

Summary of Issues Raised in 12 Public Submissions

Grouped by Colour Based on Similar Key Issues

Key Issue	Key Issues: Number of Instances Raised in Public Submissions Noting Multiple Issues/Considera tions Raised in Individual Submissions	Times Raised As a Percentage of All Submissions	Key Issues Importance Ranking Based on Number of Times Mentioned During All Submissions
Objection to Dwelling Density increase notwithstanding reduction in total lots (opposition to dual occupancy development) based on community views regarding keeping Tea Gardens as a 'village'.	3	25	9
In principle objection to number of additional dwellings being located in Tea Gardens having regard to the lack of village services and utilities available and the desire to keep Tea Gardens as a village. The proposed development presents lot sizes and associated densities which are better located on the outskirts of a 'major city'; not a small village like Tea Gardens	2	17	10
Objection to Biodiversity Impacts/Insufficient biodiversity offsets and credits for all displaced species/ Insufficient location and associated width of wildlife corridors/Impacts on both terrestrial and aquatic fauna and flora ecology/Insufficient surveys of both fauna and flora: further survey required	12	100	1

Cat Ownership (Support for Exclusion of Cats)	10	83	2
Objection to boardwalk: associated impacts on conservation	4	33	8
Objection to any type of fencing which will injure native wildlife, particularly gliders and bats etc. Given the particular wildlife in the area, prohibit barbed wire fencing?	2	17	10
Insufficient Ecosystem Credits. Offsets should be provided on site wherever possible and appropriate.	2	17	10
Objection to Traffic Modelling: No account of traffic during holiday periods/ Does not reflect revised number of dwellings despite reduction in residential lots (935).	9	75	3
Inadequacy of Bushfire Report/Associated Considerations including perimeter roads and associated egress	7	58	5
Groundwater Impacts Not Adequately Addressed	2	17	10
Objection to BioFiltration Swales: no details of implementation or maintenance available – associated engineering standards	1	8	11
Objection to methodology and detail of Integrated Water Management Strategy: Requests indemnification of Myall Quays Community Association	1	8	11
Objection to Water Management Generally	1	8	11
Plan Detail Insufficient (General)	1	8	11
Outstanding Matters Generally/Unanswered Questions including Uncertainty around Future Use of EcoTourism Precinct	8	67	4
Limited extent of community consultation: associated objection	4	33	8
Use of Section 94 to fund roadworks: questions about the inability to collect enough funds and build intersection(s)/ other physical road formation prior to it being required as a result of increases in traffic volumes.	3	25	9
No Statement of Commitments Provided	3	25	9

Validity of Maps questioned based on proper consideration of Biodiversity Matters. New maps should be provided	2	17	10
Inadequate Planning Relationship with Durness	1	8	11
New Application Required: Modified Concept Plan is too dissimilar to the original	1	8	11
Objection to Fill Material (composition and source, being Hunter Quarry): Suggestions, in part, that it should come from the Myall River to remove sand which requires dredging: more sustainable than provision from Hunter Quarry and associated win-win situation provided	6	50	6
Inadequacy of Social Infrastructure in Tea Gardens/neighbouring localities to support additional population caused by this development	2	17	10
Excavation/Bulk Earthworks Too Extensive/Unexplained	2	17	10
Cycleway Improvements Required (extent across total Riverside Development and Associated Construction Standard)	1	8	11
Development Screening Insufficient: Requires landscaping to ensure that all built development is not visible from the Myall Way (keep existing vegetation but, importantly), add to the density of landscaping that already exists	1	8	11
Objection to Entrance Gateway/Signage	1	8	11
Objection to Traffic Access from Toonang Drive	5	42	7
Traffic Safety Concerns	3	25	9
Road Safety Concerns	3	25	9
Road Speed (Prescribed)Concerns	3	25	9
Road Upgrading Required, including Intersection with Toonang Drive	2	17	10
Associated Overland Flow: Issues on Neighbouring/Downstream Properties	2	17	10
Objection to Visual Impact of Proposed New Development, particularly the notion of viewing any urban development from the Myall Way. Retain existing pines and substantially add to the	1	8	11

density of existing vegetation fronting the Myall Way. Aim for planting that will totally visually screen urban development. This is a major tourist thoroughfare and visual gateway to Tea Gardens. Important that fencing, washing lines, urban housing etc. is screened. If such was visible would detract, immensely, from the village atmosphere of Tea Gardens. People come to Tea Gardens to enjoy a sense of simplicity, relaxation and quiet, Public do not do not wish to see more and more urban development; that is what they are trying to escape. That is Tea Gardens' comparative advantage; don't destroy that.			
Objection to Construction Dust Impacts	1	8	11
Associated Flooding Impacts: On Downstream Properties	1	8	11
Traffic Speed Concerns	1	8	11
Construction Traffic Impact Concerns -Dust and Safety	1	8	11
Concerns Around Construction Damage to Local Roads	1	8	11

Note: 12 submissions in total, all in objection notwithstanding 1 submission in favour of boardwalk (Part of 1 submission only)