23: St Georges Basin Village Centre Shoalhaven Development Control Plan 2014 (SDCP 2014) (s4.15(1)(a)(iii) of the EPA Act):

- a. 5.1.1 Traffic, facilities, access, pedestrians, and car parking
- b. 5.2 Civic Domain
- c. 5.3.1 Design and siting
- d. 5.3.2 Landscaping

7. The development is likely to have adverse impacts on the built environment (s4.15 (1) (b) of the EPA Act). The Panel determined that the:

- a. proposed building envelopes do not provide sufficient certainty for the consideration and determination of future development applications.
- b. proposal for a three-storey residential flat building development of this scale is inconsistent with the zoning and height controls applying to the site;
- c. proposal is incompatible and conspicuously out of character with the St Georges Basin village and future desired character of the village and is considered an over development of the site; and d. consequently, the proposal is likely to have an adverse impact on the social amenity and way of life of the local community.

8. The site is not suitable for the development as proposed (s4.15 1)(c) of the EPA Act).

9. Subject to the reasons outlined above, the development is not in the public interest (s4.15 (1)(e) of the EPA Act).

#### **CONDITIONS**

Not applicable.

#### **BRIEFING AND SITE INSPECTION**

A site inspection was conducted by the Panel on 4th May 2022, accompanied by a Council Officer. The various issues previously identified in Council's assessment report were discussed. Council also briefed the public meeting on 4th May 2022 which included the Panel. The briefing provided an overview of the proposal and key issues identified in Council's assessment report.

## CONSIDERATION OF COMMUNITY VIEWS

In coming to its decision, the Panel considered written submissions made during the various public exhibition periods, and issues raised by those who addressed the Panel during the meeting held on 4th May 2022. The Panel notes that issues of concern included:

- Development is out of character with the Basin area. Natural state and humble character of the area is what has attracted residents and visitors, and the towering bulky structures proposed are incompatible with this.
- Housing type and proposal of 13 x 3- storey apartment buildings are not in character with surrounding areas (which is generally 1- and 2- storey single dwelling homes and small-scale commercial).
- Traffic impacts – safety, increased volume of cars and road congestion.
- Adverse visual impacts, particularly from the height, bulk and scale of the proposal.
- Height of buildings proposed are above 8.5 m height limit in LEP.
- Appearance and visual design of development is not in keeping with character of existing village, design is of low architectural quality.
- Unsuitable development that sets a precedent.
- Not a sensitive or well considered concept plan, especially in context of the wider area
- Adverse environmental impacts on the Basin and local flora and fauna, and construction impacts on the Basin in terms of soil erosion and sediment and water flows. Impact on natural environment, especially due to sediment and erosion impacts during construction, noting this development seeks to excavate soil to construct underground basements, and it is a sloping site.
- Inadequate parking for residents and visitors.
- Adverse social impacts due to significant population increase in the area, with approximately a 20% increase in dwellings in the village from this development alone (and in addition to other smaller scale developments occurring in the area)
- Significant increase in population will also increase existing pressures on services in the village such as the availability of doctors, childcare, schools, public transport (only 4 buses per day), parks etc. • Lack of adequate utilities and facilities including water supply, sewage, and roads. • Increase and changes in flow of stormwater that would adversely impact the Basin. • Does not meet the requirements of SEPP 65 in that the proposed development does not respond to or enhance the quality and identity of the area.
- Does not meet the requirements of SEPP 71.
- Adverse impact on the visual amenity and scenic qualities of the area.
- Overshadowing on neighbouring properties and loss of privacy.
- Subject site is not identified in Shoalhaven Growth Management Strategy for new housing
- Concerns regarding bushfire evacuation for the 800+ additional residents in this development
- Not in keeping with Bay and Basin [Shoalhaven] Community Strategic Plan
- No good economic data supporting the viability of the development, and no market for this type of housing, with poor uptake of Stage A and B apartments as further evidence
- The lack of parking and storage is out of character with the typical lifestyle of residents and holiday makers, e.g., owning and storing boats, and other watercraft.
- Proposal offers insufficient and segmented communal open space, which will exacerbate pressure on existing open space. The Panel considers that concerns raised by the community have been adequately addressed in the Council Assessment Report and that no new issues require assessment.