

Consolidated Public Submissions - Sandon Point

Dof Submission No.	Nature	Comment/Issues Raised	Relevant Issues	Stockland/ARV Response
1	In principle support	* Impacts of proposed works on Tramway Creek and subsequent impacts on properties at Allenby Parade eg Culvert widening of the railway embankment and stabilisation of the waterway.	* Impacts of proposed works on Tramway Creek. * Impacts on properties in Allenby Parade	Tramway Creek Impacts on Tramway Creek are detailed in Section 7.1.1 of the DFP EA report and Issue 8 of the Response to Agency Submissions . Works required for the restoration of Tramway Creek and to address flooding have previously been dealt with in the approval for Stages 2 to 6. Works relating to the regeneration of the degraded areas of Tramway Creek have commenced and will continue. Works associated with the APZs and amendment of the Vegetation Management Plan will impact positively on the ecological function of the corridor and will also assist with controlling weed invasion impacts. Tramway Creek is the subject of a plan of management for rehabilitation which will be updated as part of a Planning Agreement to address ongoing ownership and management including part of an APZ. Justification is provided in HLA Overview, State significant study and EA Report which highlight that the Turpentine Forest APZ/ buffer zone and riparian corridor through ARV site are sufficient to maintain their ecological and hydrological values. The Turpentine Forest will remain largely intact and rehabilitated with the exception of the northwest edge which needs to accommodate a 10m outer APZ for bushfire protection of the proposed nursing home. The concept plan provides for the improvement of the riparian corridor in terms of its habitat value and the quality and quantity of water flows. The Concept Plan justifies the width of riparian zones as site specific ecological and hydrological studies have maintained adequate corridors for ecological functions and protection of ecological communities.
2	Objection	* Impacts of proposal on Turpentine Forest and Bushfire Protection zones. * Also concerned with flooding and recommends 40m conservation buffers around creek and wetlands.	* Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Flooding * Bushfire Protection zones. * 40m riparian buffer zones	Turpentine Forest & APZs The Concept Plan includes 27% of the ARV site as land zoned for environmental protection on the Turpentine Forest and riparian corridor generally as proposed in the COI and Charles Hill Report. Impacts on the Turpentine Forest and APZs are addressed in Issues 9 and 83 of the Response to Agency Submissions , including disturbances to the disturbed margins of the forest. The Turpentine Forest will remain largely intact and rehabilitated with the exception of the northwest edge which needs to accommodate a 10m outer APZ for bushfire protection of the proposed nursing home. Justification is provided in HLA Overview, State significant study and EA Report which highlight that the Turpentine Forest APZ/ buffer zone is sufficient to maintain its ecological value. The Turpentine Forest will remain largely intact and rehabilitated with the exception of the northwest edge which needs to accommodate a 10m outer APZ for bushfire protection of the proposed nursing home. Flooding As described in the Browns Consulting Report, 2006, (Appendix E to DFP EA Report) both creek corridors are designed to contain flows to allow the bridges to remain trafficable. Refer also to flood reports in the EA Report. The assessment by Brown consulting (and a peer review by Cardno Forbes rigby) confirms that the proposed development will have no impact elsewhere in the floodplain. Further details in regard to the bridge designs will be provided at the Project Plan and Construction Certificate stages. Riparian Buffer widths 40m riparian buffer zones as described (ie 40m from top of bank) will result in corridors over 100m wide. These are not considered necessary as justified in the EAR and Issues 8 and 16 of the Response to Agency Submissions . The 50m wide riparian corridor proposed provides a balanced approach without severe impacts on developable land whilst providing corridors that can achieve riparian zone objections, allow EECs to be established, convey flood waters and locate development infrastructure outside of the 30m core riparian zone. As described in the Browns Consulting Report, 2006, (Appendix E to DFP EA Report) the concept plan provides for the improvement of the riparian corridor in terms of its habitat value and the quality and quantity of water flows. The Concept Plan justifies the width of riparian zones as site specific ecological and hydrological studies have maintained adequate corridors for ecological functions and protection of ecological communities.
3	Objection	Concerned with impacts of the proposal on the natural foreshore and sewerage impacts	* Sewerage impacts. * Impact on natural foreshore	Sewerage impacts Consultation with utility providers has taken place to ensure services are available. Development will connect to existing sewer mains. Impact on foreshore The proposed residential development is located approximately 400m from the coastline. Visual impacts will be minimal as demonstrated in Section 7.9 of the DFP EA Report, namely the photo montage. The concept plan provides for the improvement of the riparian corridor in terms of its habitat value and the quality and quantity of water flows impacting on the foreshore.

DoF Submission No.	Nature	Comment/Issues Raised	Relevant Issues	Stockland/ARV Response
4	In principle support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Use of Sturdee Ave during construction with regards to noise and dust and disruption of resident's access to the Princes Highway. * Impact of heavy vehicles leaving the site will result in Traffic gridlock. * Recommend that north-south access roads be constructed at the beginning of the project, not end as heavy vehicles can access the Princes Highway via Point Street. * Recommended that bridge over Sturdee Ave be used for access by emergency vehicles and pedestrians, which would be enforced by lockable boom gate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Noise, dust and Traffic impacts during construction. * Construction of north-south access road. * Bridge over Sturdee Ave use by pedestrians and emergency vehicles only. 	<p>Construction Management Plan A Traffic and Construction Management Plan will be prepared with the Project Plan to address construction traffic routes, construction noise and dust suppression measures.</p> <p>North South Link Staging of the construction of the North-South link is addressed in Issue 45 of the Response to Agency Submissions. Stockland is committed to the north-south link road including the extension of Wrexham Road which is dependent on owner's consent from Wollongong City Council and State Rail Authority. Processes are in place to obtain this consent. In the unlikely event that the Wrexham Road connection does not eventuate, access for ARV would be from Sturdee Avenue and the proposed Sardon Point Drive extension. If the Wrexham Rod connection does not occur, we have assessed the implications and conclude that the development could still operate in a manner acceptable on traffic grounds.</p> <p>Sturdee Ave Bridge The Use of Sturdee Bridge is discussed in Issue 79 of the Response to Agency Submissions. Sturdee Bridge will be used for pedestrian and cycle access with detailed design provided in future stages.</p> <p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest are addressed in the response to Submission No 2</p>
5	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Impacts of proposal on the Turpentine Forest. * Density of housing and Traffic generation by the proposal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Housing density. * Traffic generation. 	<p>Housing density The Stockland residential subdivision would allow for an indicative 285 dwellings over approximately 16ha of residentially zoned land equating to a density of approximately 18 dwellings per hectare, compared to Council's target density of 25 dwellings per hectare in DCP 94/17.</p> <p>On the ARV site the housing density is medium density that is appropriate for the requirements of a retirement village. On the ARV site, just over 20% of the site will be developed for housing and just under 80% of the site will remain as open space.</p> <p>Traffic Traffic generation has been addressed in both EA report by the respective traffic consultants (report appended to the EA reports). Traffic impacts found to be acceptable in relation to density. Traffic generated by the proposed retirement village is 15 more vehicles per peak hour than the existing factory and can be accommodated on the local road network. The traffic report by Christopher Stapleton Consulting concluded that the traffic generation is significantly below that used in the estimates in the 2001/2002 studies prepared for Council and that the proposed road network has the capacity to accommodate the original assessed higher traffic generation for the Sardon Point site. Further, key access intersections were found to continue to perform at a high level of service.</p> <p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest are addressed in the response to Submission No 2</p>
6	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Impacts of proposal on Turpentine Forest, Aboriginal cultural heritage and open space. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Turpentine Forest. * Aboriginal cultural heritage * Open space. 	<p>Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Aboriginal cultural heritage has been considered by Stuart Huy's report and further discussion provided in Issue 17, 18 and 19 of the Response to Agency Submissions. The Statement of Commitments provides for the incorporation of a heritage interpretative facility and keeping place for any artefacts discovered within the development, the details of which are to be provided at the Project Plan application stage. This could allow for inclusion and recognition of any additional aspects of Aboriginal cultural heritage confirmed by further studies recommended by Stuart Huys, should they be available and confirm any matters of significance.</p> <p>Open Space The Concept Plan for ARV site includes 27% of the ARV site as land zoned for environmental protection that is accessible to the public as open space. The Stockland proposal provides for extensive open space to be dedicated to Council including extensive rehabilitation works to the creeks and vegetation, that are currently degraded. Overall, the proposal provides clear links between the proposed regional park and beach to the east and surrounding residential areas to the north, west and south</p>
7	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Concerned that site is being overdeveloped and high density development at the southern end of Thomas Gibson Park will be intrusive. * Impacts on the Turpentine Forest by roads, APZs and subdivision. * 20m wide bridges will not cope with a 100m wide flood. * A 40m buffer is not being provided around creeks and wetlands as specified by DEC. * Stockland has not complied with conditions of consent for first subdivision. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Overdevelopment of site. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Flooding. * Buffers. * Non-compliance with conditions of consent. 	<p>Over-development of site Density of site is reasonable as discussed above in submission 5. The northern super lot is proposed for residential flat buildings consistent with the COI and Charles Hill findings to maximise density close to Thirroul Railway station.</p> <p>The Concept Plan provides only indicative building envelopes for the Stockland residential subdivision and more detail designs will be provided at the Project Plan stage which fits within these envelopes. Generally the height of the development will remain substantially below the existing tree line in the Park. In addition, the upper floors will be stepped back to reduce the apparentness of a 4th level and emphasise a building of 3 storey scale.</p> <p>The ARV housing density is medium density that is appropriate for the requirements of a retirement village. On the ARV site, just over 20% of the site will be developed for housing and just under 80% of the site will remain as open space. Residential aged care facility is 3 storeys on the upper slope side and 4 storeys on the lower slope side due to the slope of the land.</p> <p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest, flooding and riparian buffers are addressed in the response to Submission No 2.</p> <p>Non-compliance with consent Stockland is not aware of non-compliance with conditions of consent for earlier stages and this is not relevant to the current considerations.</p>

DfP Submission No.	Nature	Comment/Issues Raised	Relevant Issues	Stockland/ARV Response
8 - 825 (818)	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Proposal will desecrate a women's site in the Turpentine Forest and Men's site in Thomas Gibson Park. * Impacts of proposal on riparian buffers. * Proposal will not provide essential infrastructure such as schools and hospital and will increase Traffic Congestion. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP. * 20m wide bridges proposed will not cope with flooding. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Riparian Buffers * Infrastructure provision. * Building heights. * Flooding. * Loss of open space. 	<p>COI recommendations</p> <p>As discussed in Section 4.2.7 of the DFP EA Report addresses the NSW Coastal Design Guideline. The Concept plan has adequate regard for the design principles of the Coastal Design Guidelines for NSW. Further assessment will take place at the Project Plan Stage. COI recommendations for environmental protection are discussed at length in SSS Study and EA reports, and Response to Agency Submissions.</p> <p>Impacts to Turpentine Forest and flooding are discussed in response to Submission No.2.</p> <p>Ecology, impacts on wetlands & riparian corridors</p> <p>The impact on natural species has been addressed in the Flora and Fauna Assessment carried out by Cornell Wagner dated 7 February 2003 which includes an 8 part test under the Threatened Species Conservation Act, 1997 in a Flora and Fauna Assessment dated 12 June 2001 carried out by Cornell Wagner and Saimy & Associates. Cumberland Ecology have reviewed these assessments and provided a further assessment into the Green and Golden Bell Frog. Impacts found to be acceptable and discussed further in Appendix D to the DFP EA report and in Issue 15 of the Response to Agency Submissions.</p> <p>Riparian buffers are proposed as part of the proposal. Significantly degraded riparian corridors will be improved. The width of riparian corridors are addressed in response to Submission No.2. Impacts to floodplain elsewhere is discussed in Issue 31 of the Response to Agency Submissions and appendices and in response to Submission No.2.</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage</p> <p>Refer to Issue 17 Response to Agency Submissions for discussion of Women's Area. Stuart Huv's report included investigations into Thomas Gibson Reserve and no evidence of a Men's site was forthcoming. Heritage has been addressed appropriately at this concept plan stage as described in section 7.4 of the EA report, in response to Submission No.6 and in the statement of commitments.</p> <p>Infrastructure</p> <p>The site does not generate sufficient population to warrant the construction of a school or hospital and the site does not have the capacity to accommodate such facilities. These were matters relevant at the Local Environmental Study and rezoning stages. Department of Education and Training have responded to local school capacity which is adequate for high schools and additional demand for primary schools can be met by additional buildings to cater for the additional demand. Further discussion is provided in Issue 56 of the Response to Agency Submissions. Traffic impacts found to be acceptable, as summarised in Submission No. 5 above.</p> <p>ARV proposal includes infrastructure/ facilities for its residents.</p> <p>Building heights</p> <p>Building heights of WLEP 1990 are proposed to be amended as part of the SSS study and justified in that study. The 2 storey (plus possible attic) dwellings and townhouses are an appropriate scale for the residential subdivision consistent with housing generally found in the area. The height control for the apartment superlot is intended to present as 3 storeys to the road and park interfaces with a 4th storey setback. This stepping in built form will enable buildings to respond to the context and canopy heights of existing and future vegetation. Further, the height control for future apartments is also designed to reflect the Col and Charles Hill findings of the appropriateness of the northern part of the site for higher density, given its proximity to Thrifrol Railway Station. Further details of building form will be provided at the Project Plan Stage.</p> <p>Building heights on the ARV site are 3 storey independent living units and 3-4 storey nursing home that will remain below the tree line. Refer to visual impact analysis in the EA report. Building heights are generally of a scale consistent with the aims of Illawarra REP, and slightly exceed 11m due to the slope of the land.</p> <p>Loss of open space in Thomas Gibson Park</p> <p>The Concept Plan does not include the Wrexham Road extension through Thomas Gibson Park and will be subject of a separate process to reclassify the land from Community to Operational under the Local Government Act 1993.</p> <p>The Concept Plan for ARV site includes 27% of the ARV site as land zoned for environmental protection that is accessible to the public as open space and provides clear links between the proposed regional park and beach to the east and surrounding residential areas to the north, west and south. The proposal on the Stockland portion of the site results in a reduction in the land that is currently zoned residential and an increase in the land that is to be zoned open space.</p>
826	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposals will increase Traffic Congestion. * Proposal will not provide essential Infrastructure such as schools and hospital. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Loss of open space. 	<p>Loss of open space and Infrastructure is addressed in response to Submission No. 8-825.</p> <p>Traffic impacts found to be acceptable as detailed in response to Submission No. 5.</p>
827	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Building height not good for location. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Aboriginal cultural heritage 	<p>Building height has been justified in SSS study and the EA Reports prepared by JBA and DFP and considered appropriate for the future urban context and location to public transport, as discussed in Submission No. 8-825 above.</p>
828	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal will impact on scenic quality of the locality. * Proposal will impact population. * Density of housing and Traffic generation by the proposal. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP. * Impact on weekend visitors vital to local economy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Constraints of a unique narrow development corridor are unconsidered. 	<p>Scenic quality</p> <p>Scenic quality is addressed in Section 7.9 of the DFP EA Report. Similarly to other areas along the Illawarra coastline, the site is reasonably prominent with viewing opportunities available from more distant locations such as the Escarpment and with close viewing points being the beach/foreshore and surrounding residential areas and parks. The riparian corridors within the subject site, and the retention of vegetation on the Cookson Pillbox site will assist greatly in breaking up views of the site from these various viewing points. They will have the effect of forming smaller pockets of housing in comparison to surrounding suburbs reducing the visual impact and contributing to a green and treed character to the future residential area.</p> <p>Impacts on population</p> <p>Statement of Commitments addresses measures to integrate future residents with existing community.</p> <p>Housing density, building heights and traffic are addressed above in Submission No. 5 and 8-825.</p>

Dof Submission No	Nature	Comment/Issues Raised	Relevant Issues	Stockland/ARV Response
				Tourism Proposal will improve accessibility for weekend visitors by formalising links to the beach. Housing elsewhere along the NSW coast does not necessarily discourage visitors. The impacts upon tourism are considered to be positive. The proposal removes an industrial use of the site, will activate degraded former industrial uses and reconstruct environmental corridors with links to the regional open space and coast. These are all considered improvements from a tourism perspective.
829	Objection	* Impacts of proposal on Traffic thus increasing Traffic Congestion.	* Building on flood plain not appreciated.	Traffic issues are addressed in Submission No. 5 above.
830	Objection	* Overdevelopment. Is the demand really there for that much 'upper-class' housing.		Stockland and ARV have done market appraisals that satisfy their own requirements.
831	Objection	* Proposal will impact Traffic and increase Traffic Congestion. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Suggested that no subdivision take place until planned road upgrades. * Impacts of proposal on riparian buffers. * Proposal does not address the environmental issues adequately. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road.	* COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Riparian Buffers * Infrastructure provision. * Flooding. * Loss of open space.	Traffic issues are addressed in Submission No. 5 above. Impacts on flooding, riparian corridors, the Turpentine Forest and APZs is discussed in Submission No. 2 above. Staging of the construction of the North-South link is addressed in Submission No. 4 above. Provision of infrastructure and loss of open space is addressed in response to Submission No 8-825.
832	Objection	* Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Proposal will desecrate a women's site in the Turpentine Forest and Men's site in Thomas Gibson Park. * Impacts of proposal on riparian buffers. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Proposal will impact on Traffic and population. * Proposal ignores the department of Environment and Conservation's requirements for 40 metre buffer zones. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road.	* COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Building heights. * Flooding. * Loss of open space.	Environmental protection, impacts on wetlands, the COI recommendations, building heights and loss of open space are addressed in response to Submission No 8 - 825 Traffic is discussed in response to Submission No 5 Flooding, riparian corridors and the Turpentine Forest are addressed in response to Submission No 2 Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6 and 8-825
833 - 838 (6)	Objection	* Proposal will impact on Traffic and population. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road.	* Loss of open space and play ground.	Traffic generation has been addressed in both EA report by the respective traffic consultants (report appended to the EA reports). Traffic impacts are addressed in Submission No. 5 above. Loss of open space is addressed in response to Submission No 8-825
839	Objection	* Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Proposal will desecrate a women's site in the Turpentine Forest and Men's site in Thomas Gibson Park. * Impacts of proposal on riparian buffers. * Proposal will not provide essential infrastructure such as schools and hospital and will increase Traffic Congestion. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP. * 20m wide bridges proposed will not cope with flooding. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. * Should be more sensitive to Aboriginal Heritage in the area	* COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Riparian Buffers * Infrastructure provision. * Building heights. * Flooding. * Loss of open space. * Aboriginal Culture	Impacts on the Turpentine Forest, flooding, riparian buffers are addressed in Submission No. 2 above. COI recommendations, impacts on wetlands, infrastructure, building heights and loss of open space are addressed in response to Submission No 8-825. Aboriginal heritage is addressed in response to Submission No 6 and 8-825
840	Objection	* Proposal does not meet the urban design issues and will effect the popularity of Sea Cliff bridge. * Proposal will impact on Traffic and population. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP. * Loss of playfield for the children and local clubs. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road.	* COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Infrastructure provision. * Building heights. * Loss of open space and play field.	Urban design Urban design guidelines will be prepared as detailed in the Response to Agency Submissions reflecting a high standard of design and finish that would not impact on the popularity of the Sea Cliff Bridge. Issues of COI recommendations, impacts on wetlands, infrastructure, building height and loss of open space addressed in Submission No's 5 and 8-825. Tourism is addressed in response to Submission no 828
841	Objection	* Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Proposal does not meet the environmental and cultural values of land at Sardon Point.	* COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Aboriginal heritage. * Loss of open space and play field.	Traffic is addressed in response to Submission No 5 Impacts on the Turpentine Forest is addressed in Submission No 2 COI recommendations and loss of open space are addressed in Submission No 8-825 Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6
842	Objection	* Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Proposal does not meet the environmental and cultural values of land at Sardon Point effecting the aboriginal heritage. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road.	* Aboriginal heritage. * Housing density. * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Traffic generation. * Loss of open space.	Flooding, riparian buffers and impacts on the Turpentine Forest are addressed in Submission No. 2. COI recommendations and loss of open space are addressed in Submissions No 8-825 Traffic and density are addressed in Submission No 5 Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6
843	Objection	* Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Proposal will desecrate a women's site in the Turpentine Forest and Men's site in Thomas Gibson Park. * Impacts of proposal on traffic. * Proposal will result in over development. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road.	* COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Riparian Buffers * Traffic Congestion. * Flooding. * Loss of open space.	Flooding, riparian buffers and impacts on the Turpentine Forest are addressed in Submission No. 2. COI recommendations, impacts on wetlands and loss of open space are addressed in Submissions No 8-825 Traffic is addressed in Submission No 5

Dof Submission No.	Nature	Comment/Issues Raised	Relevant Issues	Stockland/ARV Response
844	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Proposal will result in Traffic increase and Congestion. * Impacts of proposal on riparian buffers. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Traffic Congestion. * Building heights. * Flooding. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Flooding, riparian buffers and impacts on the Turpentine Forest are addressed in Submission No. 2.</p> <p>COI recommendations, impacts on wetlands, building heights and loss of open space are addressed in Submissions No 8-825</p> <p>Traffic is addressed in Submission No 5</p>
845	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Impacts of proposal on riparian buffers. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Riparian Buffers * Infrastructure provision. * Building heights. * Flooding. 	<p>Flooding, riparian buffers and impacts on the Turpentine Forest are addressed in Submission No. 2.</p> <p>COI recommendations, impacts on wetlands, infrastructure and building heights are addressed in Submissions No 8-825</p>
846	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Impacts of proposed works on Tramway Creek and subsequent impacts on properties at Allenby Parade eg Culvert widening of the railway embankment and stabilisation of the waterway. * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Also concerned with flooding and recommends 40m conservation buffers around creek and wetlands. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Impacts of proposal on riparian buffers. * Proposal will not provide essential infrastructure such as schools and hospital and will increase traffic congestion. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest and wetlands by infrastructure. * Aboriginal heritage. * Riparian Buffers. * Impacts of proposed works on Tramway Creek. * Building heights. * Flooding. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Flooding, riparian buffers and impacts on the Turpentine Forest are addressed in Submission No. 2.</p> <p>COI recommendations, impacts on wetlands, loss of open space and building heights are addressed in Submissions No 8-825</p> <p>Impacts on Tramway Creek are addressed in Submission No 1</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6</p>
847	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Impacts of proposal on riparian buffers. * Proposal will not provide essential infrastructure such as schools and hospital and will increase traffic congestion. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Impacts on environment. * Infrastructure provision. * Building heights. * Flooding. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Flooding, riparian buffers and impacts on the Turpentine Forest are addressed in Submission No. 2.</p> <p>COI recommendations, impacts on wetlands, ecology, infrastructure, loss of open space and building heights are addressed in Submissions No 8-825</p> <p>Traffic is addressed in Submission No 5</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6</p>
848	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will result in over development, increase in population and traffic. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Aboriginal heritage. * Impacts on environment. * Infrastructure provision. * Traffic congestion. 	<p>COI recommendations, impacts on wetlands, ecology and infrastructure are addressed in Submissions No 8-825</p> <p>Traffic is addressed in Submission No 5</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6</p> <p>Over-development is addressed in Submission No 7</p>
849	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on environment and natural species. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest and wetlands by infrastructure. * Aboriginal heritage. * Building heights. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Population is discussed in Submission No.828</p> <p>COI recommendations, ecology, infrastructure and building heights are addressed in Submissions No 8-825</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6</p>
850	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Proposal will desecrate a women's site in the Turpentine Forest and Men's site in Thomas Gibson Park. * Impacts of proposal on riparian buffers. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Infrastructure provision. * Flooding. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest and riparian buffers are addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>COI recommendations, impacts on wetlands and loss of open space are addressed in Submission No 8-825.</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage issues are addressed in Submission No 6 and 8-825</p>
851	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Proposal will result in increase in population and traffic. * Also concerned with flooding and recommends 40m conservation buffers around creek and wetlands. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Use of Sturdee Ave during construction with regards to noise and dust and disruption of residents access to the Princes Highway. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Aboriginal heritage. * Infrastructure provision. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest, flooding and riparian buffers are addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>Impacts on wetlands and loss of open space are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Construction management is addressed in Submission No 4</p> <p>Traffic is addressed in Submission No 5</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6</p>
852	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Flooding. * Building heights. 	<p>Population is discussed in Submission No 828</p> <p>These matters are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p>

D&P Submission No	Nature	Comments/Issues Raised	Relevant Issues	Stockland/ARV Response
853	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Proposal will result in increase in population and traffic. * Impacts of proposal on riparian buffers. * Also concerned with flooding and recommends 40m conservation buffers around creek and wetlands. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Use of Sturdee Ave during construction with regards to noise and dust and disruption of residents access to the Princess Highway. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Aboriginal heritage. * Infrastructure provision. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest, flooding and riparian buffers are addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>Impacts on wetlands and loss of open space are addressed in Submission 8-825</p> <p>Traffic is addressed in Submission No 5</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6</p> <p>Construction management is addressed in Submission No 4</p>
854	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Proposal will result in increase in population and traffic. * Suggested that bridge joining Sturdee Ave and Bulli must be used as a pedestrian bridge only. * Proposal will impact on wild life and environment. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Proposal will result in over population and increased traffic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine forest and wetlands by infrastructure. * Impacts on population and traffic. * Aboriginal heritage. 	<p>Population is discussed in Submission No 828</p> <p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest and riparian corridors are addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>Ecology, and impacts on wetlands are discussed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Use of Sturdee Ave is discussed in Submission No 4</p> <p>Traffic is discussed in Submission No 5</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is discussed in Submission No 6</p>
855 - 856 (2)	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Also concerned with flooding and recommends 40m conservation buffers around creek and wetlands. * Impacts of proposal on riparian buffers. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP. * 20m wide bridges proposed will not cope with flooding. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Riparian Buffers and bushfire protection zone. * 40m riparian buffer zones * Building heights. * Flooding. * Loss of open space 	<p>Population is discussed in Submission No 828</p> <p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest, flooding and riparian corridors are discussed in Submission No 2</p> <p>COI recommendations, wetlands, building heights and loss of open space are discussed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is discussed in Submission No 6</p>
857	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Flooding. * Building heights. 	<p>Issues addressed in Submission No. 8-825 above.</p>
858	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Also concerned with flooding and recommends 40m conservation buffers around creek and wetlands. * Impacts of proposal on riparian buffers. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP. * 20m wide bridges proposed will not cope with flooding. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Riparian Buffers and bushfire protection zone. * 40m riparian buffer zones * Building heights. * Flooding. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest, flooding and riparian corridors are discussed in Submission No 2</p> <p>COI recommendations, impacts on wetlands, building heights and loss of open space are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is discussed in Submission No 6</p>
859	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Impacts of proposal on environment and cultural heritage. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest and wetlands by infrastructure. * Impacts on aboriginal heritage and environment. * Building heights. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest are discussed in Submission No 2</p> <p>COI recommendations, impacts on wetlands, ecology, building heights and loss of open space are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is discussed in Submission No 6</p>
860	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Impacts of proposal on environment and cultural heritage. * Proposal will result in over population. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Impacts on aboriginal heritage and environment. * Housing density. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Impacts on environment and loss of open space are discussed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is discussed in Submission No 6</p>
861	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Also concerned with flooding and recommends 40m conservation buffers around creek and wetlands. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * suggested for the creation of a regional park recognizing the cultural heritage. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on environment and cultural heritage. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Population is discussed in Submission No 828</p> <p>Flooding and buffers are addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>COI recommendations and loss of open space are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6</p>
862 - 863 (2)	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Proposal will result in increased traffic and over population. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest and wetlands by infrastructure. * Aboriginal heritage. * Building heights. * Flooding. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Regional Park</p> <p>The SSS study proposes that the lands east of the site be zoned Environmental Protection 7A and form a regional park connecting with existing coastal open space. The proposed riparian corridors are also proposed to be zoned Environmental Protection 7A connecting to this future regional park</p> <p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest are addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>COI recommendations, impacts on wetlands, building heights and loss of open space are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Population is discussed in Submission No 4</p> <p>Traffic is discussed in Submission No 5</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is discussed in Submission No 6</p>
864	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Proposal will result in over population. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest and wetlands by infrastructure. * Flooding. * Loss of open space. 	<p>COI recommendations and impacts on wetlands are discussed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Population is discussed in Submission No 828</p>

DOP Submission No.	Nature	Comment/Issues Raised	Relevant Issues	Stockland/ARV Response
865	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on tourism and employment. * Proposal will result in increased traffic and over population. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on environment. * Aboriginal heritage. * Building heights. * Tourism 	<p>COI recommendations and building height are discussed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Traffic is discussed in Submission No 5</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is discussed in Submission No 6</p> <p>Tourism and population is discussed in Submission No 828</p> <p>Employment ARV expects to create a total of 120 jobs in the aged care and health related industries with 62 jobs directly on the site. Further discussion is provided in Issue 55 of the Response to Agency Submission. There are currently approximately 75 people employed on the site by Cookson Pilgrico which retains continuing existing use rights</p> <p>COI recommendations and loss of open space are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p>
866	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Proposal will result in increased traffic and over population. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Proposal will effect tourism in this area. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest and wetlands by infrastructure. * Aboriginal heritage. * Tourism. * Housing density. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Traffic is addressed in Submission No 5</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6</p> <p>Population and tourism is addressed in Submission No 828</p>
867	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts of proposal on population and traffic. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP. * 20m wide bridges proposed will not cope with flooding. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Building heights. * Flooding. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Flooding is addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>COI recommendations, building heights and loss of open space are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Traffic is addressed in Submission No 5</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6</p>
868	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Buildings exceeding height will impact on scenic quality of the area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Building heights. * Aboriginal heritage. 	<p>Population is addressed in Submission No 828</p> <p>COI recommendations and building height are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p>
869	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal will impact on aboriginal cultural heritage and wild life. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Aboriginal heritage and wild life. 	<p>Ecology is addressed in Submission NO 8-825</p>
870	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider environmental protection and cultural heritage. * Impacts of proposal on population and traffic. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Loss of space. * Population and traffic. * Aboriginal heritage. 	<p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6</p> <p>Environmental protection and loss of open space are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Population is addressed in Submission No 4</p> <p>Traffic is addressed in Submission No 5</p>
871	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Proposal will result in increased population and traffic. * Impacts of proposal on riparian buffers. * Also concerned with flooding and recommends 40m conservation buffers around creek and wetlands. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Bushfire Protection zones. * Flooding. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6</p> <p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest, flooding and riparian corridors are discussed in Submission No 2</p> <p>COI recommendations, impacts on wetlands, building heights and loss of open space are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Population is discussed in Submission No 4</p> <p>Traffic is addressed in Submission No 5</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is discussed in Submission No 6</p>
872 - 873 (2)	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal will impact on traffic and population. * Proposal will include loss of open space and play field at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Loss of open space and play ground. 	<p>Loss of open space is addressed in Submission 8-825</p> <p>Population is addressed in Submission No 4</p> <p>Traffic is addressed in Submission No 5</p> <p>Issues addressed in Submission No. 5 above.</p>
874	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Density of housing and traffic generation by the proposal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Housing density. 	<p>Traffic is addressed in Submission No 5</p>
875	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Also concerned with flooding and recommends 40m conservation buffers around creek and wetlands. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * suggested for the creation of a regional park recognizing the cultural heritage. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on environment and cultural heritage. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Flooding and buffers are addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>COI recommendations and loss of open space is addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>The Regional Park is addressed in Submission No 861</p>
876	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Proposal will not provide essential infrastructure such as schools and hospital and will increase traffic congestion. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Suggested for planned road upgrades. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Riparian Buffers * Infrastructure provision. * Flooding. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Issues addressed in Submission No. 2, 5, 6, 8-825 above.</p> <p>Planned road upgrades have already been taken into account in the modelling as detailed in the Concept Plan 2006 Traffic Review prepared by Christopher Stapleton Consulting, attached as Appendix G to the DFP EA Report.</p>
877	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider environmental protection and cultural heritage. * Proposal will impact on tourism. * Proposal will increase traffic and population resulting in the damage of natural and scenic beauty. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impact on natural and scenic environment. * Impacts on tourism, traffic and population. 	<p>Environmental protection is addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Cultural heritage is addressed in Submission No 6</p> <p>Tourism and scenic impacts are addressed in Submission No 828</p>

DfP Submission No.	Nature	Comment/Issues Raised	Relevant Issues	Stockland/ARV Response
878	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Proposal will not provide essential infrastructure such as schools and hospital and will increase population and traffic. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Inappropriate building size will effect coastal profile. * Proposal will include loss of open space and play fields at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Population and traffic. * Infrastructure provision. * Flooding. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest are addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>COI recommendations, infrastructure and loss of open space are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Population is addressed in Submission No 4</p> <p>Traffic is addressed in Submission No 5</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6</p> <p>Scenic impacts are addressed in Submission No 828</p> <p>Agree with comments and the support is noted.</p>
879	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal shows forward thinking to house people close to the amenities the region provides. * There is already an abundance of parks to accommodate the influx of people. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Riparian Buffers * Infrastructure provision. * Building heights. * Flooding. * Loss of open space. 	
880	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP. * Proposal will impact on traffic conditions as existing roads are not enough to handle enormous traffic trees. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Traffic congestion. * Infrastructure provision. * Building heights. * Flooding. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest are addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>COI recommendations, impacts on wetlands, building heights and loss of open space are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Traffic is addressed in Submission No 5</p>
881	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Proposal will not provide essential infrastructure such as schools and hospital. * Impacts of proposal on population, traffic and parking. * Proposal will effect the employment situation resulting in unemployment. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP. * 20m wide bridges proposed will not cope with flooding. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Population and traffic. * Infrastructure provision. * Building heights. * Employment. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest and flooding are addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>COI recommendations, impacts on wetlands, infrastructure, building heights and loss of open space are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Population is addressed in Submission No 4</p> <p>Traffic is addressed in Submission No 5</p> <p>Employment is addressed in Submission No 865</p> <p>Parking Parking provision has been assessed in the traffic reports attached to the DFP and JBA EA report. Each detached housing lot is provided to enable the provision of a garage and parking space within each allotment forward of the building line. The townhouse and apartment superlots and ARV site are all of sufficient size to provide on-site parking. Further details will be provided at the Project Plan Stage. Parking can be provided within the design to meet the necessary standards. Details will be provided at the Project Plan stage.</p>
882	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations. * Suggest to increase play fields and recreational parks in the area. * Proposal will not provide essential infrastructure such as schools, hospital and other facilities. * Impacts of proposal on population and traffic. * Suggest developers should contribute to improve quality of life by building sport complex, providing adequate equipments for surf clubs and improving swimming pool of Thirroul. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on nature. * Population and traffic. * Building heights. * Loss of open space. 	<p>COI recommendations, infrastructure, building heights and los of open space are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Population and traffic are addressed in Submissions 4 and 5.</p> <p>Planning Agreement A submission on a Planning Agreement has been prepared which sets out the facilities and infrastructure to be provided as part of the development and the monetary contributions towards facilities in accordance with Wollongong Council's Section 94 Contributions Plan. Further details are set out in the <i>Submission to the Minister for Planning on a Planning Agreement for Infrastructure</i>. Both Stockland and ARV are providing considerable infrastructure that will benefit the community and improve a currently degraded site. Additionally the provision of an aged care facility will meet the demand for an aging population and s94 contributions will go towards community infrastructure as planned by Wollongong City Council.</p>
883	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest, Wildlife and Traffic. * Proposal fails to detail social benefits (like schools and hospitals) for the people of this area. * Impacts of proposal on riparian buffers as they are too narrow. * Proposal will not provide suitable design for landscape development. * Proposal does not consider COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest and cultural heritage. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP. * Suggested that proposal should set new standards in sustainable residential design. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest, Wildlife and Traffic. * Riparian Buffers * Infrastructure provision. * Building heights and high density of development. * Flooding. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest and riparian buffers are discussed in Submission No 2</p> <p>Infrastructure, ecology, COI recommendations, building height and loss of open space are discussed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Traffic is addressed in Submission No 5</p> <p>Concept Plan The proposal is for Concept Plan approval only and therefore does not provide the level of landscaping detail or building details suggested in the letter. Detailed landscaping plans and landscape design guidelines to form part of the Design Guidelines (similar to those attached as Appendix A to the Response to Agency Submission) will provide further details regarding the specific issues raised. The site has undergone considerable alteration to natural levels and earthworks are required will establish new contours to allow for drainage. Housing will reflect the new contours. These details will be provided at the Project Plan stage.</p>

DoP Submission No	Nature	Comment/Issues Raised	Relevant Issues	Stockland/ARV Response
884	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy and the community has not given the right to think about urban design. * Proposal will result in excessive density of development, building without eaves and asking for 70% of covered area. * Inadequate road widths cannot accommodate the increased traffic due to this proposal. * Proposal provided misleading intent as the type, bulk, scale and size of proposed buildings are not similar to the existing urban fabric. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest, cultural heritage, wildlife and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Proposal ignored local specialised ecology. * Impacts of proposal on riparian buffers. * Proposal will not provide essential infrastructure such as schools and hospital and will increase traffic congestion. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP * 20m wide bridges proposed will not cope with flooding. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Riparian Buffers * Infrastructure provision. * Building heights. * Flooding. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Flooding, riparian buffers and impacts on the Turpentine forest are addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>Density and traffic is discussed in Submission No 5</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6</p> <p>COI recommendations and coastal protection, ecology, wetlands, building heights, infrastructure and loss of open space are addressed in 8-825</p> <p>Urban design guidelines</p> <p>The Concept Plan does not contain any design details for future buildings such as eaves. These will be the subject of design controls similar to those contained in Appendix A to the Response to Agency Submissions. The 70% site cover relates only to the future dwellings houses for residential allotments. The FSR calculation in Appendix A of the submission is incorrect. The site cover relates to footprint of a building, not floor space over each level of a potential building.</p> <p>The Design Guidelines to be prepared as part of the Project Plan application will guide architectural detailing of buildings, including roof design and eaves. The roof form does not affect site cover or building size.</p> <p>Visual Analysis</p> <p>Stockland and ARV do not consider that the visual analysis is misleading and it needs to be considered in the context of the proposal being a Concept Plan. The photographs should not be scaled for analysis purposes. The illustrations in Appendix A of the DFP EA includes a notation that "The proposed built form imagery is intended to show likely massing of development based on typical dwelling or multi-unit dwelling layouts and configurations consistent with the proposed concept plan. All built form proposals will be subject to detail design in a future project plan application, and the overall appearance of the dwellings will include details that will reduce their mass. Bulk will be reduced through articulation and the form and scale diminished with fenestration patterns."</p> <p>Bulk, scale and height of future buildings have been fully detailed in the documentation. The building envelopes are not indicative of the final architectural treatment of potential buildings. Details will be provided at the Project Plan stage. Setback controls, upper floor setbacks, SEPP 65 requirements, landscaping requirements will all assist in ensuring a suitable built form, scale and massing for the site.</p>
885	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * 20m wide bridges proposed will not cope with flooding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Aboriginal heritage and Wildlife. * Infrastructure provision. * Flooding. 	<p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest and flooding are addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>COI recommendations and impacts on wetlands are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6</p>
886	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Proposal will desecrate a woman's site in the Turpentine Forest and Men's site in Thomas Gibson Park. * Impacts of proposal on riparian buffers. * Proposal will not provide essential infrastructure such as schools and hospital and will increase traffic congestion. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP. * 20m wide bridges proposed will not cope with flooding. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Riparian Buffers * Infrastructure provision. * Building heights. * Flooding. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest, riparian buffers and flooding are addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>COI recommendations, impacts on wetlands, infrastructure, building heights and loss of open space are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission Nos 6 and 8-825</p>
887-889 (3)	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Proposal will desecrate a woman's site in the Turpentine Forest and Men's site in Thomas Gibson Park. * Impacts of proposal on riparian buffers. * Proposal will not provide essential infrastructure such as schools and hospital and will increase traffic congestion. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP. * 20m wide bridges proposed will not cope with flooding. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Riparian Buffers * Infrastructure provision. * Building heights. * Flooding. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest, riparian buffers and flooding are addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>COI recommendations, impacts on wetlands, infrastructure, building heights and loss of open space are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission Nos 6 and 8-825</p>
890 - 891 (2)	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal will impact on reducing play fields. * Suggested for additional play fields. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Loss of play fields. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Issues addressed in Submission Nos. 6 and 8-825 above.</p>
892	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Proposal will not provide essential infrastructure as well as result in over population and destruction of natural flood plains. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Infrastructure provision. * Over population. * Cultural and natural heritage. 	<p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest are addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>COI recommendations, infrastructure and impacts on wetlands are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Population is addressed in Submission No 4</p>
893 - 894 (2)	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Proposal will desecrate a woman's site in the Turpentine Forest and Men's site in Thomas Gibson Park. * Impacts of proposal on riparian buffers. * Proposal will not provide essential infrastructure such as schools and hospital and will increase traffic congestion. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP. * 20m wide bridges proposed will not cope with flooding. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Riparian Buffers * Infrastructure provision. * Building heights. * Flooding. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6</p> <p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest, riparian buffers and flooding are addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>COI recommendations, impacts on wetlands, infrastructure, building heights and loss of open space are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission Nos 6 and 8-825</p>
895 - 896 (2)	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Building heights. 	<p>COI recommendations, building heights and coastal policy are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6</p>

DoP Submission No	Nature	Comment/Issues Raised	Relevant Issues	Stockland/ARV Response
897	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Impacts of proposal on riparian buffers. * Proposal will not provide essential infrastructure such as schools and hospital and will increase traffic congestion. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP * 20m wide bridges proposed will not cope with flooding. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Riparian Buffers * Infrastructure provision. * Building heights. * Flooding. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest, riparian buffers and flooding are addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>COI recommendations, impacts on wetlands, infrastructure, building heights and loss of open space are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission Nos 6</p>
898	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Proposal will not provide essential infrastructure for roads and will increase traffic congestion. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Traffic congestion. * Infrastructure provision. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest are discussed in Submission No 2</p> <p>COI recommendations, impacts on wetlands, infrastructure and loss of open space are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Traffic is discussed in Submission No 5</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is discussed in Submission No 6</p>
899	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Proposal will desecrate a women's site in the Turpentine Forest and Men's site in Thomas Gibson Park. * Impacts of proposal on riparian buffers. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Riparian Buffers. * Aboriginal heritage and wildlife. * Flooding. 	<p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest and riparian corridors are discussed in Submission No 2</p> <p>COI recommendations and impacts on wetlands are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is discussed in Submission No 6 and 8-825</p>
900	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Proposal will impact on archaeological site of national significance, sacred indigenous burial site and European historical significance. * Impacts of proposal on riparian buffers. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP. * 20m wide bridges proposed will not cope with flooding. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Riparian Buffers. * Building heights. * Flooding. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest, flooding and riparian corridors are addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>COI recommendations, impacts on wetlands, building heights and loss of open space are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>European heritage</p> <p>European heritage is addressed in the EA report for both components of the Concept Plan. A Heritage Interpretation Plan has been previously developed for the Thirroul Brickworks and will be adopted for the Brickworks and Woodlands Cottage. Further archaeological investigations on the northern part of Stockland's site will be carried out should artefacts be discovered during the course of construction, in accordance with Stockland's Statement of Commitments.</p>
901 - 902 (2)	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The proposal does not recognise the values and views of the community. * Gross overdevelopment in size and height * The Aboriginal issues need to be fully investigated * Some of the information provided is false and unclear eg the photomontages. * Creek corridors against the DGRs. * Major flooding issues * Traffic increases due to Sea Cliff Bridge * The link road will have serious impacts on traffic and intersections. * Lack of sports grounds * Is this a suitable place for the ages care facility considering another is being build at the Brickworks site. * Protection of the Turpentine Forest not adequate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Riparian Buffers. * Traffic congestion. * Building heights. * Flooding. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest and flooding are addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6</p> <p>Open space is addressed in Submission No 6</p> <p>Overdevelopment and urban design guidelines are addressed in Submission Nos 7 and 840.</p> <p>The visual analysis is discussed in Submission No 884</p> <p>Sea Bridge Traffic</p> <p>Traffic increase due to the Sea Cliff Bridge have been factored into the Council's traffic model used in the Traffic Assessments contained in the EA reports, as confirmed in Issue 44 of the Response to Agency Submissions. Traffic impacts for both components of the Concept Plan are also addressed in Submission No. 5 above.</p> <p>The site is suitable for an aged care facility as described in the Charles Hill Report and the State significant study.</p>
903	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Public meeting resolutions: * To implement the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry. * No loss of public land for private development * Sufficient public space be provided including sports fields and recreational areas. * Land be declared a Place of Aboriginal Significance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Further studies as recommended. * Loss of public land * Sporting and recreational areas. * Aboriginal ownership 	<p>The Minister for Planning requested a review of the COI which is contained in the Charles Hill report. The Concept Plan does not include Wrexham Road and therefore does not involve any loss of public land. The reclassification of Wrexham Road will be the subject of a separate process with Wollongong City Council. The development will facilitate an increase in the area of public land and will not result in a decrease in land available for public recreation.</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage addressed in EA reports and appendices, and in Issues 17-19 of the Response to Agency Submissions, refer also to Submission No. 8-825. Heritage has been addressed appropriately at this concept plan stage as described in section 7.4 of the EA report and in the statement of commitments.</p> <p>There is no public land on the Stockland site or the ARV site.</p>
904	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Proposal will result in over-development. * Impacts of proposal on riparian buffers. * Proposal will result in loss of opportunity to create Regional Coastal Park, open spaces and walking tracks. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * 20m wide bridges proposed will not cope with flooding. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Riparian Buffers * Over-development and traffic congestion. * Aboriginal and Cultural heritage. * Flooding. * Loss of open space. 	<p>27% of the ARV site and approximately 30% of the Stockland site is to be zoned for environmental protection that is accessible</p> <p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest, riparian corridors and flooding are addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>COI recommendations, impacts on wetlands and loss of open space are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6</p> <p>Overdevelopment is addressed in Submission No 7</p> <p>The suitability of the site for residential development has been confirmed by the Charles Hill Report. Proposal does not remove the potential for a regional park, and the proposed environmental corridors along the creeks and proposed pedestrian networks will formalise and significantly improve access to the beach and future regional park.</p>

DOP Submission No	Nature	Common/Issues Raised	Relevant Issues	Stockland/ARV Response
905	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Hill report shows lack of respect and understanding of catchment hydrology and floodplain management, both in terms of ecology and long term social and economic planning. * Hill review was limited to submissions received AFTER the Col. He claims he had no flood information yet shows the Map from the HCFRMS. * Seven creeks and tributaries covering some 8.9ha of catchment, as well as several landform changes, have been omitted from the flood study. * Sensitivity analysis of 20% is meaningless considering discharge rates are considered to be 20-30% lower than previous studies. * Issues raised by DIPNRs submission to Col are still unresolved, in particular, adopting peak design flows from the Hewitts Creek Flood Study. These issues include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Manning's hydraulic roughness coefficient (n) is too low for the expected conditions. 2. The 2hr storm used to determine critical storm burst may be too long and needs to be tested. It also fails to superimpose storm burst runoff on top of initial flows. 3. The lag coefficient is too high for catchment. 4. The flood study has adopted peak 1:100 discharge rates for Woodlands and Slacky that are less than the 1:20 figures calculated for each catchment, various checking methods show the rates in the flood study to be up to 40% lower than calculated. 5. There are discrepancies in the volume that can apparently be accepted by various culverts and what is diverted under different design events. 6. ocean level increases due to global warming may have been significantly underestimated and uses a 1% AEP ocean event which may be too conservative. The outcome could be that the peak design flows have been underestimated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Lack of understanding of the Hill report. * Hewitts Creek Flood Risk Management Study * Flooding 	<p>Flooding and hydrology</p> <p>Catchment hydrology and floodplain assessment has been undertaken independently of the Hill Report findings. Refer also to ecological and hydrological reports in the EA Report.</p>
	Objection		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Underestimation of peak design flow 	<p>The following responses have been provided by Brown Consulting and respond to the submission labelled MWV and contained in the CD provided by DOP to the proponents.</p> <p>The modelling that Browns undertook involved the adoption of the Wollongong City Council model as prepared by Forbes Rigby. They used all the parameters unchanged. The only modifications that we made were to catchment boundaries and points of discharge which were modified to reflect changed drainage paths.</p> <p>The author (Para 5 page 3) reproduces the DIPNR comments that state that there should be an independent analysis. The model used by Browns represents the cumulative experience of Council, Forbes Rigby and Browns. The model parameters were scrutinised in Court Cases 1 - 6 and the present model reflects this consensus.</p> <p>The author questions the use of the most appropriate parameter in a band of parameters, he claims that developer favourable ones as opposed to best estimates were used. This is not the case.</p> <p>Design Rainfall Intensities. The author confuses the techniques used to analyse a particular storm event as opposed to the procedures to be adopted for design flood assessment.</p> <p>The author suggests that possible sea level changes should be modelled by linear extrapolation (last Para page 8). There is no scientific basis to adopting such a model.</p> <p>The modelling undertaken by Robinson GRC indicated that sea level had no appreciable impact of flood levels for distances several hundred metres from the sea and seaward of the Sardon Point development. The claim has been substantiated.</p> <p>The author suggests that both the 100 year sea level and 100 year storm should be considered simultaneously. The combined event will have a ARI significantly greater than 100 years. Lawson & Treloar in the recent NSW Flood mitigation conference presented a paper which discussed the various option that have been used to set ocean conditions. Their approach is rational and is preferred.</p> <p>Model Calibration. The submission questions the use of parameters from studies pre 1998, although no reason was given as to the hydrological significance of pre and post 1998 events. The submission then goes on to suggest that conservative as opposed to most appropriate values should be used.</p> <p>We comment that the purpose of the analysis is to estimate the parameters as accurately as possible. If the project involves excessive risk, then a more extreme event should be adopted and we disagree with the proposition that conservative values should be adopted to address risk. If risk is addressed by adopting conservative values, margins of safety cannot be accurately assessed.</p> <p>The use of the Rational method (pages 13 - 16). Australian Rainfall & Runoff advises that the rational method should not be used for catchments > 25 km2. The reliance on this model in this circumstance is highly questionable. The other discharge estimates have much more credibility.</p> <p>Works within Tramway Creek are the subject of a Vegetation Management Plan already in place in respect to Stages 2 to 6. Impacts to SCESFC community are addressed in Cumberland Ecology's Updated Flora and Fauna Assessments (Appendix D to DFP EA Report) and the Response to Agency Submissions (Appendix D).</p> <p>The land is already zoned for urban development and the SSS study proposes a reduction in the extent of Residentially zoned land.</p> <p>Concept plan provides a balanced planning outcome with a mix of housing on disturbed parts of the site, and zones for a regional park and environmental protection on less disturbed parts of the site.</p> <p>Traffic is addressed in Submission No 5</p> <p>Infrastructure is addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Tourism is addressed in Submission No 828</p> <p>Emergency evacuation</p> <p>The north-south route will provide an evacuation route for emergencies. Due to the nature of the catchment and floodplain, floods are typically of short duration. If required, refuge can be obtained within residential dwellings which will be totally flood free during a PMF. The inability to evacuate is acceptable for the subject floodplain as specified by Schedule 4 of Wollongong DCP 54, which applies specifically to the Hewitts Creek Floodplain. For the ARV site a "stay-put/vertical evacuation" policy may be more appropriate.</p> <p>Concept plan provides a balanced planning outcome with a mix of housing on disturbed parts of the site, and zones for a regional park and environmental protection on less disturbed parts of the site.</p>
906	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Objects to urbanisation of the coast. * Believes the process is corrupt and that the Hill report is not impartial. * Valuers have stated that \$14-22M would buy the land back and believes that government should do so. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Impact on wetland 	
	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Concerned with proposed channel enlargements from the rail line to Tramway Creek and its impact on SCESFC. 		
907	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Lack of infrastructure, especially roads, to deal with even the existing community. * Lack of evacuation routes in event of an emergency. * Tourism is being promoted with natural beauty as the selling point, yet planning massive development on one of the last remaining wetlands in the Illawarra. 		
908	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Violation of public open space. * Increase in traffic on already busy roads. 		<p>Public land is not being developed. There is no public open space on the Stockland site which is vacant or the ARV site at present which is currently used for industrial purposes.</p> <p>Traffic impacts have been commented upon in Submission No. 5 above and been addressed in the Traffic Reports appended to the EA Reports prepared by DFP and JBA.</p>

DoP Submission No	Nature	Comment/Issues Raised	Relevant Issues	Stockland/ARV Response
909	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Do not want houses anywhere on Sandon Point. * The development is 'sardineville' on a floodplain with major archaeological deposits and significant Aboriginal heritage. * In violation of the Commission of Inquiry. * Have been excluded from consultation. * Don't want any form of development on the Turpentine Forest. * At the COI, Paul Hedge, Stockland, promised to give the onsite sales office to the Aboriginal community as a culture centre and employ Aboriginal gardeners to maintain creek edges if allowed to build there. Stockland are going back on these promises. * The Aboriginal people have never been compensated for mining their resources. 		<p>The land is already zoned for urban and industrial development and the SSS study proposes a reduction in the extent of Residentially zoned land. The density of housing is low and future urban areas are separate by the proposed riparian corridors. Concept plan provides a balanced planning outcome with a mix of housing on disturbed parts of the site, and zones for a regional park and environmental protection on less disturbed parts of the site.</p> <p>The Minister for Planning requested a review of the COI which is contained in the Charles Hill report.</p> <p>The reference to exclusion from consultation relates to a DEC process, not the subject Part 3A application.</p> <p>Stockland has not made assurances in this manner and, in any event, it is not a relevant matter for the Minister's consideration in the assessment of the subject application. The question of compensation for loss of mining resources is not a matter for consideration of the subject application.</p> <p>The Turpentine Forest will remain largely intact and rehabilitated with the exception of the northwest edge which needs to accommodate a 10m outer APZ for bushfire protection of the proposed nursing home. It will retain its ecological value and integrity as described in the ecological study in the EA report.</p> <p>Heritage has been addressed appropriately at this concept plan stage as described in section 7.4 of the EA report and in the statement of commitments.</p> <p>The Stuart Huys' report was not available at the time of preparing the EA Reports. Consideration of this report has been given in the Response to Agency Submissions.</p> <p>Heritage has been addressed appropriately at this concept plan stage as described in section 7.4 of the EA report and in the statement of commitments - refer to the comments on Submission No 6 and 8-825.</p>
910	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The COI recommended a comprehensive Aboriginal Heritage Study and advisory funding to the Aboriginal community to help achieve an independent outcome - these have not happened. * Social and spiritual traditions are being ignored and only inanimate physical objects looked at in isolation. * The proposal does not consider Stuart Huys' study. * The proposal should be withdrawn until it conforms with findings and recommendations from the COI. * The visual amenity from the coast to the escarpment is a significant attribute for the Aboriginal cultural and spiritual heritage. * No anthropological studies have been done. * Oppose road access through Thomas Gibson Park and a male anthropologist should be commissioned to speak to local Aboriginal men regarding this site. * A more respectful attitude towards bloodline traditional Aboriginal people and their culture should be adopted. * The Aboriginal Place declaration draft of June 2001 must be completed for the whole of Sandon Point. 		<p>The report named is not directly relevant to the Concept Plan being reviewed. It relates directly to DEC consent conditions associated with Stages 1-6. It summarised discussions at a court ordered meeting of the Aboriginal stakeholder groups, DEC and Stocklands representative to further negotiations on the Aboriginal Keeping Place. The report was tabled in the Land and Environment Court as proof that the meeting had taken place and was accepted by the Court as representing consultation in good faith.</p> <p>The report does not contain any recommendations of a 'cultural' nature but rather summarises the areas of agreement amongst the Aboriginal groups as documented at the meeting and the issues that still need to be progressed.</p> <p>Since that time a second meeting has been held which has again resulted in a positive steps towards the establishment of the Keeping Place and the court has ordered the process to continue until the Keeping Place has been established. This process is independent of the proposed development as outlined in the Concept Plan.</p>
911	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The report 'Sandon Point VCA and Keeping Place: consultation with the Aboriginal community and recommendations' by S. McIntyre-Tamwoy (June 2006) is culturally inappropriate and riddled with misinformation, falsehoods and known errors. These were corrected in written communications with Ms McIntyre-Tamwoy but included anyway. This report should not be used to base decisions on. 		<p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest, riparian corridors and flooding are addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>COI recommendations, impacts on wetlands, infrastructure, building heights and loss of open space are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Traffic is addressed in Submission No 5</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission Nos 6 and 8-825</p>
912	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Proposal will desecrate a women's site in the Turpentine Forest and Men's site in Thomas Gibson Park. * Impacts of proposal on riparian buffers. * Proposal will not provide essential infrastructure such as schools and hospital and will increase traffic congestion. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP. * 20m wide bridges proposed will not cope with flooding. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Riparian Buffers * Infrastructure provision. * Building heights. * Flooding. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest, riparian corridors and flooding are addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>COI recommendations, impacts on wetlands, infrastructure, building heights and loss of open space are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Traffic is addressed in Submission No 5</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission Nos 6 and 8-825</p>
913 - 918 (6)	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Proposal will desecrate a women's site in the Turpentine Forest and Men's site in Thomas Gibson Park. * Impacts of proposal on riparian buffers. * Proposal will not provide essential infrastructure such as schools and hospital and will increase traffic congestion. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP. * 20m wide bridges proposed will not cope with flooding. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Riparian Buffers * Infrastructure provision. * Building heights. * Flooding. * Loss of open space. 	<p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest, riparian corridors and flooding are addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>COI recommendations, impacts on wetlands, infrastructure, building heights and loss of open space are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Traffic is addressed in Submission No 5</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission Nos 6 and 8-825</p>
919	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The DEC DG requested for re-assessment of the endangered ecological communities. * The DEC DG requested that riparian areas and endangered ecological communities have a 40m buffer containing no infrastructure or APZs. * The DEC DG requested that stormwater treatment areas are outside of the buffer. * The present proposal does not meet these requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not meet DEC DGRs 	<p>The DG Requirements have been addressed in relation to biodiversity matters as detailed in issue 15 of the Response to Agency Submission. This submission also details the justification and appropriateness of the riparian corridors as proposed, and also confirms that the stormwater treatments are located outside of the core riparian buffer zone on the Stockland site and there are no EECs on the ARV site. Justification is provided in HLA Overview, State significant study and EA Report which highlight that the Turpentine Forest APZ buffer zone and riparian corridor through ARV site are sufficient to maintain their ecological and hydrological values. The Turpentine Forest will remain largely intact and rehabilitated with the exception of the northwest edge which needs to accommodate a 10m outer APZ for bushfire protection of the proposed nursing home.</p> <p>The concept plan provides for the improvement of the riparian corridor in terms of its habitat value and the quality and quantity of water flows. The concept plan justifies the width of riparian zones as site specific ecological and hydrological studies have maintained adequate corridors for ecological functions and protection of ecological communities.</p>

DOP Submission No.	Nature	Comment/Issues Raised	Relevant Issues	Stockland/ARV Response
920	Objection	* There are some things money can't buy.	* Ecological value	Concept plan provides a balanced planning outcome with a mix of housing on disturbed parts of the site, and zones for a regional park and environmental protection on less disturbed parts of the site.
921	Objection	* Reports as far back as 1992 highlight the seriousness of the flooding issues associated with the site.	* Flooding	Issues addressed in Submission No. 2 above.
922	Objection	* Mapping of all remnant and natural areas is warranted given that class 1 and 2 bird habitat zones were mapped in the Sandon Point LES 1992. 2006 Aerial pictures are now being processed at WICK. * The Cooksons have allowed the land to degrade and slashed regenerating areas. The Turpentine Forest is larger than the 11a noted in the Bushfire Report. * The proposed 2(b) medium density area overlaps the wetland between Woodlands and Hewitts Creek which has failed to be acknowledged as such. * New report by CSIRO recommends a 70 yr planning period for development of Major Infrastructure and 100 yr planning period for long term Biodiversity and Bridge Design Life & Flood Heights.	* Mapping of ecological communities * Wetland protection * Climate change	Mapping of EECs was carried out by Cornell Wagner and Sainy & Associates (June 2001) on the Stockland site. There are no EECs on the ARV site. ARV arranged for survey of the Turpentine Forest. The Residential 2(b) zone is proposed for land between Hewitts Creek and Woodlands Creek. The location of the proposed residential zone is justified in the SSS study and further justified in the Response to Agency Submissions (Issue 2). We are unaware of the report being referenced, its context or relevance in this instance.
923	Support	* There is a need for a retirement development in the northern suburbs. * Want to keep living in the area as long as possible. * Site is ideal as it has access to the bike track, rail and bus services and Bull shopping precinct and village. * Confident that adequate provisions for traffic needs and preservation of the Turpentine Forest and flood plain will be made.	* In support of retirement village	Agree with comments and support is noted.
924	Objection	* Concerned that the width of riparian corridors are too small considering ecological and Aboriginal heritage issues. * Corridors should not contain hard infrastructure. * Any destruction of the Turpentine Forest should not be countenanced. * The Hannah mound should be protected and include a 50m protection zone around its perimeter to ensure protection of sub-surface artefact deposits.	* Aboriginal cultural heritage	Impacts on the Turpentine Forest and riparian corridors are addressed in Submission No 5 2 and 6 The issue of the riparian corridor width and aboriginal heritage (COI recommendations) is addressed by Sue McIntyre-Tamwoy at Appendix H to the Response to Agency Submissions . Sue McIntyre-Tamwoy notes that the areas of highest potential for Aboriginal sites are within the proposed green corridors as indicated on the Indicative Concept Plan (HLA 6th March 2006). "The Hannah mound is not on the Stockland or the ARV site."
925	Objection	* Proposal is contrary to the recommendations of the COI * Sensitive and sacred Aboriginal land, natural heritage areas, Turpentine Forest and wetlands are disregarded by the proposal. * An Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Study has not been considered in the proposal as recommended by the COI. * Riparian corridors have been narrowed. * Requests an independent flood study. * Does not provide essential infrastructure such as schools, hospitals and public transport facilities.	* Aboriginal cultural heritage * Riparian corridor width * Flooding * Infrastructure	Impacts on the Turpentine Forest and riparian corridors are addressed in Submission No 2 Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6 COI recommendations, impacts on wetlands and infrastructure are addressed in Submission No. 8-825 above. Flood studies to be reviewed by a specialist consultant engaged by the DOP for the assessment of the Part 3A application. Flooding comments are provided in the responses to Submissions 2 and 905 as well as being extensively addressed in the EA report.
926	In principle support	* Proposal too dense for the area. * Development should address stormwater problems and alleviate existing flood issues by widening the creek corridors and flow paths under the railway line. * Need cycleway and pedestrian walks linking the site to Lawrence Hargraves Drive and Thirroul. * Lot sizes should be larger to reduce density and provide a more pleasant suburb, aesthetically and socially.	* Overdevelopment * Flooding * Cycleway and pedestrian links	Stormwater and flooding is addressed in Submission No 2 Density is addressed in Submission No 5 Pedestrian & cycleway links The use of the Sturdee Avenue bridge for pedestrian and cyclists will connect the site with Lawrence Hargraves Drive. Preliminary concepts for a pedestrian path way to Thirroul and the railway station will be shown as part of Wrexham Road connection with further details more appropriately being provided at the project plan stage. A mix of lot sizes is proposed ranging from 322m ² to 1146m ² to provide for diversity in housing choice, with smaller lots assisting with affordability being a Department of Housing objective. The design guidelines to be prepared for the Project Plan will ensure a good urban design outcome for the area. Support noted.
927	Objection	* Some detached housing lots are too small. Should be minimum of 500m ² . This would be consistent with the last development in the area - Seabreeze Place and minimise overdevelopment. * Four story apartment block too high. Maximum height should be 3 stories as recommended in the COI and as is consistent with the Thirroul area.	* Overdevelopment	Lot sizes are addressed in Submission No 926 Urban design and overdevelopment is addressed in Submission Nos 7 and 840
928	Objection	* Environmentally sensitive site * Overcrowding * No indigenous links	* Overdevelopment * Environmentally sensitive * Indigenous links	The environmental attributes of the site have been thoroughly considered in the COI and Charles Hill's reports and taken into consideration in the preparation of the Concept Plan. Refer to Submission Nos 5 and 7 (density and overdevelopment) and 6 (Aboriginal heritage).
929	Objection	* Destruction of wetland. * Destruction of flora and fauna habitat. * Destruction of Aboriginal Heritage * Roads are too busy as it is.	* Wetland * Ecology * Aboriginal Heritage * Traffic	Comments regarding the issues of ecology, aboriginal heritage and traffic are addressed in Submission No. 8-825 above as well as in the EA reports. Traffic is addressed in Submission No. 5 above. Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6

DoP Submission No.	Nature	Comment/Issues Raised	Relevant Issues	Stockland/ARV Response
930	Objection	* Desecration of a special place environmentally and in terms of Aboriginal Heritage	* Ecology * Aboriginal heritage	Ecology is addressed in Submission No 8-825 Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6
931	Objection	* Duty of the Crown - Once the purposes originally granted for the land are no longer current, the land should be returned to its original condition and returned to the Crown. * Failing this, any residential development should provide sufficient land and housing in order for the Koori elders. * Need for study of the land needs of indigenous people in the Nth Illawarra before a decision is made. * The Draft Declaration of Rights of Indigenous Peoples should be considered. * Denial of rights to practice and revitalise as noted in the Draft Declaration, without a prior study, may constitute an act of cultural genocide/ethnocide. * The present indigenous cultural heritage studies are not complete in terms of both tangible and non-tangible aspects of indigenous cultural heritage.	* Rights of indigenous people	The DEC's letter dated 10 April 2006, forming part of the DG requirements states that "The Aboriginal cultural heritage values of the site have been extensively investigated..... The DEC considers that no further assessment work in relation to Aboriginal heritage is required to inform the Concept Plan. However, the DEC does consider that it is essential that the identified Aboriginal heritage values across the site be appropriately recognised and protected as part of the planning and approval process." The return of the land by the Crown is not a matter for Stockland or ARV to comment on, but a matter for the Minister to consider in his determination. The ARV site is owned by Cookson Pibrico and will not be returned to the Crown. Heritage has been addressed appropriately at this concept plan stage as described in section 7.4 of the EA report and in the statement of commitments.
932	Objection	* Fish migration * Flooding between Woodlands and Hewitts. * Need extra playing fields.	* Fish migration * Flooding * Active open space	The issue of flooding has been addressed in Submission No's 2 and 905. Open space is addressed in Submission No 6 Fish migration Habitat and water quality will be significantly improved as a result of the development and the quantity of water will not decrease. Fish migration is expected to be positively impacted.
933	Objection	* Removal of a portion of the Turpentine Forest to accommodate the APZ. * Significant Aboriginal Heritage values across the site. * Stormwater issues. * Flooding * Biodiversity concerns * The need to protect creeks and Turpentine Forests * Protection of suggested archaeological sites.	* Turpentine Forest. * Aboriginal cultural heritage * Flooding * Biodiversity	Impacts on the Turpentine Forest, riparian corridors, flooding and stormwater are addressed in Submission No 2 Ecology and biodiversity is addressed in Submission No 8-825 Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6 and 8-825.
934	In principle support	* Need for several pedestrian overpasses to 'encourage easy pedestrian access' as stated in the proposal. * A bus route through the site should be guaranteed prior to any development and funded for the first 15yrs to ensure continuity of this service despite initial losses. * The 4 storey building is exceedingly ugly. * Contaminated site issues have not been sufficiently assessed or addressed. * Geotechnical stability of all areas of the site need to be assessed. * The many extant refractories dating from all periods of the Refractory's development should be used as part of the paving, retaining and feature walls etc throughout the development.	* Cycleways and pedestrian links * Urban design * Site contamination * Geotechnical stability * Use of heritage materials in the urban fabric	Pedestrian and cycleway links are discussed in Submission No 926 Urban design issues are discussed in Submission No 840 Bus routes As stated in the Christopher Stapleton Consulting report (Appendix G to the DRP EA Report) "Provision of a bus service will be a decision of a local bus operators and the Department of Transport, but the potential exists to extend local routes through the site between Point Street and Thirroul". Proposed roads within the development have been designed to accommodate a future bus route. ARV will provide a bus for its residents. Geotechnical and contamination Extensive geotechnical and contamination testing has already been undertaken. Stockland has stated in its Statement of Commitments that further geotechnical investigations will be undertaken for contaminants where excavations exceed 2m in depth. Geotechnical assessments for stability issues can also be undertaken at the project plan stage, or for individual buildings if necessary or recommended. Refer also to contamination report and hydrogeological report in the EA report, prepared by JBA. Stockland's Statement of Commitments includes the carrying out of further archaeological investigations on the northern part of Stockland's land (being the former brickworks and Woodlands Cottage) should archaeological artefacts be discovered during the construction.
935	Objection	* Destruction Turpentine Forest and other vegetation. * Creek treatments are grossly undersized. * Density too high. * Artists impression and insult if current Stockland proposal is anything to go by. * Local streets unable to cope with existing loads. * Building on a marsh and a flood plain * Contamination issues. * Indigenous heritage.	* Ecological value * Traffic * Overdevelopment * Flood plain * Creek corridors * Contamination * Indigenous Heritage	Impacts on the Turpentine Forest and riparian corridors are addressed in Submission No 2 Density and traffic are addressed in Submission No 5 Aboriginal archaeology is addressed in Submission No 6 Geotechnical and contamination issues are addressed in Submission No 934 Visual impacts are addressed in Submission No 884 COI recommendations are addressed in Submission No 8-825
936	Objection	* Believe there should be no further development of the site. * The COI does not provide the level of protection warranted but is a reasonable compromise. * The present proposal is not suitable for the site given the natural and cultural constraints identified.	* Natural and cultural constraints	The COI report and Charles Hill report found the development on certain components of the site was appropriate. The Concept Plan has taken into account the constraints of the site in determining where best to locate urban development. Concept plan provides a balanced planning outcome with a mix of housing on disturbed parts of the site, and zones for a regional park and environmental protection on less disturbed and environmentally sensitive parts of the site.

DOP Submission No.	Nature	Comments/Issues Raised	Relevant Issues	Stockland/ARV Response
937	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The Village people propose a retirement village on the Bull Brickworks site. Is there a need for two? * The proposed regional park should be planned and set in place before any consideration is given to allowing development. * Flood prone site unsuitable for development. * Aboriginal heritage studies need to be completed. * The concept plan does not satisfy the community and does not respect their concerns. * Borders of the Turpentine Forest does not allow further regeneration as occurred over the last 50 years. * The APZ intrudes 10m into the Forest. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Timing * Flooding * Aboriginal Heritage * Turpentine Forest * Respect for Community concerns 	<p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest, including APZs and flooding are addressed in Submission Nos 2 and 305</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6</p> <p>Stockland and ARV see no need to delay the development of the site pending the lengthy acquisition process and time required to establish the regional park. Regional Park planning is a matter for relevant authorities. Additionally, the development will facilitate the dedication of significant areas of land that can form part of any future regional park.</p> <p>Concept plan respects the community by providing a balanced planning outcome with a mix of housing on disturbed parts of the site, and zones for a regional park and environmental protection on less disturbed and environmentally sensitive parts of the site.</p>
938	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * There should be no development east of the Turpentine Forest and north of Hewitts Creek. * A comprehensive Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Study needs to be undertaken. * Full assessment and protection of the endangered ecological communities. * Sufficient riparian corridor widths. * Minimum 40m conservation buffer zones to creeks, wetlands and forests not to include infrastructure such as water treatment, roads or APZs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Aboriginal Heritage * Ecology * Riparian corridors 	<p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest and riparian corridors are discussed in Submission No 2</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6</p> <p>Ecology is addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>The limitations for development stated in the submission are inconsistent with the findings of the COI report and Charles Hill report which confirmed the suitability of the site for residential development and others for environmental protection.</p>
939	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Several areas of listed endangered communities which are yet to be fully mapped. There is also potential for other listed endangered ecological communities. * There are a number of Aboriginal sites. * The first 6 stages of development by Stockland have been plagued by poor practices, damage to Aboriginal artefacts and the endangered ecological community. * The NPA supports the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Aboriginal Heritage * Ecology 	<p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6</p> <p>The issue of mapping is addressed in the Response to Agency Submissions.</p> <p>The COI findings have been reviewed by the Charles Hill report and the Concept Plan responds to those findings.</p>
940	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Significant impact on roads and traffic. * Increase in use of finite oil as most commute to Sydney. * Lack of playing fields. * Density too high for infrastructure * Loss of green space and threatening flora and fauna * Aboriginal and white heritage ignored. * Flood plains built on 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Traffic * Natural resources * Active open space * Overdevelopment * Flood plain * Ecology * Aboriginal Heritage 	<p>Refer also to Submission 938, above.</p> <p>Flooding is addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>Traffic and density is addressed in Submission No 5 - access to Sydney is also available by rail.</p> <p>Open space is addressed in Submission No 6</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6, European heritage is addressed in Submission No 900.</p>
941	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The development would impact wetlands through alteration of hydrology - a Key Threatening Process under TSC Act. The various other associated activities would destroy the wetlands within a short time. * The development has the potential to place both property and lives at risk through flooding * The Turpentine Forest has great significance as remnant vegetation, habitat and a cultural asset * The rights of indigenous Australians has not been recognised. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Wetland * Flooding * Ecology * Aboriginal rights 	<p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest and flooding are addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>Impacts on the wetland are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is discussed in Submission No 6</p>
942	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Wetlands support vegetation listed under TSC Act. * Wetland provides habitat for migratory birds protected under JAMBA and CAMBA. * As a signatory of the Ramsar convention, Australia is obliged to apply the principles of wise use to all wetlands. The proposal is not 'wise use'. * The wetlands provide ecological services in treating water discharging to the coast. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Ecology * Wetlands 	<p>Ecology is addressed in Submission No 8-825</p>
943	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Photomontage is misleading * Building on a flood plain * Riparian widths do not comply with DGRs * Aboriginal Cultural heritage has not been adequately considered. * Object to the use of Thomas Gibson Park for access to the development. * The APZ encroach on the Turpentine Forest. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Misleading images * Flood Plain * Aboriginal heritage * Use of Thomas Gibson Park * Turpentine Forest 	<p>Flooding, riparian corridors and impacts on the Turpentine Forest, including APZs, are discussed in Submission No 2</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is discussed in Submission No 6</p> <p>Loss of open space is discussed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Visual assessment is discussed in Submission No 884</p>
944	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal deviates significantly from accepted best practice guidelines, scientific knowledge and Government policies, advice and recommendations. * Many statements are unsubstantiated. * Significant irreversible harm will occur to the cultural and environmental attribute of the site as well as the downstream 7a and 8a zone and the beach. * Lack of sensitivity and understanding of Aboriginal issues. * Water quality treatment facilities need to be independently reviewed, especially considering their location within riparian zones. * Riparian corridors are much more reduced than recommended by several parties more are they wide enough to maintain the visual connection to the escarpment. * Extreme overdevelopment without providing adequate community facilities. * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Proposal will desecrate a women's site in the Turpentine Forest and Men's site in Thomas Gibson Park. * Impacts of proposal on riparian buffers. * Proposal will not provide essential infrastructure such as schools and hospital and will increase Traffic Congestion. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP. * 20m wide bridges proposed will not cope with flooding. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Deviation from best practice and guidelines * Ecology * Aboriginal heritage * Water quality treatment systems * Riparian corridors * overdevelopment * Infrastructure * Use of Thomas Gibson Park 	<p>Riparian corridors are discussed in Submission No 2</p> <p>Ecology is discussed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Over-development is discussed in Submission No 7</p> <p>The proposal has been developed using best practice guidelines and is presented in sufficient detail for the requirements of the current application. More details will be provided during the project planning stage.</p> <p>Water quality is addressed in Submission No 1752</p> <p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest, riparian buffers and flooding are addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>Traffic is addressed in Submission No 5</p> <p>COI recommendations, impacts on wetlands, infrastructure, building heights and loss of open space are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission Nos 6 and 8-825</p>

DoP Submission No	Nature	Comments/Issues Raised	Relevant Issues	Stockland/ARV Response
1546 - 1746 (201)	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Proposal does not consider NSW Coastal Policy or the COI recommendations for environmental protection of the coastal floodplain. * Proposal will impact on Turpentine Forest and water infrastructure will impact on floodplain wetlands. * Proposal will desecrate a women's site in the Turpentine Forest and Men's site in Thomas Gibson Park. * Impacts of proposal on riparian buffers. * Proposal will not provide essential infrastructure such as schools and hospital and will increase Traffic Congestion. * ARV proposal does not consider COI Aboriginal cultural heritage study or COI recommendations for protection of Turpentine Forest. * Building height exceeds 11m limit of Illawarra REP. * 20m wide bridges proposed will not cope with flooding. * Proposal will include loss of open space at Thomas Gibson Park for a road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * COI recommendations for environmental protection. * Impacts on Turpentine Forest. * Impacts on wetlands by infrastructure. * Riparian Buffers * Infrastructure provision. * Building heights. * Flooding and Loss of open space. * Signatures of 10 persons.. 	<p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest, riparian buffers and flooding are addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>Traffic is addressed in Submission No 5</p> <p>COI recommendations, impacts on wetlands, infrastructure, building heights and loss of open space are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission Nos 6 and 8-825</p>
1747	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Aboriginal heritage must be protected 		<p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission Nos 6 and 8-825</p>
1748	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The Stockland submission should identify the full extent of land identified as developable. * Mr Hannah seeks confirmation that the road running along the common boundary can provide future access to Hannah lands. * Hannah seeks clarification as to the powers of the Minister to provide access to Council owned land for site access. * Information is sent as to how stored stormwater is dispersed onto Mr Hannah's land and if the developer can ensure that additional stormwater volume and/or flow rates is not redirected onto his property 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Stormwater * Access * Public road over public parkland. * Residential area. 	<p>Stockland believes that the Charles Hill line as indicated on Figure 6 of the SSS study has been accurately transposed. However, Stockland have no objection to the Residential 2(b) zoning extending to reflect the current zone boundary under Wollongong LEP 1990.</p> <p>The road along the eastern boundary of the Concept Plan site adjoins the Ray Hannah land. This road will be a public road that could provide access to the adjacent land subject to negotiations.</p> <p>The Wrexham Road link is not part of the Concept Plan application, but is being resolved as a separate process with Wollongong City Council to change the classification of the land from community to operational.</p> <p>Stormwater from the site will discharge to the existing creeks. The extent of flooding eventuating is consistent with the Hewitts Creek Flood Risk Management Plan. ARV concept plan proposes that stormwater discharges will remain at or below pre-development levels, and water quality will be improved. Refer to EA Report.</p>
1749	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Destruction of Aboriginal Heritage. * Turpentine Forest must be protected * No road through Thomas Gibson Park * Sufficient riparian corridors to protect Aboriginal artefacts * Creek design should mimic natural form. * Flood risk. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Aboriginal Heritage * Turpentine Forest * Use of Thomas Gibson Park * Creek design * Flooding 	<p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest and riparian corridors are addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>Flood report is in EA report and Submission No's 2 and 905</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6</p> <p>Loss of open space is addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>The creeks have been designed to reflect a natural form, and the findings of the geomorphic assessment carried out by Dr Mark Taylor, Senior Lecturer in Environmental Science, Department of Physical Geography, Macquarie University are included in the DFP EA report and Issue 5 of the Response to Agency Submissions.</p>
1750	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Huy Report was not considered in the proposals. * No women were consulted in the Mary Dallas report. * The Turpentine Forest down to the ocean should be protected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Aboriginal Heritage * Turpentine Forest 	<p>Impacts on the Turpentine Forest are discussed in Submission No 2</p> <p>Stuart Huy's report was not finalised at the time of preparing the EA reports.</p> <p>Heritage has been addressed appropriately at this concept plan stage as described in section 7.4 of the EA report and in the statement of commitments as discussed in Submission No 6.</p>
1751	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Destroying ethnic cultural heritage is an act of cultural genocide in breach of the UN Draft Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Part III * The area bound by the railway, Wilkies track, McCauleys beach and Tramway Creek should be conserved. * Interpretive signage should be erected explaining the significance of the Women's area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Aboriginal rights * Interpretive signage 	<p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6</p> <p>The area suggested for conservation is not reflective of the findings contained in the Charles Hill report.</p> <p>Interpretive signage can reflect the Women's Area if this is an appropriate finding of future Heritage Studies..</p>
1752	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Conflict of interest in choice of some consultants used. * Requests independent survey of the site. * Significant flooding risks. * Inadequate water quality treatment. * Traffic congestion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Choice of consultants * Flooding * Water quality treatment * traffic 	<p>Consultants engaged have offered independent advice free of any conflict.</p> <p>Flooding is addressed in the EA Report and in Submission No 2.</p> <p>Traffic for the ARV & Stockland components of the Concept Plan is addressed in Submission No. 5 above.</p> <p>Water quality</p> <p>The system has been conceptually designed to meet current best practice pollution retention criteria and is based on the use of rainwater tanks, gross pollutant traps and biofiltration basins. Where feasible, swales and reduction in impervious areas will be incorporated into the design to reduce reliance on the basins as the primary treatment of the stormwater. The stormwater concept report clearly shows that the proposed treatment system meets the required pollution retention criteria.</p>
1753	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Col should not be ignored. * Government should buy back the land * Aboriginal artefacts destroyed. * Community not being listen to. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Government buy back * Aboriginal heritage * Respect for Community concerns 	<p>The Minister for Planning requested a review of the COI which is contained in the Charles Hill report and the recommendations of the Hill report have been referenced in the preparation of the Concept Plan.</p> <p>Concept plan respects the community and Col in providing a balanced planning outcome with a mix of housing on disturbed parts of the site, and zones for a regional park and environmental protection on less disturbed and environmentally sensitive parts of the site.</p>
1754	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The past land owner of the whole site should pay for the rehabilitation of Woodlands and Hewitts Creek. * Core riparian corridors have been cut back with no legitimate justification * Wider corridors are more self sustaining and therefore reduces long term maintenance requirements (and therefore costs) * There is a need to map the remnant vegetation as all mapping is now very out dated. * Flood flows underestimated. * Aboriginal Heritage not properly assessed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Riparian corridors * Ecology * Flooding * Aboriginal Heritage 	<p>Flooding and riparian corridors are discussed in Submission No 2</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is discussed in Submission No 6</p> <p>Additional mapping has been prepared and included with the Response to Agency Submissions.</p>
1755	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Thomas Gibson Park is overused and does not have capacity for the increase in population. * There is a desperate need for active open space in the area. * Disagrees with the use extension of Wrexham Rd 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Active Open Space * Use of Thomas Gibson Park 	<p>Issues addressed in Submission No's 8-825 above.</p>

DOP Submission No.	Nature	Comment/Issues Raised	Relevant Issues	Stockland/ARV Response
1756	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Sandton Point has provided an excellent opportunity for developing understanding between indigenous and non-indigenous Australians * It's a very important area for recreation and tourism. * The community feels very strongly about this area. Both the local and wider community in terms of the visitors. * Wetlands will vanish. * Flooding issues are to great to ignore. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Aboriginal understanding * Recreation and tourism * Wider community * Wetlands * Flooding 	<p>Tourism is addressed in Submission No 828</p> <p>Open space is addressed in Submission No 6</p> <p>Impacts on wetlands are addressed in Submission No 8-825</p> <p>Aboriginal cultural values of the site will continue to be considered and respected as the planning of the proposal progresses. Heritage has been addressed appropriately at this concept plan stage as described in section 7.4 of the EA report and in the statement of commitments.</p> <p>The concept plan will not jeopardise the recreational and tourism potential of the area, particularly with the extensive regional park proposed between the site and the coast.</p>
1757	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Loss of part of Thomas Gibson Park * Stress on roads * Increased risk of flooding * Loss of environmental and cultural rich place. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Thomas Gibson Park * Traffic * Flooding * Ecology * Aboriginal heritage 	<p>Flooding is addressed in Submission No 2</p> <p>Ecology is addressed in Submission No. 8-825 above.</p> <p>Traffic is addressed in Submission No. 5 above.</p> <p>Aboriginal heritage is addressed in Submission No 6</p> <p>Issues addressed in Submission No. 8-825 above.</p> <p>Timing and funding are matters for negotiation between the parties.</p>
1758	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The site has been zoned light industrial even though it is a heavy industrial business. * The best way forward is to relocate. However, there needs to be sufficient funds and / or assistance to ensure this. * An interim period of up to three years will be needed to facilitate the relocation once approval for redevelopment has been given. * Loss of local jobs is a concern 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Loss of local employment * Opportunities for relocation * Lag time of development to aid relocation 	<p>Employment is discussed in Submission No 865</p> <p>Support is noted.</p>
1759	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Want to make sure a future for its employees is secure, either on the current site or more likely relocated to an industrial site somewhere in the Ilwara. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Loss of local and associated jobs 	<p>Employment is discussed in Submission No 865</p> <p>Support is noted.</p>