

Given the infrastructure in the surrounding area/s, the initial proposal seems excessive let alone the modified version which would see an increase.

I understand once developed and sold, the developer will lose the opportunity to gain further profit from this development, however this should not be the reason for making or accepting the modification and nor is this in the public's best interest.

Turning to the 'benefits' listed, it refers to taller buildings being in the town centre. I do not see this as a benefit, with taller buildings being the issue itself. The fact a building is identifiable does not define a quality or a benefit. We are not suggesting building an iconic structure here, it is simply an apartment/hotel building and other taller buildings. Prior developer submissions (sales pitches) have used the natural resources of the area as being what would draw people to this area, not the building of a taller structure. This alleged benefit is suggesting the taller buildings will become structures that tourists will travel to see, aligning the proposed buildings with other buildings worthy of such a claim. The modified proposal does not provide any scope that this is in any way a remote possibility, and simply put, we see the request for an already taller, out of place building/s to be made taller.

With reference to open space and enjoyment of the local area, I again refer to the developers' prior submissions in which they refer to the local environment offering this.

Better location of community centres etc. suggests the plan was flawed to start with. Relocating it will benefit those who reside closer to the proposed area, yet be further from those where it is expected to be located now. This is therefore as much a con, as it is a pro.

In terms of attracting people to Shell Cove, are they suggesting the current plan will not do that. As it appears this premise for the entire development was to provide precisely that. This is a broad statement, bring more people to Shell Cove. What data analysis was completed to form this view and is this available for the public to comment on, either for or against? I suspect not, as I would hold the view this is simply a sweeping statement, with no supportive data. To that end, I suggest the proposal also include a statue of a Sea Gull be placed in the centre of the water district as it will bring in a further 10,000 people per annum.

Finally, we talk about the success of the waterfront as being a benefit. I did not realise we were dealing in success or failure. Perhaps they should have provided that in prior sales sessions, letting buyers know the entire thing could fail. Again, I would be curious to see the data surrounding such a brilliant statement. Perhaps as Detroit was failing, someone should have mentioned to them to simply build taller buildings - success!!

The last benefit listed refers to more housing in walkable distance to amenities etc. This seems to be a given, seeing as though they propose to build more houses in the town centre. It would be a fact, but not necessarily a benefit.

The major negative (apart from those listed) is the sales for all property to date has been on the proviso the centre would be a particular way - changing it at this late stage has the perception of being deceitful and not in the best interest of the direct Shell Cove residents and the wider community.