



Seacliff Park Residential and Centre DPA – Public Hearing 24 October 2019

My name is David Bagshaw from the 5049 Coastal Community Association. Thank you for the opportunity to speak at the hearing. I will assume you have read our detailed submission and will only address the key issues and new aspects that have come to light in reading the submissions on line. ***There are of course more questions than answers.***

It is clear reading the submission, there are several recurring themes and in essence most are keen to see the development go ahead finally, but no one seems confident that the DPA will deliver on the promise or cover the concerns.

Let's focus on the things the DPA process can control.

The level of consultation and social impact assessment is inadequate- Given the scale and impact of this development and the minimal level of consultation and engagement conducted with the community. (Our survey and forum was the only one undertaken for this version of the DPA). The social impact statement confirms that the community was the **only one** not consulted. **We find that Ironic.** Councils need to undertake more research into the long term impacts via detailed modeling and engagements to assess the true impacts of this significant change on the community before approving the DPA?

New Planning Code– It is unclear to many, including council, how and if this DPA will fit into the new Planning Framework. There appear to be inconsistencies and any delays in the submission may render the DPA void. The level of engagement and influence over the detailed design process will be more limited than now? ***This is our one chance let's not be rushed.***

The Zoning Plan - The proportion of commercial to residential development has increased from 2015, and is incompatible with the local character. **The potential maximum size of the commercial building** suggests a **district** rather than a **local hub** in the community. The viability of this has been questioned by several respondents. The retail reports are out of date and make assumptions that are not valid. **The zone and maximum size should be reduced to better fit the "local centre intent" and allow for more room for residential and open space.**

Residential Density – the minimum block sizes are significantly less than the adjoining Draft Housing Diversity DPA and smaller than the new Planning Design Code. Given the issues experience elsewhere in the City of Marion with density; **this seems inconsistent with the intent for the area and needs careful modeling before approval.**

The maximum height of 6 storey's –Along with many residents even Boral and the Department of Mines have challenged this provision in relation to impacts on mine operations and potential conflict with the new Planning Design Code. It is unclear from the DPA where 6 storeys would occur and the likely impacts. **Some modeling is required before this is incorporated.**

Traffic & transport infrastructure – Again quite rightly this has received a good deal of attention from the public and in the Agency submission from DPTI. There currently seems to be a difference of opinion between the Traffic consultants and DPTI on the overall modelling and solutions. Consideration of the impacts of this development on smaller surrounding road networks, already suffering from “rat running” and manoeuvrability for tourists on small roundabouts and beach side parking is mostly absent. The discussions about the capacity of the public transport infrastructure and E-W links over Brighton Road are inconclusive and don't appear to reflect the experiences already! **So it is unclear if the infrastructure will have the capacity to support the development, take into account future demands more globally, to meet the aspirations of the DPA?**

Stormwater management – In the 21st Century, the DPA should ensure that the final solution is retention on site rather than putting a higher load on the underground pipe network and outfall.

Site Contamination – Can the DPA be approved based on an out of date and incomplete report? Councils should insist on the review and monitoring of the critical groundwater and vapour conditions prior to the approval of the DPA and ongoing?

Mine Interface measures not adequate – the issues of dust and noise have not been fully addressed in the reports and provisions within the DPA have been challenged by members of the community, Boral and The Department of Mines.

Overall Design Outcomes – Given the complexity of the issues. Councils should develop site specific design guidelines to ensure this is truly an 21st Century exemplar development for the area and State? This should include building in provisions for community engagement on the development approval process.

Conclusion

The community is keen to see this land is developed and acknowledge the commitment of the developer and councils to deliver the project implied by the DPA. However due to the complexity and the sheer quantity of technical information (some out of date, inaccurate and incomplete), the ability to fully understand the scope is diminished. Further, the limited level of community engagement raises concerns that the outcome will not deliver on the promise and adversely impact on the level of amenity.

It is clear that there are still more questions than answers. Given how long this DPA has been in process, the community and the process is again under pressure..

This is too important to rush. Please take our submission as a request for better, accessible information for the community and more active community engagement in helping resolve this important DPA.

Thank you.