

Dear Sir/Madam

I'm writing this as an objection to the abovemention proposal. I did lodge an objection some time ago, I think it was well over 12 months and possibly nearly 2 years ago. This is the first correspondence, we've received from anybody since our initial objection and its difficult (if not impossible) to workout if anything has changed in the application since then. Suffice is to say we still standby what we said in that initial objection.

Its also particularly disappointing, that with this current correspondence issued by you on the 15th November and received (post) by us on the 21st November that we only have a little over a week to respond to what we consider is a very important issue, which will have a detrimental impact on the Community (Seaside Village) in which we live.

It might be fine for you to direct us to a website, to get and try and update ourselves on all the documents and changes which may or may not have happened in the last two years. Seriously - for an individual resident, its impossible - and totally unfair, even without the ridiculous timeframe provided.

I'm not sure if you're aware we do have a residents association, which meets monthly (2nd Wednesday) but again with the timing, we have no chance of getting a number of heads together to work out what's going on. Was this a deliberate ploy? Last meeting was the 13th and this Letter issued 15th, with a response by the 1st Dec???

Collectively, the area is now nearly fully developed, and many/most of us made our investment decision (yes - for individuals - buying a home is one of the major investment decisions we ever make) on the basis of what was proposed or established at the time. We don't expect major changes and we do expect our representatives (the various planning authorities) to ensure the amenity and character of the area is maintained along the guidelines established for the area. Collectively - we the individual house owners have many, many more millions invested (and at stake) in this area, than the dollars proposed in this proposition. We are also the ones that will have to live with the decisions made here for the long term. The developer will have taken his profits and be long gone.

This is effectively the last development for the area, so why should they get any preferential treatment. The original developers in the area all had to abide by height restrictions and I'm pretty certain that it was a maximum of 11.5 mtrs. Impossible for me as an individual to check in the time provided. In any event the "Major Blocks" are all only 3 stories high and that should be the criteria set/enforced for this last section of work. Eg Salt, Drift, Santai and Cotton Beach. There are no other developments in this area above 3 stories.

Any increase in height above 3 stories, should not be allowed and will be out of character and not in keeping with the area. No one is forcing the developer to increase the number of individual lots - its obvious that these are the ones that will readily sell. Its a profit driven decision (more individual lots) and the Developer, shouldn't be further rewarded by an increase in heights (or floors) on the multi density segment.

When we came to the area, extensive work was (had been) done on the development of the swale. At that time it was determined it was best (the opinion of many experts) for the management of potential severe weather events (storm and sea) that the swale be established in its current form. As you know it is of open form, which allows for the carriage (displacement) of water far beyond what was achievable with a closed drain system. The allowance of a 38 mtr buffer zone incorporated into the swale was also an important element of this storm management system. Another major benefit

for the local community was that it also provided a proper "Green Buffer" plus it included a Bike and Pedestrian pathway, without risk of vehicle traffic (roadway). I think I mentioned (in my original objection) the closing over (piping) of the Swale comes with many added risks, the most dangerous is the entrapment of people. (particularly children). Ongoing maintenance and blockages, will be a greater cost and flood risk for residents. Again why should this developer be treated any differently from the original developers of this area. The original developers took the risks and accepted the template/design for the area, so why should this Developer (in the last phase) be treated differently and still want more. "Just Greedy".

A point of note - its very disappointing the current (present) developer has let this area (swale and pathway) become an eye sore. It's closed to the public and overgrown - shouldn't someone have been policing this???. I also raised a concern about the stock piling of sand - again its a disgrace. Should never have been allowed (temporary) and only plays into the Developers hands, to fill in the Swale.

I'm retired, and still find myself in a position not to be able to do this objection justice, due to lack of time and resources, I know if I was still working I would have thrown my hands up in despair.

It's all very unfair, the developer has all the time and resources, and if they don't like a decision they just keep coming back, until every body gives up. I understand this is the 10th amendment???. I think I'd call it a form of bullying.

Hopefully you the decision makers, will listen to the residents (unfortunately probably now only a few who like ourselves have been able to take the limited time available to scrape something together) and reject any amendments to :-

- 1) increase heights or floors to 4 or more levels;
- 2) close (pipe) the Swale;
- 3) reduce Green Space around the Swale to less than the original 38 mtrs.