

J - Response to Community (Exhibition)

J - RESPONSE TO COMMUNITY (EXHIBITION)

REVIEW OF PUBLIC SUBMISSION - (AS SUMMARISED BY DOP)

Threatened Species (See B.1)

- Impacts on threatened species. Assessment of significance done for all relevant species.
- Flying fox camp not threatened.
- No impact on Moonee Quassia, Beadles Grevillea and Scented Acronychal recovery plan.
- Assessments carried out as requested by DOP.
- Threatened species habitat addressed.

Endangered Ecological Communities (See B.1)

- No unacceptable impact likely on EEC's.
- Edge treatments carefully considered by means of design, management and buffers where necessary.

Vegetation Clearing (See B.1)

- The proposal will result in permanent conservation of 80,000m² of vegetated site and no fragmentation.
- The proposal clearly articulates areas of clearing required for bushfire protection, bio-retention, parklands and walking trails and these do not create additional clearing requirements of conservation areas.
- Trees will be preserved within development precincts.

Wildlife Corridors (See B.1)

- The corridor is protected along creek lines which in reality is the only functional area in the long term (with highway duplication and clearing to west of highway).
- RTA has proposed one (1) only culvert underpass under the highway on northern watercourse and they will "investigate" possible bridge crossing. The proposal suggests north and south underpasses as corridors and bridges as required for canopy species.
- 30 threatened species will be able to continue using E-W corridor at creek underpasses as per RTA and then some.

Key Threatening Processes (See B.1)

- These processes are covered in detail in Section B.1 which discusses clearing, weeds, pest species, loss of HBT's, feral animals at length and concludes that impacts are minimal.

Protection of the Site

- The proponents agree that the bulk of the site should be protected (75% plus in the Preferred Project Plan) and that this might be done either by dedication or Community Title management.
- Purchase does not seem to be an option.

Environmental Protection/Biodiversity Act

- Tests carried out where relevant.

Other Ecological Impacts (See B.1)

- Edge effects incorporated into design.
- Walkways provide controlled access to beach resource and can be managed. Negative impacts exist at the moment from

unauthorised access.

Adequacy Flora and Fauna Assessment

- Assessments were carried out by professionals and extended where appropriate to cover recommendations by DOP and DECC.

Impacts on Moonee Estuary, SEP 14 Wetland and Marine Park

- No impacts expected on Marine Park.
- 100m buffer is not required around SEP 14 wetland, endangered communities and Sugar Mill Creek.
- Stormwater runoff is managed.
- Sizing of detention ponds will be carried out as part of DA process.
- Gross pollution traps will be included where necessary.
- Riparian zones of all creeks retained beyond 50m.

Flooding, Climate Change Sea Level Rises

- Addressed in Section B5.

Urban Design

- Infill development not sprawl.
- Not ribbon development.
- Will not destroy green space between Sapphire and Moonee Beach.
- Single dwellings only in preferred plan.
- No evidence that rear lanes facilitate crime.

Aboriginal Cultural Heritage

- Aboriginal Land Council has been consulted.

Planning

- Development is appropriate for existing zoning. No density control in Moonee DCP which does not apply to this site.

Traffic and Access

- Similar car reliance to the rest of coastal development in Coffs and elsewhere.
- Highway access temporary and to be negotiated with RTA.
- Highway can cope with additional traffic.

Over Development

- The proposal is not "over development".
- Coastal land is still in demand.

Social Impacts

- The proposed social impacts are absolute nonsense and not based on fact or evidence but on prejudice.

Ecologically Sustainable Development

- The development can employ sustainable technologies in excess of most development in the region.
- The precautionary principle is employed regularly by

J - RESPONSE TO COMMUNITY (EXHIBITION)

opponents of development in case they don't win the argument with facts.

Infrastructure

- Council advise that infrastructure is available.
- S94 contribution can be negotiated with Council.

Consultation

- Documentation of correspondence with government authorities not required.

Bushfire

- Bushfire assessment included in Section B6 and appendices.

Visual Amenity

- Scenic amenity will not be "destroyed" and in fact will be little changed except for people on the site or at Green Point.

FROM DOP.

ATTACHMENT 1 – PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS

Summary of Public Submissions (94 submissions received in objection)

	Comments
<p>Ecology</p> <p><u>Threatened Species</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal will have unacceptable impacts on many threatened species that use the site. In particular, these species include Rusty Plum, Moonee Quassia, Swift Parrot, Regent Honeyeater, Green-thighed Frog, Giant Barred Frog, Yellow-bellied Glider, Squirrel Glider, Grey-headed Flying Fox, Spotted Tailed Quoll, Koala, Common Planigale, Black Flying Fox, Osprey, Square-tailed Kite, Black Necked Stork, Eastern Blossom Bat, Little Bent-wing Bat, East Coast Freetail Bat, Yellow Bellied Sheathail Bat, Large Footed Myotis, Rose Crowned Fruit Dove, Wompoo Fruit Dove, Grass Owl, Yellow Tailed and Glossy Black Cockatoo. Assessments of significance should be undertaken for all of these species. There is a Grey-headed Flying Fox camp in the area of the subject site. The development will conflict with this camp. The proposal has the potential to impact the recovery planning for the threatened Moonee Quassia, Beadle's Grevillea and Scented Acronychia. Assessments of significance have only been undertaken for threatened species recorded on site. Assessments should also be undertaken for species with a high or moderate potential to occur on site. The EA does not address the impacts of the proposal on threatened species habitat. <p><u>Endangered Ecological Communities (EECs)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area is the single most biodiverse and ecologically significant private property along the Coffs Coast with large areas comprising eight EECs listed under the NSW Threatened Species Conservation Act and the development will have an unacceptable impact upon these EECs. The proposal does not adopt the 50m buffers to EECs proposed by Sainty. <p><u>Vegetation Clearing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal will result in the clearing of over 240,000 m² and fragmentation of vegetation on the site The proposal does not properly address the amount of vegetation clearing that would be required for bushfire protection measures, bioretention swales, parklands, walking tracks. The EA states that trees will be preserved within the development precincts but once the blocks are sold, most of the trees will be removed <p><u>Wildlife Corridor</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> South Moonee Forest is a critical landscape from the viewpoint of landscape connectivity. The Forest is a crucial component of the last regional habitat corridor on Coffs Harbour's Northern Beaches area. This corridor links forests from the Great Escarpment and foothill forests to the coast and is known to be occupied by many species of threatened fauna, including koala. This habitat corridor is recognised by government departments. It requires protection and restoration. The Roads & Traffic Authority have identified this site as a major wildlife corridor. As such they have planned for measures to facilitate the migration of 	

MP05_0064, Moonee Waters

wildlife across the Highway west of the site.

- Over 30 threatened species have been documented using the east-west corridor.

Key Threatening Processes (KTPs)

- The proposal will result in a number of KTPs such as clearing of native vegetation, introduction of pest fauna species and loss of hollow bearing trees.
- The proposal will increase the feral animal populations leading to predation on the threatened species on site.
- The EA does not give full consideration to the number, location and size of tree hollows present within the study area and the likely impacts to hollow dependent threatened fauna from the loss of hollows due to the proposal.

Protection of the Site

- The site should be protected by adding it to Moonee Nature Reserve or the Coffs Coast Regional Park
- The site could be purchased using funding from the Coastal Lands Protection Scheme, Natural Heritage Trust, local council environmental levies and section 94 contributions.

Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act)

- The EA does not include tests of significance for threatened species and communities listed under the EPBC Act. Tests of significance should be undertaken in accordance with the EPBC Act Policy and Administrative Guidelines.

Other Ecological Impacts

- The proposal will result in edge effects
- The proposed walkways through the conservation area will result in additional ecological impacts such as increases in pollution, increased erosion, introduction of weeds, disturbance of native fauna, trampling of flora, dumping of garden refuse, creation of additional informal tracks, increase in pest animals and domestic animals leading to an increase in predation by foxes and dogs and cats.

Adequacy of Flora and Fauna Assessment

- The ecological survey carried out was inadequate and of a poor standard. The surveys were not undertaken in accordance with DECC's Threatened Species Survey Guidelines.
- The assessment fails to recognise the significance of fauna species listed as vulnerable under the Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995 (TSC Act) stating that they are "therefore of somewhat less concern".
- The ecological surveys carried out were not conducted at the appropriate time of year. Further, they were carried out in drought conditions and as such the surveys must be carried out again in the appropriate season and conditions.
- Appropriate trapping techniques were not employed for the Spotted-tailed Quoll.
- Proper survey and assessment for amphibians was not undertaken. No frog call backs were carried out.
- Appendix 3 of the Flora and Fauna Assessment states that the bat survey is not adequate. Further survey efforts should be made.
- Owl play back calls should have been carried out in more than two places on the site.
- The EA does not identify Koala distribution and movement patterns across the site.
- Appendix 1 of the Flora and Fauna Assessment does not address all identified vegetation communities.

MP05_0064, Moonee Waters

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The survey for hollow bearing trees only covered 5ha of the site. A larger area of the site should have been surveyed. • The flora and fauna assessment does not specify the time of the diurnal surveys. • The spotlighting undertaken for the Flora and Fauna Assessment was only undertaken along existing access tracks. This is poor practice. • The ecological survey was undertaken by a consultant based on the south coast of NSW. The survey should have been undertaken by a local consultant.
<p>Impacts on Moonee Creek Estuary, SEPP 14 wetland and Solitary Island Marine Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The entire property forms part of the Moonee Creek catchment of the Solitary Islands Marine Park and any development would lead to impacts on the system including increased sediment and nutrient loads, domestic pests, garden weeds and increased traffic. This catchment is already recognised as being 'highly stressed'. • A buffer of 100m is required around the SEPP 14 wetland, Endangered Ecological Communities and Sugar Mill Creek. • Stormwater runoff from the development has the potential to impact on seagrasses and mangroves. • No studies have been carried out to assess Stingray and Sugar Mill Creeks which are naturally very low nutrient water bodies. • The EA does not describe the capacity of the proposed detention ponds. If they are not sized adequately, runoff from the development will flow directly to Moonee Creek Estuary. • The development should include measures other than the detention ponds to control water quality, such as gross pollutant traps. • The riparian zones of all waterways should be retained for a width of at least 50m.
<p>Flooding, Climate Change and Sea Level Rise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development is subject to flooding and climate change will worsen this. The development does not adequately consider future sea level rises when considering the impacts of flooding. • The trees on the site are important for carbon storage. They should not be removed.
<p>Urban Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will result in urban sprawl. • The proposal will result in continuous ribbon development along this section of the coast. • The proposal will destroy the green space separating Sapphire Beach and Moonee Beach. • The density of dwellings proposed is too high, only single dwellings should be constructed. • The provision of rear lane access is not supported as it facilitates crime.
<p>Aboriginal Cultural Heritage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is an important site for Aboriginal cultural heritage. Specifically for the Bagawa people of the Gumbayngirr nation.
<p>Planning</p> <p><u>Strategic Planning</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development of the site is contrary to draft LEP amendment no. 24, the Moonee Development Control Plan, the Coffs Harbour Settlement Strategy and the Coffs Harbour City Council draft vegetation strategy

MP05_0064, Moonee Waters

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development exceeds the density control in the Moonee DCP. <u>Statutory Planning</u> The development does not comply with the objectives of SEPP 71. 	
Traffic and Access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development will be heavily reliant on the car. The two temporary accesses onto the Pacific Highway will be dangerous and are unacceptable. The Pacific Highway cannot cope with the additional traffic from this development. 	
Overdevelopment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development is a gross overdevelopment of the site There is enough land in the Moonee Beach area being developed. 	
Social Impacts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal will increase the population of Moonee Beach leading to increased theft and violence This proposal will impact further on unemployment in the Coffs Harbour area. The development will place additional pressure on existing local facilities such as hospitals and police. The development does not propose to provide additional community facilities. The proposal should address potential social impacts such as reduced swimming opportunities due to increased water pollution and impacts on recreational fishing. 	
Ecologically Sustainable Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development is not environmentally sustainable. The development does not comply with the precautionary principle. 	
Infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is not enough infrastructure to service the proposal. The proponent should pay section 94 contributions so that Council can provide local services. 	
Consultation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EA does not document correspondence undertaken with relevant government agencies. 	
Bushfire <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The whole site is classified as "Category 1 Bushfire Prone Vegetation" as indicated by the Coffs Harbour Certified Bushfire Land Map. This issue has not been adequately addressed as the proposed Asset Protection Zones are not large enough and the roads may not allow adequate access for emergency services. 	
Visual Amenity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal will destroy the scenic amenity of the area. 	