

I have concerns about the proposed development of the Koolewong private marina.

These include:

- Aesthetics of the marina and expanded car park
- Parking
- Necessity of the development
- Future proposed actions / development of the site

Each of these concerns are addressed in the attached document

I believe that the current proposal is too large for the site and needs to be reduced in size or rejected. In addition, other important concerns need to be addressed and resolved.

### **Aesthetics**

The proposed marina is out of character of the local area which is composed of small private jetties, a nearby commercial oyster jetty and a small public jetty at Couch Park. This proposed marina is too large and obtrusive to the rest of the environmental surrounds as it will extend a further 100m into Brisbane Waters with two arms extending to a maximum of 125m. Contrary to the Visual Impact Statement, I believe this proposed development is out of character to the local aesthetic of a small waterside community village.

In addition the capacity of the car park is to be significantly expanded. This will involve the removal of many large and mature trees in the car park and landscaping. The plans show car parking into the western corner of the car park which is currently landscaped and well maintained with grass, flower beds, shrubs and trees. The removal of this landscaping for the expanded car park will significantly degrade the aesthetics of the development. This will turn this area into a bland car park with a few trees on its edge. This is not acceptable and does not fit into the visual assessment of the site on Brisbane Water. The photo montages in the Visual Impact Assessment are misleading as they do not show the proposed changes to the car park – significant loss of trees and landscaping. Therefore the perceptions of the Visual Impact Statement are misleading and need to be corrected before any further assessment can occur.

In addition there will be additional commercial signage and visual pollution associated with this commercial business. The locked gate to the marina will be an eyesore, as the gate will need to have full high security (lights, signage, barbed wire etc). Will there be lighting on the proposed marina? Will there be a security / safety light on the gate for access to the proposed marina? Is this lighting appropriate and has this been taken into account in the Visual Impact Statement?

The aesthetic of Koolewong, Brisbane Water and its surrounds is of natural un-developed beauty. This development right on the waterfront is intrusive and the site will be spoilt with the removal of trees and landscape and the addition of more signs, fences, lights and restrictions to public land. Therefore this proposal should not be approved.

## **Car park**

The current application is only requesting a further 11 spaces to the existing car park (33 spaces) for a total of 44 parking places. Is there really 33 spaces marked in the current car park now? The current car park (in reality and not on the map) appears to have less than 33 car spaces specifically marked with two white lines.

This plan allows for the majority of car spaces to be 2.6m wide, with 2 spaces for staff in front of public access parking. Is this a standard and is it practical? What happens if the staff needs to arrive / leave and a car has parked them in? This might be the case where people may leave their car overnight when using their boat?

It appears there is no loading zone for restaurant or the proposed marina. How are deliveries made to the restaurant? Or how are supplies moved onto the proposed marina? An entry at the front of the restaurant also seems to double as a disabled access (eg side wheelchair access), so cannot be used for temporary loading zone. Loading zones must also be safe to the workers and the public.

According to the Gosford City Council (DA 30475/2006), the car parking requirement for The Boathouse restaurant (of 361 square meters area) is 24 spaces. Contrary to the Environmental Assessment, this has not been satisfactorily addressed in the application. The Traffic Assessment Report does not acknowledge the necessity for the paved / smoking areas to accommodate guests as described by local government. This is not satisfactory and should be addressed in this application.

The proposed marina of 50 berths requires a total of 25 car spaces.

TOTAL spaces (excluding offices upstairs) = (24 + 25) 49 spaces required. This is more than the 44 planned car parking spaces.

Further car parking issues relate to the capacity during peak times. The Boathouse restaurant on the same site claims on its website to cater for up to 130 guests. Where do these guests park? There is no parking on Brisbane Water Drive, as it is too dangerous and there is no other nearby parking. Car pooling and parking off site may be possible, but would not happen in reality. Already in peak times without the proposed marina, there is a car parking issue at the restaurant. Cars are often apparently illegally parked and double parked in and around the current car park. These peak times of restaurant use (weekends and public holidays) will also coincide with peak usage at the proposed marina.

Further issues which have not been appropriately addressed in the application are the car parking requirements for the lease offices at the site. According to Gosford City Council plans, there are seven offices above the restaurant which accounts for the 181 square meter of nett leasable offices above the restaurant. The standards for these offices seem poor. Full parking is essential for these offices. The Traffic Assessment Report states there is only a requirement for 4.5 spaces for the seven offices. But the offices should have minimum of one car space per office and an additional 3 spaces in total for clients and visitors, then a further 10 car spaces are required. I would have thought this

would have been very conservative, as many offices will have more than one worker and have numerous visitors.

In addition the proposed location of the garbage bin near the rock wall is problematic. Is there only one garbage bin? What about recycling or other waste? The current plan is for one bin to be shared with the restaurant, marina and offices? Is this correct? What assurances no leakage (oils etc) or garbage from the bin will pollute the water and environment? The potential provision of a fenced area for the bin (s) in the planned area so close to Brisbane Water and a rock wall with no landscaping is not aesthetic and may be an environmental risk. In addition, will the garbage truck have easy access the expanded car park?

This proposed development is far too large to be accommodated with the current and planned car park expansion. The current proposal of squeezing 44 spots into the existing car park will result in the removal current landscaping and gardens and there will still not be enough car parking to meet current standards. There is a need for at least 49 spaces plus more parking for the first floor offices which have not been accounted for. Are there enough handicapped spaces for at least 50 parking spots?

There appears to be numerous inconsistencies and grey areas for this proposal, and therefore should be clarified and agreement made by all parties, including council and RTA etc. before the application proceeds.

### **Need for another proposed marina?**

#### **Public good**

The concept of public good is just that public good. How does this proposal benefit the general public? This seems to be poorly addressed in this application. The current public good reasons are not satisfactory and appear not to have been fully thought through.

The first point of public good in the Environmental Assessment of the proposed marina is that when the F3 and Pacific highway is closed, then the proposed marina will be used for ferrying hospital patients to and from Gosford Hospital. Is this correct? Does Gosford Hospital know about this proposal and did it approve this proposal? If the hospital will accept boat transfers of sick and injured and potentially infectious patients, why not use the closer Gosford wharf? Or use the existing approved helicopter access? Will there be facilities at the proposed marina to accommodate ambulances, stretchers, trolleys in a safe way? What are the practicalities of this suggestion? Has the full public health implications of this transfer been assessed. This suggestion for the primary public benefit of the proposed marina requires clarification with Gosford Hospital.

The other suggestion that this proposed marina is in the public good as it will provide an escape for residents in case of fires is poorly thought through. How does this fit with existing disaster management strategies? Who has been consulted with this 'idea'? If this is a public meeting place in case of an emergency, how and who designated this? How will this work? In an emergency, how will residents cross the rail fencing and train line? What assurance is there that the locked gate on the

marina will be open? Who takes liability for this situation? I trust these questions have been resolved with all the appropriate authorities. Is this the case?

There are alternate escape substitutes without the further intrusion of public space with this proposed marina. There are road escape routes in Woy Woy Road, Brisbane Water Drive and across the Rip Bridge. In addition, there are numerous private and public jetties already existing at Koolewong for possible resident escape.

The list of general benefits list in 9.13 in the Environmental Impact statement are general unsubstantiated statements which need to be quantified:

- 'increased jetty access' – this is for those who can afford a private marina. This is not a general public interest.
- 'likelihood of increased fish populations around the pylons' - What is the likelihood of this and what are its effects? What is the evidence for this on a private marina, where boats are using anti-fouling and other activities? Need to quantify how much more fish populations will increase, how does this compare to the nearby oyster leases and its importance to the local ecosystem?
- 'emergency services using deep water berthing' – see above comments
- 'increased support for existing business' - does this development benefit the general community or the developer? There is a need to provide more details and appropriate analysis.
- 'employment during and after construction' - what guarantees will be given to use local (Central Coast) contractors during and after construction. Need to quantify this claim. How much employment will be created after construction? How many local jobs in the short and long term will be created?

These suggested public good benefits for this proposal are unsubstantiated, tenuous and are not satisfactory. This is a large development proposal on crown land of state significance with no stated apparent public good.

Public good is for good of all public. These are meant to be non-exclusive and non rival in consumption. This proposal is excluding people from public lands. A full social economic analysis needs to be conducted before this proposal advances.

### **Business case**

Does Brisbane Water really need another marina? There are numerous marinas which offer more services, public moorings, and hundreds of private jetties on Brisbane Water. In addition there are numerous boat ramps on Brisbane Water and local beaches to service the local boating community. What more does this proposal add? There will be no pump-out facilities, re-fuelling. Why does the Central Coast need another over developed marina on an already busy road?

This business case is simply a financial / profitability assessment for the business and does not provide an analysis of the social economics of the proposal.

A full cost benefit analysis that considers the economic benefit for society, rather than the financial benefit of the applicant is required to fully assess this proposal. This information is not available and therefore this application cannot be properly assessed.

### **Lack of public consultation**

Contrary to the assertions of the Environmental Assessment, the public consultation for this project has been poor. The letter box drop in March 2011 and the two public notices hidden in the back of the local newspaper are not satisfactory for a major development of state importance in our local community. The website for the development was at best basic and did not add any more information. My neighbours did not know this was happening. An article independent of the developer in the local newspaper about the proposal seemed to confuse some local people who thought that this development was already stopped and not going ahead as the proposal was too big. A lack of consultation with the community is a serious deficiency in this application and will disenfranchise the local community.

Apparently the Developer invited representatives of the local progress association to an information day at the site, but the local progress association has not reported on the outcomes of this meeting on their website (at the time of submission) and will not report these results at their meeting until after submissions close. Inviting such selected groups to meetings cannot be classified as community consultation. All the community (rather than handpicked groups) needs an opportunity to hear, discuss and question the proposal. This has not been done and is a serious flaw in this application.

### **Future of proposal**

If successful, who is responsible for monitoring and oversight of the proposal?

How will the spread of the marine pest *C. taxifolia* be prevented? The mitigation proposals appear weak and rely on providing information, suggestions and recommendations. This is a serious marine threat. How will this pest be actually managed? Who is responsible for monitoring and control both during construction and during its day to day use? What risk management procedures have been put in place to control this pest, and how and who will monitor this? The proposed management of this pest seems poor and unlikely to guarantee its spread.

Similarly the general recommendations for the general construction and use of the marina are very general. For example educating boat owners about the use of copper based anti-fouling agents and navigating over shallow seagrasses. How do you ensure that boat owners do the right thing? Our aquatic environment is precious and cannot be destroyed by absent minded boat owners who inadvertently do the wrong thing. Once seagrasses are disturbed they are difficult to return. Who is responsible for ensuring there is no environmental impact of this proposed marina?

What guarantees are that the proposal will not develop even further to allow re-fuelling and pump out? Dredging of the channels and marina? Extension of the existing rock wall to reclaim more land for the car park / extensions? etc. If Gosford City Council are not involved in this application, who is

responsible for the current and future planning of this site and when will this be done? This site has been subject to wedge development and what guarantees that this proposal won't continue to develop? The applicant or users of the proposed marina must confirm that they will not seek to dredge any waterway as a result of the application.

How does this proposal fit into the planning of public space in Brisbane Water? The development of public land needs strategic planning rather than ad hoc proposals in response to profit motives. There are always competing needs for public land and this need to be managed in an open, transparent and strategic manner. This proposal needs to be fully assessed in an open full manner. The lack of public consultation seriously questions this process.

How will the existing jetty be available for public use? The procedure for the public use of the jetty is not clear. How will public boat owners that have come from the jetty get back through the locked gate? How often will the on-site manager be present? I was unaware there was to be an on-site manager. How will a temporary access card be issued? Who and how will this be done? The practicalities of this situation needs to be clarified and made public.

In addition, the use of toilets in the restaurant for the users of the proposed marina will rely on the restaurant being open. Is this correct? Is this satisfactory, when the proposed marina will be open 24 hours, and when the proposed marina does not have sewage pumping facilities? What happens if the restaurant is closed or if the restaurant lease closes/ terminates? Will the toilets still be made available and who is responsible for their maintenance?

I understand that the land is still owned by the Crown and leased to the developer. How long is the lease, how and when is this reviewed and what are the circumstances at the end of the lease to renew or would the marina revert back to public ownership? Who will own the marina at the end of the lease? Who will be responsible for its upkeep, removal etc at the end of the lease? This lease is on public land.

The implication of these concerns is that there are too many unresolved issues and uncertainties for this application to proceed in its current form and should be rejected.