

## COMMENT ON MOD 20- HUNTLEE

I am concerned at the lack of detail contained in the proposed changes to lot layout and road hierarchy, particularly when the detail can be changed and approved by private certification, chosen and paid by the developer. There is obviously a conflict between pleasing the developer and achieving the best community outcomes. This has been evident in recent past amendments where lack of detail has allowed approval of two-dimensional plans only to be compromised by subsequent approval of different horizontal levels, when compared to the plans submitted with the original development approval and not shown in the Statement of Effects.

By way of example:

- A) The constructed longsection of the road adjacent to the southern boundary of Lot 34 was raised significantly, as compared to the longsection originally approved, necessitating a retaining wall. This has been constructed along the southern boundary of Lot 34, in some cases over 2 meters high. This has prevented the connectivity shown in approved stage 1 concept plan.
- B) On the western boundary of Lot 34 roads have been terminated and WQCP approved which will prevent the connectivity as shown in the approved Stage 1 Concept Plan. This has been done without recognition of the easement for access and service connections from Lot 34 to existing Scott Street in North Rothbury. I notice the road hierarchy plan for Mod 20, shows relocated access for Lot 34, which does not join Scott Street. I can find no discussion of this, so don't know if this is assumed to be approved by referencing the plan in any approval. This appears to have been the case in the past where road connectivity has been deleted in plans modified from the approved Stage 1 Concept Plan without any written discussion in the associated statement of effects.

Comment on Mod 20:

The modification does not comply with the approved Development Control Plan.

The applicant must demonstrate that the development is substantially the same as outlined on page 17 of 33 of the Statement of Effects. In my opinion the applicant has not demonstrated the differences between Mod 20 and the original approved development consent.

### 1. The reconfiguring of Stage 13:

- a. further reduces the future options for connection the development of lot 34. The approved Stage 1 Concept Master Plan identified 5 proposed road links from Stage 13 across the eastern boundary of Lot 34. These roads could have provided vehicular and pedestrian links as well as connectivity for services.
- b. The reconfiguring of the lot layout causes the loss of 8 residential lots effectively sterilises what was previously considered developable land. This is not desirable in these times of housing shortages. It is likely that the creation of the drainage reserve on the high side of the southern boundary of Lot 34, will impact the future developable land in Lot 34, as compared to the proposed orderly plan in the Approved Concept Master Plan.
- c. The creation of an isolated pocket of public land which is not connected to other environmental corridors, produces less environmental benefit than adding that area of land to a larger environmental parcel which form part of a connective corridor. An

isolated pocket creates long term community maintenance obligations which are lessened if the area is part of a larger contiguous parcel.

- d. The approved Stage 1 Concept Master Plan provided obvious links for stormwater along the east west roads to the existing natural riparian area.
- e. 3.1.2 states that the changes to the Stage 13 layout are necessary to accommodate increase APZ as required in revised Bushfire Planning. The suggested increase of 2m in the APZ will not be necessary on Lot 34 is developed and will only require the stage 13 lots adjoining Lot 34 not be built on until Lot 34 is developed. This could easily be done with a suitable 88(b) on those lots.

Thankyou for considering my points raised which I hope will produce a better community outcome.

Regards,