(1)

Brent Devine - Submission Details for ANONYMOUS.

From:
To: <brent.devine@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 11/24/2011 11:25 PM
Subject: Submission Details for
CC: <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>

NSW GOVERNMENT | Planning & Infrastructure

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Content:
I object to the bulk earthwork and land clearing. Our local community is special due to its flaura and fauna but it will be lost in this area due to massive habitat destruction.
Every day driving past this site I worry about the future of our wetland eco system and animal habitats as over a hundred logs are piled high beside the development area.
An independent organisation such as the National Parks And Wildlife Service should be asked to establish small parks in this development area to allow for the new 4,500 homes for humans and still provide homes for the native wildlife also. Improve this proposal to benefit the life-cycle of children growing up in the area to see the growth and movement of nat ive Australian plants and animals.

h[illegible]projects.affinitylive.com?action=view_diary&id=23624

Submission for Job: #2642 08_0194 Stage 1 Project Application
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_job&id=2642

Site: #549 Kings Forest, Kingscliff
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_site&id=549

(2)

Brent Devine - Submission Details for ANONYMOUS

From:
To: <brent.devine@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 12/5/2011 9:12 AM
Subject: Submission Details for
CC: <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>

NSW GOVERNMENT | Planning & Infrastructure

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Content:
I would like to object to the whole Kings Forest project. Local people should have a say when it comes to new HUGE development of the sort. How can the small Tweed Coast community keep growing at this rate? Over the past decades, projects have burgeoned everywhere, the foreshore was ripped to build Casuarina and then Salt. Those are massive developments and now only a few years later, Mr Kelly thinks that it is appropriate to approve a development of 4500 dwellings !!!????? I am outraged with his decision and the dirty tricks played by the wealthy and greedy Mr Ell and his Leda Group.
Our roads and services are not adequate, our bush and beaches are already under so much pressure. Local people have had enough of the rel entless push for development. This must stop. Community consultation at both local and state level need to be conducted. We must debate our population target for the sake of our future. Our environment cannot sustain such flogging indefininitely.
Thank you.

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_diary&id=24165

Submission for Job: #2642 08_0194 Stage 1 Project Application
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_job&id=2642

Site: #549 Kings Forest, Kingscliff
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_site&id=5 49

DUP. (2)

Brent Devine - Kings Forest - Stage 1

From:
To: <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 1/24/2012 11:07 AM
Subject: Kings Forest - Stage 1

Good morning,

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the Kind Forest development.
I disagree with and resent the way governments force such high population growth without proper public consultation.
I can't believe that Leda and their scoundrel directors and lawyers can be allowed to develop sensitive land with such blatent lack of ethics.
I am appauled that our governments, at all levels, are showing such contempt towards the plight of koalas and their disappearance. What a terrible shame!
This development should NEVER allow cats or dogs. I am so fed up with people's pets killing native animals. I live at Koala Beach and it is a real joy to live here. Pets are not needed in sensitive environments.
I don't care about parties, left or right, I just want to see politicians making the RIGHT decisions for people and our environment.
Kings Forest is going to do nothing good for either.

Thank you,

(3)

Brent Devine - Submission Details for , ANONYMOUS

From:
To: <brent.devine@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 12/10/2011 11:57 AM
Subject: Submission Details for
CC: <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>

NSW GOVERNMENT | Planning & Infrastructure

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Address:

Content:
I object to the Kings Forest Development Proposal for the following reasons;
It fails to provide adequate protection for the dwindling Koala population and other fauna within it's borders.
It is too dense with houses, which will not be self sufficient in water or power.
It will place enormous pressure on what remains of the natural coastal ecosystem.
It is all about a big developer making big money, at any cost to the environment and the community.

If there must be a development, then I suggest the following;
The Golf Course should become a wildlife park, which would provide employment and ongoing interest for tourists.
Like Koala Beach, all domestic cats and dogs sho uld be banned.
The development should be self sufficient in water, with tanks and recycling mandatory. Cycleways should be included. Lots sizes should be larger, to provide room for shade trees and gardens for native birds and other wildlife to inhabit.
The number of dwellings should be halved

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_diary&id=24415

Submission for Job: #2642 08_0194 Stage 1 Project Application
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_job&id=2642

Site: #549 Kings Forest, Kingscliff
http s://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_site&id=549

(4)

Brent Devine - Submission Details for ANONYMOUS

From:
To: <brent.devine@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 12/16/2011 2:28 PM
Subject: Submission Details for
CC: <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>

NSW GOVERNMENT | Planning & Infrastructure

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Content:
I submit there is to much development in the proposal and not enough green space and natural habitat. Everything is maximised for the developer except the natural environment.

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_diary&id=24591

Submission for Job: #2642 08_0194 Stage 1 Project Application
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_job&id=2642

Site: #549 Kings Forest, Kingscliff
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_site&id=549

(5)

Brent Devine - Submission Details for ANONYMOUS

From:
To: <brent.devine@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 12/18/2011 8:33 AM
Subject: Submission Details for
CC: <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>

NSW GOVERNMENT | Planning & Infrastructure

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Content:
Because of its size and impact on the delicate coastal flora and fauna, including koalas and their food trees, this subdivision should exclude ownership of domestic animals, namely cats and dogs.

Also in line with Tweed Shire Council guidelines, this subdivision should include provisions for storm water harvesting for use as grey water.

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_diary&id=24613

Submission for Job: #2642 08_0194 Stage 1 Project Application
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_job&id=2642

Site: #549 Kings Forest, Kingscliff
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_site&id=549

(6)

Brent Devine - Submission Details for

ANONYMOUS

From:
To: <brent.devine@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 12/22/2011 4:35 PM
Subject: Submission Details f
CC: <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>

NSW GOVERNMENT | Planning & Infrastructure

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Content:
I beleive the development will be detrimental and damaging to local enviroment- it will force wildlife i.e koalas,bandicoots, wailabies, echidna, potteroos, and reptiles etc into agricultural areas where too many already reside due to habitat loss. It's already impossible to establish small crops and orchid without expensive tree-guarding and heavy fencing, due to the already large numbers of animals that venture into agricultural land as much of their native habitat has already been cleared. The concentration of animals ie. wallabies and bandicoots in particular are causing excessive cultivation of the soil(erosion) and browsing(they eat everything). And finally, the site where the development is proposed is flood-prone i.e Jun e 30th 2005 flooding of the exact area.

https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_diary&id=25179

Submission for Job: #2642 08_0194 Stage 1 Project Application
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_job&id=2642

Site: #549 Kings Forest, Kingscliff
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_site&id=549

7

24 November 2011

Major Projects Assessment,
Department of Planning and Infrastructure,
GPO Box 39,
Sydney NSW 2001

PCU028430

TROPICAL FRUIT WORLD
GOLD COAST-TWEED • AUSTRALIA

Department of Planning
Received
2 8 NOV 2011
Scanning Room

Attention: Director-Metropolitan and Regional Projects North
Cc: submissions@ledaholdings.com.au
Cc: The General Manager- Tweed Shire Council

I write in response to the exhibition of *Kings Forest- Stage 1 Subdivision and Bulk Earthworks.*
Application Number: 08_0194

Attached is a letter submitted by Tropical Fruit World (TFW) in December 2008 highlighting our concern of buffer zone requirements for low density housing neighbouring our existing agricultural operation. We wish to again ask that the department review the buffer requirements.

Agricultural buffers of 150m were established for the project by the SEPP (Major Development) 2005 (amendment 10). Since then the buffers in the concept plan have been reduced to 30m and 40m between low density housing in precinct 13/16 and the boundary of our existing agricultural operation.

The decision to reduce the buffer zones in the concept plan came after an assessment of land use for agriculture bordering the Kings Forest development. In the case of TFW, the paddocks adjoining Kings Forest are currently under rest due to market influences (a common sustainable soil management practice) and are growing grass for use as mulch. This will not be the case in the future when the paddocks are again ploughed and used for intensive small crop production. At this time the reduced buffer zones will become ineffective and agriculture will impact on residents by way of dust, noise and spray drift. We strongly recommend that the buffer zones of 150m be re-instated to provide appropriate distance between the low density housing in precinct 13/16 and our boundary to avoid inevitable future conflicts.

We are in support of the Kings Forest development and the economic growth it will bring to this region. We write with intention of ensuring residents of the Kings Forest Development are not unnecessarily impacted by our existing agriculture operation.

Yours truly,

Aymon Gow
Manager
Tropical Fruit World

TROPICAL FRUIT WORLD PTY LTD. ABN 44 054 785 134
DURANBAH RD DURANBAH NSW 2487 AUSTRALIA
P +61(0)2 6677 7222 **F** +61(0)2 6677 7363
E info@tropicalfruitworld.com.au **W** www.tropicalfruitworld.com.au

8

Brent Devine - Kings forest development MP 08_0194

From: Ashley Hannam <AHannam@lindisfarne.nsw.edu.au>
To: "information@planning.nsw.gov.au" <information@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 12/1/2011 8:36 AM
Subject: Kings forest development MP 08_0194

A Hannam
19 Fawcett St. Tumbulgum
N.S.W. 2490

To whom it may concern

I would like to make known my objection to the proposed King's Forest development (mp 08_0194). My objections are based on the threat to biodiversity in the region and the pressures this will place on the existing infrastructure. I am also concerned about the developers poor record of compliance when it comes to environmental protection and management.

Yours Sincerely
Ashley Hannam

(9)

Brent Devine - Submission Details for Cathie Sherwood

From: Cathie Sherwood <cathiesherwood@bigpond.com>
To: <brent.devine@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 12/3/2011 6:00 PM
Subject: Submission Details for Cathie Sherwood
CC: <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>

NSW GOVERNMENT | Planning & Infrastructure

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Cathie Sherwood
Email: cathiesherwood@bigpond.com

Address:
30 Peter St

Banora Point, NSW
2486

Content:
It is too late when you have killed them all...that in the
Kings Forest Extension of Stage 1 Application Process
I ask that Council makes a request to the NSW Planning Department for an extension of the Public Exhibition process until 28 February 2012 in light of the complex and extensive nature of the application and need to obtain advice from a network of local specialists on the new Koala Plan of Management.
Motions Dec

Kings Forest Extension of Stage 1 Application Process

I, Councillor Milne move,

That

Council makes a request to the NSW Planning Department for an extension of the Public Exhibition process until 28 February 2012 in light of the complex and extensive nature of the application and need to obtain advice from a network of local specialists on the new Koala Plan of Management.

Kings Forest Stage 1 Application Community Consultation Process I request that the Council requests the NSW Planning Department for the Department to hold public meetings on the Kings Forest Stage 1 Application in light of the wide spread public interest and ramifications of this development and the community concern for the preservation of the Tweed Coast Koalas.

IP Address: cpe-124-186-247-25.lns8.woo.bigpond.net.au - 124.186.247.25
Submission: Online Submission from Cathie Sherwood (comments)
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_diary&id=24092

Submission fo r Job: #2642 08_0194 Stage 1 Project Application
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_job&id=2642

Site: #549 Kings Forest, Kingscliff
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_site&id=549

Cathie Sherwood

E : cathiesherwood@bigpond.com

10

Brent Devine - Submission Details for Karin Hannah

From: Karin Hannah <karinhannah@bigpond.com>
To: <brent.devine@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 12/4/2011 6:23 PM
Subject: Submission Details for Karin Hannah
CC: <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>

NSW GOVERNMENT | Planning & Infrastructure

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Karin Hannah
Email: karinhannah@bigpond.com

Address:
21/204 Byangum Road

Murwillumbah, NSW
2484

Content:
The Tweed Valley needs protection against continued, wanton development of its natural habitats by greedy developers who are always trying to convince everyone, including our councils that we need more housing. A great many of us are all well aware what these developers and some councilors alike care about, and that is the bottom line. Environmental issues come way down on their list of priorities. Are our councils going to continue allowing this to happen when so many in the general community have already called out against it? When are our councils going to stop betraying those whose interests and priorities they are supposed to be representing?

IP Address: cpe-121-213-37-7.lns2.cht.bigpond.net.au - 121.213.37.7
Submission: Online Submission from Karin Hannah (object)
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_diary&id=24132

Submission for Job: #2642 08_0194 Stage 1 Project Application
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_job&id=2642

Site: #549 Kings Forest, Kingscliff
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_site&id=549

Karin Hannah

E : karinhannah@bigpond.com

(11)

Kim Stephan Ecological Consultant

27 Prince Street, Murwillumbah, NSW, 2484

Ph: (02) 6672 7578, Mob: 0418692442

To/ Tweed Shire Council,
PO Box 816
Murwillumbah
NSW 2484

RE: Kings Forest, Kingscliff, 08_0194 Stage 1 Project Application

Dear Sir Madam,

I wish to comment on the above Kings Forest residential development.

I am concerned that the development will have a detrimental effect on the survival of the Tweed Coast's Koala population. The Bogangar/Kings Forest/Forest Hill Koala population, estimated to be between 5-66 individuals (Philips, 2004), is isolated from other local Koala populations and at high risk of becoming extinct due to continuing loss of habitat and other urban pressures.

The Kings Forest (Stage 1) Koala Plan of Management (Warren& Associates, 2011) comprehensively discusses the main threats to this population from the development. Recommendations and objectives have been listed (pp33-35) to increase the chance of this Koala population surviving into the future. These objectives need to be adopted by the developer as a minimum level of Koala protection. The habitat improvement recommendations by Philips (2011) (pp29-31) to improve habitat connectivity and linkage corridors should specifically be adhered to.

The issue of dog attack on Koalas from the resulting housing development has not been adequately addressed. The list of dangerous dog breeds to Koalas is underestimated (p20). Many more breeds could be added to the list and many smaller dog breeds would impact on Koalas through barking, chasing and causing stress. A total ban on dogs within the Kings Forest development would improve the chances of long term survival for the Bogangar/Kings Forest/Forest Hill Koala population and reduce the impacts on other wildlife. No dogs in the upper catchment would benefit downstream aquatic values with less dog faeces entering the waterways. A total ban on dogs and cats (a well documented threat to wildlife) should also be added to the above objectives. Extreme measures are necessary in the case of this development. Even without the Kings Forest development, the Tweed Coast Koala population is on the brink and close to the point of no recovery.

Considering the history of the developer, Leda, in regards to illegal clearing of native vegetation and non-compliance with planning and environmental laws, I am gravely concerned that Koala protection regulations will not be honoured. An environmental officer or independent environmental supervisor should be on site during the construction and revegetation phases to ensure obligations are met. If they are not then the developer should be penalised or precluded from further development approvals, fining is not enough.

The completed development will have long term consequences on Koala populations and local ecosystems e.g., Cudgen Lake. All efforts must be made to alleviate the impacts from the development on aquatic environments, wildlife and natural areas of the Tweed coastline.

In summary I ask Tweed Shire Council to ensure the developer:

1. Adopts the objectives of the Kings Forest Koala Management Plan (pp33-35);
2. Adopts the habitat improvement recommendations by Philips (2011) in the Kings Forest Koala Management Plan (pp29-31);
3. Incorporates a total ban on dogs and cats in the Kings Forest estate during and after construction;
4. Abides by the regulations imposed on the development, especially in regards to Koala management, wildlife preservation, native vegetation clearing and maintaining aquatic values or risk serious penalties; and
5. Has an employee or independent environmental officer on site during construction and for a minimum of 2 years post development to ensure environmental and Koala regulations are met.

Yours sincerely,

Kim Stephan
Ecologist
0418692442

References

Philips, S. (2011) Tweed Coast Koala Habitat Study. Report to Tweed Shire Council. January Parks and Wildlife Service.

(12)

Brent Devine - Submission Details for William West

From: William West <william.west4@bigpond.com>
To: <brent.devine@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 12/6/2011 10:01 PM
Subject: Submission Details for William West
CC: <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>

NSW GOVERNMENT | Planning & Infrastructure

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: William West
Email: william.west4@bigpond.com

Address:
689 Commissioners Creek Rd.

Doon Doon, NSW
2484

Content:
Many Queenslanders cross the border, especially on weekends, to leave the never-ending urban sprawl of their own state to enjoy the rural nature of the Northern Rivers. My fear is that NSW will go the way of Queensland with such developments as Kings Forest & Cobaki Lakes with their high-density housing, poor planning & complete disregard for natural assets such as koalas etc.

IP Address: cpe-58-168-83-225.lns5.ken.bigpond.net.au - 58.168.83.225
Submission: Online Submission from William West (comments)
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_diary&id=24277

Submis sion for Job: #2642 08_0194 Stage 1 Project Application
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_job&id=2642

Site: #549 Kings Forest, Kingscliff
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_site&id=549

William West

E : william.west4@bigpond.com

13

nt Devine - Submission Details for Barry Stegeman

m: Barry Stegeman <barry.anita@bigpond.com>
: <brent.devine@planning.nsw.gov.au>
te: 12/8/2011 1:43 PM
ubject: Submission Details for Barry Stegeman
C: <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>

NSW GOVERNMENT | Planning & Infrastructure

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: Barry Stegeman
Email: barry.anita@bigpond.com

Address:
10 secret lane

Kings Forest, NSW
2487

Content:
1. It is essential that the proposed koala fencing is put in place as soon as practical in those areas that will affect the corridors.
2. The Buffer fencing needs to be in place before earthworks commence to protect fauna and to ensure that the earthwoks are contained within the approved areas.
3. The construction traffic should be limited to 40km/hr and traffic controllers used in risk locations and during risk times of the day (before 11am and towards dusk)
4. The proposed stormwater pipe accross the entrance parkway near Tweed Coast Road intersection (beside the fauna underpass should be fitted with a flood gate to allow controll of the drainage upstream which will then allow the Swamp Schlerophll a chance to regenerate strongly. The open drain around precinct 2 runs through to the farmland to the north west and is important for the drainage of the farms but could be managed to great advantage as described.
5. The road descriptions on the earthwoks plan by Morton Urban Solutions are wrong. It incorrectly decribes the location of Secret Lane. It describes the unnamed Crown road reserve and Council road reserve as Secret lane and Depot road.
6. Greater attention needs to be given to the timing and extent of fauna fencing in relation to the stagings of the developments. A hollistic approach should be taken otherwise there is likely to between the fauna movements and development.
7. Maintenance into the future of the fauna/buffer fencing needs to be considered to ensure that the fencing remains effective.
8. Dogs should not be permitted in the estate.
9. The fauna culvert design needs to consider dry passage for koalas and needs to inco rporate protective structures such as raised logs, to assist in safe passage for koalas.

IP Address: cpe-124-179-79-107.lns5.cht.bigpond.net.au - 124.179.79.107
Submission: Online Submission from Barry Stegeman (comments)
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_diary&id=24348

Submission for Job: #2642 08_0194 Stage 1 Project Application
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_job&id=2642

Site: #549 Kings Forest, Kingscliff
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_site&id=549

Barry Stegeman

E : barry.anita@bigpond.com

(14)

CUDGEN ORGANICS ABN 53 089 509 923

Ken & Lyndel Small
194 Tweed Coast Road
CUDGEN NSW 2487
Ph: (02)6674 1254 Fax: (02)6674 5552
Mobile: 0431 087 025

Email: cudgenorganics@iprimus.com.au

12th December, 2011

Attention: Director-Metropolitan and Regional Projects North
NSW Department of Planning & Infrastructure
GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

Comments Re: Application No 08-0194 - Kings Forest, Kingscliff NSW 2487

Dear Sir,

We own and manage a Certified Organic farm on Lot 132 Tweed Coast Road Cudgen and would like to express our concerns on some issues of the Kings Forest development by Proponent Project 28 Pty Ltd. Our first concern is regarding the drain that since the 1950's has carried storm and flood water runoff from our property and adjoining properties at the end of the Cudgen plateau. The drain currently runs from our farm past the edge of Precinct 2 and under both Old Bogangar road and Tweed Coast Road, exiting into Cudgen Creek.

The area where the drain runs under Old Bogangar Road has been washed away at least 3 times in my life time during heavy rain periods. My concern is that this drain needs to be upgraded as well as regularly maintained so that it can, given the forecast of climate change and the intersection development, be able to cope with the volume of flood and storm water runoff needing to escape to the eastern side of Tweed Coast road and into Cudgen Creek. The proposed road entrance and associated intersection works must not impede or reduce its capacity in fact I believe it would be prudent to increase its capacity. If this drain is not maintained properly it will result in the waters backing up and causing flooding and crop damage to the State Significant farmland as well as the houses in this area and of course the intersection itself could be compromised.

On a second matter we would like to raise our concerns with regards to the entrance to our property. We were led to believe by Council that the entrance into Kings Forest would be a major roundabout, however we have found 2 sets of plans on the website one for a roundabout and one showing a major intersection. If the entrance becomes an intersection then a solution to entry and exit to ours and other farmer's properties on Tweed Coast Road will become a concern. As a producing vegetable farm we have large freight trucks, fuel tankers and farm supply trucks as well as ourselves and our staff entering our driveway daily, mostly from the north. We are worried that when the road is upgraded to four lanes and with the projected increase in traffic volumes that entering from the north will become too hazardous. If the Kings Forest entrance is a roundabout, then entrance from the south becomes an option, visiting traffic would be able to travel down around the roundabout and travel back up Tweed Coast Road to

enter our property safely, however this will require upgrade work to our property entrance. If the option of an intersection instead of roundabout is implemented we can envisage all traffic needing to enter our farm and others on this road, having to first travel south, enter Kings Forest parkway and travel to the first internal roundabout in Kings Forest so that they can turn around to return to properties on the western side of Tweed Coast Road from the south.

We have the full support of the Tweed Fruit & Vegetable Association of which Ken is a committee member regarding these concerns.

It is not our intension to impede the development of Kings Forest because it is imperative that any proposed drainage and traffic plans will work for everybody concerned in this rural community.

We would like to ask for a sign to be erected on this road to ask truck drivers to refrain from compression braking as noise levels are quite high and extremely irritating.

We would like to meet with Project 28 and TSC representatives to discuss our concerns.

Kind Regards

Ken Small
Cudgen Organics
Committee Member – Tweed Vegetable Growers Association

Lyndel Small
Cudgen Organics

(15)

Brent Devine - Kings Forest Development Tweed Shire- Submission

From: Tracey Stride <traceystride@gmail.com>
To: <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>, <office@hazzard.minister.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 12/15/2011 4:42 PM
Subject: Kings Forest Development Tweed Shire- Submission

Re: KINGS FOREST Stage 1 Subdivision and Bulk Earthworks
Application No. 08_0194
Submission of Objection & Request from the Planning Minister for Full Inquiry and Referral to UNESCO

Dear Sir / Madam,

I object to the Kings Forest development on the following grounds and seek an extension until end of February and improved community consultation.

I also request a full inquiry into this development as well as referral to UNESCO for impact on World Heritage values of the Caldera's coastal lowlands.

1.Failure to protect biodiversity of the area, in light of estimated only 144 Tweed Coastal Koalas (see further details below), and Tweed having the highest concentration of threatened species in Australia. Resumption should be seriously considered in context of the value the community place on Tweed's natural environment (Community Strategic Plan 2010).

2. Enormous financial, ecological and loss of amenity and basic infrastructure consequences are foreseeable for the development in the longer term due to inevitable impacts from sea level rise in this extreme low lying floodplain 94% of the site between .

Provision for human and ecological adaption and retreat must be catered for under a worst case scenario post the year 2100. The developer must be held responsible for future rectification required rather than the taxpayer.

Resumption should be considered now before these costs become exponential.

3.Impact must be assessed on the World Heritage values of key fauna species due to their reliance on the coastal lowlands as integral food sources in the winter, identified as 'Sibling' World Heritage areas (Office of Environment and Heritage).

4.Lack of recycled water infrastructure largely contributing to the need for a new dam and necessitating further major destruction of hinterland World Heritage complimentary areas and values must be considered. 'Basix' building requirements that exist for all other developments in the area appear to have been to have been swept under the carpet to allow high density, maximum profit development.

5. Impact should be further assessed on Key Fish Habitats of the Cudgen Creek, identified for a Marine Protected Area in 1999, which will take the flow of the main drainage channel, and the increased nutrients from urban areas, including nearly 1 million cubic metres of fill, as well as impacts on the severely stressed Cudgen Lake Nature Reserve, also identified as a State Significant Coastal Lake.

6.Erosion of public confidence in the planning process must be rectified that has resulted from lack of effective consultation, the voiding of significant Council planning standards, perceived conflicts of interest due to developer donations, the failure to back zone as recommended in the Woodward Investigation 2005, and the history of lack of prosecution for unauthorised works.

1. (Continued) Failure to Protect Koalas and other biodiversity
The Kings Forest development has historically failed to apply the basic principles of landscape ecology and again attempts to continue this practice with this new application despite very disturbing new data on the likely extinction of Tweed coast Koalas.
The sensitive eastern side and southern Cudgen Paddock areas were accepted by NSW Department of Environment officers in the 2005 zoning, and Council staff and Councillors for the Concept Plan in 2009, as well as by numerous other ecologists, as the minimum areas required to maintain biodiversity, but so far has been disregarded by NSW Planning.
The inappropriateness of this development footprint has become strikingly apparent with the Council's latest reports of the Tweed Coast Koalas, already on the brink of extinction (Koala Habitat Study 2011).

1.1The development footprint needs to be rectified or there is little likelihood of success for any form of Koala Plan of Management or biodiversity preservation.

Failing the above:
1.2A full analysis of this new approach for koala proof fencing the entire development must be demonstrated, particularly the impacts of the fence on other species, , and how the situation will be managed if the koala fence is shown to be undesirable, or fails in the future. The burden of fence maintenance funding must be borne by the developer.
1.3Cattle grids must be demonstrated to be foolproof from dogs, and koala underpasses immune from sea level rise and flooding.

1.4The 50m ecological buffer zones should be increased and must not serve multiple uses such as fire buffers, the full length of roads, golf courses, bike or walking trails etc, other than that which is unavoidable, due to extreme sensitivity of the ecological values of the site.

1.5'No dogs policy' must be applied as even the scent of dogs will disturb wildlife in the adjacent Cudgen Nature Reserve, and any management techniques such as fencing etc are subject to political will, resource vulnerabilities and other human variables.

1.6Roads should be restricted to 40km with mandatory speed bumps as demonstrated to be the only effective means of speed reduction as in Koala

Beach Estate.

1.7Planning for Bushfire must include planning for protection of the environment.

1.8Monitoring to achieve stated outcomes should be carried out in perpetuity and performance criteria applied to rehabilitation plans particularly tree growth targets.

1.9Ecological rehabilitation across the whole site should be undertaken in the immediate term, not staged as development progresses.

1.10Funding for ecological maintenance should be provided by the developer in perpetuity including for any contingency plans. A bond should be placed on the development in perpetuity that would provide for compensation in case these management plans fail.

1.11The developer should fund the Department of Environment and Heritage or Council to provide an environmental compliance officer as required.

Yours sincerely,

Signature: Tracey A Stride
Name: Christopher A Eaton

Address: 72 Plantation Road, Cudgen NSW 2487
0400 148 778

(16)

ent Devine - KINGS FOREST Stage 1 Subdivision and Bulk Earthworks

From: "Bugs BUNNEY" <buglesbbunney@bigpond.com>
To: <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 12/15/2011 7:49 PM
Subject: KINGS FOREST Stage 1 Subdivision and Bulk Earthworks

Re: KINGS FOREST Stage 1 Subdivision and Bulk Earthworks

Application No. 08_0194

Submission of Objection & Request from the Planning Minister for Full Inquiry and Referral to UNESCO

Dear Sir / Madam,

I object to the Kings Forest development on the following grounds and seek an extension until end of February and improved community consultation.

I also request a full inquiry into this development as well as referral to UNESCO for impact on World Heritage values of the Caldera's coastal lowlands.

1.Failure to protect biodiversity of the area, in light of estimated only 144 Tweed Coastal Koalas (see further details below), and Tweed having the highest concentration of threatened species in Australia. Resumption should be seriously considered in context of the value the community place on Tweed's natural environment (Community Strategic Plan 2010).

2. Enormous financial, ecological and loss of amenity and basic infrastructure consequences are foreseeable for the development in the longer term due to inevitable impacts from sea level rise in this extreme low lying floodplain 94% of the site between .

Provision for human and ecological adaption and retreat must be catered for under a worst case scenario post the year 2100. The developer must be held responsible for future rectification required rather than the taxpayer.

Resumption should be considered now before these costs become exponential.

3.Impact must be assessed on the World Heritage values of key fauna species due to their reliance on the coastal lowlands as integral food sources in the winter, identified as 'Sibling' World Heritage areas (Office of Environment and Heritage).

4.Lack of recycled water infrastructure largely contributing to the need for a new dam and necessitating further major destruction of hinterland World Heritage complimentary areas and values must be considered. 'Basix' building requirements that exist for all other developments in the area appear to have been to have been swept under the carpet to allow high density, maximum profit development.

5. Impact should be further assessed on Key Fish Habitats of the Cudgen Creek, identified for a Marine Protected Area in 1999, which will take the flow of the main drainage channel, and the increased nutrients from urban areas, including nearly 1 million cubic metres of fill, as well as impacts on the severely stressed Cudgen Lake Nature Reserve, also identified as a State Significant Coastal Lake.

6.Erosion of public confidence in the planning process must be rectified that has resulted from lack of effective consultation, the voiding of significant Council planning standards, perceived conflicts of interest due to developer donations, the failure to back zone as recommended in the Woodward Investigation 2005, and the history of lack of prosecution for unauthorised works.

1. (Continued) Failure to Protect Koalas and other biodiversity

The Kings Forest development has historically failed to apply the basic principles of landscape ecology and again attempts to continue this practice with this new application despite very disturbing new data on the likely extinction of Tweed coast Koalas.

The sensitive eastern side and southern Cudgen Paddock areas were accepted by NSW Department of Environment officers in the 2005 zoning, and Council staff and Councillors for the Concept Plan in 2009, as well as by numerous other ecologists, as the minimum areas required to maintain biodiversity, but so far has been disregarded by NSW Planning.

The inappropriateness of this development footprint has become strikingly apparent with the Council's latest reports of the Tweed Coast Koalas, already on the brink of extinction (Koala Habitat Study 2011).

1.1The development footprint needs to be rectified or there is little likelihood of success for any form of Koala Plan of Management or biodiversity preservation.

Failing the above:

1.2A full analysis of this new approach for koala proof fencing the entire development must be demonstrated, particularly the impacts of the fence on other species, , and how the situation will be managed if the koala fence is shown to be undesirable, or fails in the future. The burden of fence maintenance funding must be borne by the developer.

1.3Cattle grids must be demonstrated to be foolproof from dogs, and koala underpasses immune from sea level rise and flooding.

1.4The 50m ecological buffer zones should be increased and must not serve multiple uses such as fire buffers, the full length of roads, golf courses, bike or walking trails etc, other than that which is unavoidable, due to extreme sensitivity of the ecological values of the site.

1.5'No dogs policy' must be applied as even the scent of dogs will disturb wildlife in the adjacent Cudgen Nature Reserve, and any management techniques such as fencing etc are subject to political will, resource vulnerabilities and other human variables.

1.6Roads should be restricted to 40km with mandatory speed bumps as demonstrated to be the only effective means of speed reduction as in Koala Beach Estate.

1.7Planning for Bushfire must include planning for protection of the environment.

1.8Monitoring to achieve stated outcomes should be carried out in perpetuity and performance criteria applied to rehabilitation plans particularly tree growth targets.

1.9Ecological rehabilitation across the whole site should be undertaken in the immediate term, not staged as development progresses.

1.10Funding for ecological maintenance should be provided by the developer in perpetuity including for any contingency plans. A bond should be placed on the development in perpetuity that would provide for compensation in case these management plans fail.

1.11The developer should fund the Department of Environment and Heritage or Council to provide an environmental compliance officer as required.

Yours sincerely,

Signature: Lee Bunney

Name: Lee Bunney

Address: 102 Cabarita Road, Bogangar NSW 2488

17

Brent Devine - Kings Forest Development Tweed Shire- Submission

From: TIM SMERD <timmysmerd@gmail.com>
To: <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>, <office@hazzard.minister.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 12/16/2011 7:40 AM
Subject: Kings Forest Development Tweed Shire- Submission

Re: KINGS FOREST Stage 1 Subdivision and Bulk Earthworks

Application No. 08_0194

Submission of Objection & Request from the Planning Minister for Full Inquiry and Referral to UNESCO

Dear Sir / Madam,

I object to the Kings Forest development on the following grounds and seek an extension until end of February and improved community consultation.

I also request a full inquiry into this development as well as referral to UNESCO for impact on World Heritage values of the Caldera's coastal lowlands.

1.Failure to protect biodiversity of the area, in light of estimated only 144 Tweed Coastal Koalas (see further details below), and Tweed having the highest concentration of threatened species in Australia. Resumption should be seriously considered in context of the value the community place on Tweed's natural environment (Community Strategic Plan 2010).

2. Enormous financial, ecological and loss of amenity and basic infrastructure consequences are foreseeable for the development in the longer term due to inevitable impacts from sea level rise in this extreme low lying floodplain 94% of the site between . Provision for human and ecological adaption and retreat must be catered for under a worst case scenario post the year 2100. The developer must be held responsible for future rectification required rather than the taxpayer.
Resumption should be considered now before these costs become exponential.
3.Impact must be assessed on the World Heritage values of key fauna species due to their reliance on the coastal lowlands as integral food sources in the winter, identified as 'Sibling' World Heritage areas (Office of Environment and Heritage).

4.Lack of recycled water infrastructure largely contributing to the need for a new dam and necessitating further major destruction of hinterland World Heritage complimentary areas and values must be considered. 'Basix' building requirements that exist for all other developments in the area appear to have been to have been swept under the carpet to allow high density, maximum profit development. 5. Impact should be further assessed on Key Fish Habitats of the Cudgen Creek, identified for a Marine Protected Area in 1999, which will take the flow of the main drainage channel, and the increased nutrients from urban areas, including nearly 1 million cubic metres of fill, as well as impacts on the severely stressed Cudgen Lake Nature Reserve, also identified as a State Significant Coastal Lake.

Erosion of public confidence in the planning process must be rectified that has resulted from lack of effective consultation, the voiding of significant Council planning standards, perceived conflicts of interest due to developer donations, the failure to back zone as recommended in the Woodward Investigation 2005, and the history of lack of prosecution for unauthorised works.

1. (Continued) Failure to Protect Koalas and other biodiversity

The Kings Forest development has historically failed to apply the basic principles of landscape ecology and again attempts to continue this practice with this new application despite very disturbing new data on the likely extinction of Tweed coast Koalas.

The sensitive eastern side and southern Cudgen Paddock areas were accepted by NSW Department of Environment officers in the 2005 zoning, and Council staff and Councillors for the Concept Plan in 2009, as well as by numerous other ecologists, as the minimum areas required to maintain biodiversity, but so far has been disregarded by NSW Planning.

The inappropriateness of this development footprint has become strikingly apparent with the Council's latest reports of the Tweed Coast Koalas, already on the brink of extinction (Koala Habitat Study 2011).

1.1The development footprint needs to be rectified or there is little likelihood of success for any form of Koala Plan of Management or biodiversity preservation.

Failing the above:

1.2A full analysis of this new approach for koala proof fencing the entire development must be demonstrated, particularly the impacts of the fence on other species, , and how the situation will be managed if the koala fence is shown to be undesirable, or fails in the future. The burden of fence maintenance funding must be borne by the developer.

1.3Cattle grids must be demonstrated to be foolproof from dogs, and koala underpasses immune from sea level rise and flooding.

1.4The 50m ecological buffer zones should be increased and must not serve multiple uses such as fire buffers, the full length of roads, golf courses, bike or walking trails etc, other than that which is unavoidable, due to extreme sensitivity of the ecological values of the site.

1.5'No dogs policy' must be applied as even the scent of dogs will disturb wildlife in the adjacent Cudgen Nature Reserve, and any management techniques such as fencing etc are subject to political will, resource vulnerabilities and other human variables.

1.6Roads should be restricted to 40km with mandatory speed bumps as demonstrated to be the only effective means of speed reduction as in Koala Beach Estate.

1.7Planning for Bushfire must include planning for protection of the environment.

1.8Monitoring to achieve stated outcomes should be carried out in perpetuity and performance criteria applied to rehabilitation plans particularly tree growth targets.

1.9Ecological rehabilitation across the whole site should be undertaken in the immediate term, not staged as development progresses.

1.10Funding for ecological maintenance should be provided by the developer in perpetuity including for any contingency plans. A bond should be placed on the development in perpetuity that would provide for compensation in case these management plans fail.

1.11The developer should fund the Department of Environment and Heritage or Council to provide an environmental compliance officer as required.

Yours sincerely,

Signature:

Name: Tim Smerd

Address: 11 Towners Ave Bogangar 2488

18

Brent Devine - Kings Forest Development Tweed Shire- Submission

From: Kerrie-Ann Foxwell <K.Foxwell@griffith.edu.au>
To: <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>, <office@hazzard.minister.nsw.gov.a>
Date: 12/16/2011 7:44 AM
Subject: Kings Forest Development Tweed Shire- Submission
Attachments: grad11.gif

Re: KINGS FOREST Stage 1 Subdivision and Bulk Earthworks

Application No. 08_0194

Submission of Objection & Request from the Planning Minister for Full Inquiry and Referral to UNESCO

Dear Sir / Madam,

I object to the Kings Forest development on the following grounds and seek an extension until end of February and improved community consultation.

I also request a full inquiry into this development as well as referral to UNESCO for impact on World Heritage values of the Caldera's coastal lowlands.

1.Failure to protect biodiversity of the area, in light of estimated only 144 Tweed Coastal Koalas (see further details below), and Tweed having the highest concentration of threatened species in Australia. Resumption should be seriously considered in context of the value the community place on Tweed's natural environment (Community Strategic Plan 2010).

2. Enormous financial, ecological and loss of amenity and basic infrastructure consequences are foreseeable for the development in the longer term due to inevitable impacts from sea level rise in this extreme low lying floodplain 94% of the site between .

Provision for human and ecological adaption and retreat must be catered for under a worst case scenario post the year 2100. The developer must be held responsible for future rectification required rather than the taxpayer.

Resumption should be considered now before these costs become exponential.

3.Impact must be assessed on the World Heritage values of key fauna species due to their reliance on the coastal lowlands as integral food sources in the winter, identified as 'Sibling' World Heritage areas (Office of Environment and Heritage).

4.Lack of recycled water infrastructure largely contributing to the need for a new dam and necessitating further major destruction of hinterland World Heritage complimentary areas and values must be considered. 'Basix' building requirements that exist for all other developments in the area appear to have been to have been swept under the carpet to allow high density, maximum profit development.

5. Impact should be further assessed on Key Fish Habitats of the Cudgen Creek, identified for a Marine Protected Area in 1999, which will take the flow of the main drainage channel, and the increased nutrients from urban areas, including nearly 1 million cubic metres of fill, as well as impacts on the severely stressed Cudgen Lake Nature Reserve, also identified as a State Significant Coastal Lake.

6.Erosion of public confidence in the planning process must be rectified that has resulted from lack of effective consultation, the voiding of significant Council planning standards, perceived conflicts of interest due to developer donations, the failure to back zone as recommended in the Woodward Investigation 2005, and the history of lack of prosecution for unauthorised works.

1. (Continued) Failure to Protect Koalas and other biodiversity

The Kings Forest development has historically failed to apply the basic principles of landscape ecology and again attempts to continue this practice with this new application despite very disturbing new data on the likely extinction of Tweed coast Koalas.

The sensitive eastern side and southern Cudgen Paddock areas were accepted by NSW Department of Environment officers in the 2005 zoning, and Council staff and Councillors for the Concept Plan in 2009, as well as by numerous other ecologists, as the minimum areas required to maintain biodiversity, but so far has been disregarded by NSW Planning.

The inappropriateness of this development footprint has become strikingly apparent with the Council's latest reports of the Tweed Coast Koalas, already on the brink of extinction (Koala Habitat Study 2011).

1.1The development footprint needs to be rectified or there is little likelihood of success for any form of Koala Plan of Management or biodiversity preservation.

Failing the above:

1.2A full analysis of this new approach for koala proof fencing the entire development must be demonstrated, particularly the impacts of the fence on other species, , and how the situation will be managed if the koala fence is shown to be undesirable, or fails in the future. The burden of fence maintenance funding must be borne by the developer.

1.3Cattle grids must be demonstrated to be foolproof from dogs, and koala underpasses immune from sea level rise and flooding.

1.4The 50m ecological buffer zones should be increased and must not serve multiple uses such as fire buffers, the full length of roads, golf courses, bike or walking trails etc, other than that which is unavoidable, due to extreme sensitivity of the ecological values of the site.

1.5'No dogs policy' must be applied as even the scent of dogs will disturb wildlife in the adjacent Cudgen Nature Reserve, and any management techniques such as fencing etc are subject to political will, resource vulnerabilities and other human variables.

1.6Roads should be restricted to 40km with mandatory speed bumps as demonstrated to be the only effective means of speed reduction as in Koala Beach Estate.

1.7Planning for Bushfire must include planning for protection of the environment.

1.8Monitoring to achieve stated outcomes should be carried out in perpetuity and performance criteria applied to rehabilitation plans particularly tree growth targets.

1.9Ecological rehabilitation across the whole site should be undertaken in the immediate term, not staged as development progresses.

1.10Funding for ecological maintenance should be provided by the developer in perpetuity including for any contingency plans. A bond should be placed on the development in perpetuity that would provide for compensation in case these management plans fail.

1.11The developer should fund the Department of Environment and Heritage or Council to provide an environmental compliance officer as required.

Yours sincerely,

Signature: Kerrie Foxwell

Name: Kerrie Foxwell

Address: 29 Ti=Tree Ave, Bogangar NSW 2488

19

Brent Devine - Re: 08_0194 Stage 1 Project Application - Kings Forest, Kingscliff

From: Vicki Lloyd <vickilloyd@netspace.net.au>
To: <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 12/16/2011 7:53 AM
Subject: Re: 08_0194 Stage 1 Project Application - Kings Forest, Kingscliff

Re: KINGS FOREST Stage 1 Subdivision and Bulk Earthworks

Application No. 08_0194

Submission of Objection & Request from the Planning Minister for Full Inquiry and Referral to UNESCO

Dear Sir / Madam,

I object to the Kings Forest development on the following grounds and seek an extension until end of February and improved community consultation.

I also request a full inquiry into this development as well as referral to UNESCO for impact on World Heritage values of the Caldera's coastal lowlands.

1.Failure to protect biodiversity of the area, in light of estimated only 144 Tweed Coastal Koalas (see further details below), and Tweed having the highest concentration of threatened species in Australia. Resumption should be seriously considered in context of the value the community place on Tweed's natural environment (Community Strategic Plan 2010).

2. Enormous financial, ecological and loss of amenity and basic infrastructure consequences are foreseeable for the development in the longer term due to inevitable impacts from sea level rise in this extreme low lying floodplain 94% of the site between . Provision for human and ecological adaption and retreat must be catered for under a worst case scenario post the year 2100. The developer must be held responsible for future rectification required rather than the taxpayer.
Resumption should be considered now before these costs become exponential.
3.Impact must be assessed on the World Heritage values of key fauna species due to their reliance on the coastal lowlands as integral food sources in the winter, identified as 'Sibling' World Heritage areas (Office of Environment and Heritage).

4.Lack of recycled water infrastructure largely contributing to the need for a new dam and necessitating further major destruction of hinterland World Heritage complimentary areas and values must be considered. 'Basix' building requirements that exist for all other developments in the area appear to have been to have been swept under the carpet to allow high density, maximum profit development. 5. Impact should be further assessed on Key Fish Habitats of the Cudgen Creek, identified for a Marine Protected Area in 1999, which will take the flow of the main drainage channel, and the increased nutrients from urban areas, including nearly 1 million cubic metres of fill, as well as impacts on the severely stressed Cudgen Lake Nature Reserve, also identified as a State Significant Coastal Lake.

6.Erosion of public confidence in the planning process must be rectified that has resulted from lack of effective consultation, the voiding of significant Council planning standards, perceived conflicts of interest due to developer donations, the failure to back zone as recommended in the Woodward Investigation 2005, and the history of lack of prosecution for unauthorised works.

1. (Continued) Failure to Protect Koalas and other biodiversity

The Kings Forest development has historically failed to apply the basic principles of landscape ecology and again attempts to continue this practice with this new application despite very disturbing new data on the likely extinction of Tweed coast Koalas.

The sensitive eastern side and southern Cudgen Paddock areas were accepted by NSW Department of Environment officers in the 2005 zoning, and Council staff and Councillors for the Concept Plan in 2009, as well as by numerous other ecologists, as the minimum areas required to maintain biodiversity, but so far has been disregarded by NSW Planning.

The inappropriateness of this development footprint has become strikingly apparent with the Council's latest reports of the Tweed Coast Koalas, already on the brink of extinction (Koala Habitat Study 2011).

1.1The development footprint needs to be rectified or there is little likelihood of success for any form of Koala Plan of Management or biodiversity preservation.

Failing the above:

1.2A full analysis of this new approach for koala proof fencing the entire development must be demonstrated, particularly the impacts of the fence on other species, , and how the situation will be managed if the koala fence is shown to be undesirable, or fails in the future. The burden of fence maintenance funding must be borne by the developer.

1.3Cattle grids must be demonstrated to be foolproof from dogs, and koala underpasses immune from sea level rise and flooding.

1.4The 50m ecological buffer zones should be increased and must not serve multiple uses such as fire buffers, the full length of roads, golf courses, bike or walking trails etc, other than that which is unavoidable, due to extreme sensitivity of the ecological values of the site.

1.5'No dogs policy' must be applied as even the scent of dogs will disturb wildlife in the adjacent Cudgen Nature Reserve, and any management techniques such as fencing etc are subject to political will, resource vulnerabilities and other human variables.

1.6Roads should be restricted to 40km with mandatory speed bumps as demonstrated to be the only effective means of speed reduction as in Koala Beach Estate.

1.7Planning for Bushfire must include planning for protection of the environment.

1.8Monitoring to achieve stated outcomes should be carried out in perpetuity and performance criteria applied to rehabilitation plans particularly tree growth targets.

1.9Ecological rehabilitation across the whole site should be undertaken in the immediate term, not staged as development progresses.

1.10Funding for ecological maintenance should be provided by the developer in perpetuity including for any contingency plans. A bond should be placed on the development in perpetuity that would provide for compensation in case these management plans fail.

1.11The developer should fund the Department of Environment and Heritage or Council to provide an environmental compliance officer as required.

Yours sincerely,

Vicki Lloyd

28 Kurrajong Ave.

BOGANGAR 2488

20

Brent Devine - Submission Details for loraine watson

From: loraine watson <loriwatson10@gmail.com>
To: <brent.devine@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 12/16/2011 11:22 AM
Subject: Submission Details for loraine watson
CC: <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>

NSW GOVERNMENT | Planning & Infrastructure

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Name: loraine watson
Email: loriwatson10@gmail.com

Address:
90 glenock rd

Dum Dum, NSW
2484

Content:
I would like to voice my objection to this development mainly on environmental issues.
The dwindling Koala habitat & other threatened species in this unique part of the north coast of NSW is reason enough to stop this development.
Development is not always good. This is only for pure monetry greed by Leda. They dont care about our enviroment.
Leda's Reg Van Rij's comment that the cause of dwindling numbers of Koalas in the Tweed was "not development but wildfires & road fatality hotspots. This development would increase these causes for the Koalas demise.

IP Address: cpe-58-168-72-11.lns4.ken.bigpond.net.au - 58.168.72.11
Submission: Online Submission from loraine watson (object)
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_diary&id=24579

Submission for Job: #2642 08_0194 Stage 1 Project Application
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_job&id=2642

Site: #549 Kings Forest, Kingscliff
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_site&id=549

loraine watson

E : loriwatson10@gmail.com

(21)

The Director Metropolitan and Regional Projects North
Major Projects Assessment
Dept of Planning
GPO Box 39
Sydney, NSW 2001

Re: KINGS FOREST Stage 1 Subdivision and Bulk Earthworks
Application No. 08_0194
Submission of Objection & Request from the Planning Minister for Full Inquiry and Referral to UNESCO

Dear Sir / Madam,

I object to the Kings Forest development on the following grounds and seek an extension until end of February and improved community consultation.
I also request a full inquiry into this development as well as referral to UNESCO for impact on World Heritage values of the Caldera's coastal lowlands.

1. Failure to protect biodiversity of the area, in light of estimated only 144 Tweed Coastal Koalas (see further details below), and Tweed having the highest concentration of threatened species in Australia. Resumption should be seriously considered in context of the value the community place on Tweed's natural environment (Community Strategic Plan 2010).

2. Enormous financial, ecological and loss of amenity and basic infrastructure consequences are foreseeable for the development in the longer term due to inevitable impacts from sea level rise in this extreme low lying floodplain 94% of the site between .
   Provision for human and ecological adaption and retreat must be catered for under a worst case scenario post the year 2100. The developer must be held responsible for future rectification required rather than the taxpayer.
   Resumption should be considered now before these costs become exponential.

3. Impact must be assessed on the World Heritage values of key fauna species due to their reliance on the coastal lowlands as integral food sources in the winter, identified as 'Sibling' World Heritage areas (Office of Environment and Heritage).

4. Lack of recycled water infrastructure largely contributing to the need for a new dam and necessitating further major destruction of hinterland World Heritage complimentary areas and values must be considered.

5. Impact should be further assessed on Key Fish Habitats of the Cudgen Creek, identified for a Marine Protected Area in 1999, which will take the flow of the main drainage channel, and the increased nutrients from urban areas,

including nearly 1 million cubic metres of fill, as well as impacts on the severely stressed Cudgen Lake Nature Reserve, also identified as a State Significant Coastal Lake.

6. Erosion of public confidence in the planning process must be rectified that has resulted from lack of effective consultation, the voiding of significant Council planning standards, perceived conflicts of interest due to developer donations, the failure to back zone as recommended in the Woodward Investigation 2005, and the history of lack of prosecution for unauthorised works..

1. (Continued) Failure to Protect Koalas and other biodiversity

The Kings Forest development has historically failed to apply the basic principles of landscape ecology and again attempts to continue this practice with this new application despite very disturbing new data on the likely extinction of Tweed coast Koalas.
The sensitive eastern side and southern Cudgen Paddock areas were accepted by NSW Department of Environment officers in the 2005 zoning, and Council staff and Councillors for the Concept Plan in 2009, as well as by numerous other ecologists, as the minimum areas required to maintain biodiversity, but so far has been disregarded by NSW Planning.
The inappropriateness of this development footprint has become strikingly apparent with the Council's latest reports of the Tweed Coast Koalas, already on the brink of extinction (Koala Habitat Study 2011).

1.1 The development footprint needs to be rectified or there is little likelihood of success for any form of Koala Plan of Management or biodiversity preservation.

Failing the above:

1.2 A full analysis of this new approach for koala proof fencing the entire development must be demonstrated, particularly the impacts of the fence on other species, , and how the situation will be managed if the koala fence is shown to be undesirable, or fails in the future. The burden of fence maintenance funding must be borne by the developer.

1.3 Cattle grids must be demonstrated to be foolproof from dogs, and koala underpasses immune from sea level rise and flooding.

1.4 The 50m ecological buffer zones should be increased and must not serve multiple uses such as fire buffers, the full length of roads, golf courses, bike or walking trails etc, other than that which is unavoidable, due to extreme sensitivity of the ecological values of the site.

1.5 'No dogs policy' must be applied as even the scent of dogs will disturb wildlife in the adjacent Cudgen Nature Reserve, and any management techniques

such as fencing etc are subject to political will, resource vulnerabilities and other human variables.

1.6Roads should be restricted to 40km with mandatory speed bumps as demonstrated to be the only effective means of speed reduction as in Koala Beach Estate.

1.7Planning for Bushfire must include planning for protection of the environment.

1.8Monitoring to achieve stated outcomes should be carried out in perpetuity and performance criteria applied to rehabilitation plans particularly tree growth targets.

1.9Ecological rehabilitation across the whole site should be undertaken in the immediate term, not staged as development progresses.

1.10Funding for ecological maintenance should be provided by the developer in perpetuity including for any contingency plans. A bond should be placed on the development in perpetuity that would provide for compensation in case these management plans fail.

1.11The developer should fund the Department of Environment and Heritage or Council to provide an environmental compliance officer as required.

Yours sincerely,

Lisa M Crook
75 Kingscliff Street
KINGSCLIFF NSW 2487

22

Brent Devine

From: "Ros & Gary Buckpitt" <gary.buckpit@bigpond.com>
To: <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>, <office@hazzard.minister.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 12/16/2011 7:56 AM

To: plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au; office@hazzard.minister.nsw.gov.au
Subject: Kings Forest Development Tweed Shire- Submission

Re: KINGS FOREST Stage 1 Subdivision and Bulk Earthworks

Application No. 08_0194

Submission of Objection & Request from the Planning Minister for Full Inquiry and Referral to UNESCO

Dear Sir / Madam,

I object to the Kings Forest development on the following grounds and seek an extension until end of February and improved community consultation.

I also request a full inquiry into this development as well as referral to UNESCO for impact on World Heritage values of the Caldera's coastal lowlands.

1.Failure to protect biodiversity of the area, in light of estimated only 144 Tweed Coastal Koalas (see further details below), and Tweed having the highest concentration of threatened species in Australia. Resumption should be seriously considered in context of the value the community place on Tweed's natural environment (Community Strategic Plan 2010).

2. Enormous financial, ecological and loss of amenity and basic infrastructure consequences are foreseeable for the development in the longer term due to inevitable impacts from sea level rise in this extreme low lying floodplain 94% of the site between .
Provision for human and ecological adaption and retreat must be catered for under a worst case scenario post the year 2100. The developer must be held responsible for future rectification required rather than the taxpayer.
Resumption should be considered now before these costs become exponential.
3.Impact must be assessed on the World Heritage values of key fauna species due to their reliance on the coastal lowlands as integral food sources in the winter, identified as 'Sibling' World Heritage areas (Office of Environment and Heritage).

4.Lack of recycled water infrastructure largely contributing to the need for a new dam and necessitating further major destruction of hinterland World Heritage complimentary areas and values must be considered. 'Basix'

building requirements that exist for all other developments in the area appear to have been to have been swept under the carpet to allow high density, maximum profit development. 5.
Impact should be further assessed on Key Fish Habitats of the Cudgen Creek, identified for a Marine Protected Area in 1999, which will take the flow of the main drainage channel, and the increased nutrients from urban areas, including nearly 1 million cubic metres of fill, as well as impacts on the severely stressed Cudgen Lake Nature Reserve, also identified as a State Significant Coastal Lake.
6.Erosion of public confidence in the planning process must be rectified that has resulted from lack of effective consultation, the voiding of significant Council planning standards, perceived conflicts of interest due to developer donations, the failure to back zone as recommended in the Woodward Investigation 2005, and the history of lack of prosecution for unauthorised works.

1. (Continued) Failure to Protect Koalas and other biodiversity

The Kings Forest development has historically failed to apply the basic principles of landscape ecology and again attempts to continue this practice with this new application despite very disturbing new data on the likely extinction of Tweed coast Koalas.

The sensitive eastern side and southern Cudgen Paddock areas were accepted by NSW Department of Environment officers in the 2005 zoning, and Council staff and Councillors for the Concept Plan in 2009, as well as by numerous other ecologists, as the minimum areas required to maintain biodiversity, but so far has been disregarded by NSW Planning.

The inappropriateness of this development footprint has become strikingly apparent with the Council's latest reports of the Tweed Coast Koalas, already on the brink of extinction (Koala Habitat Study 2011).

1.1The development footprint needs to be rectified or there is little likelihood of success for any form of Koala Plan of Management or biodiversity preservation.

Failing the above:

1.2A full analysis of this new approach for koala proof fencing the entire development must be demonstrated, particularly the impacts of the fence on other species, , and how the situation will be managed if the koala fence is shown to be undesirable, or fails in the future. The burden of fence maintenance funding must be borne by the developer.

1.3Cattle grids must be demonstrated to be foolproof from dogs, and koala underpasses immune from sea level rise and flooding.

1.4The 50m ecological buffer zones should be increased and must not serve multiple uses such as fire buffers, the full length of roads, golf courses, bike or walking trails etc, other than that which is unavoidable, due to extreme sensitivity of the ecological values of the site.

1.5'No dogs policy' must be applied as even the scent of dogs will disturb wildlife in the adjacent Cudgen Nature Reserve, and any management techniques such as fencing etc are subject to political will, resource vulnerabilities and other human variables.

1.6Roads should be restricted to 40km with mandatory speed bumps as demonstrated to be the only effective means of speed reduction as in Koala Beach Estate.

1.7Planning for Bushfire must include planning for protection of the environment.

1.8Monitoring to achieve stated outcomes should be carried out in perpetuity and performance criteria applied to rehabilitation plans particularly tree growth targets.

1.9Ecological rehabilitation across the whole site should be undertaken in the immediate term, not staged as development progresses.

1.10Funding for ecological maintenance should be provided by the developer in perpetuity including for any contingency plans. A bond should be placed on the development in perpetuity that would provide for compensation in case these management plans fail.

1.11The developer should fund the Department of Environment and Heritage or Council to provide an environmental compliance officer as required.

Yours sincerely,

Name: Rosalynde & Gary Buckpit

Address: 122 Cabarita Rd Bogangar. 2488

23

Brent Devine - Kings Forest Development Tweed Shire- Submission

From: "ross marshall" <ross.p.marshall@gmail.com>
To: <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>, <office@hazzard.minister.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 12/16/2011 9:28 AM
Subject: Kings Forest Development Tweed Shire- Submission

To: plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au; office@hazzard.minister.nsw.gov.au
Subject: Kings Forest Development Tweed Shire- Submission

Re: KINGS FOREST Stage 1 Subdivision and Bulk Earthworks

Application No. 08_0194

Submission of Objection & Request from the Planning Minister for Full Inquiry and Referral to UNESCO

Dear Sir / Madam,

I object to the Kings Forest development on the following grounds and seek an extension until end of February and improved community consultation.

I also request a full inquiry into this development as well as referral to UNESCO for impact on World Heritage values of the Caldera's coastal lowlands.

1.Failure to protect biodiversity of the area, in light of estimated only 144 Tweed Coastal Koalas (see further details below), and Tweed having the highest concentration of threatened species in Australia. Resumption should be seriously considered in context of the value the community place on Tweed's natural environment (Community Strategic Plan 2010).

2. Enormous financial, ecological and loss of amenity and basic infrastructure consequences are foreseeable for the development in the longer term due to inevitable impacts from sea level rise in this extreme low lying floodplain 94% of the site between . Provision for human and ecological adaption and retreat must be catered for under a worst case scenario post the year 2100. The developer must be held responsible for future rectification required rather than the taxpayer.
Resumption should be considered now before these costs become exponential.
3.Impact must be assessed on the World Heritage values of key fauna species due to their reliance on the coastal lowlands as integral food sources in the winter, identified as 'Sibling' World Heritage areas (Office of Environment and Heritage).

4.Lack of recycled water infrastructure largely contributing to the need for a new dam and necessitating further major destruction of hinterland World Heritage complimentary areas and values must be considered. 'Basix' building requirements that exist for all other developments in the area appear to have been to have been swept under the carpet to allow high density, maximum profit development. 5. Impact should be further assessed on Key Fish Habitats of the Cudgen Creek, identified for a Marine Protected Area in 1999, which will take the flow of the main drainage channel, and the increased nutrients from urban areas, including nearly 1 million cubic metres of fill, as well as impacts on the severely stressed Cudgen Lake Nature Reserve, also identified as a State Significant

Coastal Lake.
6.Erosion of public confidence in the planning process must be rectified that has resulted from lack of effective consultation, the voiding of significant Council planning standards, perceived conflicts of interest due to developer donations, the failure to back zone as recommended in the Woodward Investigation 2005, and the history of lack of prosecution for unauthorised works.

1. (Continued) Failure to Protect Koalas and other biodiversity

The Kings Forest development has historically failed to apply the basic principles of landscape ecology and again attempts to continue this practice with this new application despite very disturbing new data on the likely extinction of Tweed coast Koalas.

The sensitive eastern side and southern Cudgen Paddock areas were accepted by NSW Department of Environment officers in the 2005 zoning, and Council staff and Councillors for the Concept Plan in 2009, as well as by numerous other ecologists, as the minimum areas required to maintain biodiversity, but so far has been disregarded by NSW Planning.

The inappropriateness of this development footprint has become strikingly apparent with the Council's latest reports of the Tweed Coast Koalas, already on the brink of extinction (Koala Habitat Study 2011).

1.1The development footprint needs to be rectified or there is little likelihood of success for any form of Koala Plan of Management or biodiversity preservation.

Failing the above:

1.2A full analysis of this new approach for koala proof fencing the entire development must be demonstrated, particularly the impacts of the fence on other species, , and how the situation will be managed if the koala fence is shown to be undesirable, or fails in the future. The burden of fence maintenance funding must be borne by the developer.

1.3Cattle grids must be demonstrated to be foolproof from dogs, and koala underpasses immune from sea level rise and flooding.

1.4The 50m ecological buffer zones should be increased and must not serve multiple uses such as fire buffers, the full length of roads, golf courses, bike or walking trails etc, other than that which is unavoidable, due to extreme sensitivity of the ecological values of the site.

1.5'No dogs policy' must be applied as even the scent of dogs will disturb wildlife in the adjacent Cudgen Nature Reserve, and any management techniques such as fencing etc are subject to political will, resource vulnerabilities and other human variables.

1.6Roads should be restricted to 40km with mandatory speed bumps as demonstrated to be the only effective means of speed reduction as in Koala Beach Estate.

1.7Planning for Bushfire must include planning for protection of the environment.

1.8Monitoring to achieve stated outcomes should be carried out in perpetuity and performance criteria applied to rehabilitation plans particularly tree growth targets.

1.9Ecological rehabilitation across the whole site should be undertaken in the immediate term, not staged as development progresses.

1.10Funding for ecological maintenance should be provided by the developer in perpetuity including for any contingency plans. A bond should be placed on the development in perpetuity that would provide for compensation in case these management plans fail.

1.11The developer should fund the Department of Environment and Heritage or Council to provide an environmental compliance officer as required.

Yours sincerely,

Signature:

Name: Ross Marshall

Address: 16 Towners Ave,

Bogangar. N.S.W. 2488.

24

Brent Devine

From: Beth Meehan <meehan.beth@gmail.com>
To: <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>, <office@hazzard.minister.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 12/16/2011 2:11 PM

Re: KINGS FOREST Stage 1 Subdivision and Bulk Earthworks

Application No. 08_0194

Submission of Objection & Request from the Planning Minister for Full Inquiry and Referral to UNESCO

Dear Sir / Madam,

I object to the Kings Forest development on the following grounds and seek an extension until end of February and improved community consultation.

I also request a full inquiry into this development as well as referral to UNESCO for impact on World Heritage values of the Caldera's coastal lowlands.

1.Failure to protect biodiversity of the area, in light of estimated only 144 Tweed Coastal Koalas (see further details below), and Tweed having the highest concentration of threatened species in Australia. Resumption should be seriously considered in context of the value the community place on Tweed's natural environment (Community Strategic Plan 2010).

2. Enormous financial, ecological and loss of amenity and basic infrastructure consequences are foreseeable for the development in the longer term due to inevitable impacts from sea level rise in this extreme low lying floodplain 94% of the site between .
Provision for human and ecological adaption and retreat must be catered for under a worst case scenario post the year 2100. The developer must be held responsible for future rectification required rather than the taxpayer.
Resumption should be considered now before these costs become exponential.
3.Impact must be assessed on the World Heritage values of key fauna species due to their reliance on the coastal lowlands as integral food sources in the winter, identified as 'Sibling' World Heritage areas (Office of Environment and Heritage).

4.Lack of recycled water infrastructure largely contributing to the need for a new dam and necessitating further major destruction of hinterland World Heritage complimentary areas and values must be considered. 'Basix' building requirements that exist for all other developments in the area appear to have been to have been swept under the carpet to allow high density, maximum profit development. 5. Impact should be further assessed on Key Fish Habitats of the Cudgen Creek, identified for a Marine Protected Area in 1999, which will take the flow of the main drainage channel, and the increased nutrients from urban areas, including nearly 1 million cubic metres of fill, as well as impacts on the severely stressed Cudgen Lake Nature Reserve, also identified as a State Significant Coastal Lake.
6.Erosion of public confidence in the planning process must be rectified that has resulted from lack of effective consultation, the voiding of significant Council planning standards, perceived conflicts of interest due to developer donations, the failure to back zone as recommended in the Woodward Investigation 2005, and the history of lack of prosecution for unauthorised works.

1. (Continued) Failure to Protect Koalas and other biodiversity

The Kings Forest development has historically failed to apply the basic principles of landscape ecology and again attempts to continue this practice with this new application despite very disturbing new data on the likely extinction of Tweed coast Koalas.

The sensitive eastern side and southern Cudgen Paddock areas were accepted by NSW Department of Environment officers in the 2005 zoning, and Council staff and Councillors for the Concept Plan in 2009, as well as by numerous other ecologists, as the minimum areas required to maintain biodiversity, but so far has been disregarded by NSW Planning.

The inappropriateness of this development footprint has become strikingly apparent with the Council's latest reports of the Tweed Coast Koalas, already on the brink of extinction (Koala Habitat Study 2011).

1.1The development footprint needs to be rectified or there is little likelihood of success for any form of Koala Plan of Management or biodiversity preservation.

Failing the above:

1.2A full analysis of this new approach for koala proof fencing the entire development must be demonstrated, particularly the impacts of the fence on other species, , and how the situation will be managed if the koala fence is shown to be undesirable, or fails in the future. The burden of fence maintenance funding must be borne by the developer.

1.3Cattle grids must be demonstrated to be foolproof from dogs, and koala underpasses immune from sea level rise and flooding.

1.4The 50m ecological buffer zones should be increased and must not serve multiple uses such as fire buffers, the full length of roads, golf courses, bike or walking trails etc, other than that which is unavoidable, due to extreme sensitivity of the ecological values of the site.

1.5'No dogs policy' must be applied as even the scent of dogs will disturb wildlife in the adjacent Cudgen Nature Reserve, and any management techniques such as fencing etc are subject to political will, resource vulnerabilities and other human variables.

1.6Roads should be restricted to 40km with mandatory speed bumps as demonstrated to be the only effective means of speed reduction as in Koala Beach Estate.

1.7Planning for Bushfire must include planning for protection of the environment.

1.8Monitoring to achieve stated outcomes should be carried out in perpetuity and performance criteria applied to rehabilitation plans particularly tree growth targets.

1.9Ecological rehabilitation across the whole site should be undertaken in the immediate term, not staged as development progresses.

1.10Funding for ecological maintenance should be provided by the developer in perpetuity including for any contingency plans. A bond should be placed on the development in perpetuity that would provide for compensation in case these management plans fail.

1.11The developer should fund the Department of Environment and Heritage or Council to provide an environmental compliance officer as required.

Yours sincerely,

Name: Beth Meehan

Address: 16/79 Tweed Coast Road Bogangar NSW 2488

25

Brent Devine - Kings Forest Development Tweed Shire - Submission

From: caroline carnelley <carnelley26@hotmail.com>
To: <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>, <office@hazzard.minister.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 12/16/2011 4:58 PM
Subject: Kings Forest Development Tweed Shire - Submission

Re: KINGS FOREST Stage 1 Subdivision and Bulk Earthworks

Application No. 08_0194

Submission of Objection & Request from the Planning Minister for Full Inquiry and Referral to UNESCO

Dear Sir / Madam,

I object to the Kings Forest development on the following grounds and seek an extension until end of February and improved community consultation.

I also request a full inquiry into this development as well as referral to UNESCO for impact on World Heritage values of the Caldera's coastal lowlands.

1.Failure to protect biodiversity of the area, in light of estimated only 144 Tweed Coastal Koalas (see further details below), and Tweed having the highest concentration of threatened species in Australia. Resumption should be seriously considered in context of the value the community place on Tweed's natural environment (Community Strategic Plan 2010).

2. Enormous financial, ecological and loss of amenity and basic infrastructure consequences are foreseeable for the development in the longer term due to inevitable impacts from sea level rise in this extreme low lying floodplain 94% of the site between . Provision for human and ecological adaption and retreat must be catered for under a worst case scenario post the year 2100. The developer must be held responsible for future rectification required rather than the taxpayer.
Resumption should be considered now before these costs become exponential.
3.Impact must be assessed on the World Heritage values of key fauna species due to their reliance on the coastal lowlands as integral food sources in the winter, identified as 'Sibling' World Heritage areas (Office of Environment and Heritage).
4.Lack of recycled water infrastructure largely contributing to the need for a new dam and necessitating further major destruction of hinterland World Heritage complimentary areas and values must be considered. 'Basix' building requirements that exist for all other developments in the area appear to have been to have been swept under the carpet to allow high density, maximum profit development.
5. Impact should be further assessed on Key Fish Habitats of the Cudgen Creek, identified for a Marine Protected Area in 1999, which will take the flow of the main drainage channel, and the increased nutrients from urban areas, including nearly 1 million cubic

metres of fill, as well as impacts on the severely stressed Cudgen Lake Nature Reserve, also identified as a State Significant Coastal Lake.
6.Erosion of public confidence in the planning process must be rectified that has resulted from lack of effective consultation, the voiding of significant Council planning standards, perceived conflicts of interest due to developer donations, the failure to back zone as recommended in the Woodward Investigation 2005, and the history of lack of prosecution for unauthorised works.

1. (Continued) Failure to Protect Koalas and other biodiversity

The Kings Forest development has historically failed to apply the basic principles of landscape ecology and again attempts to continue this practice with this new application despite very disturbing new data on the likely extinction of Tweed coast Koalas.
The sensitive eastern side and southern Cudgen Paddock areas were accepted by NSW Department of Environment officers in the 2005 zoning, and Council staff and Councillors for the Concept Plan in 2009, as well as by numerous other ecologists, as the minimum areas required to maintain biodiversity, but so far has been disregarded by NSW Planning.

The inappropriateness of this development footprint has become strikingly apparent with the Council's latest reports of the Tweed Coast Koalas, already on the brink of extinction (Koala Habitat Study 2011).

1.1The development footprint needs to be rectified or there is little likelihood of success for any form of Koala Plan of Management or biodiversity preservation.

Failing the above:

1.2A full analysis of this new approach for koala proof fencing the entire development must be demonstrated, particularly the impacts of the fence on other species, , and how the situation will be managed if the koala fence is shown to be undesirable, or fails in the future. The burden of fence maintenance funding must be borne by the developer.

1.3Cattle grids must be demonstrated to be foolproof from dogs, and koala underpasses immune from sea level rise and flooding.

1.4The 50m ecological buffer zones should be increased and must not serve multiple uses such as fire buffers, the full length of roads, golf courses, bike or walking trails etc, other than that which is unavoidable, due to extreme sensitivity of the ecological values of the site.

1.5'No dogs policy' must be applied as even the scent of dogs will disturb wildlife in the adjacent Cudgen Nature Reserve, and any management techniques such as fencing etc are subject to political will, resource vulnerabilities and other human variables.

1.6Roads should be restricted to 40km with mandatory speed bumps as demonstrated to be the only effective means of speed reduction as in Koala Beach Estate.

1.7Planning for Bushfire must include planning for protection of the environment.

1.8Monitoring to achieve stated outcomes should be carried out in perpetuity and performance criteria applied to rehabilitation plans particularly tree growth targets.

1.9Ecological rehabilitation across the whole site should be undertaken in the immediate term, not staged as development progresses.

1.10Funding for ecological maintenance should be provided by the developer in perpetuity including for any contingency plans. A bond should be placed on the development in perpetuity that would provide for compensation in case these management plans fail.

1.11The developer should fund the Department of Environment and Heritage or Council to provide an environmental compliance officer as required.

Yours sincerely,

Caroline Carnelley
1/24 Poinciana Avenue
Bogangar NSW 2488