

[REDACTED]

Date: 22.10 October 2019

**ATTENTION: DIRECTOR – KEY SITES ASSESSMENTS**

**Planning and Assessment**

**Department of Planning, Industry and Environment**

**GPO Box 39**

**Sydney NSW 2001**

Dear Director,

**OBJECTION**

**State Significant Development Application No: SSD-10300, Coffs Harbour Cultural and Civic Space**

**I object to the Development Application and request that a Public Hearing be held.**

The reasons for my objection are as follows:

1. As evidence of Council's failure to consult, 14,768 residents have signed a community petition calling the project to be suspended, which has been ignored by Council.
2. There is insufficient land area to accommodate a major integrated cultural complex and inadequate capacity to accommodate any appreciable future growth in the context of a developing city.
3. There is insufficient onsite storage space for the incorporated cultural facilities or Council.
4. The inclusion of the Council offices without community consent, has compromised the suitability of the project to properly accommodate the long-term Cultural needs of the city.
5. In the context of an already congested zone, greater vehicular traffic, heavy vehicle and bus movements will create choke points around the project.
6. The site location undermines the opportunity for an iconic building, limits architectural design, limits open landscaping, reduces recognition and appeal to visitors
7. The flood modelling confirms the site to be subject to a Probable Maximum Flood. Whilst the consultants suggest that unlikely, their report notes the event having occurred in the past. There have been two 1:100yr floods since 1996 and several close events. There is little doubt the proposed building will be subject to flood inundation in its usable life.
8. The proposal is non-compliant with Council's own development controls, substantially fails the community consultation test, raises questions as to probity in respect of land purchase finance, tendering (or lack thereof) for consultants and more particularly the architects.
9. Council's financial standing is less than secure, evidenced by it requiring 2015 IPart approval to increase rates by over 20% in 3 years, force staff redundancies, and necessitating the sale of 4 public building for \$20Mil to reduce the principal debt it could borrow.
10. The impact of the financial drain on Council for a non-income producing building, will compromise future community initiatives and burden future generations.

[REDACTED]

Please DO/DO NOT delete my personal information before publication of this submission
---