

I live in Shell Cove have always been a firm supporter of the Shell Cove project. The original approved concept plan did seem rather dense at the time of approval, however I thought that with some careful design controls the development could be sympathetic to the surroundings and enhance the Shellharbour area. I understood that some level of density was required to make the project viable and allow it to progress. Since that approval land prices have escalated more than anyone would have predicted and land demand in shell cove is so high that it is sold by ballot. There could not be any case for making the development more financially viable unless some very big mistakes were made in earlier financial plans.

This new section 75W modification seems very inappropriate and I suggest, is only be driven by a desire by the developers for more profit. The proposed changes do not appear to add anything for residents or tourists to the area and if anything detract from the appeal by causing more shadowing, more congestion, more car parking around surrounding streets and a reduction in views and vistas. I don't see anything in the proposal aimed at 'public interest' or any reasonable justification for changes, in the submission or in the attachments. The proposal only seems to reduce benefit to future users and residents and to those people who have already invested in the area and have done so on the basis of current approved plans.

Specifically I comment as follows:

The density and massing in the development is not sympathetic to any of the surrounding areas such as Shellharbour village and Kiama.

The new hotel location to the north of the public square, together with its extra height causes extreme shadowing to public spaces. This is most significant in winter where sunlight is lost from mid-day. I believe that this is very poor planning practice and will reduce the amenity of the area significantly.

Any of the apartments constructed to the north of public open space should be minimised in height so as not to reduce any sunlight in these important areas.

There is no extra car parking proposed despite a massive increase in residences and hotel accommodation. Even the current car parking provision is unlikely to be adequate and I fear that there will be informal car parking on the sides of narrow residential street and possibly in open space areas. Some car parking control should be put in the residential streets to prevent this.

Usable open space has not been increased despite an increase of 328 residences (26% increase). Usable open space should at least be increased by this amount if there is to be no reduction in amenity to residents.

There is a reduction in views and vistas generally. All roads directed towards the harbour should have a vista of the marina and therefore any apartment developments should have wide spaces at these locations.

The area identified as 'northern lands' does need some attention/development but not necessarily all building development.

The conclusion to the Ethos Urban report recommends the changes on the basis of 'planning merits' but does not clarify any of these 'merits'. It merely states the losses in solar access, open space provision and parking.

In summary, I do not support any of the proposed changes and see no justification for any of them except developer profit.

I am keen to see this project be a success and an icon for Shellharbour so please take my comments as positive criticism intended in the best interests of all future users and owners, as well as current owners and investors who have made decisions based on current approved plans.