



51 Bilambil Road,
Terranora N.S.W. 2486
Email: baz.mclauchlan@gmail.com

Major Projects Assessment,
Department Planning,
G.P.O. Box 39,
SYDNEY N.S.W. 2001



**RW: Application No 09-0166, 320 Lot Subdivisions,
Fraser Drive, Terranora N.S.W. 2486**

In this submission, I wish to comment on some aspects of the application, and raise concern over others. My capacity to constructively provide input towards the determination process is reflected in my being a Terranora resident of 35 years, who return travels to Tweed Heads via Fraser Drive 10 – 14 times weekly, but also my situation in being a retired development consultant and consulting survey principal in the area for over 30 years. In that period, I was deeply involved in the subdivisional developments creating around 1,500 residential, rural residential, and industrial allotments to the immediate east and adjacent south-west of this subject application site.

Positive comments:

1. The internal roading and lot layout appears to be as satisfactory as could be achieved given the fairly steep topography and other natural constraints.
2. The move to initiate development in 'Area E' is long overdue with landowners being frustrated since 1996.

Matters of concern and objected to:

1. Non-compliance with the Tweed L.E.P.
In response to your letter of 21 December 2009, Tweed Council outlined significant matters which should be addressed, and which the Department incorporated in its D.G.Rs to the proponent. They include:
 - Ad-Hoc development prior to a D.C.P. and Sec 94 contribution plan being adopted.
 - Planning to be co-ordinated with provision of future road networks, access points etc.
 - Road. "- The E.A. should demonstrate that adequate provision of this infrastructure is feasible". The subdivision is premature given that feasibility and environmental studies for Broadwater Parkway have not been undertaken. Not surprising when the final connection from the site to Fraser Drive is as yet undecided, with no representation shown in the application to which residents are invited to comment.

The Parkway is presented as a two-lane configuration. However, the traffic predictions by Tweed Council is for volumes 11,800 vpd. Reference to Tweed Roadworks Standards depicted in drawing S.D. 002 dated 2004, shows that a

normal neighbourhood collector road should cater for up to 7,000 vpd, while volumes in excess of 7,000 vpd require a four lane facility with median strip.

It is submitted that the application cannot be rationally determined until the parkway alignment and design is completed, and the public are given time to inspect and comment. Meantime the application must be deemed to be incomplete.

In regard to the general alignment location approaching Fraser Drive, it should be noted (as referred to in the application) that four properties will be involved and basically destroyed by encroachment of massive batters, loss of amenity and subjection to excessive traffic noise from the steep grades, should the road be constructed in this vicinity.

Should design standards be grossly departed from, and moral obligations be ignored, to provide a road linkage for the future, when it is so destructive yet 30 years out of date before it is even constructed?

The community deserves better. Other alternatives however difficult, or constrained must be investigated.

2. Exhibition period

The proposal is listed to be on exhibition for 39 days. This is considerably shorter than similar cases. Relative urgency may or may not be justified in areas such as Western Sydney where available residential land is in shortage.

The same reason does not exist here in the Tweed, with the Minister quite recently in late 2010 approving the following:

Cobali Lakes – 5,000 lots
Kings Forest – 4,500 lots
Bilambil Hts – 1,694 lots

Why the urgency with a fundamentally incomplete application?

B.J. McLauchlan



*I hereby declare that I have never
made political donations.*

