

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS

No.	Date Received	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary	Response
1	06/09/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about cumulative impacts of Rose Groups and Coal and Allied's development on Gwandalan. Concerned that the resources of the Central Coast will be used to support a development that is identified in the Hunter Strategy. Wyong Shire is now in its 6th year of water restrictions. Concerned that there will not be enough water for a further housing development. Gwandalan has no industry to support employment Not enough infrastructures to deal with current population. In particular emergency services – the nearest ambulance is 14km away in Doyalson and the nearest police station is 22km away in Toukley. Access road to Gwandalan is in a poor state of disrepair and barely copes with current traffic pressure. Concerned about the extra traffic load on the Pacific Highway intersection Gwandalan is an isolated and quiet village – concerned about the impacts on the peace and quiet. Would like to see all of the land returned to National Parks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cumulative impacts with Coal and Allied proposal Water Employment Infrastructure Emergency services Traffic Amenity Land se 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic and service issues have been examined on a cumulative basis Hunter Water will supply water to Catherine Hill Bay. The Gwandalan site will be supplied from the Kanangra Reservoir. The development is consistent with the Draft Central Coast Regional Strategy The Hunter and Central Coast regions have robust labour markets Emergency service issues can be managed within the scope of the contributions schedule but are matters for the State Government The developer contributions schedule allows funding for roads Discussions are underway with the RTA about upgrades to pacific highway intersections at Catherine Hill Bay The Gwandalan development is in keeping with the current community A high proportion of the site is being returned to National Parks
2-	14/09/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acknowledge that this Proposal in an improvement Still builds and will be highly prominent on headlands Inconsistent with Government's own coastal policy Should be considered with the Coal Allied Development for Middle Camp Will Increase size of town tenfold Significant Impact on the numbers of cars Currently each developer is proposing access strategies to the Pacific Highway that contradict each other Development Proposal exceeds the development potential agreed in the MO 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land se Traffic Traffic Access MO 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no development on the headland The development is consistent with the coastal policy as outlined in Appendix T of the EA Traffic and service issues have been examined on a cumulative basis Impact on Catherine Hill Bay village has been minimised Traffic will be within applicable standards and efforts are being made to minimise the impact on the existing village by routing traffic from the development in and out via Montefiore Street Accesses to the Pacific highway are being negotiated ointly with RTA Development complies with MO
9-16 19-4 1	12/09/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ob ect to the development of the Gwandalan site. The only access road into Gwandalan (Kanangra Driver) cannot handle the level of today's traffic, let alone the possible increase of no less than 100 cars. There is limited public transport available to Gwandalan. There is a lack of infrastructure. In particular, there have been Level 4 water restrictions for the last 3 years. Further development would cause further strain in the water supply. There is a lack of medical care – only one doctor and a locum to serve the community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic Water Infrastructure Medical services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic levels will be within applicable standards Provision is being made for public transport. More population will increase the viability of services The development is consistent with the Draft Central Coast Regional Strategy which has been informed by water planning for the Central Coast. Water Plan 2050 sets out a program to secure the region's water supply Increased population will assist to attract services.
17	17/09/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deliberate attempt to misinform the department The Concept Plan provides incorrect figure for the number of Mining cottages 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> misinformed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There has been no attempt at misinformation at any level.
1	17/09/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building on headland is inconsistent with NSW Coastal Policy and guidelines. Proposed houses on headland are highly visible from beach and parts of village. IHAP made it clear that commercial development should be for daily convenience needs, not 9 shops with shop top housing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coastal Policy Visual impacts IHAP recommendations Commercial development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no development on the headland The development is consistent with the coastal policy as outlined in Appendix T of the EA Every effort has been made to minimise the visual impact of the development. Commercial development will be for daily convenience needs.
19-4 1	12/09/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ob ect to the development of the Gwandalan site. The only access road into Gwandalan (Kanangra Driver) cannot handle the level of today's traffic, let alone the possible increase of no less than 100 cars. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic Water Infrastructure Medical services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic levels will be within applicable standards Provision is being made for public transport. More population will increase the viability of services The development is consistent with the Draft Central Coast Regional Strategy

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is limited public transport available to Gwandalan. • There is a lack of infrastructure. In particular, there have been Level 4 water restrictions for the last 3 years. Further development would cause further strain in the water supply. • There is a lack of medical care – only one doctor and a locum to serve the community. 		<p>which has been informed by water planning for the Central Coast. Water Plan 2050 sets out a program to secure the region's water supply</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased population will assist to attract services.
4 2	/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is there open space in the middle of the road – is this the only space where children can play • Wildlife corridor is also used as a bike path, walking path, has 2 playgrounds at either end, crosses 7 roads and is to be lit at night time. • Developer says offsets on the other side of Lake Macquarie will compensate for biodiversity loss but cannot see how this will work. • There is not an adequate firebreak between Point Wollstonecraft and the proposed development. • Thew new proposal has only 1 road in and out which creates a fire trap. • New residents will be isolated from rest of the community. The only access is past the school and there is no need for other residents to venture up this road. • Rosecorp should be made to provide public access to the waterfront as this is Government Policy. • The proposal should be re ected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open Space • Wildlife Corridor • Bushfire • Isolated community • Public waterfront access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • The proposed development fully complies with RFS guidelines • There are three ingress and egress points. • The development is in keeping with the existing community • There is no waterfront land included in the Gwandalan proposal
4 3	4/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The population increase form this development and the Coal and Allied development will change the make up of the town. • The environmental issues raised by this development cannot be ignored. To say the issues will be replaced by offsets on the other side of Crangan Bay is irresponsible. • Hopes the proposal is re ected so that the residents can en oy the peace and ambience of our town. • Is not a significant site and should not be included in the Lower Hunter Region. • No connection between Gwandalan and Catherine Hill Bay proposals and so they should not be grouped together. • Not close to transport. • Non-existent local obs. • Could be assessed by Wyong Council. • Change from original Precinct 1A makes it impossible to evaluate the outcome. Dividing original Precinct 1A will enable regulations regarding foreshore access to be bypassed. • No proper significance to watercourses. • nacceptable that drainage is provided on land not under consideration as no control of the system is possible. • Site will be totally cleared. • No consideration of threatened species. • Does not meet the requirements of the Review Panel. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Character • Environment • Significant site status • Transport • Employment • Consent authority • Watercourses • Drainage • Foreshore access • Clearing • Threatened species • Review Panel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development will be in keeping with the existing character of Gwandalan • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • The roads are designed so that bus services are accommodated within 400m of any residence • The Hunter and Central Coast regions have robust labour markets • Exclusion of precinct containing existing dwelling was done at the Panel's request • There are no natural perennial waterways on the site, post and pre development flows will be equalised so there will be no impact on the lake • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • Clearing is fully offset
4 4	4/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developer says pro ect is consistent with the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy. There is no mention of Gwandalan in the Strategy apart from an inset map. There is no mention of Wyong Shire and the table on page 27 does not include Wyong. Is not a significant site and should not be included in the Lower Hunter Region. • Gwandalan is in the Wyong Shire and increased population will affect this area, not the Lower Hunter. • The population increase would be 500 which would represent 17.25 increase from this development alone. There are a number of holiday homes and vacant land in Gwandalan which will most likely become permanent homes within the next 5-10years so this could be another 15 increase in population. • Believe Wyong Council would be consent authority as they have the local knowledge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower Hunter Regional Strategy • Population increase • Consent authority • Bushfire • Waterways • Panel requirements • Significant site status • Transport • Employment • Watercourses • Drainage • Foreshore access • Clearing • Threatened species 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal is consistent with both the Lower Hunter and the Draft Central Coast Regional Strategies • There is no waterfront land included in the Gwandalan proposal • There are no natural perennial waterways on the site • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • Stormwater flows to the lake will match pre and post development flows • The proposed development fully complies with RFS guidelines • The Hunter and Central Coast regions have robust labour markets • The roads are designed so that bus services are accommodated within 400m of any residence • Clearing is fully offset

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rosecorp should be made to provide public access to the waterfront as this is Government Policy and every other part of Gwandalan allows it. • Residents could be totally isolated from rest of town if development remains enclosed. Residents could be trapped in the case of a bushfire. • There are three waterways on the Gwandalan site that have been ignored and will be lost when clearing commences causing run off into the lake that is already silting up from previous developments. They should be given adequate riparian zones and setbacks • Plan does not address requirements set by the Independent Panel. • No connection between Gwandalan and Catherine Hill Bay proposals and so they should not be grouped together. • Not close to transport. • Non-existent local obs. • Change from original Precinct 1A makes it impossible to evaluate the outcome. Dividing original Precinct 1A will enable regulations regarding foreshore access to be bypassed. • No proper significance to watercourses. • unacceptable that drainage is provided on land not under consideration as no control of the system is possible. • Site will be totally cleared. • No consideration of threatened species. 		
4 5	4/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is there open space in the middle of the road – is this the only space where children can play • Wildlife corridor is also used as a bike path, walking path, has 2 playgrounds at either end, crosses 7 roads and is to be lit at night time. • Developer says offsets on the other side of Lake Macquarie will compensate for biodiversity loss but cannot see how this will work. • There is not an adequate firebreak between Point Wollstonecraft and the proposed development. • Thew new proposal has only 1 road in and out which creates a fire trap. • New residents will be isolated from rest of the community. The only access is past the school and there is no need for other residents to venture up this road. • Rosecorp should be made to provide public access to the waterfront as this is Government Policy. • The proposal should be re ected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open Space • Wildlife Corridor • Bushfire • Isolated community • Public waterfront access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • The proposed development fully complies with RFS guidelines • There are three ingress and egress points. • The development is in keeping with the existing community • There is no waterfront land included in the Gwandalan proposal
4 6	4/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is inappropriate to plant exotic trees in an area surrounded by natural bush. • The offset lands are not near the township of Gwandalan. The bush in Gwandalan will be destroyed with no replacement. • There is no provision for public access along the waterfront. This does not comply with SEPP 71 Coastal Protection and Wyong Council's policy to provide waterfront access during rezoning. • Proposed wildlife corridor is inappropriate as it is also to be used as a pedestrian/cycle way and contains 2 playgrounds. This area is 10m wide and crosses 7 roads. It is inappropriate. • Developer claims development is ustified as it is the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy and Draft CCRS and claim that there is a need for residential development. • The LHRS shows Gwandalan only as an insert map after the deals with the developer were done. • The proposal should be re ected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exotic Trees • Offset Lands • Public waterfront access • Community parkland or open space • Lower Hunter Regional Strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscaping will be carefully controlled to use native species wherever possible. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC but more is being retained based on changes in the PPR • There is no waterfront land included in the Gwandalan proposal • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Proposal is consistent with both the Lower Hunter and the Draft Central Coast Regional Strategies
4 7	26/9/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no provision for public access along the waterfront. This does not comply with SEPP 71 Coastal Protection and Wyong Council's policy to provide waterfront access during rezoning. • Developer claims that there are no perennial watercourses on the site. Who will undertake maintenance of the drainage water and sewerage pump – they are not accessible to the public. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public waterfront access • Waterways • Environment • Wildlife Corridors • Offset Lands • Exotic Tree • Lower Hunter Regional 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land included in the Gwandalan proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The natural bush will be destroyed to cut and fill for blocks. • Proposed wildlife corridor is inappropriate as it is also to be used as a pedestrian/cycle way and contains 2 playgrounds. This area is 10m wide and crosses 7 roads. It is inappropriate. • The offset lands are not near the township of Gwandalan. The bush in Gwandalan will be destroyed with no replacement. • 	<p>Strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community parkland or open space 	
4	3/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledge that this proposal is a significant improvement on the previous one. • Development still builds and will be highly prominent on the Catherine Hill Bay Headland. This is inconsistent with the NSW Government's own coastal policy, which is supposed to protect the remaining coastal headlands. • Rose Group's proposal must be considered in tandem with the Coal and Allied proposal for Middle Camp. Together these proposals will increase the size of the own tenfold (100 to 1,000 houses) and will have a significant increase in number of cars. Traffic issues, in particular the access to Pacific Highway, which each developer is has a contradictory strategy. • The Mo state clearly that the maximum quantity of development is 600 dwellings. The IHAP made it clear that commercial development should be "only for daily convenience needs (general store or the like)" This does not mean 600 houses 9 shops shoptop housing tourism accommodation apartments in the bin building on the headland. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coastal Policy • Cumulative impacts • Traffic • Mo • Overdevelopment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no development on the headland • The development is consistent with the coastal policy as outlined in Appendix T of the EA • Traffic and service issues have been examined on a cumulative basis • Accesses to the Pacific highway are being negotiated ointly with RTA • Development complies with MO
4 9	4/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is there open space in the middle of the road – is this the only space where children can play • Wildlife corridor is also used as a bike path, walking path, has 2 playgrounds at either end, crosses 7 roads and is to be lit at night time. • Developer says offsets on the other side of Lake Macquarie will compensate for biodiversity loss but cannot see how this will work. • There is not an adequate firebreak between Point Wollstonecraft and the proposed development. • Thew new proposal has only 1 road in and out which creates a fire trap. • New residents will be isolated from rest of the community. The only access is past the school and there is no need for other residents to venture up this road. • Rosecorp should be made to provide public access to the waterfront as this is Government Policy. • The proposal should be re ected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open Space • Wildlife Corridor • Bushfire • Isolated community • Public waterfront access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • The proposed development fully complies with RFS guidelines • There are three ingress and egress points. • The development is in keeping with the existing community • There is no waterfront land included in the Gwandalan proposal •
490	4/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developer says pro ect is consistent with the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy. There is no mention of Gwandalan in the Strategy apart from an inset map. There is no mention of Wyong Shire and the table on page 27 does not include Wyong. • Gwandalan is in the Wyong Shire and increased population will affect this area, not the Lower Hunter. • The population increase would be 500 which would represent 17.25 increase from this development alone. There are a number of holiday homes and vacant land in Gwandalan which will most likely become permanent homes within the next 5-10years so this could be another 15 increase in population. • Believe Wyong Council would be consent authority as they have the local knowledge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower Hunter Regional Strategy • Population increase • Consent authority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal is consistent with both the Lower Hunter and the Draft Central Coast Regional Strategies
491	27/09/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rosecorp should be made to provide public access to the waterfront as this is Government Policy and every other part of Gwandalan allows it. • Residents could be totally isolated from rest of town if development remains enclosed. Residents could be trapped in the case of a bushfire. • There are three waterways on the Gwandalan site that have been ignored and will be lost when clearing commences causing run off into the lake that is already silting up from previous developments. They should be 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bushfire • Waterways • Panel requirements • Wildlife corridors • Inadequacy of environmental assessment • Open space 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • The proposed development fully complies with RFS guidelines • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • Stormwater flows to the lake will match pre and post development flows • There are three ingress and egress points.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> given adequate riparian zones and setbacks Plan does not address requirements set by the Independent Panel. The new proposal has only 1 road in and out which creates a fire trap. Poor street layout No wildlife corridors no vegetation corridors within the site No delineated proposal to retain significant trees Open space is within the middle of roads Environmental assessment should be more rigorous and carried out over 12 months. <i>Tetratheca juncea</i> has not been protected although there have been 17 plants found across the site. Wyong Council submission 2006 states that over 100 plants need to be protected as it is of high conservation value. Rose Group is still trying to get land rezoned which is on one title but only getting rezoned for 1 ha. The independent body and Wyong Council recommend 150 home sites. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Conservation (significant trees, <i>tetratheca juncea</i>) Overdevelopment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offsets have been agreed with DECC New Threatened species surveys have been carried out on the site to ensure compliance with EPBC requirements and to update existing information Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed.
492	3/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rosecorp should be made to provide public access to the waterfront as this is Government Policy and every other part of Gwandalan allows it. Rosecorp is thumbing its nose at the community and the Panel. Subdivision and existing house are on one title. How can subdivision be made a separate entity while the house and surrounding areas remain intact with no waterfront access. Sure under government policy this is illegal. Gwandalan does not have enough infrastructure to carry additional population. Poor transport, lack of local employment opportunities, local school is not large enough. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public waterfront access Panel requirements Subdivision Infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no waterfront land included in the Gwandalan proposal A full SIA has been provided with the application
493	5/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community is not happy about the environmental impact of the proposed development Rosecorp does not intend to hand the waterfront back to the community and this is against Government's own policy. Flow of traffic into the site will cause a problem because of the design of the roads. The main road actually passes in front of the primary school. Gwandalan does not have enough infrastructure to carry additional population. There is a shortage of doctors, insufficient public transport, a school which would be too small, lack of local employment opportunities. The plan should be rejected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Impacts Public waterfront access Traffic Infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no waterfront land included in the Gwandalan proposal Roads comply with all relevant standards A full SIA for a larger development found facilities to be adequate
494	5/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New plan does not provide proper wildlife corridors – the one on the plan crosses 7 roads and supports a 2 metre cycle/pedestrian way. There is not enough public open space within the development. There is no public access to the waterfront. The number of people commuting from the site could be up to 1000 people per day and these people have to pass the school twice a day, which will create an unsafe environment for children making their way to school. Gwandalan public school will be unable to cope with the increased population. Maybe Rosecorp could have given over part of the proposed estate to the Department of Education for future expansion. When was it deemed acceptable for Rosecorp to develop waterfront land without giving up part of the waterfront for public open space. Would like to know what Rosecorp's plans are for the other half of the site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wildlife corridors Public open space Public waterfront access Traffic School Future development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed. There is no waterfront land included in the Gwandalan proposal The proposed development fully complies with RFS guidelines Infrastructure that exists on private land will be subject to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner Stormwater flows to the lake will match pre and post development flows There are three ingress and egress points. Offsets have been agreed with DECC New Threatened species surveys have been carried out on the site to ensure compliance with EPBC requirements and to update existing information
495	20/09/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Catherine Hill Bay is a significant part of Newcastle's historical heritage and is extremely essential to future generations. Failing to protect Catherine Hill Bay will be highly disastrous and devastating to its people and its surrounding environment. This irreplaceable and unspoilt beauty will be lost forever. With it, numerous amounts of endangered species, both flora and fauna will be driven to extinction. Please protect the key areas of this unique character and environment of this special place. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage Environment Flora and fauna Character. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development has been designed to be low impact and to reflect and augment the heritage character of the area. The building and landscape design is based on a classic McHarg landscape and visual analysis of the site and seeks to subsume the development within the surrounding landscape. Development is set well back from Catherine Hill Bay village

496	4/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledge that this proposal is a significant improvement on the previous one. • Development still builds and will be highly prominent on the Catherine Hill Bay Headland. This is inconsistent with the NSW Government's own coastal policy, which is supposed to protect the remaining coastal headlands. • Rose Group's proposal must be considered in tandem with the Coal and Allied proposal for Middle Camp. Together these proposals will increase the size of the own tenfold (100 to 1,000 houses) and will have a significant increase in number of cars. Traffic issues, in particular the access to Pacific Highway, which each developer is has a contradictory strategy. • The Mo state clearly that the maximum quantity of development is 600 dwellings. The IHAP made it clear that commercial development should be "only for daily convenience needs (general store or the like)" This does not mean 600 houses 9 shops shoptop housing tourism accommodation apartments in the bin building on the headland. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coastal Policy • Cumulative impacts • Traffic • Mo • Overdevelopment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no development on the headland • The development is consistent with the coastal policy as outlined in Appendix T of the EA • Traffic and service issues have been examined on a cumulative basis • Impact on Catherine Hill Bay village has been minimised • Accesses to the Pacific highway are being negotiated ointly with RTA • Development complies with MO
497	4/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is there open space in the middle of the road – is this the only space where children can play • Wildlife corridor is also used as a bike path, walking path, has 2 playgrounds at either end, crosses 7 roads and is to be lit at night time. • Developer says offsets on the other side of Lake Macquarie will compensate for biodiversity loss but cannot see how this will work. • There is not an adequate firebreak between Point Wollstonecraft and the proposed development. • Thew new proposal has only 1 road in and out which creates a fire trap. • New residents will be isolated from rest of the community. The only access is past the school and there is no need for other residents to venture up this road. • Rosecorp should be made to provide public access to the waterfront as this is Government Policy. • The proposal should be re ected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open Space • Wildlife Corridor • Bushfire • Isolated community • Public waterfront access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • The proposed development fully complies with RFS guidelines • There are three ingress and egress points. • There is no waterfront land included in the Gwandalan proposal
49	26/09/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no provision for public access along the waterfront. This does not comply with SEPP 71 Coastal Protection and Wyong Council's policy to provide waterfront access during rezoning. • Developer claims that there are no perennial watercourses on the site. Who will undertake maintenance of the drainage water and sewerage pump – they are not accessible to the public. • The natural bush will be destroyed to cut and fill for blocks. • Proposed wildlife corridor is inappropriate as it is also to be used as a pedestrian/cycle way and contains 2 playgrounds. This area is 10m wide and crosses 7 roads. It is inappropriate. • The offset lands are not near the township of Gwandalan. The bush in Gwandalan will be destroyed with no replacement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public waterfront access • Waterways • Environment • Wildlife Corridors • Offset Lands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land included in the Gwandalan proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns.
499	/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is there open space in the middle of the road – is this the only space where children can play • Wildlife corridor is also used as a bike path, walking path, has 2 playgrounds at either end, crosses 7 roads and is to be lit at night time. • Developer says offsets on the other side of Lake Macquarie will compensate for biodiversity loss but cannot see how this will work. • There is not an adequate firebreak between Point Wollstonecraft and the proposed development. • Thew new proposal has only 1 road in and out which creates a fire trap. • New residents will be isolated from rest of the community. The only access is past the school and there is no need for other residents to venture up this road. • Rosecorp should be made to provide public access to the waterfront as this is Government Policy. • The proposal should be re ected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open Space • Wildlife Corridor • Bushfire • Isolated community • Public waterfront access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • The proposed development fully complies with RFS guidelines • There are three ingress and egress points. • There is no waterfront land included in the Gwandalan proposal

500	26/9/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no provision for public access along the waterfront. This does not comply with SEPP 71 Coastal Protection and Wyong Council's policy to provide waterfront access during rezoning. • Developer claims that there are no perennial watercourses on the site. Who will undertake maintenance of the drainage water and sewerage pump – they are not accessible to the public. • The natural bush will be destroyed to cut and fill for blocks. • Proposed wildlife corridor is inappropriate as it is also to be used as a pedestrian/cycle way and contains 2 playgrounds. This area is 10m wide and crosses 7 roads. It is inappropriate. • The offset lands are not near the township of Gwandalan. The bush in Gwandalan will be destroyed with no replacement. • It is inappropriate to plant exotic trees in an area surrounded by natural bush. • The LHRS shows Gwandalan only as an insert map after the deals with the developer were done. • Developer claims development is ustified as it is the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy and Draft CCRS and claim that there is a need for residential development. • There is no provision for public access along the waterfront. This does not comply with SEPP 71 Coastal Protection and Wyong Council's policy to provide waterfront access during rezoning. • Proposed wildlife corridor is inappropriate as it is also to be used as a pedestrian/cycle way and contains 2 playgrounds. This area is 10m wide and crosses 7 roads. It is inappropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public waterfront access • Waterways • Environment • Wildlife Corridors • Offset Lands • Exotic Trees • Lower Hunter Regional Strategy • Public waterfront Access • Wildlife Corridor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land included in the Gwandalan proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Landscaping will be carefully controlled to use native species wherever possible • Proposal is consistent with both the Lower Hunter and the Draft Central Coast Regional Strategies
501	26/9/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developer claims development is ustified as it is the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy and Draft CCRS and claim that there is a need for residential development. • The LHRS shows Gwandalan only as an insert map after the deals with the developer were done. • Proposed wildlife corridor is inappropriate as it is also to be used as a pedestrian/cycle way and contains 2 playgrounds. This area is 10m wide and crosses 7 roads. It is inappropriate. • There is no provision for public access along the waterfront. This does not comply with SEPP 71 Coastal Protection and Wyong Council's policy to provide waterfront access during rezoning. • It is inappropriate to plant exotic trees in an area surrounded by natural bush. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower Hunter Regional Strategy • Community Parkland/Open Space • Exotic Trees • Public waterfront Access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal is consistent with both the Lower Hunter and the Draft Central Coast Regional Strategies • There is no waterfront land included in the Gwandalan proposal • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Landscaping will be carefully controlled to use native species wherever possible
502	4/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed wildlife corridor is inappropriate as it is also to be used as a pedestrian/cycle way and contains 2 playgrounds. This area is 10m wide and crosses 7 roads. It is inappropriate. • There is no provision for public access along the waterfront. This does not comply with SEPP 71 Coastal Protection and Wyong Council's policy to provide waterfront access during rezoning. • Developer claims that there are no perennial watercourses on the site. Who will undertake maintenance of the drainage water and sewerage pump – they are not accessible to the public. • The natural bush will be destroyed to cut and fill for blocks. • It is inappropriate to plant exotic trees in an area surrounded by natural bush. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Parkland/Open Space • Public waterfront Access • Drainage • Exotic Trees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • There is no waterfront land included in the Gwandalan proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will be carefully controlled to use native species wherever possible
503	26/9/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The offset lands are not near the township of Gwandalan. The bush in Gwandalan will be destroyed with no replacement. • Proposed wildlife corridor is inappropriate as it is also to be used as a pedestrian/cycle way and contains 2 playgrounds. This area is 10m wide and crosses 7 roads. It is inappropriate. • There is no provision for public access along the waterfront. This does not comply with SEPP 71 Coastal Protection and Wyong Council's policy to provide waterfront access during rezoning. • Developer claims development is ustified as it is the Lower Hunter 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offset Lands • Community Parkland/Open Space • Public waterfront access • Lower Hunter Regional Strategy • Drainage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • There is no waterfront land included in the Gwandalan proposal • Proposal is consistent with both the Lower Hunter and the Draft Central Coast Regional Strategies • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner

			<p>Regional Strategy and Draft CCRS and claim that there is a need for residential development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LHRS shows Gwandalan only as an insert map after the deals with the developer were done. • The proposal should be re ected. • Developer claims that there are no perennial watercourses on the site. Who will undertake maintenance of the drainage water and sewerage pump – they are not accessible to the public. • The natural bush will be destroyed to cut and fill for blocks. 		
504	27/09/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The offset lands are not near the township of Gwandalan. The bush in Gwandalan will be destroyed with no replacement. • Proposed wildlife corridor is inappropriate as it is also to be used as a pedestrian/cycle way and contains 2 playgrounds. This area is 10m wide and crosses 7 roads. It is inappropriate. • There is no provision for public access along the waterfront. This does not comply with SEPP 71 Coastal Protection and Wyong Council's policy to provide waterfront access during rezoning. • Developer claims development is ustified as it is the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy and Draft CCRS and claim that there is a need for residential development. • The LHRS shows Gwandalan only as an insert map after the deals with the developer were done. • The proposal should be re ected. • Developer claims that there are no perennial watercourses on the site. Who will undertake maintenance of the drainage water and sewerage pump – they are not accessible to the public. • The natural bush will be destroyed to cut and fill for blocks. • Not against the development but believes it should be done in harmony with the surroundings with decent sized blocks and supporting infrastructure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offset Lands • Community Parkland/Open Space • Public waterfront access • Lower Hunter Regional Strategy • Drainage • Character • Infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • There is no waterfront land included in the Gwandalan proposal • Proposal is consistent with both the Lower Hunter and the Draft Central Coast Regional Strategies • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner
505	3/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developer claims development is ustified as it is the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy and Draft CCRS and claim that there is a need for residential development. • The LHRS shows Gwandalan only as an insert map after the deals with the developer were done. • Proposed wildlife corridor is inappropriate as it is also to be used as a pedestrian/cycle way and contains 2 playgrounds. This area is 10m wide and crosses 7 roads. It is inappropriate. • There is no provision for public access along the waterfront. This does not comply with SEPP 71 Coastal Protection and Wyong Council's policy to provide waterfront access during rezoning. • It is inappropriate to plant exotic trees in an area surrounded by natural bush. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower Hunter Regional Strategy • Community Parkland/Open Space • Exotic Trees • Public waterfront Access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal is consistent with both the Lower Hunter and the Draft Central Coast Regional Strategies • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • There is no waterfront land included in the Gwandalan proposal • Landscaping will be carefully controlled to use native species wherever possible
506	/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No mention of Gwandalan or Wyong Shire in the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy apart from an inset map. Table 5 does not include any houses for Wyong Shire. • Wildlife corridor is inappropriate because it is a pedestrian/cycle way and will contain playgrounds. • Exotic trees inappropriate. • No public waterfront access contrary to existing town design and Wyong Council's rezoning requirements. • Conservation values of the area will not be protected. • Does not comply with SEPP 71. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower Hunter Regional Strategy • Wildlife corridor • Native vegetation • Conservation • SEPP 71 • Public waterfront access • Pedestrian access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal is consistent with both the Lower Hunter and the Draft Central Coast Regional Strategies • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • There is no waterfront land included in the Gwandalan proposal • Landscaping will be carefully controlled to use native species wherever possible • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • The development is consistent with the coastal policy as outlined in Appendix T of the EA
507	/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No mention of Gwandalan or Wyong Shire in the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy. • Increased population will affect Wyong Shire not the Lower Hunter. • Holiday homes and vacant land likely to become permanent homes, further increasing the population. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional Strategy • Population increase • Impacts on Wyong Shire • Consent authority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal is consistent with both the Lower Hunter and the Draft Central Coast Regional Strategies

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal should be assessed by Wyong Council. 		
50 -509	/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • nclear whether homes will face Kanangra Drive and this will affect access. • Rosecorp should provide additional car parking for existing boat ramp. • No open space/playing fields for children. • Traffic passing school and impacts on children's safety. • Existing schools at capacity and only one doctor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access • Boat ramp car parking • Open space • Traffic and safety • Social infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Just 6 lots where access from Kanangra Drive will be required • Parking at the boat ramp is something that Rose Group would be happy to consider funding within the scope of the proposed contributions agreement • Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed. • SIA completed for a larger development and found facilities to be adequate. • Traffic passing the school will be in a school zone where appropriate •
510-511	/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not in the interests of Gwandalan residents. • Inadequate services in Gwandalan to cater for increased population particularly in view of Coal and Allied development. • No access to the water and not representative of the "old Gwandalan subdivision". • Is the open space in the middle of the road for children • Wildlife corridor is inadequate because it will be a bike and pedestrian path, intersected by roads and lit at night. • How can land in another area replace the environmental impact on Gwandalan • 310 hectares for national park is double dipping because it refers to the Catherine Hill Bay area not Gwandalan. • Traffic would have to pass the school and children's safety is of great concern. • Developer is trying to get the most lots they can. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public interest. • Traffic and safety • Social infrastructure • Waterfront access/subdivision • Open space • Wildlife corridor • National park location • Overdevelopment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SIA completed for a larger development and found facilities to be adequate. Cannot comment on detail of C A proposal • There is no waterfront land included in the Gwandalan proposal access is via the existing residential area • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed by DECC • Traffic passing the school will be in a school zone where appropriate • Developer has significantly reduced the lots requested compared to the previous concept plan
512-513	24/09/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gwandalan site should not be part of the Catherine Hill Bay state significant site because is 10km away, in a different LGA and has an estimate 12 million value. • Does not give back the waterfront as required by SEPP 71 and Wyong Council. • The community has determined that rezoning should not occur until after the year 2011. • Critical water supply will worsen if land is developed before 2011. • Gwandalan is not close to employment opportunities or have good access to public transport – contrary t the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy ob ectives. • Providing public land at Catherine Hill Bay will do nothing for future Gwandalan residents. • Kanangra Drive struggles to cope with existing traffic. • Summerland Point has a quiet village atmosphere which should be retained. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State significant site status • Waterfront • Rezoning timing • Water supply • Employment • Public transport • Regional Strategy • National park location • Traffic • Amenity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land included in the Gwandalan proposal • The development is consistent with the coastal policy as outlined in Appendix T of the EA • The development is consistent with the Draft Central Coast Regional Strategy which has been informed by water planning for the Central Coast. Water Plan 2050 sets out a program to secure the region's water supply • The roads are designed so that bus services are accommodated within 400m of any residence • There are strong employment markets in the hunter and Central Coast • Proposal is consistent with both the Lower Hunter and the Draft Central Coast Regional Strategies • The development is in keeping with existing development in the area • The traffic study for the site shows that the road can accommodate the increased traffic flows
514	05/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All residents will go to Catherine Hill Bay Beach. • Traffic impact assessment should address this and proposed number of dwellings. • Traffic report acknowledges highest traffic volumes on weekends but considers weekday periods only for Hamlets 1 and 2. • A lot of the new traffic from Hamlets 2-7 and the 1,000 Gwandalan homes will use Clarke Street contrary to assertion in traffic impact study. • People with families, boogie boards and umbrellas will drive, not walk or cycle to the beach, contrary to traffic impact study. • Huge amenity impact on increased traffic volumes. • Existing speeding problem and road accidents in Catherine Hill Bay connected with Wallarah Hotel. Realigning intersection at Hale Street would provide an unimpeded race strip through the town with serious consequences. • Inconsistent with NSW Government's Coastal Policy. • Does not comply with IHAP's interim report to the Minister. • Impacts on scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of Catherine 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact/pressure on Catherine Hill Bay Beach. • Traffic. • Speeding/accidents. • Amenity • Coastal Policy • IHAP • Scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage • Visual impact • Jetty and bin building/ ses • Coal mining conditions/rehabilitation of headland 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic impact assessment shows that roads are well within standards. • Additional parking for beach traffic is provided in the Concept Plan both ad acent to the village centre, on street and at the Moonee Car Park • If the locals wish, Clarke Street could be closed to traffic from Montefiore Street • People already drive to the beach, the proposed development will provide facilities and enhanced parking • Traffic calming can be looked at if speeding problems emerge, however, the design of the roads and the development will be conducive to pedestrian use not to speeding • The development is consistent with the coastal policy as outlined in Appendix T of the EA • Development is based on a classic McHag landscape analysis and is buffered from the existing village. • All housing is set a minimum of 10 metres back from the cliff edge. • The adaptive reuse of the bin building is canvassed in the Concept Plan. The Jetty is beyond the scope of this proposal • The cliff walk will be carefully landscaped to reflect the character of the coast

			<p>Hill Bay.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing on cliff edge will dominate views from Middle Camp Beach and create reflectivity and night light issues. • Development further back from cliff will still be visible from coast. • Needs well researched commercial use for petty and bin building. • Cliff access should reflect wild coastline. • Permission for coal mining on headland given on proviso that land be rehabilitated for public open space upon cessation of mining. 		
515	05/10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will be prominent on Catherine Hill Bay headland, contrary to government's coastal policy. • Aspects of development will be visible from existing middle camp settlement, not in keeping with the Independent Panel's planning principles. • Sketchy/conceptual traffic impact details, especially given size of proposal and inadequate existing infrastructure. • Traffic impact on Flowers Drive and capacity of two, existing access points from Pacific Highway. • No indication of target market - difficult to assess the proposed community and commercial infrastructure. • 1 00sqm of commercial likely to be a white elephant if houses sold to weekenders. Or it may be inadequate if housing sold to retirees or young families who need medical and educational/pre-school facilities. • Drain on state resources particularly for water management. • Proposed community swimming pool is insulting in pristine beachside community and negligent in current drought. • Which community will be responsible for community title assets If it is the greater Catherine Hill Bay area, this is untenable. • Houses will consume the majority of the land. This will be out of character with the existing village and create high density living at odds with the coastal/rural nature of the area. • Surveillance/gated communities are anathema to the historical and current Catherine Hill Bay character which enjoys a safe and crime free environment. • Should be considered in tandem with the Coal and Allied development for Middle Camp. Both developments will have a significant impact on the number of cars. • At odds with the best development interests of Catherine Hill Bay. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headland/coastal impact. • Independent Panel's planning principles. • Traffic • Target market • Social infrastructure • Water • Swimming pool • Community title assets • Siting and development/density • Surveillance/gated communities • Coal and Allied development/cumulative impact • Public interest. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no development on the headland • The development is consistent with the coastal policy as outlined in Appendix T of the EA • Development is based on a classic McHag landscape analysis and is buffered from the existing village. Visual impacts are minimised • Traffic impact assessment shows that roads are well within standards. • A full SIA is provided with the EA • There will be up to 1 00sqm of commercial not exactly 1 00sqm • Water recycling and management will ensure that the development is highly water efficient • Only residents of the new development will be responsible for the community title assets • The development is well spaced and located carefully within the landscape to maintain the area's natural character • This will not be a gated community • Traffic and service issues have been examined on a cumulative basis
516	05/10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will increase the capacity of the MO by including 1, 00m² commercial space – previously reflected by the IHAP. • The bin building and petty should be demolished as they have no heritage values and are public liabilities. • Use of bin building for apartments will increase its impact on the headland. • Stability of the bin building and the headland is inadequately addressed as are the physical and administrative requirements of the proposed cliff walk. • Proposed development of headland contravenes coastal policy and Heritage Office guidelines and the IHAP recommendations. • Amenity impacts of increased traffic on existing heritage properties not addressed credibly. • Catherine Hill Bay is a self sustaining eco system and should not be touched. • Water and sewerage should not be connected because this will mean connection fees and rate increases. It is crazy to draw additional water from a depleting resource. • The coastline and unique mining settlement should be preserved at all costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity reflected by IHAP • Bin building and petty • Coastal impacts • Traffic • Amenity • Water and sewerage • Unique community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The commercial space caters only for the day to day needs of residents • The proposal has no impact on the petty. Demolition of the bin building would destabilise the cliff face. • The converted bin building will be no larger than it was prior to decommissioning and the design will need to be unobtrusive for a PA to succeed • The stability of the bin building is to be assessed fully prior to development. • The coastal walk is committed to and will be provided as part of PA1. Further information on the walk will be provided with the preferred project report. • There is no development on the headland • Traffic flows meet all applicable standards • Catherine Hill Bay is not a self sustaining ecosystem. The area is subject to pressures both ecologically and environmentally as was demonstrated in evidence during the public hearings. The development will manage impacts and importantly will make a dedication to DECC to protect the area from further degradation • Connection of water and sewer will provide environmental improvements and reduce the risk of pollution in creeks and on the beach. Residents will not be obliged to connect. The availability of mains water will also assist greatly in the fire safety of the community. It would currently be very difficult for the RFS to protect Catherine Hill Bay in a major bushfire event • Development is buffered from the existing village.

517	05/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should not be a State Significant Site because number of lots is insignificant compared with needs of Central Coast and Hunter Regions. • Wyong Shire Council should deal with the application. • Conservation land will not form part of an important conservation corridor. • Offset land at another location is unacceptable. • Zoning split in foreshore land is contrary to SEPP 71 and contrary to Wyong Shire Council's policy. • Due procedure should be followed and a waterfront public reserve, with recreation facilities and boat ramp provided. • Stormwater runoff will be large. • Proposed detention ponds on adjoining land is unacceptable and unworkable. Water should be reticulated through the site for non-potable water use. • Inadequate protection of vulnerable species and significant bushland, particularly <i>Tetratheca juncea</i>. • I request a meeting with the Review Panel to clarify the panel's powers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Significant Site status • Consent authority • Conservation • Offset land location • Zoning split • SEPP 71 • Waterfront public reserve • Stormwater • Detention ponds • Review Panel powers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The areas to be dedicated as a conservation corridor were determined in conjunction with DECC who wanted these areas. All the land not despoiled by mining is being dedicated. • The split in the zoning at Gwandalan does not contravene any policy. • The developer contribution plan could be used to enhance local facilities if Council wish. • Runoff will be managed to equate pre and post development flows in line with best practice • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be subject to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • Houses will all have to meet BASI standards and to do this most will install rainwater tanks for non potable uses • Offsets were agreed with DECC
51	04/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not meet the requirements of the Review Panel. • Inappropriate and not ecologically sustainable. • There are no vegetation corridors. • No retention of significant trees. • Inadequate open space. • Wildlife corridor is inadequate. • <i>Tetratheca juncea</i> is not protected. • No rigorous environmental assessment of threatened, vulnerable or endangered species. This should be carried out over a 12 month period. • Should not be a State Significant Site because it does not meet the criteria to be "called in". • Inappropriate housing density given ecological sensitivities of the site. • No public waterfront access. • No cycleways. • No integration with surrounding area. • Impacts will be felt by Wyong Shire Council. • Increased traffic flow. • Extra burden on health services, child care facilities, parks, sewerage and water. • Current level 4 water restrictions and 23 dam capacity. • Existing public school at capacity with no expansion plans. • Contrary to Lower Hunter Regional Strategy because the site is remote, has only 1 access to the Pacific Highway, little or no work and poor public transport. • Is poor planning. • Density and configuration are inappropriate. • Appropriate development is for 150 homes over the entire site with resumption of the waterfront as per Wyong Shire Council's environmental assessment. • Stocklands development at Murray's Beach should be the benchmark. • Should be developed as per year 2011 timeline. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Panel • Ecological and conservation • Open space • Wildlife corridor • State Significant Site status • Density • Waterfront access • Cycleways • Impacts on Wyong Shire • Traffic • Social infrastructure • Water • Regional Strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes have been made to the PPR to address many of the concerns raised here. • Offsets were agreed with DECC. • Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed. • At 12 dwellings per hectare the density on the site is lower than usually required for residential subdivisions • There is no waterfront land included in the proposal • Cycleways are provided • The development is consistent with development in the surrounding area • Traffic levels will fall within applicable standards. • SIA found that facilities can cope with a higher population. • The development is consistent with the Draft Central Coast Regional Strategy which has been informed by water planning for the Central Coast. Water Plan 2050 sets out a program to secure the region's water supply • The site is included in the Lower Hunter Strategy and is consistent with it • Stocklands development at Murray's beach is not an appropriate benchmark. It could not be done under current RFS guidelines and would not be commercially viable.
519	04/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not meet Review Panel's requirements. • Inappropriate and not ecologically sustainable. • There are no vegetation corridors. • Inadequate open space. • No retention of significant trees. • Wildlife corridor is inadequate. • <i>Tetratheca juncea</i> is not protected. • Contrary to offsetting which requires avoidance of impacts before consideration of offsets. Offset land is associated with a different company and different major project application. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Panel • Ecological and conservation • Open space • Wildlife corridor • State Significant Site status • Density • Waterfront access • Impacts on Wyong Shire • Traffic • Social infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All offsets were agreed with DECC • Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed. • Additional Threatened species assessment work will be included in the PPR to meet Commonwealth requirements • At 12 dwellings per hectare the density on the site is lower than usually required for residential subdivisions. There are no natural perennial water courses on the site. • There is no waterfront land included in the proposal and the proposal is fully

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No rigorous environmental assessment of threatened, vulnerable or endangered species. This should be carried out over a 12 month period. Should not be a State Significant Site because it does not meet the criteria to be "called in". Inappropriate density with no on-site mitigation of impacts on watercourses, flora or fauna. Loss of integrity of existing corridor between Lake Munmorah State Recreation Area and vegetation to the north in Lake Macquarie LGA. Potential for more road kill as fauna cross road between areas. No proposal for Stage 2 (whole site not being rezoned) is contrary to SEPP 71. Will be highly prominent from the Catherine Hill Bay headland and is not set back 50-100m from the coastline, contrary to SEPP 71. Stormwater will run off into adjoining 7b zoned land. This will become the responsibility of owners not subject to the rezoning. Natural, perennial watercourses through the site treated as stormwater runoff and drains. They should be protected by riparian corridors (identified by the WildThing Report 2003, contrary to the proponent's concept plan). Impacts will be felt by the Wyong Shire and should be subject to the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy. Increased traffic flow and impacts on local roads. Extra burden on health services, child care facilities, parks, sewerage and water. Current level 4 water restrictions and 23 dam capacity. Contrary to Lower Hunter Regional Strategy because the site is remote, has only 1 access to the Pacific Highway, little or no work and poor public transport. Is poor planning. Density and configuration are inappropriate. Appropriate development is for 150 homes over the entire site with resumption of the waterfront as per Wyong Shire Council's environmental assessment. MO is for 600 dwellings. Wyong Shire Council should oversee the application to its original timeline, the year 2011. Should be assessed in tandem with the Coal and Allied development. Traffic access strategies of both applications contradict each other. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water Regional Strategy Stormwater MO 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> compliant with SEPP 71 in so far as it applies Cycleways are provided The development is consistent with development in the surrounding area There will be no development on the headland The development is consistent with the coastal policy as outlined in Appendix T of the EA Stormwater will be managed to equate pre and post development flows. There will be no runoff to the SEPP 14 wetland, further work will be provided in the PPR to demonstrate this more clearly Traffic impact assessment shows that roads are well within standards. A full SIA is provided with the EA
520-521	0 /10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased population of this and the Coal and Allied development will change the make up of the town. Environmental issues cannot be ignored Providing offsets on the other side of Crangan Bay is irresponsible. Government ministers cannot make a decision about the site if they have not been there. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Town character Amenity Environmental issues Offsets land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Matters for the Department
522	0 /10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal should be assessed by Wyong Shire Council. Many social issues including a lack of medical services, shops and public transport. Nearest train station is 1 km distant accessible only by car. Increased greenhouse gas emissions by reliance on cars. Will increase the population and change the area. Would be better to site development near a railway station. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consent authority. Social infrastructure and facilities Population Town character and amenity Greenhouse gas emissions Public transport 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A full SIA has been provided with the EA There is no requirement that development should be close to a rail station. The entire east side of Lake Macquarie is a lot further from rail Greenhouse emissions will be reduced by efficient design in homes and by encouraging walking and cycling within the community
523	0 /10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal is an improvement on the previous one. Will build on and be highly prominent from the Catherine Hill Bay headland. Inconsistent with the government's coastal policy. Should be considered with the Coal and Allied development for Middle Camp. Both developments will increase the size of the town tenfold. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visual impact Coastal policy considered with the Coal and Allied development Population Traffic MO 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There will be no development on the headland The development is consistent with the coastal policy as outlined in Appendix T of the EA Traffic and service issues have been examined on a cumulative basis Accesses to the Pacific highway are being negotiated jointly with RTA Development complies with MO Heritage impacts have been ameliorated through removing development from

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant impact on the number of cars. • Traffic access has not been solved and the two developments have contradictory access strategies to the Pacific Highway. • MO is for 600 dwellings. The 1, 00m² commercial space was previously re ected by the Review Panel which said it must be for daily convenience needs only. • Significant impacts on the environmental and heritage significance of the Catherine Hill Bay area. • Tranquillity and natural beauty of the area and the original mining town should be preserved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment and heritage 	the vicinity of the village.
524	0 /10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not in the best interest of Gwandalan and Summerland Point communities. • No direct benefit to the community but enormous financial benefit to the developer. • Increased traffic on Kanangra Drive. • Extra traffic would put pressure on Kanangra Drive in emergencies, for example, bushfire. • Only access goes past Gwandalan Public School. This will eopardise safety of children and parents. Noise and disturbance during construction would disrupt classes. • Limited facilities and services for increased population. • Lack of services will lead to anti social behaviour. • No capacity at Gwandalan Public School. • Stage 4 water restrictions apply. Increased population would increase pressure for water and the treatment of effluent. • General amenity would be compromised • Small blocks not large enough for large houses and out of character with the area. • Increased usage of boats on the lake would add to congestion and existing etty facilities are poor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public interest • Financial benefit to the developer • Traffic • Roads • Safety and amenity for Gwandalan Public School • Social infrastructure and facilities • Population • Anti social behaviour • Water and sewerage • Amenity • Density • Congestion on the lake • Jetty facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic impact assessment shows that roads are well within standards. • These are homes, the presence of homes near a school does not eopardise the safety of children, if anything it enhances it • The PPR leaves room for the school to expand. • Construction impacts will be carefully managed to minimise disruption to residents and the school. • A full SIA is provided with the EA • At 12 dwellings per hectare the density on the site is lower than usually required for residential subdivisions and is in keeping with the area. • A developer contribution plan is provided that could be used by Council to assist to upgrade boating facilities. • The development is consistent with the Draft Central Coast Regional Strategy which has been informed by water planning for the Central Coast. Water Plan 2050 sets out a program to secure the region's water supply •
525	04/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catchment of Moonee Beach would be developed. • The north-south conservation corridor would be seriously constricted. • Siginificant long term effects on the conservation value pf land east of the Pacific Highway. • The heritage village of Catherine Hill Bay would be impacted in many ways. • Increased population with no additional employment. • Figure 2.1.1 (p. 3) of the concept plan erroneously shows the Moonee site as it was before its post-mining restoration. • Future value of sites as conservation corridor has been ignored contrary to the Review Panel's recommendation. • Visual separation from the existing village should not be provided at the expense of the north-south conservation corridor. • The value of the land to the developer after rezoning would be disproportionate and generous. • Is an improvement on the previous proposal but still unacceptable. • Government should negotiate a more reasonable outcome given impending expiry of MO . 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation • Heritage • Population • Employment • Accuracy of plans • Review Panel • Benefit to the developer • MO 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The areas to be dedicated as a conservation corridor were determined in con unction with DECC who wanted these areas. All the land not despoiled by mining is being dedicated. • The impacts on the village are minimised by the removal of development from in the village itself and through the sensitive placing of development based on a Classic McHarg landscape analysis. • There is significant employment available in the Hunter and Central Coast regions • Figure 2.1.1 is a photograph of the land with mining taking place this is neither erroneous or misleading
526-527	26/09/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan. • The bush will be destroyed and not replaced. • Wildlife corridor is inappropriate as it will be a pedestrian/bike path, contain playgrounds and cross 7 roads. • Should follow the same design as the existing town which has walkways to waterfront reserves. • No provision for public foreshore access contrary to SEPP 71. • Exotic trees inappropriate. • Concern that drainage runs into the Environmental Protected Area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offsets • Bushland • Wildlife corridor • Waterfront access • SEPP 71 • Native plantings • Drainage • Environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • The development is consistent with the existing settlement, but has no waterfront land included in the proposal • Landscaping will be carefully controlled to use native species wherever possible • The development is consistent with the coastal policy and SEPP 71 • Drainage is managed to equate pre and post flows and there will be no impact on environmentally protected areas.

52	24/09/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not in the interests of Gwandalan residents. • Would be a 16.5 increase in housing, plus the Coal and Allied proposal. • Loss of trees and impacts on wildlife. • Trees are necessary to combat global warming. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public interest • Population • Vegetation • Wildlife • Global warming 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offsets agreed by DECC
529	25/09/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are plenty of homes and land for sale in Gwandalan and Summerland Point which take a long time to sell and are often taken off the market. • Release of more land would make it harder for people to sell. • Could take 10 years for the development to be sold. • No access to the water and no water views. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing market • Waterfront access • Water views 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The developer is confident of the market for the site. • There are very few new lots available in the area • There is no waterfront land included in the proposal
530	05/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans fail to meet revised Director-General's requirements. • Plans are inconsistent with government policies and NSW Heritage office guidelines and recommendations. • Impacts of plans would be deleterious to the coastal environment and the heritage village. • Is an improvement on previous submission but still has significant adverse impacts. • Failure to justify capability of the sites in terms of physical constraints, policy settings, social and environmental contexts. • Contrary to SEPP 71 and the government's Coastal Policy particularly goal 3. • Pays inadequate regard to the NSW Coastal Design Guidelines. • Quantum and type of development is contrary to current zonings under Lake Macquarie LEP 2004 and Wyong LEP 1991. • Quantum of development is at odds with coastal village character, for example, Pearl Beach, Patonga and Nord's Wharf. • No justification for development within the coastal strip 7(4) Environmental (Coastline) Zone. • No alternatives presented, no consideration given to limiting development to areas severely disturbed by mining. • Improper that existing planning controls and policies are entirely disregarded. Existing zonings provide a conservation outcome, enhance heritage protection and facilitate public access and ownership of coastal lands. • Catherine Hill Bay not anticipated as a 'proposed urban area' in Draft Lower Hunter Regional Strategy and therefore not subject to community consultation. Visually prominent and sensitive coastal features should reasonably be protected by local planning process – by application of the 7(4) Zone. • No detailed information or design guidelines for effective control of future development - only generic objectives and vague concept plan for Hamlets 3-7. • Clear design controls and independent design review processes should be in place to ensure quality design outcomes. • Current DCPs not specific enough to ensure impacts would be minor or predictable. • Uncertainty over future ownership of later stages is inappropriate for sensitive coastal location. • Increase in scale will overwhelm the existing village. • Application fails to provide a McHarg analysis or justification as per Review Panel recommendation. • Unclear how shop top housing and apartments are accounted for in the maximum 600 dwellings. • Number of dwellings should be reduced to achieve coastal village vision. • Commercial area is grossly in excess of Review Panel's recommendation and should be reduced to less than 300sqm. Community facilities and commercial floor space should be regarded in lieu of residential floor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Director-General's requirements • Government policies and guidelines • Environment • Heritage • Justification • SEPP 71 • Coastal Policy • Coastal Design Guidelines • Current zonings • Alternatives • Existing planning regime • Concept plan • Lack of detail and information • Village character • Commercial floor space • Review Panel • Pacific Highway • Visual impact • Vegetation/screening • Siting • Ecological values • Offset • Traffic • Car parking • Moonee Beach access • Amenity • Coal and Allied development • Pedestrian foreshore access • Number of dwellings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application passed the adequacy test • We believe that the development complies with all relevant Government policies. • All development has been removed from the existing village. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • Site capability and justification for development is demonstrated in the State Significant site report and the EA • The development is fully compliant with SEPP 71 and the coastal policy as detailed in Appendix T of the EA • There have been applications that have demonstrated a range of alternative uses for the site. Consideration of those alternatives have led to the current Concept Plan application • Development is limited to areas despoiled by mining • The development is fully consistent with the Lower Hunter Strategy. As the site is identified for development in that Strategy it will be zoned as such in the comprehensive LEPs for Wyong and Lake Macquarie • The concept plan provides a framework for future design that restricts the nature of future development • DCPs are not required when the Concept Plan deals with issues of design • Ownership is not a relevant factor, Rose Group has no intent to sell but the Concept Plan provides a framework to ensure that all future development complies. • The application is based on a McHarg analysis • The maximum of 600 dwellings is the maximum and includes shop top housing • The development is consistent with the MO • The commercial area is designed to cater for the day to day needs of residents and has been substantially reduced • There is no hotel accommodation in the concept plan • Access to the highway is currently being negotiated with the RTA and will be safe • All development is set back from the cliff top • A thorough visual analysis has been provided with the Concept Plan • A full landscaping plan will ensure that long term visual impacts are not increased by vegetation removal. • DECC has agreed all offsets • The town currently comprises many two storey homes, however, the village centre will have one storey homes only (apart from shop top housing) and other hamlets will provide a maximum of two storeys. • Traffic impacts have been modelled and are within guidelines and standards • Traffic studies have been done for 900 dwellings and show standards are met • Vehicular management through DECC land is subject to negotiations. There are significant alternative parking spaces available on the development site • More detail on the cliff walk will be provided in the PPR • Open space around the hamlets 2 to 4 is publically accessible via fire trails

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> space not additional to. Hotel/tourist accommodation contrary to Review Panel. Arrangements for provision of safe access from the Pacific Highway are inadequate. Cliff top development will have severe impact on views and natural landscape of visual catchments. No account of topographic features. Vegetation relied upon by proponent to ameliorate visual impact will be cleared. Likelihood of new trees achieving height adequate to screen buildings is remote. Avoid visual impacts by development siting instead of new planting. Development should be located east of the existing village and south of the main east west ridge and west of the north south ridge. Number of significant ecological values and threatened species and potential habitat. Offset strategy and undefined management measures impossible to assess because of a lack of ecological benefits of the offset lands. Limited understanding of urban and architectural form: 2 storey houses are an anomaly and there are no fences in the town. No solution for detrimental impact of increased traffic on Montefiore Street and Floweres Drive on amenity of existing residents. No account of Coal and Allied development in the traffic studies, or of cumulative traffic impacts. Proposed vehicular access to Moonee Beach through land not owned by proponent. No assessment of provision and demand management for car parking. Pedestrian coastal foreshore access cut into the cliff face is in appropriate. Does not address erosion, geotechnical, public liability, maintenance and visual impact. DAs should be endorsed by design review panel. All developments should have publicly accessible frontage to open space and buffers. Provide vegetated buffers to screen views of development from Moonee Beach, Munmorah SCA and along Montefiore Road. Comprehensive conservation and land use management plan should be prepared. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> and park land Buffers are to be provided along Montefiore Street and to Munmorah SCA Conservation management will be carried out by DECC after dedication. Discussions are underway to determine the handover process
531-534	2/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is inappropriate to plant exotic trees in an area surrounded by natural bush. The offset lands are not near the township of Gwandalan. The bush in Gwandalan will be destroyed with no replacement. There is no provision for public access along the waterfront. This does not comply with SEPP 71 Coastal Protection and Wyong Council's policy to provide waterfront access during rezoning. Proposed wildlife corridor is inappropriate as it is also to be used as a pedestrian/cycle way and contains 2 playgrounds. This area is 10m wide and crosses 7 roads. It is inappropriate. Developer claims development is ustified as it is the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy and Draft CCRS and claim that there is a need for residential development. The LHRS shows Gwandalan only as an insert map after the deals with the developer were done. The proposal should be re ected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exotic Trees Offset Lands Public waterfront access Community parkland or open space Lower Hunter Regional Strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Native trees and shrubs will be used wherever appropriate Offsets have been agreed with DECC There is no waterfront land in the Gwandalan proposal. The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. The development is fully consistent with the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy and the Draft Central Coast Regional Strategy
535-537	2 /09/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no provision for public access along the waterfront. This does not comply with SEPP 71 Coastal Protection and Wyong Council's policy to provide waterfront access during rezoning. Developer claims that there are no perennial watercourses on the site. Who will undertake maintenance of the drainage water and sewerage pump – they are not accessible to the public. The natural bush will be destroyed to cut and fill for blocks. Proposed wildlife corridor is inappropriate as it is also to be used as a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public waterfront access Waterways Environment Wildlife Corridors Offset Lands Exotic Tree Lower Hunter Regional Strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no waterfront land in the Gwandalan proposal. Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. Offsets have been agreed with DECC

			<p>pedestrian/cycle way and contains 2 playgrounds. This area is 10m wide and crosses 7 roads. It is inappropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The offset lands are not near the township of Gwandalan. The bush in Gwandalan will be destroyed with no replacement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community parkland or open space 	
53 -540	3/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed wildlife corridor is inappropriate as it is also to be used as a pedestrian/cycle way and contains 2 playgrounds. This area is 10m wide and crosses 7 roads. It is inappropriate. There is no provision for public access along the waterfront. This does not comply with SEPP 71 Coastal Protection and Wyong Council's policy to provide waterfront access during rezoning. Developer claims that there are no perennial watercourses on the site. Who will undertake maintenance of the drainage water and sewerage pump – they are not accessible to the public. The natural bush will be destroyed to cut and fill for blocks. It is inappropriate to plant exotic trees in an area surrounded by natural bush. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Parkland/Open Space Public waterfront Access Drainage Exotic Trees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. There is no waterfront land in the Gwandalan proposal. Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner Offsets have been agreed with DECC Native trees and shrubs will be used wherever appropriate
541	2 /09/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development is neither appropriate nor ecologically sustainable for the site. Site has no vegetation corridors and only one block dedicated to open space. No suitable retention of tetratheca uncea (an EPBC listed species) – it is not protected even though 17 plants have been found across the site. The Payne report states that over 100 plants on a site need to be protected as it is of high conservation value. The wildlife corridor crosses 7 roads and has lighting. There is no delineated proposal to retain significant trees. A rigorous assessment needs to be carried out over a full 12 month period. Development should be dealt with by Wyong Council. Proposed offsets are 10km away from the Gwandalan site. Should adhere to the principle that impacts are avoided before offsetting is considered. Housing density is inappropriate for the ecological sensitivity of the site, allowing for no on-site mitigation of the impact of development on the watercourses, flora and fauna. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Impacts Consent authority Offsets Housing density 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The offsets for the site have been agreed by DECC Vegetation has been retained wherever possible The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. Supplementary flora and fauna studies are being carried out to meet EPBC requirements The housing density is in keeping with the existing community
542	3/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why is there open space in the middle of the road – is this the only space where children can play Wildlife corridor is also used as a bike path, walking path, has 2 playgrounds at either end, crosses 7 roads and is to be lit at night time. Developer says offsets on the other side of Lake Macquarie will compensate for biodiversity loss but cannot see how this will work. There is not an adequate firebreak between Point Wollstonecraft and the proposed development. The new proposal has only 1 road in and out which creates a fire trap. New residents will be isolated from rest of the community. The only access is past the school and there is no need for other residents to venture up this road. Rosecorp should be made to provide public access to the waterfront as this is Government Policy. The proposal should be re ected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open Space Wildlife Corridor Bushfire Isolated community Public waterfront access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. Offsets have been agreed with DECC The Concept plan complies with the latest RFS guidelines There are three access and egress points There is no waterfront land in the Gwandalan proposal.
543-546	3/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rosecorp should be made to provide public access to the waterfront as this is Government Policy and every other part of Gwandalan allows it. Residents could be totally isolated from rest of town if development remains enclosed. Residents could be trapped in the case of a bushfire. There are three waterways on the Gwandalan site that have been ignored and will be lost when clearing commences causing run off into the lake that is already silting up from previous developments. They should be given adequate riparian zones and setbacks Plan does not address requirements set by the Independent Panel. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bushfire Waterways Panel requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no waterfront land in the Gwandalan proposal. The Concept plan complies with the latest RFS guidelines There are three access and egress points There are no natural perennial waterways on the site, post and pre development flows will be equalised so there will be no impact on the lake. The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns.

547	2 /9/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Builds on and will be highly prominent on Catherine Hill bay headland. This is inconsistent with the government's coastal policy. • Should be considered in tandem with Coal and Allied development at Middle Camp. • Both developments will increase size of town tenfold to 1,000 houses. • Significant impact on number of cars. • Traffic access has not been solved as both developers propose contradictory access to Pacific Highway. • MO states maximum of 600 dwellings. • The IHAP made it clear that commercial development was for daily convenience needs only. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual impact • Coastal policy • Size • Traffic generation • Pacific Highway access • MO • IHAP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no development on the headland • The development is consistent with the coastal policy as outlined in Appendix T of the EA • Traffic and service issues have been examined on a cumulative basis • Impact on Catherine Hill Bay village has been minimised • Traffic will be within applicable standards and efforts are being made to minimise the impact on the existing village by routing traffic from the development in and out via Montefiore Street • Accesses to the Pacific highway are being negotiated ointly with RTA • Development complies with MO • Commercial development is for daily convenience needs only
54 -923	2 /09/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ob ect to the development of the Gwandalan site. • Needs to be considered in tandem with Coal Allied development proposed for Middle Camp • Increase in dwelling will have significant impact on number of cars • Contradictory traffic access to Pacific Highway • Too many dwellings proposed (600houses 9 shops shoptop housing tourism accommodation apartments in Bin Building 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic • Water • Infrastructure • Medical services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic and service issues have been examined on a cumulative basis • Impact on Catherine Hill Bay village has been minimised • Traffic will be within applicable standards and efforts are being made to minimise the impact on the existing village by routing traffic from the development in and out via Montefiore Street • Accesses to the Pacific highway are being negotiated ointly with RTA • Development complies with MO
924	12/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gwandalan was not included in the draft Lower Hunter Regional Strategy and therefore residents did not have an opportunity to comment. Mo was signed before before Regional Strategy was completed and days later when final version was released Gwandalan had become part of the lower hunter. • Would like to see matters relating to lack of access to employment and reasonable public transport addressed. • Nu useable public open space has been provided in the latest proposal. • Traffic impacts will get worse with an extra 312 homes surrounding the school. Application did not measure traffic flow at peak time – when school finishes at 3pm. • Both state and local legislation require that development of land with absolute water frontage needs to include the return of the foreshore for public access. • Rose Group have indicated that they will discuss returning the foreshore when Stage 2 of the development takes place. All of Gwandalan, other than Rosecorp land is waterfront reserve and we suggest that if they seek to change the zoning of the land property and develop the site for significant financial gain, compliance with SEPP 71 should not be avoided. • Peninsula has very limited public transport, a school dealing with twice the student population it was designed to accomodateisolated from ma or retail facilitie and have a serious overworked medical practice and a frightening response from emergency services. Consideration should be given to Council's report which highlighted reasons why this area was not suitable for development until after 2011, when all infrastructure shortcomings have been resolved. • Rose corp were advised by Council when they purchased the land that a rezoning would not be considered until after 2011. An application was lodged with Council anyway. The proposal was put before the Councillors and they advised the developer to withdraw their application. Recision motion went to Council to try to overturn the decision. It was overturned. Proposal went to a final Council meeting where the developers were advised that a rezoning would not be considered until its correct time frame (after 2011). • Rosecorps proposal (Appendix P – page 56 identifies watercourses on the site and recommends their retention along with vegetation corridor. The concept plan does not consider these watercourses. • The lack of provision of foreshore access is not compliant with SEPP 71 and if it is not provided would create a precedent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional Strategy • Employment • Public transport • Open space • Traffic • Public foreshore access • SEPP 71 • Limited infrastructure • Watercourses • Drainage • Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roads have been designed to accommodate bus routes. • Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed. • Only 214 homes are proposed • Traffic impact assessment shows that roads are well within standards. • There is no waterfront land included in the proposal and the proposal is fully compliant with SEPP 71 in so far as it applies • A full SIA is provided with the EA • There are no natural perennial waterways on the site, post and pre development flows will be equalised so there will be no impact on the lake. • The Point Wollstonecraft Sport and Rec camp does not encourage or allow public access • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The proposal is consistent with the MO • All offsets were agreed with DECC • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. •

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wyong Council require a link to be created between Point Wollstonecraft Sport and Rec Camp and public open space corridor along the lake to the South. • Since proposal is to now only subdivide 1 ha of the 26ha area this means that remaining area would be zoned 7b – which would create precedents for future zoning applications. • Can drainage from the new subdivision be allowed to enter an environmentally protected area, on private property. The owners of this land would remain responsible for the maintenance of this drainage. • Concerned that the Gwandalan proposal should have been included in SSS listing with the Catherine Hill Bay site over 17kms away. Believe that the offset land applies to the Catherine Hill Bay development only. • The eMo states that b) if the development potential of the Catherine Hill Bay Schedule 1 land in relation to the number of dwellings or lots to be achieved is reduced then a proportional reduction will occur in the amount of Schedule 2 land to be transferred to the Minister for the Environment. The DGRS relate the “conservation and public areas comprising approximately 5% of the site. Neither of these include Gwandalan 1A. For these reasons offsets cannot be considered part of the Gwandalan site and proper environmental considerations should be given to the subdivision. • DEC’s offsetting principles states that “first priority is to avoid losses to biodiversity and protect biodiversity values in situ”. As a last resort, compensate for unavoidable losses to biodiversity by providing appropriate offsets. Impacts must be avoided first by using prevention and mitigation measures. Offsets are then used to address remaining impacts”. • We believe biodiversity loss on Precinct 1A can be avoided by proper management. The offset land at Catherine Hill Bay is not in the same region, so should not be accepted. • It is unclear now that there is a separate major project number, if the project is still connected to Catherine Hill Bay. • Believe that Gwandalan on its own would not meet criteria for being a major project. CIV is 16mil not the required 50 mil. • Developer states that he would provide 115,000 new dwellings identified in Regional Strategy. A 214 lot subdivision is only 0.16%. A 214 lots subdivision represents a 10.77% increase to the Gwandalan/Summerland Point area. • A subdivision of this size should be located closer to existing work opportunities and public transport. • Rosecorp was invited by the Government to enter into negotiations between Government and major landholders to have offset lands dedicated in return for development rights. Gwandalan portion of these negotiations was added at a later date and does not include the offset land. 		
925-1077	04/10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the development of the Gwandalan site. • Needs to be considered in tandem with Coal Allied development proposed for Middle Camp • Increase in dwelling will have significant impact on number of cars • Contradictory traffic access to Pacific Highway • Too many dwellings proposed (600houses 9 shops shoptop housing tourism accommodation apartments in Bin Building) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Traffic ▪ Water ▪ Infrastructure ▪ Medical services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic will be within applicable standards and efforts are being made to minimise the impact on the existing village by routing traffic from the development in and out via Montefiore Street • Accesses to the Pacific highway are being negotiated jointly with RTA
107	04/10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gwandalan has no relationship to Catherine Hill Bay/Moonee project and should not be a State significant site. • Gwandalan project is incomplete because it excludes waterfront section of the property. • Public access to waterfront areas is required by legislation. The proposal should be rejected on these grounds. • No suitable public transport to employment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State significant site • Waterfront access • Public transport • Social infrastructure • Roads • Housing/property market • Public interest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land included in the proposal and the proposal is fully compliant with SEPP 71 in so far as it applies • The roads have been designed to accommodate bus routes. • A full SIA is provided with the EA • Traffic impact assessment shows that roads are well within standards. •

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of school and medical facilities. • Will overload a narrow and dangerous road. • Adequate land and housing exists to suit the present market. • Community does not want or require the large development. • No benefit to NSW or Australia. • Benefit only to Rose Group. 		
1079	04/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of issues have not been addressed. • No offsets for Gwandalan residents. • Whole area will be clear felled and this will add to global warming. • No allowance for open space or parkland. • Animals would avoid wildlife corridor due to its design. • Exotic plants and vegetation would be an ecological disaster. • No pedestrian access to the lake contrary to SEPP 71. • Contrary to Wyong Council's requirement that Precinct 1A not be rezoned until 2010/2011. • Proposal should be dealt with by Council. • Lack of medical facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offsets • Vegetation • Global warming • open space • Wildlife corridor • Exotic vegetation • Waterfront access • SEPP 71 • 2011 rezoning timing • Consent authority • Social infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roads have been designed to accommodate bus routes. • Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed. • Only 214 homes re proposed • Traffic impact assessment shows that roads are well within standards. • There is no waterfront land included in the proposal and the proposal is fully compliant with SEPP 71 in so far as it applies • A full SIA is provided with the EA • There are no natural perennial waterways on the site, post and pre development flows will be equalised so there will be no impact on the lake. • The Point Wollstonecraft Sport and Rec camp does not encourage or allow public access • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The proposal is consistent with the MO • All offsets were agreed with DECC • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. •
10 0	21/09/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catherine Hill Bay is a unique heritage village. It is quiet, beautiful, unspoilt, with a nice, village atmosphere and should stay that way. • Existing bush with flora and fauna also provides a buffer between the Central Coast and Newcastle. • Building on coastal headlands is bad planning. • Popular with many users. • Should be less than 300 houses that cannot be seen from the villages or the sea. • 600 of the new houses will overlook Moonee Beach which currently has none. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage • Amenity • Bushland • Biodiversity • Coastal Policy • Size • Visual impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development has been carefully designed according to classic McHarg landscape principles to fit into the landscape. Development has been removed from the existing village and is buffered to minimise impacts • The offsets agreed with DECC for this development will provide the buffer between the Lower Hunter and Central Coast regions • There is no development on the headland • Development levels are according to the MO • Amenities for surfers and other beach goers will be enhanced. Rose Group is prepared to discuss providing funding for a new surf club at Catherine Hill Bay as part of its developer contributions plan
10 1	20/09/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative affects on immediate environs of Gwandalan and Catherine Hill Bay. • Catherine Hill Bay is an iconic heritage area of significance to NSW and Australia. • Resulting urban sprawl would devalue and devastate these pristine areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Heritage • rban sprawl 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development has been carefully designed according to classic McHarg landscape principles to fit into the landscape. Development has been removed from the existing village and is buffered to minimise impacts •
10 2	20/09/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not address community concerns about the built environment on the old washery site at Catherine Hill Bay. • The development is inconsistent with the government's policies. • Highly visible and prominent structures will be visible from the beach and the ocean. • Old washery site sits atop an unstable cliff. • Land is despoiled and will rehabilitate if left alone. • Should be considered as one development with the Coal and Allied development. • Catherine Hill Bay of 100 houses will be swallowed by 1,000 houses. • Traffic unsatisfactorily addressed. Streets are narrow. • Community and environment will suffer from excessive construction traffic. • Nine shops with shop top housing contradicts proponent's assertion that commercial space would be mainly a general fish and chip shop. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community concerns • Government policies • Visual impact • Geotechnical • Coal and Allied development • Cumulative impact • Inappropriate • Scale • Context • Traffic • Construction impacts • Amenity • Commercial floor space 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development has been carefully designed according to classic McHarg landscape principles to fit into the landscape. Development has been removed from the existing village and is buffered to minimise impacts • The development is consistent with coastal and other policies • Development is positioned so as to minimise visual impacts • The cliff is stable • A traffic report is provided and shows that the levels post development will not exceed standards • Construction traffic will use Montefiore Street and will have no impact on residents. ntil now coal trucks have used that route with much greater impact • The commercial component is to meet the day to day needs of residents
10 3	2 /09/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is an improvement on previous application. • Should be assessed with Coal and Allied development and address traffic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coal and Allied development • Cumulative impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic and service issues have been examined on a cumulative basis • A phasing plan is provided in the Concept Plan

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> management, and housing/green space design. Approval should require satisfactory arrangements for phased building of each development component. Should be consistent with Coastal Policy. Community should be rekindled using ecological and sustainable guidelines. Some of the land is not owned by RoseCorp. This makes the Concept Plan invalid. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfactory arrangements Coastal Policy ESD Land ownership/concept plan validity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development is consistent with the coastal policy as outlined in Appendix T of the EA Areas not owned by Rose Group are either excluded from the concept plan or are sub ect to a letter of consent
10 4	2 /09/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no stage 2 proposal. This will mean a portion only of the site is rezoned, avoiding assessment under coastal requirements for future rezonings. This will result in no public access to the waterfront. Runoff will be directed onto land zoned 7b Environmental/Scenic Protection. Sewerage outlet is on land not yet rezoned. Stormwater and sewerage systems will be maintained by owners of adjoining land not proponent's land. Site's natural watercourses treated as stormwater runoff and drains. Natural watercourses should be protected by riparian areas to provide vegetation retention and on-site mitigation. Should be assessed by Wyong Council to its original timeline of the year 2011. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staging Precedent Coastal Policy Waterfront access Environmental protection Stormwater and drainage Natural watercourses Riparian areas Consent authority Rezoning timing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is not intent to develop stage 2 There is no waterfront land included in this proposal Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner Rezoning is not required for the housing of a sewerage outlet There are no natural perennial watercourses on the site
10 5	2 /09/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is an improvement on previous application. Proposal builds on, and is highly prominent from the Catherine Hill Bay headland, contrary to the Coastal Policy. Should be considered with Coal and Allied development. Both developments will increase the size of the town tenfold and have a significant impact on cars. Small village should be retained as a tourist attraction. Traffic access not resolved as proposal and Coal and Allied development have contradictory access strategies to the Pacific Highway. Would prohibit future provision of a coastal walk between Patonga and Newcastle. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coastal Policy Visual impact Coal and Allied development Cumulative impact Traffic Coastal pedestrian access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no development on the headland The development is consistent with the coastal policy as outlined in Appendix T of the EA Traffic and service issues have been examined on a cumulative basis Impact on Catherine Hill Bay village has been minimised Traffic will be within applicable standards and efforts are being made to minimise the impact on the existing village by routing traffic from the development in and out via Montefiore Street Accesses to the Pacific highway are being negotiated ointly with RTA Access across the site for walkers will be provided and significantly enhanced over the current situation
10 6	2 /09/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community is being destroyed. The look of the area should be kept by blending development with the bush and environment. Green areas should be provided. A wildlife corridor should be provided as a buffer next to the public school. Wildlife refuge. Consider future generations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Character Appearance Wildlife corridor Noise Bushland Open space Fauna Inter-generational equity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees will be retained wherever possible The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed.
10 7	2 /09/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased population will change Gwandalan. Coal and Allied development will add to the impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased population Character Amenity Coal and Allied development Cumulative impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Matters for State Government
10	02/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gwandalan is part of the Central Coast and it is illogical to consider it with the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy. National environmental and cultural heritage would be swamped by proposal. Rezoning not tied to Deeds of Agreement and therefore not in the public interest. Proponent should uphold MO by honouring public land conservation. High value cultural and conservation lands. Should be reduced to maximum 150 dwellings on previous industrial land with buildings to existing tree height only. If size and height cannot be reduced and transfer of land to public enforced by Deed, existing zonings should be retained. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Strategy context Heritage Deeds of Agreement Public interest MO Public land conservation Conservation values Cultural values Height Density Existing zonings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MO will be upheld The development has been carefully designed according to classic McHarg landscape principles to fit into the landscape. Development has been removed from the existing village and is buffered to minimise impacts

10 9	02/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public access should be provided to the waterfront in accordance with government policy. Existing waterways ignored. Should be provided with riparian zones with appropriate setbacks and vegetation. Water flow through Environmental Protection zone is unacceptable. Does not address Review Panel requirements. Lack of facilities to support proposal and Coal and Allied development Siting next to a school will have safety, noise and pollution implications. Traffic report ignores hazard of extra traffic to school children. Site will be totally cleared. Wildlife corridor has pedestrian/bike path, crosses 7 roads and will be lit at night. Playgrounds do not have equipment. Open space is between 2 roads and is small. <i>Tetratheca juncea</i> is located on the site. Inadequate environmental risk assessment - other threatened species may be present. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public waterfront access Government policy Waterways Riparian zones Environmental Protection zone Review Panel Social infrastructure Facilities and services Coal and Allied development Cumulative impact Siting Impacts on school Traffic Clearing Wildlife corridor Playgrounds Open space <i>Tetratheca juncea</i> Threatened species Environmental risk assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. There is no waterfront land included in the proposal and the proposal is fully compliant with SEPP 71 in so far as it applies There are no natural perennial waterways on the site, post and pre development flows will be equalised so there will be no impact on the lake. Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner A full SIA is provided with the EA There are no safety implications siteing homes next to a school that cannot be routinely managed Traffic impact assessment shows that roads are well within standards. School zones will protect children Playground equipment will be provided as part of the developer contributions plan All offsets were agreed with DECC
1090	03/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Catherine Hill Bay should remain unaltered by significant development. New sprawling apartments and medium/high density development will destroy the unique character of the area. Will be more of the same tourist/multi-storey development as other coastal areas. Gullies and ridges to the west of the hotel and main settlement will suffer impacts. Many clusters of bush orchids and <i>Tetratheca juncea</i>. Little coastal heath remains and should be protected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Character Overdevelopment Environmental impacts Flora <i>Tetratheca juncea</i> Coastal heath 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development has been carefully designed according to classic McHarg landscape principles to fit into the landscape. Development has been removed from the existing village and is buffered to minimise impacts There is no medium to high density development on the site Offsets have been agreed with DECC
1091	03/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing has changed from previous application. Obscene over-development. Gwandalan is part of Wyong Shire not of the Lower Hunter. Tightening water restrictions, poor electricity mains supply, poor roads and general infrastructure, lack of medical facilities. Proposal will lead to huge social and welfare problems. No prospect of employment for new residents. No ma or shops and only 3 bus services poor day. Lack of waterfront access. Drainage into Lake Macquarie. No provision for public open space Existing public school si at capacity is without ad oining land to expand. Should be assessed by Wyong Council. Bushland will be bulldozed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over-development Regional context Water and electricity Roads Social infrastructure Social impacts Employment Facilities and services Public transport Waterfront access Drainage Public open space Consent authority Bushland Social responsibility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development has been carefully designed according to classic McHarg landscape principles to fit into the landscape. Development has been removed from the existing village and is buffered to minimise impacts Services can be provided A full SIA is provided in the EA There are strong employment markets in the Hunter and Central Coast Bus services may increase, shops will cater for the day to day needs of residents There is no waterfront land included in the Gwandalan proposal Post and pre development flows will be equalised so there will be no impact on the lake. Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner
1092	02/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has been inculcated into the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy after the exhibition period. Gwandalan is remote with only one road to the pacific Highway, little or no work and poor public transport. This is contrary to the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy which requires development around ma or centres and transport corridors. Inappropriate density, configuration, type and style of development. Insufficient child care places, local doctor has closed his books and local public school at capacity. No public waterfront access, no cycle ways and one small park for 215 families. Should be assessed by Wyong Council according to its original year 2011 timeline. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional context Regional Strategy Density Development type and style Social infrastructure Waterfront access Cycle ways Open space Consent authority Rezoning timing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A traffic study shows roads are within standards The configuration of the development is in keeping with the existing community A full SIA has been provided with the EA and finds facilities to be adequate Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed. There is no waterfront land included in the proposal and the proposal is fully compliant with SEPP 71 in so far as it applies
1093	02/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal is as bad as the first one. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review Panel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The housing density is in keeping with the character of the area, however,

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developer should not get a third chance. • Does not comply with the Review Panel's requirements apart from excluding stage 2. • Housing numbers have been reduced only by exclusion of stage 2. • Housing density ecologically unsustainable • Open space is a median strip 10m wide tapering to nil and deemed a playground. • No retention of significant trees or vegetation corridors and wildlife corridor is inadequate. • <i>Tetratheca juncea</i> is not proposed to be protected. • Location of offset lands does not adhere to DECC principle that <i>"impacts must first be avoided before offsetting is considered."</i> Offsets should not be considered part of the Gwandalan site. • MO and DGRs requirements regarding offsets have not been met. • No rigorous environmental assessment of threatened, vulnerable or endangered species. Assessment is required over 12 months as per Wyong Council's requirements. • No on-site mitigation. • Inappropriate type and style of development. Council's reports states capacity for 150 homes with waterfront resumption as per the Coastal Policy. • Loss of integrity for corridor between Lake Munmorah State Conservation Area (SCA) and Lake Macquarie SCA. • Potential for road kill as fauna have to cross the road to move between areas. • Dangerous precedent if stage 1 (part of site) is developed with no proposal for stage 2 (entire site). This is contrary to SEPP 71. Stage 2 would then not be considered coastal, and no public waterfront access would be provided. • Stormwater will run off onto 7b Environmental Protection zoned land and then into the lake. The drainage systems will be maintained by those land owners and not the owners of the subject land. • Natural watercourses treated as stormwater runoff and series of drains. Watercourses should be protected by riparian areas (as identified in the Wildthing Report 2003). • Gwandalan introduced into the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy long after the exhibition period expired. Only one reference (an inset map) to it in the strategy. • Impacts will be felt in Wyong Shire not the Lower Hunter – maintenance of roads, extra burden on health services, child care facilities, parks, water and sewerage. • Current level 4 water restrictions in Wyong and 23 dam capacity. • Gwandalan is remote with only one road to the Pacific Highway, little or no work, poor public transport and lack of doctors. This is contrary to the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy which requires development around major centres and transport corridors and poor planning. • Low demand for housing in area. • Need to address capacity of primary school. • Should be assessed by Wyong Council according to its original year 2011 timeline. • Inadequate existing access and parking for boat ramp and Taylor Bay mooring facilities. • Traffic impacts on school. • Should not be a State significant site/Major or Protected. • Not in the public interest. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban design • Environment • ESD • Vegetation corridors • Open space • Significant trees • Wildlife/conservation corridor • Offsets • MO and DGRs • Environmental assessment • Threatened species • Density • Mitigation • Development type and style • SEPP 71/ Coastal Policy • Stormwater • Natural watercourses • Riparian areas • Regional context • Impacts on Wyong Shire • Water • Regional Strategy • Rezoning timing • Social infrastructure • Social impacts • Traffic and parking • Precedent • Rezoning legality • State significant site status • Public interest 	<p>The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed. • Trees will be retained where practical • All offsets were agreed with DECC • Further threatened species work is underway to be lodged with the PPR • There is no waterfront land included in the proposal and the proposal is fully compliant with SEPP 71 in so far as it applies • There are no natural perennial waterways on the site, post and pre development flows will be equalised so there will be no impact on the lake. • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be subject to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The development is consistent with the Draft Central Coast Regional Strategy which has been informed by regional water planning. Water Plan 2050 sets out a program to secure the region's water supply • A full SIA is provided with the EA • Traffic impact assessment shows that roads are well within standards. • A developer contribution plan is provided that could be used by Council to assist to upgrade boating facilities.
1094	02/10/2007	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised plan is the best so far. • Would be beneficial to shopkeepers and small businesses by creating more employment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic benefits • Compatible • Traffic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is similar in size to other developments so it fits the area and local amenities. • Offers more to the local area regarding traffic movement • Developer retains an interest personally in the local area. 		
1095	11/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased population from this and the Coal and Allied development will change the make up of the town. • Environmental issues cannot be ignored. • Irresponsible to say issues are replaced by offsets on other side of Crangan Bay. • Existing peace and ambience will be changed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Population • Character • Coal and Allied development • Offsets • Amenity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offsets are agreed with DECC
1096	11/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gwandalan is not a significant site. • Should not be included in the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy. • No connection to Catherine Hill Bay proposal and should not be grouped together. • Not close to transport. • Local obs non-extent. • Could be assessed by Wyong Council. • Change from original Precinct 1A could be a dangerous precedent. • No proper significance to watercourses. • nacceptable for drainage to be on land not under consideration. Drainage should be on sub ect land to enable control of it. • Dividing Precinct 1A will enable regulations regarding foreshore access to be bypassed. • Site will be totally cleared. • Does not consider threatened species. • Does not address Review Panel's requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant site status • Regional Strategy context • Transport • Employment • Consent authority • Watercourses • Drainage • Foreshore access • Clearing • Threatened species • Review Panel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roads are designed so that bus services are accommodated within 400m of any residence • Buses already serve the area • There are no natural perennial waterways on the site, post and pre development flows will be equalised so there will be no impact on the lake. • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • There is no foreshore land included in the development •
1097	11/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gwandalan is not a significant site. • Should not be included in the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy. • No connection to Catherine Hill Bay proposal and should not be grouped together. • Not close to transport. • Local obs non-extent. • Could be assessed by Wyong Council. • Change from original Precinct 1A could be a dangerous precedent. • No proper significance to watercourses. • nacceptable for drainage to be on land not under consideration. Drainage should be on sub ect land to enable control of it. • Dividing Precinct 1A will enable regulations regarding foreshore access to be bypassed. • Site will be totally cleared. • Does not consider threatened species. • Does not address Review Panel's requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant site status • Regional Strategy context • Transport • Employment • Consent authority • Watercourses • Drainage • Foreshore access • Clearing • Threatened species • Review Panel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roads are designed so that bus services are accommodated within 400m of any residence • Buses already serve the area • There are no natural perennial waterways on the site, post and pre development flows will be equalised so there will be no impact on the lake. • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • There is no foreshore land included in the development • Additional threatened species work being carried out • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns.
109	09/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has been inculcated into the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy after the exhibition period. • Gwandalan is remote with only one road to the pacific Highway, little or no work and poor public transport. This is contrary to the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy which requires development around ma or centres and transport corridors. • Inappropriate density, configuration, type and style of development. • Insufficient child care places, local doctor has closed his books and local public school at capacity. • No public waterfront access, no cycle ways and one small park for 215 families. • Should be assessed by Wyong Council according to its original year 2011 timeline. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional context • Regional Strategy • Density • Development type and style • Social infrastructure • Waterfront access • Cycle ways • Open space • Consent authority • Rezoning timing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic impact assessment shows that roads are well within standards. • The roads are designed so that bus services are accommodated within 400m of any residence • Buses already serve the area • The housing density is in keeping with the character of the area • A full SIA is provided with the EA • Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed. • Cycleways are provided
1099	11/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased population will change Gwandalan. • Coal and Allied development will add to the impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased population • Character 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenity • Coal and Allied development • Cumulative impact 	
1100-1101	10/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts to shoehorn 600 houses onto the site and ameliorate impacts rather than locate in less sensitive areas. • Does not comply with IHAP requirements. • 1, 00m² commercial floor space previously re ected by IHAP. Will be in a highly visible location. • Visual impact (reflectivity and night lighting) on headland and beach. • Visual impact contravenes Coastal Policy and Heritage Office guidelines • Adaptive reuse of bin building not sub ect to long term engineering feasibility and stability. • Significant adverse impacts on environmental and heritage significance of Catherine Hill Bay. • No scientific analysis of condition of offset conservation lands. • No assessment of environmental or social value of offset lands. • Huge community investment in protecting land by existing zonings. • Earthworks will greatly reshape landscape. This and the development's access to views could have serious impacts on conservation values and bushland setting of the town. • Flood report does not address construction impacts on conservation areas. • Lack of scientific analysis of effect of night light on conservation area even though level of exposure acknowledged in visual impact assessment. • No analysis of effect of likely dramatic increase of cat and dog population on adjacent conservation areas. • Physical and administrative requirements of proposed cliff walk inadequately addressed. • Does not address amenity impacts of increased traffic on heritage properties. • Does not address cumulative traffic impacts of this and Coal and Allied development. • No comparative economic assessment of cost of new or upgraded infrastructure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Review Panel • Visual impact • Coastal Policy • Heritage Office • Engineering feasibility • Heritage • Offsets • Existing zonings • Community cost • Earthworks • Conservation values • Bushland • Aesthetics • Flood report • Domestic pets • Cliff walk • Amenity • Traffic • Cumulative impacts • Coal and Allied development • Infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The commercial area is designed to cater for the day to day needs of residents and has been substantially reduced • All development has been removed from the existing village. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • Studies on the engineering feasibility of the adaptive reuse of the bin building will be completed prior to a pro ect application being lodged. If the structure is not suitable it will be capped and used ust as a viewing area as per the Concept Plan • Further studies on the flora and Fauna impacts are underway to satisfy EPBC guidelines. • Earthworks will aim to return the landscape to something resembling its pre mining condition but there will be no impacts on the existing town in terms of its outlook or setting • Construction impacts will be carefully managed according to Statement of Commitments • Educational material will be provided to residents on the importance of controlling domestic pets • Traffic impacts have been modelled and are within guidelines and standards • Traffic and service impacts have been assessed for 900 dwellings
1102	05/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No proposal for stage 2. This would set a dangerous precedent because the whole site will not be rezoned. The developed land will not be considered coastal and not sub ect to the same guidelines. • Will result in no public waterfront access. • Stormwater will run off onto land zoned 7b Environmental/Scenic Protection. Sewerage outlet is also on land not rezoned. These services will not be maintained by owners of sub ect development. • Natural watercourses treated as stormwater. Should be protected by riparian areas. • Should be assessed by Wyong Council as per original year 2011 timeline. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staging • Precedent • Coastal Policy • Public waterfront access • Stormwater • Sewerage • Environmental/Scenic Protection • Watercourses • Riparian areas • Consent authority • Rezoning timing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is not intent to develop stage 2 • There is no waterfront land included in this proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • Rezoning is not required for the housing of a sewerage outlet • There are no natural perennial watercourses on the site
1103-1156	10/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catherine Hill Bay is a unique heritage village. • Building on coastal headlands is bad planning. • Loved destination for surfers, divers, fishers and tourists. • Would destroy a beautiful place. Developed areas should be developed. • Should be less than 300 houses that cannot be seen from the villages or the sea. • 600 of the new houses will overlook Moonee Beach which currently has no houses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage • Coastal Policy • Amenity • Character • Context • Size • Visual impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All development has been removed from the existing village. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • There is no development on the headland • Development has been removed from the existing village • Amenities for surfers and other beach goers will be enhanced. Rose Group is prepared to discuss providing funding for a new surf club at Catherine Hill Bay as part of its developer contributions plan
1157-19	05/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ob ect to the development of the Gwandalan site. • Needs to be considered in tandem with Coal Allied development proposed for Middle Camp • Increase in dwelling will have significant impact on number of cars 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage • Coastal Policy • Amenity • Character 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic and service issues have been examined on a cumulative basis • Impact on Catherine Hill Bay village has been minimised • Traffic will be within applicable standards and efforts are being made to minimise the impact on the existing village by routing traffic from the

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contradictory traffic access to Pacific Highway Too many dwellings proposed (600houses 9 shops shoptop housing tourism accommodation apartments in Bin Building 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Context Size Visual impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> development in and out via Montefiore Street Accesses to the Pacific highway are being negotiated ointly with RTA Development complies with MO
19 9-202	11/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Catherine Hill Bay is a unique heritage village. Building on coastal headlands is bad planning. Loved destination for surfers, divers, fishers and tourists. Would destroy a beautiful place. Developed areas should be developed. Should be less than 300 houses that cannot be seen from the villages or the sea. 600 of the new houses will overlook Moonee Beach which currently has no houses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage Coastal Policy Amenity Character Context Size Visual impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All development has been removed from the existing village. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. There is no development on the headland Development has been removed from the existing village Amenities for surfers and other beach goers will be enhanced. Rose Group is prepared to discuss providing funding for a new surf club at Catherine Hill Bay as part of its developer contributions plan
2029-2277	12/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Catherine Hill Bay is a special place located between Lake Macquarie, the beach and within a bushland setting. There is a lack of town water and sewer to the area and the change from company to private ownership in the 1960s has helped retain the original character. The community accept the numerous restrictions in terms of lack of services and a predominantly single storey height control. The development proposals being considered by the Minister will add 900 much larger dwellings and 1 00m² of commercial development to the heritage mining village of about 100 small miners cottages. It is considered inappropriate to increase the number of houses by 10 times and the existing town footprint by 20 times. The impact on the town amenity of considerable. The impact on the heritage of a rare mining town of State Significance will undermine its state listing. Some area of development is on the former mining lands, environmentally sensitive flora and fauna will be affected. The importance of separating new development physically and visually from the Catherine Hill Bay township is critical to retaining its heritage setting and existing amenity. The proposal is ustified because of the dedication of 0 of the land holdings of key landowners in the Hunter Region to National Park in exchange for being able to develop in a sensitive coastal location. The land is already zoned by the State Government for high conservation control and cannot be developed. The area is highly visible from the coast and heritage town of Catherine Hill Bay. The proposal maximises views for the new development at the expense of a unique place. While a proposed National Park is supported, the offsets of 60ha of land on areas of high visual and environmental impact is disproportionate to the benefit. The proposal dominates the town with development. Restricting development away from sensitive visual areas will not impact on the significant profitability of the development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Character Development footprint Environmental Visual impacts development intensity and location 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All development has been removed from the existing village. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. Offsets have been agreed by DECC A full visual impact assessment has been carried out. The visual impact of the proposed development is minimal due to use of the existing landscape to screen development
227 -232	12/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Catherine Hill Bay is a unique heritage village. Building on coastal headlands is bad planning. Loved destination for surfers, divers, fishers and tourists. Would destroy a beautiful place. Developed areas should be developed. Should be less than 300 houses that cannot be seen from the villages or the sea. 600 of the new houses will overlook Moonee Beach which currently has no houses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage Coastal Policy Amenity Character Context Size Visual impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All development has been removed from the existing village. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. There is no development on the headland Development has been removed from the existing village Amenities for surfers and other beach goers will be enhanced. Rose Group is prepared to discuss providing funding for a new surf club at Catherine Hill Bay as part of its developer contributions plan
2329	12/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised plan only cosmetically addresses concerns of previous plan. Proposal is larger than previous proposal. Incomprehensible that Gwandalan proposal is lumped in with Catherine Hill Bay development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amenity Character Context Size 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The revised plan directly addresses the concerns raised by agencies, the IHAP and the community during exhibition of the previous concept plan. The community initially publicly welcomed the plan prior to changing their position The proposal is significantly smaller in terms of footprint and impact than the

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gwandalan development is not state significant and should be assessed by the local government authority. Local Aboriginal community has identified areas of significance protected under NPWS Act. Native plants and animals are threatened. Destruction of bushland must stop. Will cause significant drainage problems. Will impact upon environmental health of Crangan Bay, Lake Macquarie. Sewer pumping station is unable to handle increased number of dwellings. Critical water supply (Level 4 restrictions) will be worsened. Bushfire assessment fails to consider several issues including topography. Section 94 donation of undesirable land will only benefit Catherine Hill Bay with no benefit for Gwandalan. No appropriate land reserved for development of essential infrastructure, such as shops, schools, and churches - will lead to community isolation. Lack of existing facilities at Gwandalan. Does not return foreshore land for public use. Puts big business interests ahead of community and local concerns. Gross overdevelopment. No thought of future community. Impacts for future generations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State significant status Consent authority Aboriginal significance NPWS Act Flora and fauna Threatened species Drainage Bushland Cumulative impacts Bushfire Sewer Water Offsets Social infrastructure Public foreshore Public interest Inter generational equity 	<p>previous proposal with only 1 ha of development area at Gwandalan and 45ha of urban development at Moonee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A full aboriginal heritage study was submitted with the EA. This was conducted according to DECC guidelines The offsets for the development were agreed by DECC Stormwater drainage will be carried out according to best practice on both sites. Pre and post development flows will be equalised so there is no impact on surrounding land or water bodies Sewer infrastructure will be upgraded to necessary capacity The proposal is consistent with the Draft Central Coast Regional Strategy. Water supply issues are addressed by Water Plan 2050 which outlines a number of initiatives to secure the region's water supply The site complies with the latest RFS bushfire guidelines There is no waterfront land included in this proposal The developer contributions plan proposed matches the requirements in the current plans for Gwandalan and offers an additional regional levy. Contributions at Gwandalan do not rely on any dedication or services provided at Catherine Hill Bay. A full SIA was provided with the EA that found the impact of the development to be acceptable
2330	12/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gwandalan development is not state significant. Gwandalan development has no connection with Catherine Hill Bay and should not be a combined development. Should be assessed by Wyong Shire Council under long developed and locally sensitive local government planning regulations. Local Aboriginal community has identified areas of significance protected under NPWS Act. Native plants and animals are threatened. Destruction of bushland must stop. Will cause significant drainage problems. Will impact upon environmental health of Crangan Bay, Lake Macquarie. Sewer pumping station is unable to handle increased number of dwellings. Bushfire assessment fails to consider several issues including topography. Section 94 donation of undesirable land will only benefit Catherine Hill Bay with no benefit for Gwandalan. No appropriate land reserved for development of essential infrastructure, such as shops, schools, and churches - will lead to community isolation. Lack of existing facilities at Gwandalan. Does not return foreshore land for public use. Questions about governance procedures in place. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amenity Character Context Size State significant status Consent authority Aboriginal significance NPWS Act Flora and fauna Threatened species Drainage Bushland Cumulative impacts Bushfire Sewer Offsets Social infrastructure Public foreshore Public interest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The revised plan directly addresses the concerns raised by agencies, the IHAP and the community during exhibition of the previous concept plan. The community initially publicly welcomed the plan prior to changing their position The proposal is significantly smaller in terms of footprint and impact than the previous proposal with only 1 ha of development area at Gwandalan and 45ha of urban development at Moonee A full aboriginal heritage study was submitted with the EA. This was conducted according to DECC guidelines The offsets for the development were agreed by DECC Stormwater drainage will be carried out according to best practice on both sites. Pre and post development flows will be equalised so there is no impact on surrounding land or water bodies Sewer infrastructure will be upgraded to necessary capacity The proposal is consistent with the Draft Central Coast Regional Strategy. Water supply issues are addressed by Water Plan 2050 which outlines a number of initiatives to secure the region's water supply The site complies with the latest RFS bushfire guidelines There is no waterfront land included in this proposal The developer contributions plan proposed matches the requirements in the current plans for Gwandalan and offers an additional regional levy. Contributions at Gwandalan do not rely on any dedication or services provided at Catherine Hill Bay. A full SIA was provided with the EA that found the impact of the development to be acceptable
2331-2335	15/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Catherine Hill Bay is a unique heritage village. Building on coastal headlands is bad planning. Loved destination for surfers, divers, fishers and tourists. Would destroy a beautiful place. Developed areas should be developed. Should be less than 300 houses that cannot be seen from the villages or the sea. 600 of the new houses will overlook Moonee Beach which currently has no houses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage Coastal Policy Amenity Character Context Size Visual impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All development has been removed from the existing village. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. There is no development on the headland Development has been removed from the existing village Amenities for surfers and other beach goers will be enhanced. Rose Group is prepared to discuss providing funding for a new surf club at Catherine Hill Bay as part of its developer contributions plan
2336	15/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Catherine Hill Bay is a unique heritage village. Building on coastal headlands is bad planning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage Coastal Policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All development has been removed from the existing village. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loved destination for surfers, divers, fishers and tourists. Would destroy a beautiful place. Developed areas should be developed. Should be less than 300 houses that cannot be seen from the villages or the sea. 600 of the new houses will overlook Moonee Beach which currently has no houses. Attempts to shoehorn 600 houses and ameliorate its impact rather than locate development in less sensitive areas. Attempts to increase capacity of development by providing commercial space contrary to the MO and IHAP. Bin building previously proposed for demolition and remediation under Mine Rehabilitation Plan. No demonstration of engineering feasibility and stability of adaptive reuse of bin building. Significant development on the headland. Will increase impact from reflectivity and night lighting making it highly visible from key viewpoints along the beach. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amenity Character Context Size Visual impact MO IHAP Mine Rehabilitation Plan bin building Geotechnical Engineering feasibility Headland 	<p>landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no development on the headland Development has been removed from the existing village Amenities for surfers and other beach goers will be enhanced. Rose Group is prepared to discuss providing funding for a new surf club at Catherine Hill Bay as part of its developer contributions plan The Concept Plan complies with the MO The mine remediation plan is for the bin building to be filled and capped not removed The appropriateness of the bin building for reuse will be determined prior to a PA being lodged for that work
2337-2376	15/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Catherine Hill Bay is a unique heritage village. Building on coastal headlands is bad planning. Loved destination for surfers, divers, fishers and tourists. Would destroy a beautiful place. Developed areas should be developed. Should be less than 300 houses that cannot be seen from the villages or the sea. 600 of the new houses will overlook Moonee Beach which currently has no houses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage Coastal Policy Amenity Character Context Size Visual impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All development has been removed from the existing village. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. There is no development on the headland Development has been removed from the existing village Amenities for surfers and other beach goers will be enhanced. Rose Group is prepared to discuss providing funding for a new surf club at Catherine Hill Bay as part of its developer contributions plan
2377-23 9	17/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ob ect to the development of the Gwandalan site. Needs to be considered in tandem with Coal Allied development proposed for Middle Camp Increase in dwelling will have significant impact on number of cars Contradictory traffic access to Pacific Highway Too many dwellings proposed (600houses 9 shops shoptop housing tourism accommodation apartments in Bin Building 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage Coastal Policy Amenity Character Context Size Visual impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic and service issues have been examined on a cumulative basis Impact on Catherine Hill Bay village has been minimised Traffic will be within applicable standards and efforts are being made to minimise the impact on the existing village by routing traffic from the development in and out via Montefiore Street Accesses to the Pacific highway are being negotiated ointly with RTA Development complies with MO
2390-2396	1 /10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Catherine Hill Bay is a unique heritage village. Building on coastal headlands is bad planning. Loved destination for surfers, divers, fishers and tourists. Would destroy a beautiful place. Developed areas should be developed. Should be less than 300 houses that cannot be seen from the villages or the sea. 600 of the new houses will overlook Moonee Beach which currently has no houses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage Coastal Policy Amenity Character Context Size Visual impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All development has been removed from the existing village. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. There is no development on the headland Development has been removed from the existing village Amenities for surfers and other beach goers will be enhanced. Rose Group is prepared to discuss providing funding for a new surf club at Catherine Hill Bay as part of its developer contributions plan
2397	15/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Included in Lower Hunter Regional Strategy after exhibition period had expired. Gwandalan is remote, 19km from a shopping centre, has one entry/exit road to the highway, little work in the area, and poor public transport. This is contrary to the Regional Strategy requirement for development around ma or centres and transport corridors. Inappropriate density and configuration, type and style of development. Insufficient child care, local doctor has closed his books, and local school has reached capacity. No public waterfront access, no cycle ways and one small park for 215 families. Should be returned to Wyong Shire Council for its consideration to the original year 2011 timeline. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower Hunter Regional Strategy Social infrastructure Density, type and scale Public waterfront access Cycle ways Open space Consent authority Rezoning timing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic impact assessment shows that roads are well within standards. The roads are designed so that bus services are accommodated within 400m of any residence Buses already serve the area The housing density is in keeping with the character of the area A full SIA is provided with the EA Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed. Cycleways are provided
239	15/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No proposal for stage 2 would set dangerous precedent. As whole site is not being rezoned it is not considered coastal and not sub ect to same guidelines, for example, not public waterfront access would be provided because the land is considered private property. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Precedent Stage 2 Coastal Policy Public waterfront access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is not intent to develop stage 2 There is no waterfront land included in this proposal Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stormwater runoff will be discharged onto 7b Environment/Scenic Protection land. Sewerage outlet is on land that has not been rezoned. Dams and drainage will be maintained by owners of adjoining land not by proponent. Natural watercourses treated as stormwater runoff and series of drains. Watercourses should be protected by riparian corridors as part of on-site mitigation. Should be returned to Wyong Shire Council for its consideration to the original year 2011 timeline. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stormwater Natural watercourses 7b Environment/Scenic Protection Sewerage outlet Riparian corridors Mitigation Consent authority Rezoning timing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> appropriate manner Rezoning is not required for the housing of a sewerage outlet There are no natural perennial watercourses on the site Discussions have taken place with DWE on this issue
2399	15/10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will be prominent on Catherine Hill Bay headland. This is inconsistent with government's coastal policy. Should be considered in tandem with Coal and Allied Middle Camp proposal. Unique Catherine Hill Bay settlement will disappear. IHAP recommendation was for commercial development for daily convenience needs only. Not for 9 shops, shop top housing, tourist accommodation, apartments plus 600 houses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visual impact Headland Coastal Policy Coal and Allied proposal IHAP Commercial uses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All development has been removed from the existing village. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. There is no development on the headland Traffic and service issues have been examined on a cumulative basis Impact on Catherine Hill Bay village has been minimised Development complies with MO .
2400	15/10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would add 900 much larger dwellings and 1, 00m² commercial space to unique, heritage mining village. Will increase housing 10 fold and existing town footprint 20 fold. Considerable amenity impact. Impacts will undermine its State significant site listing. Environmentally sensitive flora and fauna will be affected. Should be sited physically and visually separate from Catherine Hill Bay township. Land is zoned for high conservation control - this should be upheld and the land not developed. Highly visible from coast and Catherine Hill Bay. Will dominate the town. Catherine Hill Bay is popular, recreational area for range of users. Should be kept for our children. Intrusive, 'get rich quick' scheme. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scale and size Heritage Amenity State significant site listing Flora and fauna Environmental impacts Siting and design Conservation Zoning Visual impacts Inter generational equity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All development has been removed from the existing village. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. There is no development on the headland Additional supplementary flora and fauna studies are underway to meet EPBC requirements Traffic and service issues have been examined on a cumulative basis Impact on Catherine Hill Bay village has been minimised Development complies with MO
2401	15/10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should be the responsibility of Wyong Council to look into such matters. Many social issues to address such as lack of medical services, distance to shops, insufficient public transport. Town will be changed by increased population. Nearest railway is Wyee, 1.25km distant, accessible only by car. Increased population and car reliance would add to greenhouse gas emissions. Better to locate near a railway station. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consent authority Social infrastructure Social impacts Population Public transport Greenhouse gas emissions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The roads are designed so that bus services are accommodated within 400m of any residence Buses already serve the area The housing density is in keeping with the character of the area A full SIA is provided with the EA Cycleways are provided Many towns are not near a railway station GHG emissions will be minimised with homes meeting BASI standards
2402	15/10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No mention of Gwandalan or Wyong Shire in Lower Hunter Regional Strategy apart from an inset map. Gwandalan is in Wyong Shire and increased population (17.25%) effects will be felt there, not in Lower Hunter. Should be returned to Wyong Shire Council for its consideration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower Hunter Regional Strategy Population Impacts on Wyong Shire Consent authority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Matters for State Government
2403	15/10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No public waterfront access contrary to government policy. Why is it included in the Lower Hunter Gwandalan is part of the Wyong Shire and Central Coast Region. How can Gwandalan sustain another development Primary school and doctor are at capacity, there is no high school, public transport is irregular and poor, and there is a lack of facilities for teenagers. No policing. 45km away from job opportunities. Environment will suffer: rare plant species and many native animals. Contrary to government's green and sustainable living policies. Will cut down hundreds of trees and ruin natural wonders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public waterfront access Coastal Policy Regional Strategy context Sustainability Social infrastructure Public transport Police Employment Overdevelopment Amenity Environmental impacts Flora and fauna 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no waterfront land included in the proposal and the proposal is fully compliant with SEPP 71 in so far as it applies A full SIA is provided with the EA Traffic impact assessment shows that roads are well within standards. The roads are designed so that bus services are accommodated within 400m of any residence More people means bus services will be more viable All offsets were agreed with DECC. The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. The development is consistent with the Draft Central Coast Regional Strategy which has been informed by regional water planning. Water Plan 2050 sets out a program to secure the region's water supply

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Central Coast has tough water restrictions. Should be returned to Wyong Shire Council for its consideration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government policy Trees Water 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A developer contribution plan is provided that could be used by Council to assist to upgrade boating facilities.
2404	15/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant adverse impacts on environmental and heritage significance of Catherine Hill Bay area. Contrary to MO in respect of commercial space, and its location, adaptive reuse of bin building and etty. No demonstration of engineering feasibility and long term stability for bin building. Significant development on headland. Bin building will have reflectivity and night light impacts and be highly visible from the beach. Physical and administrative requirements of proposed cliff walk inadequately addressed. Headland development contravenes coastal policy, Heritage Office guidelines and IHAP recommendations. Amenity impacts of increased traffic on heritage properties have not been addressed. Does not address cumulative impacts of this and the Coal and Allied development on road network and beach parking. No economic assessment of cost to the State. No scientific analysis of condition, environmental and social values of offset lands. Site has been zoned for conservation and public values over many years of public consultation. Earthworks will greatly re-shape the landscape. Serious impacts on conservation values and bushland setting. Flood mitigation report does not address impact on conservation areas during construction of Hamlets 1 and 2. Visual impact assessment clearly states exposure of flora and fauna to development but contains no scientific analysis. No analysis of impacts of increased cat and dog population on conservation areas. Size and location of commercial space contrary to IHAP recommendations. No adaptive reuse of bin building and etty for commercial use. No long term engineering/stability assessment for residential reuse of bin building. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Heritage MO Commercial floor space Bin building etty Engineering/stability Visual impacts Coastal Policy Heritage Office guidelines IHAP Amenity Traffic assessment Cumulative impacts Economic impacts Public cost Offsets Scientific analysis Public interest Equity Bushland Conservation Earthworks Domestic animals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All development has been removed from the existing village. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. Development complies with MO The appropriateness of the bin building for reuse will be determined prior to a PA being lodged for that work Development is set back from the cliff edge The design of the bin building will minimise reflectivity and light pollution Further information on the cliff walk will be provided in the PPR There is no development on the headland Cumulative impacts on roads and services have been considered in EA DECC have agreed offsets Additional supplementary flora and fauna studies are underway to meet EPBC requirements Management of construction will ensure that impacts on conservation area during construction are carefully managed. This is detailed in the Statement of Commitments Additional beach parking is provided in three areas. Educational material will be provided to residents on the importance of controlling pets The etty is not part of this proposal
2405	15/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is already enough global warming and we do not need more electricity. Historic village and native bushland. Many different and interesting types of flora and fauna. Already developed areas should be developed not the beauty and history of Catherine Hill Bay. Will destroy sleepy village feel. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Global warming Historic values Native bushland Flora and fauna Amenity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development will not add to global warming. People will be housed in carefully designed energy efficient homes and the design of the site is conducive to walking. Development has been removed from the village and its surrounds and has been based on a McHarg landscape analysis to minimise its landscape impact
2406	15/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Original concerns not addressed by revised concept. Catherine Hill Bay is a special, unique place with old world character. One of few, small hamlets to escape ongoing coastline development. Existing view shed should be protected so that development is not seen from the town and impact is reduced. Commercial centre on ridgeline will erase existing, strong, visual backdrop critical to the town's character. Significant impact on views of Catherine Hill Bay village and beach, particularly from Middle Camp. Will erode existing vegetated and undeveloped backdrop. Views from the north and Flowers Drive will be one that dominates sensitive coastal edge and overwhelms town's structure and landscape setting. Beachfront and headland are integral to unique character of town. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> View shed Visual impacts Character Ridgeline Landscape Beachfront and headland Vegetation Visual analysis Coastal Design Guidelines and SEPP 71 CHB and Gwandalan combined assessment State Significant status 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All development has been removed from the existing village. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. Existing view shed is protected There is no commercial centre on the ridgeline – this was the old concept plan Full visual analysis provided in EA. This submission appears to refer to the old concept plan Development is set back from the cliff edge DECC have agreed offsets

			<p>Headland includes protruding area between southern village section and the beach. Removal of any vegetation would destroy essential natural element. No encroachment should occur on these areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs a detailed visual analysis with cross sections and photo simulations. Direct conflict with almost all stated objectives of Coastal Design Guidelines and SEPP 71. CHB and Gwandalan sites should not be a combined assessment as they are totally unrelated. Gwandalan should not be considered a State Significant development. 		
2407	19/10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will permanently change austere, little mining town. Town has heritage value and deserves to be respected. Development will annihilate heritage value. Will be highly visible from the water. Coastal land should be allocated to public park and housing development out of eyesight of original town. Decision should be based on long term society benefits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage Visual impacts Public coastal park Public interest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All development has been removed from the existing village. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible.
240	03/10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not give proper significance to watercourses. New plan is an isolated community with no integration with surrounding community. Is a fire trap with one way in out. Amount of cut and fill will mean not many significant trees retained. Trees on each block should be retained until building commences. Threatened species, <i>Tetratheca juncea</i> is located on the site in significant numbers as reported by Wildthing 2003. This species is protected by federal law but proposal plans to clear the site and argue that dedicating land to National Park is sufficient. Environmental risk assessment is not adequate. Approach to offsets does not fit with the policy laid down by DEC in the Draft Lower Hunter Regional Conservation Plan which says: 1. impacts must be avoided first by using prevention and mitigation measures, 6. offsets should aim to result in a net improvement in biodiversity over time., 9. offsets must be quantifiable – the impacts and benefits must be reliably estimated. Rosegroup have not attempted to mitigate the loss of biodiversity. The offset has not been reliably assessed. It is critical that an appropriate wildlife corridor be created between the bush on the ridge at Gwandalan and the National park on Point Wollstonecraft so creating continuity from Munmorah SCA. The land on the other side of Kanangra Drive is zoned 7b – which is currently being sold (40 lots) for 10million. The road design and layout seems to make people go the long way round. Some blocks face onto Kanangra Drive which does not happen anywhere else on that road. There is no provision for public access to the waterfront, which is contrary to the Department of Planning's own SEPP71 and would not happen anywhere else. All of Gwandalan has access along the waterfront and mostly to it by means of walkways. The north/south wildlife corridor shown in the plan has a pedestrian/bike path in it, two areas identified as playgrounds but with equipment, crosses 7 roads and is lit at night. This is a joke The only open space is between 2 roadways, starts about 10metres wide and tapers to nothing. This can't be regarded as public open space. RoseGroup are not serious about following the Panels recommendations and they have no concern for this special community or the people who may eventually buy their land. Proposal should be returned to Wyong Council. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Watercourses Isolation Integration Fire trap Cut and fill Flora species impacts Offsets Wildlife Corridor Road design and layout Public open space Panel recommendations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no natural perennial waterways on the site, post and pre development flows will be equalised so there will be no impact on the lake. The concept plan complies with the latest RFS Guidelines There are three ways in and out of the development Given the infrastructure and site preparation works it will be difficult to retain all trees until homes are constructed, however, every effort will be made to retain trees as this adds to the amenity of the site. All offsets were agreed with DECC Further threatened species work is underway to be lodged with the PPR Traffic impact assessment shows that roads are well within standards. There is no waterfront land included in the proposal and the proposal is fully compliant with SEPP 71 in so far as it applies The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed.

2409	15/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The destruction of coastal bushland must cease. We cannot create new bushland. • The development will harm our native Themeda sp. Grasslands which have been declared EECs on our coastal headlands and cliffs. • Catherine Hill Bay is a unique village on the east coast. • Building on coastal headlands is bad planning and would have visual consequences. Visual considerations should exercise an important influence on land use decisions because of high values Australians place on visual amenity of these areas. • This headland has the highest value for landscape characteristics when assessed against Guidelines for Visual Assessment and Management of Coastal Landscapes by the State Pollution Control Commission Feb 19 1 • Catherine Hill Bay is a loved destination for surfers, divers, fisherman and tourists. • Why destroy a beautiful place. We should be re-developing the developed areas, not destroying a unique coastal village. • Any new development should be less than 300 houses that can't be seen from the villages or the sea. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Visual Impacts • Coastal setting • Development size 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This development will create a ma or dedication of bushland to national park. All offsets have been agreed by DECC • All development has been removed from the existing village and from the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible.
2410	15/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed development at Gwandalan, including Coal and Allied's will destroy the make up of the town. • Some development potential is possible but it needs to address environmental issues • To say these issues are offset by land on the other side of Crangan Bay is irresponsible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Character • Environment • Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matters for Coal and Allied and the Departments
2411-2414	15/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned that Rose Group and Coal and Allied's combined developments of 1000 dwellings will encircle the village. • Why are the traffic plans from the two developers contradicting • Most homes in the village are built close to the kerb which means they have no opportunity to protect themselves from traffic noise and pollution. • There has been no McHarg analysis or any other scientific report supporting the developers desire to add 600 dwellings to this area. No detail has been provided as to the total number of dwellings and their placement throughout areas 1-7. • Are the proposed apartments, shoptop accommodation, Wallarah House (proposed B B), etty masters house etc. included in the 600 dwelling count. Will any dual or multi occupancy buildings be permitted now or in the future • There is a statutory mine closure plan in place with funds allocated, which is meant to remediate the despoiled areas for recreation uses. Ob ects to the proposal to vary statutory obligations that encumber this land. These obligations were in place before the land was purchased and should be honoured. Development is not rehabilitation. Who gets the money if it's not spent • Why is there no mention of preserving the etty. How can the etty be of no value but the bin building be so important • The Coastal Protection Act and other planning instruments such as SEPP 11, SEPP 14, SEPP 55 and SEPP71 are not planning suggestions but laws put in place to protect the environment from unsuitable or over development. Like all laws they should be adhered to and enforced. I ob ect to the laws of the land being bent, twisted or ignored to the benefit of some, but to the disadvantage of everyone else in the Australian community. • The village centre will contain up to 1 00m² of commercial/retail floor space with no more than 200m² in any individual shop. Is that 9 shops at 200m² or 1 shops at 100m² or even 36 shops at 50m². I ask that all details be confirmed and capped if this proposal is to go ahead. • The NSW government should negotiate a better deal for NSW and not let developers dictate the terms. The headland should be remediated and kept in public hands, hunter area water should be put to better use and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overdevelopment • Traffic • Mine closure plan • Legislation • Commercial 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All development has been removed from the existing village. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • Traffic impacts have been modelled and are within guidelines and standards • Traffic and service impacts have been assessed for 900 dwellings • Joint discussions with RTCA and RTA are now being held • Yes the shop top dwellings and apartments are all included in the total of 600 dwellings. Wallarah House and the Jetty Masters Cottage are not included, they are existing • The Jetty is not part of this proposal and Rose Group has no interest in it. • The proposal complies with all relevant SEPPs • There is no expectation that there will be more than 10 shops.

			the laws of the land should be obeyed and enforced.		
2415	15/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development would detract from the heritage character and natural beauty of Catherine Hill Bay or of its surrounds. Particular, any development of the headlands that frame the historic township would also permanently degrade a valuable piece of our coastal heritage. This state has one of the most beautiful coastlines in the world, an asset that must be protected in the general case but more so in areas of such significance as Catherine Hill Bay. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Character Coastal amenity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All development has been removed from the existing village and the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible.
2416-2419	15/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Catherine Hill Bay is a unique heritage village. On the coast, there is nothing else like it so don't destroy it. The perceived benefit of a National Park is disproportionate to the offsets of 60hectares of land development areas of high visual and environmental impact. There is no scientific analysis of the condition of the offset lands or assessment of where development could best occur. 600 of the proposed new houses are overlooking pristine Moonee Beach, where there are currently no houses. Building on coastal headlands is bad planning and is inconsistent with government policies. Local environmental groups oppose the proposal as un ustified and a poor outcome. Catherine Hill Bay is a loved destination for surfers, divers, fishermen and tourists, they go there for what Catherine Hill Bay doesn't have – not what it does have. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage Character Visual Environment Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All development has been removed from the existing village and the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. All offsets have been agreed with DECC There is no development on the headland Amenities for surfers and other beach goers will be enhanced. Rose Group is prepared to discuss providing funding for a new surf club at Catherine Hill Bay as part of its developer contributions plan
2420	1 /10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan would seriously compromise the current spirit, peace, community and environment and is totally inappropriate place for such a development. The Draft LHRS has identified that areas such as South Wallarah “underpins human wellbeing” and “provides recreational opportunities and is a source of inspiration and cultural identity” through the maintenance of biodiversity. If the concept plan is approved the government would be responsible for this loss as the human impact of this area would lead to the eventual loss and degradation as set out in the Draft LHRS Section 4.3 Threats to the biodiversity of the Lower Hunter. DECs report “Conservation Assessment of Lands South Wallarah Peninsula) had a concluding statement ”that the South Wallarah Study area is of extremely high conservation value and that development opportunities across the site are limited due to the potential for incremental habitat loss and fragmentation. The concept plan does not demonstrate it will improve or maintain the biodiversity in the area but will degrade this quality. The development does not demonstrate effectively that it will protect the wetlands of Moonee and waterways at Catherine Hill Bay. This area is of Commonwealth significance and humans and construction would seriously impact these areas. The concept plan does not demonstrate excellence or world class practices for developing in such an environmentally sensitive area. Scenic protection has been compromised by headland development and the Moonee Beach Hamlets are evident from the Lake Munmorah conservation area headland. The Green and wildlife corridors are seriously under threat from human impact. There does not seem to be evidence in the concept plan of how these corridors effectively work for the fauna, especially under increased threat of fire: by human activity. The EIS appears to be insufficient for the significance of the biodiversity on the study area – demonstrated by statements that surveys not complete on offset areas for conservation maybe a third of area studied and that there may be species “potentially using”, “maybe present” and possibility species may still occur” on the development site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Character Lower Hunter Regional Strategy Environmental Values Wetlands/waterways Visual/scenic impacts Offset lands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All development has been removed from the existing village and the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. The concept plan will see the vast ma ority of this private land holding dedicated to National Park to secure public access and conservation All offsets have been agreed with DECC Stormwater will be managed to equate pre and post development flows. There will be no runoff to the SEPP 14 wetland, further work will be provided in the PPR to demonstrate this more clearly Development has been removed from the headland The corridors within the development areas are primarily for human movement and scenic amenity, though they will serve a corridor function, particularly for bird species. Conservation movement is catered for in the offset lands Further flora and fauna work will be presented with the PPR

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Gwandalan concept plan adds increased human impact to the Crangan Bay water system of Lake Macquarie. The bay is slowly recovering from the mining activity of the past and does not need increase activity from further human impact. • National Parks are under funded and are struggling to cope with its current land in the area – evidenced by increase of dumping, weed invasion, motorbikes and habitat loss due to vandalism, • With the increased environmental pressures of global warming, it would be a disaster to allow the approval of this concept plan or any further concept plans of this proportion. • Proposal should be rejected and total acquisition of the land to restore its integrity and spirit for the traditional land owners, current resident and visitors and future generations. This would achieve part of the outcome of securing perpetuity of the south Wallarah Peninsula. 		
2421	11/10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 215 housing development proposed is being promoted as a development for young families • The development has been included in the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy after the exhibition period had expired. • The Regional Strategy states that development should be around major centres and transport corridors. Gwandalan is remote, over 19kms from the nearest major shopping centre there is only 1 entry/exit road to the highway. There is little, to no work in the immediate vicinity of the development. The area has poor public transport. • The development's density and configuration are inappropriate. • Objection is not to development per se but the type and style of development proposed. • There are insufficient child-care places, the local doctor has closed his books, and the local public school is at capacity. • There is no public access to the waterfront from the development, no cycleways and one small block for a park for 215 young families. • Development should be returned to Wyong Council for consideration on its original timeline which is 2011. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demographics • Development location (away from services) • Density • Social services • Waterfront pedestrian access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development is not targeted at any particular demographic but may provide an affordable source of family homes. • Gwandalan is adjacent to the Pacific Highway • There are many developments without close rail access • The density and configuration are consistent with existing areas in Gwandalan • A full SIA has been provided • There is no waterfront land included in this development • Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed.
2422	11/10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjustments to existing infrastructure should be made before development, rather than after or during. • Updated electricity and water supplies are needed. • Consideration should be given to roads including the highway to Sydney or Newcastle, as well as local. • Schooling and medical needs to be considered. • Transport is insufficient for current population. • Gwandalan/Summerland Point has grown slowly without town water, electricity and sewerage for people wanting to escape the hurley burley of city life. Over the last few years development has taken over without the thought of the environment. Flora and fauna pushed back further from their natural habitat. • The houses are too large and too expensive – now many are for sale. • Police are needed to patrol the area. • Understand the need for houses but object to the intrusion of developments on the village lifestyle. • Wyong Council identified development of this land in 2011. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure • Servicing • Traffic • Schooling • Medical • Lifestyle • Market • Police 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service infrastructure is available and will be upgraded prior to development of homes • The traffic study finds acceptable impacts on the road network • A full SIA was submitted with the EA that considers these issues • More people will make public transport more viable. Roads are suited to bus traffic • The houses are not defined for Gwandalan
2423	9/10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal is an improvement on previous proposal but still has concerns. • Proposal will be highly prominent on Catherine Hill Bay headland, which is inconsistent with the government's own coastal policy. • Proposal needs to be considered in tandem with Coal and Allied's proposal. Together, these proposals will increase the size of the town by 10 (from 100 to 1,000) and will have a significant impact in the number of cars. • Traffic access has not been solved as currently each developer is proposing access strategies to the Pacific Highway that contradict each other. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coastal Policy • Cumulative impacts • Traffic • Overdevelopment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All development has been removed from the existing village. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • There is no development on the headland • Traffic and service issues have been examined on a cumulative basis • Discussions with RTA are being held with RTCA • Development complies with MO

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Mo states that the maximum quantum of dwellings is 600. • The IHAP made it clear that commercial development should be “only for daily convenience needs (general store of the like)”. This doesn’t mean 600 houses 9 shops and shoptop housing and tourism accommodation and apartments and the Bin Building on the headland. 		
2424	11/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catho is a unique heritage village on the East Coast • Building on coastal headlands is very bad planning. • Catho is a loved destination for surfers, divers, fisherman and tourists. They go there fore what Catho does not have – not what it does have. • Why destroy such a beautiful place We should be re-developing the developed areas, not destroying a unique coastal village. Please leave this place alone. • Any new development should be less than 300 houses that cannot be seen from either Catho Village or the sea (600 of the proposed new houses are overlooking Moonee Beach,(where there are currently no houses), an area that should remain unspoilt 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage • Coastal development • Development location impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All development has been removed from the existing village and the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • All offsets have been agreed with DECC • There is no development on the headland • Amenities for surfers and other beach goers will be enhanced. Rose Group is prepared to discuss providing funding for a new surf club at Catherine Hill Bay as part of its developer contributions plan
2425	11/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Holidays in Catherine Hill Bay and spends time swimming, running, walking and going to the bowling club restaurant. • Sees very little difference from previous submission. They are still putting a high-density development that is clearly visible from all aspects of Catherine Hill Village and beach. This development will destroy what is a conservation area, so a developer can make money. • Development should be re ected for the reasons identified by the Progress Association, as well as the following <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development is not in keeping with the interim report ie. to reduce the impact of development on the character of Catherine Hill. Squeezing 600 houses into 6 hamlets, which can be seen from all sections of Catherine Hill Village and beach. • The proposal ignores the overall limit and documents 650 housing lots, with no explanation why. • Does not agree with the IHAPs recommendation to look at reusing the Bin Building for commercial uses, due to its prominent position. The Bin Building should be removed, as previously proposed under the Mine Rehabilitation plan. This recommendation has been ignored with apartments being proposed. There is no engineering feasibility to suggest this is possible. This may be a way to increase the density of housing, with no respect for planning considerations. • No scientific analysis of what value the offset conservation lands has to the area to allow even the 600 houses and the size of that land. This land has been zoned to protect its conservation and public values over many years of public consultation by various agencies and represents huge community investment. • There must be risks associated with mine subsidence which are increased by building on this site. The movement of so much spoil must increase instability of the area with significant ramifications. There is no information on how this issue is going to be managed. • Proposed development of houses and shops on the headland contravenes the coastal policy and guidelines and IHAPs recommendations. • There is no traffic report that gauges the impact of traffic on Catherine Hill Bay as the number of properties is going from 100 to 600 (7x the size) and will have massive impacts on existing residents and infrastructure. • Report talks about a sustainable development but with no public transport, a location away from local centres, no infrastructure (roads, sewerage, stormwater) does not meet any of the principles or any planning ones. This development will put continued pressure on the limited funds of all government agencies. • Development is totally unacceptable and will have a large impact on 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density • Visual impact • IHAPs recommendations • Mine rehabilitation • Bin building • Offsets • Mine subsidence • Coastal policy • Traffic • Servicing • infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All development has been removed from the existing village and the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • Amenities for surfers and other beach goers will be enhanced. Rose Group is prepared to discuss providing funding for a new surf club at Catherine Hill Bay as part of its developer contributions plan • Development is for a maximum of 600 dwellings at Moonee, as per the MO • Reuse of the bin building is contingent on structural feasibility. The bin building cannot be removed without destabilising the entire cliff face. There will be a viewing platform and caf on top of the bin building to ensure the public can en oy this space. • DECC have approved the offsets • Mine subsidence risks can be managed to the satisfaction of the MSB • The development is consistent with the coastal policy as outlined in Appendix T of the EA • Traffic and service issues have been examined on a cumulative basis • Impact on Catherine Hill Bay village has been minimised • Traffic will be within applicable standards and efforts are being made to minimise the impact on the existing village by routing traffic from the development in and out via Montefiore Street • Accesses to the Pacific highway are being negotiated ointly with RTA

			all facets of life at Catherine Hill Bay.		
2426-2444	19/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catherine Hill Bay is a special place located between Lake Macquarie, the beach and within a bushland setting. • There is a lack of town water and sewer to the area and the change from company to private ownership in the 1960s has helped retain the original character. • The community accept the numerous restrictions in terms of lack of services and a predominantly single storey height control. • The development proposals being considered by the Minister will add 900 much larger dwellings and 1 00m² of commercial development to the heritage mining village of about 100 small miners cottages. It is considered inappropriate to increase the number of houses by 10 times and the existing town footprint by 20 times. The impact on the town amenity of considerable. • The impact on the heritage of a rare mining town of State Significance will undermine its state listing. • Some area of development is on the former mining lands, environmentally sensitive flora and fauna will be affected. • The importance of separating new development physically and visually from the Catherine Hill Bay township is critical to retaining its heritage setting and existing amenity. • The proposal is ustified because of the dedication of 0 of the land holdings of key landowners in the Hunter Region to National Park in exchange for being able to develop in a sensitive coastal location. The land is already zoned by the State Government for high conservation control and cannot be developed. • The area is highly visible from the coast and heritage town of Catherine Hill Bay. The proposal maximises views for the new development at the expense of a unique place. While a proposed National Park is supported, the offsets of 60ha of land on areas of high visual and environmental impact is disproportionate to the benefit. • The proposal dominates the town with development. • Restricting development away from sensitive visual areas will not impact on the significant profitability of the development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Character • Development footprint • Environmental • Visual impacts • development intensity and location 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All development has been removed from the existing village and the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • Connection of water and sewer will provide environmental improvements and reduce the risk of pollution in creeks and on the beach. Residents will not be obliged to connect. The availability of mains water will also assist greatly in the fire safety of the community. It would currently be very difficult for the RFS to protect Catherine Hill Bay in a ma or bushfire event • It is difficult to see how many of the dwellings in Catherine Hill Bay can be categorised as single storey. However, Hamlet 1 will be single storey other than the shop top housing and the other hamlets will have a maximum of two storeys • Decc has approved all offsets • New development is physically and visually separated from the existing village • A visual assessment is provided. The development has been carefully designed to minimise the visual impacts.
2445-2467	22/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ob ect to the development of the Gwandalan site. • Needs to be considered in tandem with Coal Allied development proposed for Middle Camp • Increase in dwelling will have significant impact on number of cars • Contradictory traffic access to Pacific Highway • Too many dwellings proposed (600houses 9 shops shoptop housing tourism accommodation apartments in Bin Building 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic and service issues have been examined on a cumulative basis • Discussions with RTA are being held with RTCA • Development complies with MO
246	22/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catherine Hill Bay is a unique heritage village. • Building on coastal headlands is bad planning. • Loved destination for surfers, divers, fishers and tourists. • Would destroy a beautiful place. Developed areas should be developed. • Should be less than 300 houses that cannot be seen from the villages or the sea. • 600 of the new houses will overlook Moonee Beach which currently has no houses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage • Coastal Policy • Amenity • Character • Context • Size • Visual impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All development has been removed from the existing village and the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • All offsets have been agreed with DECC • There is no development on the headland • Amenities for surfers and other beach goers will be enhanced. Rose Group is prepared to discuss providing funding for a new surf club at Catherine Hill Bay as part of its developer contributions plan
2469	22/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catherine Hill Bay is a unique heritage village. On the coast, there is nothing else like it so don't destroy it. • The perceived benefit of a National Park is disproportionate to the offsets of 60hectares of land development areas of high visual and environmental impact. • There is no scientific analysis of the condition of the offset lands or assessment of where development could best occur. • 600 of the proposed new houses are overlooking pristine Moonee Beach, where there are currently no houses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage • Character • Visual • Environment • Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All development has been removed from the existing village and the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • All offsets have been agreed with DECC • Amenities for surfers and other beach goers will be enhanced. Rose Group is prepared to discuss providing funding for a new surf club at Catherine Hill Bay as part of its developer contributions plan

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building on coastal headlands is bad planning and is inconsistent with government policies. • Local environmental groups oppose the proposal as unjustified and a poor outcome. • Catherine Hill Bay is a loved destination for surfers, divers, fishermen and tourists, they go there for what Catherine Hill Bay doesn't have – not what it does have. 		
2470-2473	22/10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catherine Hill Bay is a unique heritage village. • Building on coastal headlands is bad planning. • Loved destination for surfers, divers, fishers and tourists. • Would destroy a beautiful place. Developed areas should be developed. • Should be less than 300 houses that cannot be seen from the villages or the sea. • 600 of the new houses will overlook Moonee Beach which currently has no houses. • Gwandalan is not in the same local government area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage • Coastal Policy • Amenity • Character • Context • Size • Visual impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All development has been removed from the existing village and the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • All offsets have been agreed with DECC • There is no development on the headland • Amenities for surfers and other beach goers will be enhanced. Rose Group is prepared to discuss providing funding for a new surf club at Catherine Hill Bay as part of its developer contributions plan • The Concept plan is consistent with the MO • The majority of the development at Catherine Hill Bay is in Wyong Council area, so is Gwandalan
2474	11/10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not take into account any of the IHAP recommendations. • Has not been redesigned in accordance with current best practice urban design principles. • No attention paid to existing watercourses. • No retention of significant trees. • No appropriate open parkland areas. • Open space area is narrow, long and between 2 access roads. • Wildlife corridor unsuitable because it goes over 7 roads, includes a cycle/footpath and night lighting. • No suitable offset land applicable or adjacent to the proposed development site. • Does not address public waterfront access. • Unrealistic and unacceptable to suggest that only part of the site (Precinct 1A) be subject to rezoning. This would be an improper use of Ministerial powers in relation to part 3A of the Act and the Coastal Protection Policy. • Partial rezoning would also set a precedent for private use of public land. • Independent Panel should review this proposal in relation to the whole site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IHAP • Urban design • Best practice • Watercourses • Trees • Open space • Wildlife corridor • Offset • Public waterfront access • Partial rezoning/MO • Precedent • Propriety • Coastal Protection Policy • EP A Act • IHAP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no natural perennial waterways on the site, post and pre development flows will be equalised so there will be no impact on the lake. • Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed. • Trees will be retained where practical • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • All offsets were agreed with DECC • There is no waterfront land included in the proposal and the proposal is fully compliant with SEPP 71 in so far as it applies
2475	03/10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the same as the first plan. • Inappropriate and unnecessary development. • Offset land is an excuse not to improve the plan. Should not be possible for developer to transfer land not owned by it to the government. • 5% of the land is the Catherine Hill Bay area. By including it as part of Gwandalan, they are double dipping. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate • Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All development has been removed from the existing village and the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC
2476-2473	22/10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catherine Hill Bay is a unique heritage village. On the coast, there is nothing else like it so don't destroy it. • The perceived benefit of a National Park is disproportionate to the offsets of 60 hectares of land development areas of high visual and environmental impact. • There is no scientific analysis of the condition of the offset lands or assessment of where development could best occur. • 600 of the proposed new houses are overlooking pristine Moonee Beach, where there are currently no houses. • Building on coastal headlands is bad planning and is inconsistent with government policies. • Local environmental groups oppose the proposal as unjustified and a poor outcome. • Catherine Hill Bay is a loved destination for surfers, divers, fishermen and tourists, they go there for what Catherine Hill Bay doesn't have – not what it does have. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage • Character • Visual • Environment • Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All development has been removed from the existing village and the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • All offsets have been agreed with DECC • Amenities for surfers and other beach goers will be enhanced. Rose Group is prepared to discuss providing funding for a new surf club at Catherine Hill Bay as part of its developer contributions plan

24 4	12/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has been moved into Lower Hunter Regional Strategy but its impacts will be felt by Wyong Shire Council. pkeep of road from Gwandalan to highway from increased traffic. Extra burden on health services, child care centres, parks, sewerage and water. Wyong Shire currently has Level 4 water restrictions and 23 dam capacity. No state government plans to expand/improve public school which is at capacity. Development has very little open space, no public waterfront access and no cycle ways as recommended by the independent panel. Site is not integrated into the surrounding area. Would be better to return to Wyong Council for its original 2011 rezoning time line. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Strategy context Traffic Social infrastructure Water Open space Public waterfront access Review Panel Integration Cosent authority Rezoning timing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed. Traffic levels will fall within applicable standards. The development is consistent with the Draft Central Coast Regional Strategy which has been informed by water planning for the Central Coast. Water Plan 2050 sets out a program to secure the region's water supply SIA found that facilities can cope with a higher population. The development is consistent with development in the surrounding area There is no waterfront land included in the proposal Cycleways are provided The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns.
24 5	10/10/2007	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is about time the area was made available to more residential occupancy. Very few services at present. Seems very generous in its donation of land back to the public. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AGREE
24 6	09/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Population has increased despite lack of services. Would be a greater demand for extra services and this would change lifestyle for current population who do not want change. Large number of unoccupied dwellings and vacant blocks of land. If they are occupied/developed along with proposed development, there will be a population explosion. Does not give access to Lake Macquarie with only way in being past the school. Nearest boat ramp is Garema Road and there s no parking for trailers. Will be high demand for these facilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of services Population Boating facilities Lake Macquarie access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SIA found that facilities can cope with a higher population. A developer contribution plan is provided that could be used by Council to assist to upgrade boating facilities. No waterfront land is included
24 7	12/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not in the interest of existing residents. 215 new homes would be a 16.5 increase in housing. On top of this is the Coal and Allied proposal. Prospect of losing so many trees. Where is the wildlife to go Trees are necessary to combat global warming. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public interest Coal and Allied proposal Trees Wildlife Global warming 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offsets agreed by DECC Housing numbers considerably reduced over previous concept plan Trees will be retained where practical. The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns.
24	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would destroy unique heritage qualities of Catherine Hill Bay. Building on a coastal headland is wrong in any location. Coastal planning laws should prevent inappropriate construction. Drastic reduction to 300 houses maximum might be acceptable but not overlooking Moonnee Beach. Catherine Hill Bay's attraction is its lack of coastal development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage Coastal Policy Size Public interest Amenity Character Visual impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All development has been removed from the existing village and the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible.
24 9	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Catherine Hill Bay is a unique heritage village. On the coast, there is nothing else like it so don't destroy it. The perceived benefit of a National Park is disproportionate to the offsets of 60hectares of land development areas of high visual and environmental impact. There is no scientific analysis of the condition of the offset lands or assessment of where development could best occur. 600 of the proposed new houses are overlooking pristine Moonnee Beach, where there are currently no houses. Building on coastal headlands is bad planning and is inconsistent with government policies. Local environmental groups oppose the proposal as un ustified and a poor outcome. Catherine Hill Bay is a loved destination for surfers, divers, fishermen and tourists, they go there for what Catherine Hill Bay doesn't have – not what it does have. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage Character Visual Environment Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All development has been removed from the existing village and the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. All offsets have been agreed with DECC Amenities for surfers and other beach goers will be enhanced. Rose Group is prepared to discuss providing funding for a new surf club at Catherine Hill Bay as part of its developer contributions plan
2490	10/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has been zoned non-residential for almost 40 years because of agreements reached through due process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rezoning/Due process Coal and Allied proposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Department ranking referred to here was a multi criteria analysis model designed to be used test different scenarios. This model was run for a

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be processed with Coal and Allied proposal at Middle Camp to appreciate full extent upon villages. • Site assessed as least feasible for residential development (out of 91 locations) by Department of Planning. • If preserved, this area will provide heart and soul of the area. • Save heritage village and natural bushland. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cumulative impact • Heritage • Suitability • Bushland • Inter-generational equity 	<p>scenario strongly weighted towards conservation over social and economic outcomes and ranked sites based on total size (in other words not per dwelling) it also assumed total development on the entire site. Not surprisingly large sites came out worst. This model assumed total development from the headland to the lake nothing like what is being proposed. Unfortunately this particular scenario was leaked to the green movement who have been misrepresenting it since. Correspondence issued by the Director General has sought to clarify this matter in the past.</p>
2491	10/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is there open space in the middle of the road and is it the only play space for children • Wildlife corridor also used as bike/foot path, playgrounds, crosses 7 roads and will be lit at night. • Cannot see how offsets on other side of Lake Macquarie will compensate for biodiversity loss. • Inadequate fire break between development and Point Wolstencraft recreation area. In a bushfire, is only 1 road in – past the school. • New residents would be isolated from rest of community. • Government policy to provide waterfront access for rezonings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open space • Children's safety • Wildlife corridor • Offsets • Biodiversity • Bushfire • Isolation • Waterfront access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • The Concept plan complies with the latest RFS guidelines • There are three access and egress points
2492	12/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inculcated into Lower Hunter Regional Strategy after expiry of exhibition period • Gwandalan is remote, over 19kms from nearest shopping centre, with only 1 road from highway. • Lack of work in immediate vicinity and poor public transport. • These features are contrary to the Strategy which requires development around major centres and transport corridors. • Inappropriate density, type, scale and configuration. • Insufficient child care, local doctor has closed his book, and local school is at capacity. • No public waterfront access, no cycle ways and 1 small block for a park. • Should be returned to Wyong Council to original 2011 rezoning timeframe. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower Hunter Regional Strategy • Public transport • Employment • Access • Facilities • Social infrastructure • Density • Scale • Public waterfront access • Cycle ways • Open Space • Consent authority • Rezoning timing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A full SIA has been provided with the EA • There is no requirement that development should be close to a rail station. The entire east side of Lake Macquarie is a lot further from rail • Roads are suited to bus use, there is already a bus service to the site • The density and configuration is consistent with the existing settlement pattern • There is no waterfront land in the proposed development area • Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed. • Cycleways are provided
2493	12/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contradictory traffic plans for Rosecorp and Coal and Allied proposals. • Most existing homes built very close to kerb leaving no chance to protect themselves from traffic noise and pollution. • No McHarg Analysis or other scientific report to support the number of dwellings. • No details of total dwellings, dwelling mix and placement throughout areas. • Developer seeking to vary statutory mine closure plan, which is meant to remediate the despoiled area for recreation. • Headland should be remediated and kept in public hands. • No mention of preserving Betty, a unique heritage feature. • Coastal Protection Act, SEPPs 11, 14, 55 and 71 are laws not planning suggestions. Designed to protect environment from unsuitable or overdevelopment. Laws should be adhered to. • Lack of detail about shops and distribution of 1, 00m² floor space. • Should negotiate better deal for NSW and not let developers dictate the terms. • Hunter Area water should be put to better use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic • Noise and pollution • Size • Dwelling mix and distribution • McHarg Analysis • Statutory mine closure plan • Remediation • Public land • Heritage • Coastal Protection Act • SEPPs 11, 14, 55 and 71 • Public interest • Commercial floor space • Lack of detail • Water 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rose Group and Coal and Allied proposals are totally independent. However, joint discussions are being held with RTA and other service providers • All development has been removed from the existing village and the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • Details of dwelling totals are given in the phasing plan within the concept plan • There is no development on the headland • The concept plan is consistent with SEPPs • All offsets have been agreed with DECC
2494	09/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate boat ramp parking. • No open space for children. • Traffic passing the school will be a safety hazard for children. • What will happen to new children as existing schools are at capacity. • We have only one doctor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking • Open space • Traffic • Children's safety • Schools • Social infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A developer contribution plan is provided that could be used by Council to assist to upgrade boating facilities. • SIA found that facilities can cope with a higher population. • Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed. • School traffic impacts will be minimal and will be managed with school zones

2495	11/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public waterfront access should be provided as per government policy and other parts of Gwandalan. The development would be isolated and residents trapped in bushfire because Kanagra Drive only goes to the fitness centre. No provision for shops, community areas or other public facilities. Increased traffic load on public streets. Existing waterways are ignored. They should be given proper riparian zones. Water from development will flow through environmental protection area – this is unacceptable. Insufficient open space. 10m wide is not enough. Stage 2 should be declared and rezoned at same time as Stage 2. Rosecorp will need to upgrade water, electricity, phone, sewerage and roads. These services are under stress. Should be a covenant requiring installation of water tanks and solar panels. Does not address Independent Panel's requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public waterfront access Isolation Access Bushfire Social infrastructure Community facilities Traffic and roads Waterways Riparian zones Environmental protection Open space Rezoning staging Essential services Covenants Water tanks Solar energy Review Panel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no waterfront land included in the proposal and the proposal is fully compliant with SEPP 71 in so far as it applies The Concept plan complies with the latest RFS guidelines There are three access and egress points Traffic levels will fall within applicable standards. There are no natural perennial waterways on the site, post and pre development flows will be equalised so there will be no impact on the lake. Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed. Service infrastructure will be upgraded All dwellings will have to meet BASI standards
2496	12/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contradictory traffic plans for Rosecorp and Coal and Allied proposals. Most existing homes built very close to kerb leaving no chance to protect themselves from traffic noise and pollution. No McHarg Analysis or other scientific report to support the number of dwellings. No details of total dwellings, dwelling mix and placement throughout areas. Developer seeking to vary statutory mine closure plan, which is meant to remediate the despoiled area for recreation. Headland should be remediated and kept in public hands. No mention of preserving etty, a unique heritage feature. Coastal Protection Act, SEPPs 11, 14, 55 and 71 are laws not planning suggestions. Designed to protect environment from unsuitable or overdevelopment. Laws should be adhered to. Lack of detail about shops and distribution of 1, 00m² floor space. Should negotiate better deal for NSW and not let developers dictate the terms. Hunter Area water should be put to better use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic Noise and pollution Size Dwelling mix and distribution McHarg Analysis Statutory mine closure plan Remediation Public land Heritage Coastal Protection Act SEPPs 11, 14, 55 and 71 Public interest Commercial floor space Lack of detail Water 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rose Group and Coal and Allied proposals are totally independent. However, oint discussions are being held with RTA and other service providers Traffic impacts on the village have been minimised and are within acceptable standards All development has been removed from the existing village and the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. Details of dwelling totals are given in the phasing plan within the concept plan There is no development on the headland which will be given to the public The Jetty is not part of this proposal The concept plan is consistent with SEPPs All offsets have been agreed with DECC All commercial floor space will be in the village centre
2497	11/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Few coastal towns in Australia with character like Catherine Hill Bay. Interests of few to get rich should be balanced against need to retain such settlements before they become like Queensland. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Character Public interest Equity 	
249	24/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would add 900 much larger dwellings and 1, 00m² commercial space to unique, heritage mining village. Will increase housing 10 fold and existing town footprint 20 fold. Considerable amenity impact. Impacts will undermine its State significant site listing. Environmentally sensitive flora and fauna will be affected. Should be sited physically and visually separate from Catherine Hill Bay township. Land is zoned for high conservation control - this should be upheld and the land not developed. Highly visible from coast and Catherine Hill Bay. Will dominate the town. Catherine Hill Bay is popular, recreational area for range of users. Should be kept for our children. Intrusive, 'get rich quick' scheme. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scale and size Heritage Amenity State significant site listing Flora and fauna Environmental impacts Siting and design Conservation Zoning Visual impacts Inter generational equity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amenity will be significantly enhanced for both residents and visitors with access to local shops and services Offsets have been agreed by DECC There is visual and physical separation between the existing village and the proposed development Development will not be visible from the existing village
2499	11/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little change from previous submissions. Housing will be visible from all aspects of Catherine Hill village and beach. Headland development contravenes coastal policy and Heritage Office February 2007 guidelines. Will destroy conservation area. Will destroy feel, look, history and sole of unique area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visual impacts Conservation Coastal policy Heritage Office guidelines Inter generational equity Water and sewer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All development has been removed from the existing village and the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. Housing will not be visible from the village Will create a conservation area

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be preserved for future generations. • Existing residents self sufficient and responsible for own water and sewer. No proposed rain water tanks only expensive recycled system which will become responsibility of owners or government. • Not in keeping with interim report to reduce impact on town character and exceeds 600 houses. • Bin building should be removed as per Mine Rehabilitation Plan. • Residential use of bin building contrary to IHAP recommendation. No supporting engineering feasibility. • No scientific analysis of value of offset conservation lands. Huge community investment over many years to zone land for protection. • Land is sub ect to mine subsidence and would pose risks for building. Movement of spoil will increase instability. No information on how this will be managed. • No traffic report gauging massive impact on residents. • Development with no public transport, away from local centres, and no infrastructure does not meet sustainable development or planning principles. • Will put continued pressure on limited government funds. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESD • Interim report • Character • Size • Bin building • Engineering feasibility • Offsets • Mine subsidence • Geotechnical • Traffic • Public transport • Sustainable development • Public interest • Equity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rain water tanks are proposed in Hamlet 1 whilst a recycling third pipe system is proposed in other hamlets which will be funded by the community title association • The mine rehabilitation plan involves retaining the bin building, it would be filled and capped • Engineering viability of the reuse of the bin building will be assessed prior to the PA being lodged • All offsets have been agreed with DECC • The MSB has agreed conditions for the site • There is a traffic report • The roads are designed so that bus services are accommodated within 400m of any residence
2500-2501	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current proposal continues to have significant adverse impacts on environmental and heritage significance of Catherine Hill Bay area. • No scientific analysis of value of offset conservation lands or of its environmental or social values. • Huge community investment over many years to zone land for protection. • Maximising access to views and earthworks which will greatly reshape landscape, will have serious impacts on conservation values and bushland setting. • Flood mitigation report does not address impact on conservation areas. • Lack of scientific analysis of effect of night light on conservation area's flora and fauna, even though visual impact assessment acknowledges exposure of these areas to development. • No analysis of likely dramatic increase in cat and dog population on conservation areas. • Conversion of bin building to residences will increase its visual impacts from reflectivity and night lighting. • Stability of bin building and headland inadequately addressed. • Contravenes coastal policy and Heritage Office February 2007 guidelines. • No credible report gauging amenity impacts of increased traffic on town's heritage properties. • No economic assessment of cost to the state, especially compared with alternative Hunter locations. • Does not address cumulative impacts of this an the Coal and Allied development on road network and beach parking. • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental impacts • Heritage • Public interest • Conservation • Flora and fauna • Domestic pets • Offsets • Social values • Earthworks • Bushland • Flood mitigation report • Scientific rigour • Visual impacts • Geotechnical • Coastal policy • Heritage Office guidelines • Traffic, road network and parking • Cumulative impacts • Economic impacts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All offsets have been agreed with DECC • All development has been removed from the existing village and the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • Stormwater will be managed to equate pre and post development flows. There will be no runoff to the SEPP 14 wetland, further work will be provided in the PPR to demonstrate this more clearly • Further flora and fauna work will be presented with the PPR • Educational material will be provided to residents on the importance of controlling domestic pets • Studies on the engineering feasibility of the adaptive reuse of the bin building will be completed prior to a pro ect application being lodged. If the structure is not suitable it will be capped and used ust as a viewing area as per the Concept Plan. The PA will ensure lighting and reflectivity impacts are minimised • The proposal is consistent with the coastal policy • Traffic and service impacts have been assessed on a cumulative basis
2502	24/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower Hunter Regional Strategy ranks Catherine Hill Bay area very low on list of desirable areas to develop. • Sketchy/conceptual details on impacts on roads and traffic management. • Traffic impact on Flowers Drive is serious concern. Two highway access points will require ma or upgrades. • Should be considered in con unction with Coal and Allied development. Both will have significant impacts on village. • Impact of proposal on visual catchment of Catherine Hill Bay. Contrary to planning principles of Independent Panel. Visual catchment should obtain a heritage listing. • Building will be highly prominent on headland, contrary to government's coastal policy. Should be located completely on southern side of ridge. • No discussion of target market therefore it is difficult to assess proposed community and commercial infrastructure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower Hunter Regional Strategy • Traffic • Coal and Allied development. • Cumulative impacts • Visual impacts • Review Panel • Heritage • Coastal policy • Target market • Infrastructure • Water management • Bin building • Community title • Density 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Department ranking referred to here was a multi criteria analysis model designed to be used test different scenarios. This model was run for a scenario strongly weighted towards conservation over social and economic outcomes and ranked sites based on total size (in other words not per dwelling) it also assumed total development on the entire site. Not surprisingly large sites came out worst. This model assumed total development from the headland to the lake nothing like what is being proposed. nfortunately this particular scenario was leaked to the green movement who have been misrepresenting it since. Correspondence issued by the Director General has sought to clarify this matter in the past. • A full traffic management study is provided • Services and traffic have been assessed on a cumulative basis • Discussions with RTA are underway regarding highway access • All development has been removed from the existing village and the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1, 00sqm of commercial space likely to be white elephant especially if houses sold to weekenders. • Will be a drain on state resources, particularly water management. Proposal for swimming pool is insulting in this pristine environment and drought conditions. • No reassurance that a motel or hotel will not be developed. Is shop top housing for tourists and is it included in dwelling count. • No discussion of re use of bin building. • Community title aspects are concerning (pocket parks, village pool and community infrastructure). Which community will be accountable • Floor space ratio appears high indicating a very high density. Storeys, layout and density are inconsistent with 'coastal village'. • Surveillance is contrary to current community environment and unacceptable. • Areas shaded grey are not included in concept plan and more specifics should be provided. • Concept plan does not mention flora and fauna referred to in Site Analysis. • Dwelling numbers exceed MO . • At odds with best development interests of Catherine Hill Bay. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Character • Surveillance • Level of detail/Concept plan • Heritage • MO • Public interest • 	<p>development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A visual assessment is provided • There will be up to 1 00sqm of commercial not exactly 1 00sqm • Water recycling and management will ensure that the development is highly water efficient • There is no hotel or motel in the Concept Plan • Community elements will be paid for by the new not the existing community • There is no high density development • The grey areas are lots in other ownership • The Concept Plan complies with the MO
2503	22/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rose Groups proposal needs to be considered in tandem with the Coal and Allied development proposed for Middle Camp. Together these 2 developments will increase the size of the town 10 fold (from 100 to 1000 houses and will have a significant increase on the number of cars. • The problem of traffic access as not been solved as currently each developer is proposing a different access strategy to the Pacific Highway. • Pro ected traffic in Clarke Street is a ma or problem. All houses in Clarke Street have to be built close to the road to keep alignment consistent with all other houses and also consistent with the mining theme. The amenity of those houses will be completely destroyed. • If the amenity of the village is destroyed, the development must be kept to an appropriate level and only provide sufficient services for daily convenience needs and not multiple shops, tourism accommodation and the like. • This is the last village on the NSW coast that has relatively closely maintained its links with the past. We ob ect to any development that will adversely impact on the historical links that Catherine Hill Bay provides to this and future generations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cumulative impacts • Traffic • Amenity • Over development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A full traffic management study is provided • Services and traffic have been assessed on a cumulative basis • Joint discussions with RTA are underway regarding highway access • Every effort has been made to ensure that traffic levels on Clarke Street do not increase. If the locals think it appropriate the street could be closed to through traffic • Shops will provide only for daily convenience needs
2504-2507	3/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not in the interests of the people that live in Gwandalan. • Not enough services in Gwandalan to cater for an increased population, particularly in view of the other development planned by Coal and Allied. • Plan does not have any access to the water. The proposal says that it is based on the old Gwandalan subdivision however, it does not recognise that there are walkways all over town, down to the open space at the water front. • The plan shows open space in the middle of the road. Is this where the children are to play • Wildlife corridor is inadequate because it also has a bike path, pedestrian path, crosses 7 roads and is to be lit at night and Rose Group have said this is sufficient because they are giving 310ha of land to the Government for National Park. How can land in another area replace the environmental impact on the land at Gwandalan. The letter from Planning states that 5 of land in Catherine Hill Bay area is for conservation. • All the traffic would have to pass by the school. The safety of the children is of great concern. The ma or aspect of the plan seems to be the developers desire to get most of the lots they can from the area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Servicing • Cumulative impact • Public foreshore access. • Wildlife corridor • Offsets • traffic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SIA found that facilities can cope with a higher population as per the Rose development. • The development is consistent with the Draft Central Coast Regional Strategy which has been informed by water planning for the Central Coast. Water Plan 2050 sets out a program to secure the region's water supply • Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed. • The development is consistent with development in the surrounding area • There is no waterfront land included in the proposal • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets are agreed by DECC • Traffic levels will fall within applicable standards. • Cycleways are provided
250 -2513	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 215 housing development is being promoted as a development for young families. • The development has been inculcated into the Lower Hunter Regional 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional Strategy • Remote location • Employment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development is not targeted at any particular demographic but may provide an affordable source of family homes. • Gwandalan is ad acent to the Pacific Highway

			<p>Strategy after the exhibition period had expired.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional Strategy states that development should be around ma or centres and corridors. Gwandalan is remote, over 19kms from the nearest ma or shopping centre with only one exit/entry road to the highway. There is little to no work in the immediate vicinity of the development. The area has poor public transport. The facts go against all the points of the Regional Strategy. The development's density and configuration are inappropriate. The ob ection is not to the development per se but the type and style of the development proposed. There are insufficient child-care places, the local doctor has closed his books and the local public school is at capacity. There is no public access to the waterfront from the development and no cycleways and one small block for 215 young families. Development would be much better served by returning to the hands of the Wyong Council for consideration on its original timeline which is 2011. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public transport Development density and configuration Social services Public waterfront access Consent authority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are many developments without close rail access The density and configuration are consistent with existing areas in Gwandalan A full SIA has been provided There is no waterfront land included in this development Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed.
2514	9/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development is neither appropriate nor ecologically sustainable for the site. Site has no vegetation corridors and only one block dedicated to open space. Tetratheca Juncea is not protected on site although 17 plants found across the site. The Payne Report 2000, states that over 100 plants on a site need to be protected as it is of high conservation value. The wildlife corridor crosses seven roads and has lighting. There is no delineated proposal to retain significant trees. Neither rigorous environmental assessment nor comparison of threatened, vulnerable or endangered species from the proposed dedicated to the proposed development site. A rigorous assessment needs to be conducted over a full 12 month period. Development should be returned to the hands of Wyong Council on its original timeframe of 2011. Development at Gwandalan is is offsetting land 10kms from Gwandalan at Catherine Hill Bay. They are separate companies, and these are different pro ects with their own Ma or Pro ect numbers. Therefore, it is imperative that there be adherence to the underlying principle of offsetting which is impacts must first be avoided before offsetting is considered. Housing density is inappropriate for the ecological sensitivity of the site, allowing for no on-site mitigation of the impact of development on watercourses, flora and fauna. Proposed development would produce a loss of integrity of existing corridor between Lake Munmorah State Rec Area and vegetation to the north of Lake Macquarie LGA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Impacts Adequacy of flora and fauna assessment Offsetting Development density Vegetation corridors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed. Offsets have been agreed with DECC New Threatened species surveys have been carried out on the site to ensure compliance with EPBC requirements and to update existing informaiton Trees will be retained where practical The density and configuration are consistent with existing areas in Gwandalan
2515	12/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development is neither appropriate nor ecologically sustainable for the site. Site has no vegetation corridors and only one block dedicated to open space. Tetratheca Juncea is not protected on site although 17 plants found across the site. The Payne Report 2000, states that over 100 plants on a site need to be protected as it is of high conservation value. The wildlife corridor crosses seven roads and has lighting. There is no delineated proposal to retain significant trees. Neither rigorous environmental assessment nor comparison of threatened, vulnerable or endangered species from the proposed dedicated to the proposed development site. A rigorous assessment needs to be conducted over a full 12 month period. Development should be returned to the hands of Wyong Council on its original timeframe of 2011. Development at Gwandalan is is offsetting land 10kms from Gwandalan at Catherine Hill Bay. They are separate companies, and these are different 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Impacts Adequacy of flora and fauna assessment Offsetting Development density Vegetation corridors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed. Offsets have been agreed with DECC New Threatened species surveys have been carried out on the site to ensure compliance with EPBC requirements and to update existing informaiton Trees will be retained where practical The density and configuration are consistent with existing areas in Gwandalan

			<p>projects with their own Major Project numbers. Therefore, it is imperative that there be adherence to the underlying principle of offsetting which is impacts must first be avoided before offsetting is considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing density is inappropriate for the ecological sensitivity of the site, allowing for no on-site mitigation of the impact of development on watercourses, flora and fauna. Proposed development would produce a loss of integrity of existing corridor between Lake Munmorah State Rec Area and vegetation to the north of Lake Macquarie LGA. 		
2516-2522	11/10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wyong Council should be the responsible authority rather than State Government. Many social issues need to be addressed as there are not enough medical services available in the area. It is a long way for people to travel to the shops. We like the isolation of being away from the crowds of the city. Rose Group want to change all of that by increasing the population even though the residents of Gwandalan and Summerland Point are against the idea. Inadequate public transport. Increased population would not guarantee a better public transport option because you would still need to use a car to get around, so why would you use public transport. Gwandalan's nearest railway is Wyee which is 18.25km away. Wyong is 30km away. To have an increased population at Gwandalan would add to the greenhouse gas emissions by using the car. It would be better to have development nearer a railway station such as the Warnervale. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consent authority Social services Public transport Vehicle use Greenhouse gas emissions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A full SIA was provided The 216 dwelling proposed will not change the character of the area Provision is provided for bus routes. There is no requirement to have a railway near residential development
2523	16/10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site which would come under the State Government's coastal protection policy is proposed to be developed as a single stage 1 with no proposal for the development of Stage 2. This would set a dangerous precedent as the coastal property is being allowed to be developed on a portion of the title so that the whole site is not being rezoned. The land for development is then not considered coastal and not subject to same guidelines. This means for example, that no public access to the waterfront as the waterfront is now considered private property on a separate title. Although the site is not re-zoned the proponent proposes to run all of the stormwater run-off onto the land that is still zoned 7b Environmental Protection, Scenic Protection via a series of detention, retention ponds and on into the lake through the man-made moat. The sewerage outlet that is also to be up-graded is on land that has not been re-zoned. These dams and drainage system are to be maintained by the owners of this land, not where the development occurs. There are natural watercourses on the site but they are all treated as stormwater run-off and dealt with by a series of drains across the site. The watercourses should be protected by riparian areas along either side of their length. This would provide a lot more vegetation retention and become part of the on-site mitigation of proposed developments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coastal Policy Re zoning Watercourse treatment Location of stormwater treatment and sewerage Protection of watercourses and riparian vegetation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no waterfront land in the proposal Infrastructure that exists on private land will be subject to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner Service infrastructure will be upgraded There are no natural perennial water courses on the site. Discussions have taken place with DWE which will be reflected in the PPR
2524	12/10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development will disrupt north-south bushland corridor (connecting Wallarah National Park, Catherine Hill Bay and Munmorah State Conservation Area) which has significant ecological communities. Proposed "bushland corridors" poorly designed, not wide enough and likely to be ineffective. If corridors are also Asset Protection Zones, they will be rendered useless. Will destroy habitat of endangered Squirrel Glider and Masked Owl. Land also supports rare orchids and protected <i>Tetratheca juncea</i> and <i>Angophora inopina</i>. Will result in pet incursions, noise, lighting and general human disturbance to conservation areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecological communities Bushland corridor Asset Protection Zones Endangered/protected species/EEC Environmental impacts Domestic pets Fauna and flora assessment Traffic Road kill SEPP 14 Design, size 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DECC has agreed the offsets The bushland corridors do not serve primarily a conservation function, the offset lands do this. The bushland corridors provide amenity, walkways and ensure the development sits in the landscape Educational material will be provided to residents on the importance of controlling domestic pets There is no development proposed for the headland The boundary of the wetland is being surveyed to ensure no intrusion and additional work is being carried out to ensure that there is no impact on the wetland All development has been removed from the existing village and the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fauna and flora assessment is inadequate. It does not include the rare Themada Grassland, an EEC likely to be found on the headland. • Increased traffic will result in more road kill within major conservation corridor. • Effectiveness of proposed buffer to SEPP 14 wetlands (Munmorah State Conservation Area) inadequately addressed. • Design, size and number of new house will totally engulf heritage area. • Should be listed on State Heritage Register and not developed. • Not appropriate to include for housing and employment land in Lower Hunter Regional Strategy. The sites were rated poorly for new development based on biodiversity impact, and distance from public transport and a major centre. • Development is contrary to Regional Strategy to develop close to schools, public transport, employment and services. Unsustainable and contribute to greenhouse gas emissions and social isolation. • Has not been endorsed by any strategic land use assessment. • Donation of land by proponent for environmental offsets sets a very bad precedent for NSW. • Undermines integrity of Coastal Policy SEPP 71. • Is against the wishes of local communities ignores decisions of local councils and Land and Environment Court. • Large ecological footprint. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage • State Heritage Register • Lower Hunter Regional Strategy • Sustainability • Social infrastructure • Public transport • Greenhouse gas emissions • Offsets • Precedent • Coastal Policy SEPP 71 • Community and public interest • Ecological footprint 	<p>development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development is fully consistent with the Lower Hunter Regional Strategy and was explicitly included in that strategy • An assessment of the site is provided in the SSS report • The development complies fully with SEPP 71 • The councils and Land and Environment court have never judged this proposal
2525	12/10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Watercourse adjacent to primary school provides crucial runoff drain in heavy rain. Difficult to ascertain if watercourse will be retained. • No scope for retention of significant trees, contrary to Department of Planning guidelines. • No contemporary or rigorous environmental impact study. • Possible damage to <i>Tetratheca juncea</i>, which has high conservation value. There are over 100 plants on the site (Wyong Council submission, 2006). • Partial rezoning of the land is unique and new approach and will set a dangerous and unprecedented future approach. • Lack of public area and playing space. • Lack of appropriate fauna corridor. • Concerns about density 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of detail • Watercourse • Trees • Environmental impact study • <i>Tetratheca juncea</i> • Partial rezoning precedent • Public area • Open space • Fauna corridor • Density 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre and post development flows of stormwater will be equated. • Trees will be retained wherever practical • DECC have agreed offsets • Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed. • The density is consistent with the existing community
2526	11/10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intactness and rarity of Catherine Hill Bay's mining cottages makes it worthy of listing on State Heritage Register. • Will destroy village's character. • Will increase housing stock by 600 (1000 with Coal and Allied) and swallow it up. • Two and three storey building heights compared with current building stock of 1 storey. • Architecturally incompatible buildings in heritage precinct. • Destroy visual relationship between village, the coast and surrounding bushland. • Increase traffic by 600. Will cause significant congestion during morning and evening peaks. • Housing development never part of social contract - environmental planning approval for the mining activity. Contract required rehabilitation of site to natural bushland upon cessation of mining activities. • Insufficient local employment and educational opportunities. • Negligible public transport. • Stormwater/recycled water design proposal is overly complex. Would place ongoing reliance on council to fund maintenance of dual water systems. Unclear if stormwater drainage system for storm flood prevention is part of the proposal. • Hydraulic services proposal is flawed. • Should incorporate simpler and cost effective water saving initiatives, for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Heritage Register • Character • Size • Height • Architecture • Visual impacts • Bushland • Traffic • Environmental planning approval for the mining activity • Social contract • Mine rehabilitation • Public transport • Stormwater • Water recycling and reuse • Hydraulic services • Sewerage • IHAP • Cumulative impacts • Inter generational equity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no buildings of more than 2 storeys and the visual impact on the existing village has been minimised by basing the design on a classic McHarg analysis • The architectural differences with the current village ensure that there is a sense of difference between hamlets. However, all the architecture is low key and consistent with a coastal hamlet • A traffic study is provided, all roads are well within accepted standards and no congestion is anticipated • A full SIA found acceptable social impacts • Public transport will be more viable with the development • The stormwater system represents best practice and will place no burden on council • Sewer will be provided

			<p>example, collection and use of roof water and grey water, reducing drain on public finances.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sewerage is not covered in proposal. Septic tanks would not be feasible for subdivision. • Proposal is significantly larger than IHAP recommendation. • Coupled with Coal and Allied development, proposal would increase size from 100 to 1,000 houses. • Keep Catherine Hill Bay for future generations to enjoy. 		
2527	10/10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes significant development on headland. • Conversion of bin building will increase its impact from reflectivity and night lighting and make it highly visible from viewpoints along the beach. • Stability of bin building and headland inadequately addressed as are physical and administrative requirements of proposed cliff walk. • Development of headland contravenes coastal policy and Heritage Office guidelines and reinforces in IHAP recommendations. • No credible report addressing amenity impacts of increased traffic on existing heritage properties. • No assessment of cumulative impacts of this and the Coal and Allied development on low scale network or beach parking. • No economic assessment of cost to the state of upgrading or providing new infrastructure. • 1, 00m² commercial space contrary to MO . • Commercial space will be in highly visible location. • No long term engineering/stability feasibility of adaptive reuse of bin building. • No scientific analysis of condition, and no assessment of environmental or social value of conservation lands. • Earthworks will greatly reshape landscape, seriously impacting conservation values and bushland setting of town. • Flood mitigation report does not address impacts on conservation areas even though 750,000m³ will be moved. • Lack of scientific analysis of effect of night light on conservation area's flora and fauna. This is despite the visual impact assessment confirming exposure of these areas. • No analysis of certain dramatic increase in domestic pet population on conservation areas. • Lack of respect for community values and state planning policies and institutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual impacts • Geotechnical • Cliff walk • Coastal policy • Heritage Office guidelines • Traffic • Heritage • Coal and Allied development • Cumulative impacts • Infrastructure • Economic assessment • Equity • Commercial space • MO • Bin building • Engineering feasibility • Offset • Scientific analysis • Earthworks • Landscape values • Conservation values • Bushland • Flood mitigation report • Visual impact assessment • Domestic pet • Community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All development has been removed from the existing village and the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • The project application for the Bin Building will need to demonstrate appropriate reflectivity and lighting • Reuse of the bin building is contingent on structural feasibility. The bin building cannot be removed without destabilising the entire cliff face. There will be a viewing platform and cafe on top of the bin building to ensure the public can enjoy this space. • Traffic will be within applicable standards and efforts are being made to minimise the impact on the existing village by routing traffic from the development in and out via Montefiore Street • Accesses to the Pacific highway are being negotiated jointly with RTA • Proposal is consistent with MO • Commercial space will not be visible from beaches or village • Earthworks will return the landscape to something close to its pre mining condition • There will be no drainage impacts on the conservation area as pre and post development flows will be equalised. Further work is being done to ensure this is the case • Educational material will be provided to residents on the importance of controlling domestic pets
252	10/10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poorly revised. • Inappropriate and misleading not to have RoseCorp and Coal and Allied proposals available for public scrutiny at the same time. Both plans will have potential impacts on whole area. • Land with high conservation value should not be rezoned. • Outrageous to bypass zoning arrangements agreed to by robust consultation. • Destroy a self-sustaining community by imposing infrastructure (water and sewerage) on it. • Not supported by numerous environmental groups, including State Heritage authority. • Nothing to separate new development physically and visually from setting of Catherine Hill Bay. • Vandalism and arrogance for region's integrity and heritage. • Increased traffic will devastate amenity of miners' cottages. • Road maps not to scale and inexplicable indicating poor quality plans. • No detail on coastal management issues in respect of NSW Coastal Policy. • No detail on environmental safeguards. • Lacks clarity or evidence of sound planning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coal and Allied development • Cumulative impacts • Conservation • Rezoning process • Sustainability • Heritage Council • Context • Visual impact • Traffic • Miners' cottages • Amenity • Level of detail/quality • Coastal Policy • Environmental safeguards • Design • Mining regeneration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The introduction of water and sewerage will make the community more sustainable, will reduce pollution and will enhance bushfire defences • The new development is to be both visually and physically separated from the existing village • A full traffic report demonstrates that roads will be within standards • Complies with coastal policy

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design of houses is not harmonious to current environment. • The Act requires all mining infrastructure to be removed, made safe and the land regenerated. 		
2529	10/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • nique heritage village will be destroyed. • Isolation of the village is its biggest value and this will be destroyed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage • Character • Amenity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All development has been removed from the existing village and the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. •
2530	12/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development will be prominent on a headland, which is inconsistent with Government Policy • Rose Group development to be considered together with Coal and Allied proposal • Development will create increased car numbers and create problems with traffic access • Quantum of development needs to be 600 dwellings, not 600 houses 9 shops shoptop housing tourism accommodation apartments in theBin Building 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistency with Government Coastal Policy • Traffic • Consistency with Mo / IHAP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All development has been removed from the existing village and the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • Services and traffic have been assessed on a cumulative basis • A full traffic report demonstrates that roads will be within standards • The shop top housing and apartments in the bin building are included in the 600 dwellings
2531-2537	24/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catherine Hill Bay unique heritage village • Benefit to National Park disproportionate to development of housing in areas of high visual and environmental impact • No scientific analysis on offset lands or assessment of development's best siting • 600 new houses overlooking Moonee Beach, which has no houses • Development on coastal headland which is inconsistent with NSW policy • Local gourps oppose the development • CHB destination for recreational users 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage • Environmental 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All development has been removed from the existing village and the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • DECC have approved offsets • Amenities for surfers and other beach goers will be enhanced. Rose Group is prepared to discuss providing funding for a new surf club at Catherine Hill Bay as part of its developer contributions plan
253	12/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development does not comply with Government Coastal policy or design guidelines • Environmental attributes of the site not considered • development does not provide access to the lake , coastal walks, cycle paths • inadequate consideration of Stage 2 in Concept Plan • Impact of new housing on housing values • Agree that land is identified for release by Wyong Council • Poor services in the area • No consideration of community concerns of youth violence, misbehaviour, vandalism and dangerous driving 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistency with Government policy • Infrastructure / services • Environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Cycle ways and paths are provided • The SIA udged services to be adequate
2539-2542	2 /9/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One road in creates a fire trap • poor street layout • no wildlife corridors • open grassed area in the middle road • no waterfront access • No rigourous environmental study done over 12 month period • Three waterways to be lost • Health services are poor/ no doctors available in area • Wyong Council and independent board recommend 150 lots, whereas Rosecorp want 225 • Lake will silt up 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bushfire • rban design • Environment • Technical / procedural • Services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are three access and egress points and the design complies with RFS guidelines • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • DECC have agreed offsets • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Additional flora and fauna studies are being prepared to meet EPBC requirements • There are no natural perennial water courses on the site. Discussions have taken place with DWE which will be reflected in the PPR • Pre and post development flows of stormwater will be equated. • The density is consistent with the existing community
2543-2544	10/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development no consistent with rest of Gwanadalan given no direct access to water • Drainage from the site will run into an Environmental Protection zone • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan • Development will increase pressure on Gwandalan Public School 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • rban Design • Drainage • Environment • Offset • Infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • The SIA found impacts to be acceptable
2545	12/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • rban Design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offsets have been agreed with DECC

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Development no consistent with rest of Gwandalan given no direct access to water • Why is Gwandalan part of Lower Hunter Regional Strategy • Drainage from the site will run into an Environmental Protection zone • Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drainage • Environment • Offset • Access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Development is consistent with the existing settlement • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
2546	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • Drainage from the site will run into an Environmental Protection zone • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • rban Design • Drainage • Environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC
2547	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • Drainage from the site will run into an Environmental Protection zone • Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • rban Design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC
254	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan • Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Why is Gwandalan part of Lower Hunter Regional Strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access • Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC
2549	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • Drainage from the site will run into an Environmental Protection zone • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • rban Design • Drainage • Environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC
2550	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan • Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Why is Gwandalan part of Lower Hunter Regional Strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access • Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
2551	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • Drainage from the site will run into an Environmental Protection zone • Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
2552-2553	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan • Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Why is Gwandalan part of Lower Hunter Regional Strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access • Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical

2554	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • Drainage from the site will run into an Environmental Protection zone • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access • Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
2555	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is Gwandalan part of Lower Hunter Regional Strategy • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
2556	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan • Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Why is Gwandalan part of Lower Hunter Regional Strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access • Offset 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
2557	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • Drainage from the site will run into an Environmental Protection zone • Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
255	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is Gwandalan part of Lower Hunter Regional Strategy • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
2559-2660	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan • Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Why is Gwandalan part of Lower Hunter Regional Strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access • Offset 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
2661	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • Drainage from the site will run into an Environmental Protection zone • Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
2662	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • Drainage from the site will run into an Environmental Protection zone • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access • Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. Offsets have been agreed with DECC Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
2663	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore Why is Gwandalan part of Lower Hunter Regional Strategy Drainage from the site will run into an Environmental Protection zone 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Access Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no waterfront land in the proposal Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. Offsets have been agreed with DECC Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
2664	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate Why is Gwandalan part of Lower Hunter Regional Strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Access Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no waterfront land in the proposal Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. Offsets have been agreed with DECC Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
2665	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore Drainage from the site will run into an Environmental Protection zone 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Access Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no waterfront land in the proposal Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. Offsets have been agreed with DECC Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
2666	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore Drainage from the site will run into an Environmental Protection zone Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Offsets Access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no waterfront land in the proposal Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. Offsets have been agreed with DECC Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
2667	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why is Gwandalan part of Lower Hunter Regional Strategy 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no waterfront land in the proposal Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. Offsets have been agreed with DECC Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
266	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore Why is Gwandalan part of Lower Hunter Regional Strategy Drainage from the site will run into an Environmental Protection zone 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Offset Access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no waterfront land in the proposal Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. Offsets have been agreed with DECC Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
2669	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why is Gwandalan part of Lower Hunter Regional Strategy 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no waterfront land in the proposal Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. Offsets have been agreed with DECC Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical

2670	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • Drainage from the site will run into an Environmental Protection zone • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access • Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
2671	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • Drainage from the site will run into an Environmental Protection zone • Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
2672-2673	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan • Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Why is Gwandalan part of Lower Hunter Regional Strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access • Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
2674	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Why is Gwandalan part of Lower Hunter Regional Strategy • Drainage from the site will run into an Environmental Protection zone 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access • Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
2675	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is Gwandalan part of Lower Hunter Regional Strategy • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access • Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
2676	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • Drainage from the site will run into an Environmental Protection zone • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access • Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
2677	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • Drainage from the site will run into an Environmental Protection zone • Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
267	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan • Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access • Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Why is Gwandalan part of Lower Hunter Regional Strategy 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
2679	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is Gwandalan part of Lower Hunter Regional Strategy • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
26 0	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan • Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Why is Gwandalan part of Lower Hunter Regional Strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access • Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
26 1	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • Drainage from the site will run into an Environmental Protection zone • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access • Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
26 2-26 3	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • Drainage from the site will run into an Environmental Protection zone • Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access • Offset 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
26 4	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan • Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Why is Gwandalan part of Lower Hunter Regional Strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access • Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
26 5	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is Gwandalan part of Lower Hunter Regional Strategy • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
26 6	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Why is Gwandalan part of Lower Hunter Regional Strategy • Drainage from the site will run into an Environmental Protection zone 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access • Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical

26 7	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is Gwandalan part of Lower Hunter Regional Strategy • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
26	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan • Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Why is Gwandalan part of Lower Hunter Regional Strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access • Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
26 9-2690	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • Drainage from the site will run into an Environmental Protection zone • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access • Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
2691-2692	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan • Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Why is Gwandalan part of Lower Hunter Regional Strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access • Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
2693	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Why is Gwandalan part of Lower Hunter Regional Strategy • Drainage from the site will run into an Environmental Protection zone 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access • Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
2694	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Why is Gwandalan part of Lower Hunter Regional Strategy • Drainage from the site will run into an Environmental Protection zone 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access • Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
2695	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • Drainage from the site will run into an Environmental Protection zone • Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access • Offset 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
2696	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan • Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access • Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Why is Gwandalan part of Lower Hunter Regional Strategy 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
2697	9/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No apparent change to Rose Groups concept plan. • How can development be considered without rezoning and access to waterfront • No indication of impacts on Stage 2 • No indication of impact to watercourses • Infrastructure cannot cope with additional land uses • No open space provided • Development considered in context of Coal and Allied proposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access • Infrastructure • Context 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • There are no natural perennial water courses on the site. Pre and Post development flows will be equalised so there will be no impact on the lake. • Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed. • Road infrastructure is adequate services will be upgraded
269	16/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only relationship between Precinct 1A and Catherine Hill Bay is that they are owned by the same developer. • Public transport in Gwandalan is almost non-existent. • Development of Gwandalan has been disastrous for the lake with storm water drains spewing mud and rocks into the lake during heavy downpours. • Central coast draft regional strategy indicates development close to public transport around Warnervale in Stage 1 with no proposed timetable for the development of Gwandalan. • Timetable for rezoning Precinct 1A has been set by Wyong Council at 2011. • No open space for active recreation in Precinct 1A. • No plans to return the water frontage to the public at Gwandalan • Water supply- Level 5 water restrictions. • Proximity to industrial employment. • Development at Gwandalan is unimaginative • Proposal will create traffic chaos, especially for boat owners • Pt Wolstonecroft cannot be considered as recreation facility for new residents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Infrastructure • Open Space • rban Design • Traffic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public transport is catered for in the design services will only be viable with greater population • There are no natural perennial water courses on the site. Pre and Post development flows will be equalised so there will be no impact on the lake. • The Concept Plan is consistent with the Draft Central Coast Regional Strategy • Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed. • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • The development is consistent with the Draft Central Coast Regional Strategy which was prepared with full knowledge of the region's water issues. Water Plan 2050 sets out a series of measures to secure water supply • Road infrastructure is adequate according to a comprehensive traffic study
2699	9/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal breaches SEPP 71 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistency with Government Policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No it doesn't! – Appendix T of the EA
2700	9/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal does not comply with Government Coastal Policy or guidelines • does not consider environmental aspects • Does not provide public access to waterfront • Minimal allowance for open space, walkways, cycle paths, and similar recreation areas • Sets precedent to retain waterfront in private ownership • Isolates development from rest of Gwandalan • No additional housing needed at Gwandalan • Insufficient demand for new housing in area • Proposal does not reduce demand on private transport • Reason for inclusion of Gwandalan in LHRS • Rose group proposal does not reflect old Gwandalan subdivision pattern • Rose Group and Coal and Allied proposal will be disastrous • Ma ority of residents at Gwandalan do not want development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistency with Government Policy • Environment • Traffic • Access • rban Design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal at Gwandalan. The entire concept plan complies with SEPP 71 • Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed. • Public transport is catered for in the design services will only be viable with greater population • Subdivision reflects existing patterns of community
2701	9/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised plan does not comply with Coastal Policy or guidelines • Inadequate provision for open space, walkways, cycle paths, and similar recreation areas • No public access to waterfront provided • Access to and from proposed development is past school, and traffic impact to children will increase • Gwandalan has limited medical facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistency with Government Policy • Environment • Traffic • Access • rban Design • Infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal at Gwandalan. The entire concept plan complies with SEPP 71 • Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed. • Full SIA provided • Public transport is catered for in the design services will only be viable with

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gwandalan Public School cannot accommodate additional children • Little employment in area • Poor public transport in area • No demand for additional housing at Gwandalan • Sets precedent to retain waterfront in private ownership • Reason for inclusion of Gwandalan in LHRS • Infrastructure is inadequate for population at Gwandalan • Subdivision lots are too small • Rose Group and Coal and Allied proposal will be disastrous 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • greater population • Subdivision reflects existing patterns of community
2702	11/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure proposed expensive to install and maintain • Mass catchment of water not appropriate for contaminated site • No details on recycled water treatment system • Staging of infrastructure not discussed • Little detail on water and sewer supply and delivery • Recycled water expensive to install • Sewer system will have no benefit to the community of CHB • The development does not reflect the style of buildings at CHB • The development is too dense • The proposal will impact on the coast • The proposed development will impact on the heritage of CHB • Nothing in the proposal identifies what the ecological benefits are of the offset and does not identify whether there are any net benefits • Proposal limits ESD to water infiltration and water reuse • Traffic will increase and impact on CHB • Traffic collection in winter does not reflect peak traffic summer flows • Insufficient public transport in this area • No apparent Bushfire Management Plan and no details provided on on-going management • APZ will reduce visual amenity of the site • Proposal has 650 dwellings, but Mo says only 600 • Proposal does not adequately address impact on threatened species • Proposal includes earthworks on mined land which poses issues of stability and contamination • No information is provided on the existing community • Impacts on water quality and drainage not assessed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure • rban Design • Visual Impact • Heritage • ESD • Traffic • Bushfire • Environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be no cost burden from infrastructure on councils or the existing community • The stormwater recycling is appropriate for the site • Details of the water system are provided in the EA • Detail in the EA and PAs • Sewer will serve the existing community • The style of buildings is designed to be low impact and to reflect a typical Australian coastal village • The development footprint has been minimised • All development has been removed from the existing village. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • ESD also applies to energy measures and to walking and cycling facilities and the provision of local shops • Traffic impacts have been modelled and are within guidelines and standards • Traffic studies have been done for 900 dwellings and show standards are met • All RFS guidelines complied with • APZs contained in the development area • There will be a maximum of 600 dwellings • Additional flora and fauna work being carried out
2703-2704	11/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development does not comply with Government's coastal policy • Proposal will destroy Catherine Hill Bay and its heritage values • Government should purchase land from developer • Rose group and Coal and Allied developments must be considered together • Development should be 600 dwellings, not 600 dwellings 9 shops shoptop housing toursim accommodation apartments • Proposal includes adaptive reuse of the bin building without identifying providing engineering information to say this is possible • Proposal does not provide a scientific analysis of the condition of the off set conservation lands and has no assessment of the environmental or social value of the off set land • No assessment of the construction impact on the conservation area by the movement of 75,000 m³ of earth • No assessment of the impact that light will have on the conservation areas or of dog and cat impacts • Development includes significant development on the headland. • The amenity impact from traffic has not been considered. • No economic assessment of the cost to the State from the development as opposed to developing in alternative locations in the Hunter 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage • Engineering • Consistency with Government policy • Environment • Amenity • Environment • Economic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development is fully compliant with SEPP 71 and the coastal policy as detailed Appendix T of the EA • All development has been removed from the existing village. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • Analysis of traffic and services has been carried out for 900 dwellings • There will only be 600 dwellings • Reuse of the bin building is contingent on structural feasibility. The bin building cannot be removed without destabilising the entire cliff face. There will be a viewing platform and caf on top of the bin building to ensure the public can en oy this space. • DECC has approved the offsets however, additional flora and fauna work is being carried out • Impacts of construction on the conservation area will be minimised as per the Statement of Commitments • Educational material will be provided to residents on the importance of controlling domestic pets
2705	9/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local roads of Catherine Hill Bay and Middle Camp will not be able to cope with increased traffic from development and Coal and Allied development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic • Amenity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A full traffic study for 900 additional dwellings shows all roads will remain comfortably within accepted standards. Every effort has been made to route traffic away from the existing village

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scale of development by Rose Group and Coal and Allied excessive in comparison to existing development • Northwood Road will see increase traffic and will impact on amenity of our property • Keeping the existing road network to serve these developments will impact on the community <p>Report by Samsa Consulting provided: Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No cumulative impact assessment of the Rosecorp and Coal and Allied developments provided • No cumulative impact assessment of additional traffic attracted to CHB from surrounding areas (eg Nords Wharf, Gwandalan, Murrays Beach, Warnervale, Munmorah, etc) • Access treatment to CHB not yet resolved by RTA • Uncertainty with proposed parking access to Moonee beach via NPWS land • Suitable traffic mitigation measures will be needed to accommodate traffic impacts from Rosecorp and Coal and Allied Developments, including a new bypass and access to the beach • Local road environmental capacity will be exceeded from the Rosecorp and Coal and Allied developments • Rosecorp's development chooses a lower vehicle trip number based on a subjective justification and should be substantiated with traffic generation survey data from a comparable development • No analysis on the traffic generation impact from additional parking • Insufficient resolution of bus services are proposed to cater to the Rosecorp and Coal and Allied developments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cumulative Assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access from the highway is currently being resolved in talks with RTA and RTCA • Parking is provided on Montefiore St, on road in the development and at the Moonee beach car park.
2706-2707	11/10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development seeks to exceed development in Mo • Proposal an improvement, but remains inadequate in terms of environment and heritage significance on Catherine Hill Bay • Proposal maximises views by significant earthworks. • No assessment of the construction impact on the conservation area by the movement of 75,000 m³ of earth • Development proposes development on the headland, which is contrary to the views of the IHAP and Heritage Office. • No credible report addresses amenity impacts from traffic on the heritage of town • No economic assessment of the cost to the State from the development as opposed to developing in alternative locations in the Hunter 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage • Consistency with Mo • Environment • Traffic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Concept Plan is consistent with the MO • All development has been removed from the existing village. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • The earth works will return the landscape to a resemblance of the pre mining landscape • Impacts of construction on the conservation area will be minimised as per the Statement of Commitments • There is no development on the headland
270	11/10/2007	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal will destroy native flora and fauna • Proposal will increase traffic and increase danger from traffic • Proposal will lead to increased traffic noise • Proposal will increase in pollution from cars • Proposal will lead to construction noise, which will impact residents and native species • The visual impact from construction will be significant • Proposal will create construction pollution and runoff • Construction traffic will create impacts on existing road infrastructure • There is no police station and the proposal will increase crime rate • Residents will experience more noise during construction due to lightweight construction of houses • Proposal will create visual impact on Catherine Hill Bay and National Park • Proposal will generate noise from the shopping area, • Proposal will lead to light pollution on native habitats. • Proposal is not consistent with Council's current land use zone • Proposal is not consistent with the heritage conservation area listing in Council's LEP • The proposal exceeds the current height controls 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Urban Design • Noise • Traffic • Transport • Infrastructure • Construction management • Heritage • Technical / Procedural 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offsets have been agreed by DECC • A full traffic study for 900 additional dwellings shows all roads will remain comfortably within accepted standards. Every effort has been made to route traffic away from the existing village • Access from the highway is currently being resolved in talks with RTA and RTCA • Impacts of construction will be minimised as per the Statement of Commitments • A report on measures to include community safety will be included in the PPR • All development has been removed from the existing village and from the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • Construction noise will be no more intrusive than mining was. • The shopping area is low key and for the day to day needs of residents only • The proposal has a best practice stormwater plan • An independent audit of site contamination will take place prior to construction beginning. • The MSB are satisfied with the proposal subject to conditions

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal has a poor catchment management plan • No independent survey of site contamination provided • The contractual rehabilitation of the site has not been completed • The site remains contaminated and sub ect to mine subsidence • The site has no existing use rights • No consultation has been made with the Aboriginal community • The proposal will destroy Catherine Hill Bay's unique qualities • The proposal will affect the Catherine Hill Bay community • The proposal will make Catherine Hill Bay less attractive to visitors • The proposal will lead to the loss of a community asset • The development provides nothing to the community • The bowling club says it is involved in the development, but this is not shown on the plans • The weight of community ob ections should be greater than the views of the developer • The proposal will remove the green buffer zone along the coast • The proposal will reduce the open space available in the Lake Macquarie district • The proposal will set a precedent for development in coastal areas • The proposal will increase the demand for water in the area • The proposal ignores the recommendations of the IHAP 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The aboriginal community has been extensively consulted • The proposal will provide increased amenity to Catherine Hill Bay residents and visitors • The bowling club has no direct involvement in the development • The proposal would create the green buffer zone and increase the publicly available open space • Hunter Water are providing water to the site.
270 -2710	24/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catherine Hill Bay is a unique heritage village on the east coast • Building on coastal headlands is bad planning • Catherine Hill Bay is a loved destination for surfers, divers, fishermen and tourists. They go there for what Catherine Hill Bay doesn't have – not what it does have • Why destroy such a beautiful place We should be redeveloping the developed areas, not destroying a unique coastal village. • Everywhere else has been spoilt, leave this alone. • Any new development should be less than 300 houses that can't be seen from the villages or the sea (600 of the proposed new houses are overlooking Moonee Beach, where there are currently no houses) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage • Visual impact • Consistency with Government Policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All development has been removed from the existing village and from the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • Impact on Catherine Hill Bay village has been minimised • Amenities for surfers and other beach goers will be enhanced. Rose Group is prepared to discuss providing funding for a new surf club at Catherine Hill Bay as part of its developer contributions plan
2711-2712	29/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exotic trees not appropriate at Gwandalan • Offset lands are not in or near Gwandalan • Proposal does not provide public access to foreshore • 10 m wildlife corridor inappropriate • Why is Gwandalan part of Lower Hunter Regional Strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment • Access • Offsets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • Infrastructure that exists on private land will be sub ect to a positive covenant in favour of the local council to ensure that maintenance is carried out in an appropriate manner • The site layout has been amended in the PPR to address these concerns. • Offsets have been agreed with DECC • Landscaping will use native species of trees and shrubs wherever practical
2713-2715	30/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ob ect to the development of the Gwandalan site. • Needs to be considered in tandem with Coal Allied development proposed for Middle Camp • Increase in dwelling will have significant impact on number of cars • Contradictory traffic access to Pacific Highway • Too many dwellings proposed (600houses 9 shops shoptop housing tourism accommodation apartments in Bin Building 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic and service issues have been examined on a cumulative basis • Impact on Catherine Hill Bay village has been minimised • Traffic will be within applicable standards and efforts are being made to minimise the impact on the existing village by routing traffic from the development in and out via Montefiore Street • Accesses to the Pacific highway are being negotiated ointly with RTA • Development complies with MO
2716-2719	30/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catherine Hill Bay is a unique heritage village on the east coast • Building on coastal headlands is bad planning • Catherine Hill Bay is a loved destination for surfers, divers, fishermen and tourists. They go there for what Catherine Hill Bay doesn't have – not what it does have • Why destroy such a beautiful place We should be redeveloping the developed areas, not destroying a unique coastal village. • Everywhere else has been spoilt, leave this alone. • Any new development should be less than 300 houses that can't be seen 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage • Visual impact • Consistency with Government Policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All development has been removed from the existing village and from the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • Impact on Catherine Hill Bay village has been minimised • Amenities for surfers and other beach goers will be enhanced. Rose Group is prepared to discuss providing funding for a new surf club at Catherine Hill Bay as part of its developer contributions plan

			from the villages or the sea (600 of the proposed new houses are overlooking Moonee Beach, where there are currently no houses)		
2720-2722	30/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ob ect to the development of the Gwandalan site. • Needs to be considered in tandem with Coal Allied development proposed for Middle Camp • Increase in dwelling will have significant impact on number of cars • Contradictory traffic access to Pacific Highway • Too many dwellings proposed (600houses 9 shops shoptop housing tourism accommodation apartments in Bin Building 	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic and service issues have been examined on a cumulative basis • Impact on Catherine Hill Bay village has been minimised • Traffic will be within applicable standards and efforts are being made to minimise the impact on the existing village by routing traffic from the development in and out via Montefiore Street • Accesses to the Pacific highway are being negotiated ointly with RTA • Development complies with MO
2723	01/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raises issue of zoning of lots excluded from concept plan 	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussions have been held with DeWitt and it has been explained to them that although the lots they represent are excluded from the Concept plan they would still be rezoned under the proposal. This deals with their ob ection/
Stockland		Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports existing zonings for the site • Opposes any exempt and complying development status • Proposal contravenes coastal policy • Proposal contravenes IHAP • Fails to meet DGRs • Heritage Issues • Visual impacts • Intrusion onto headland 	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Concept Plan is consistent with the coastal policy • The Concept Plan and EA passed the adequacy test and is therefore consistent with the DGRs • All development has been removed from the existing village and from the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible • The submission by a competing developer is full of sub ective statements with which we strongly disagree
Wallarah Peninsula Alliance		Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design aspects of proposal improved • Development on headland • Commercial area too large and prominent • There should be no residential development west of Hale St • Traffic Management • Visual catchments 	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All development has been removed from the existing village and from the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • The commercial area is a maximum of 1 00sqm and is ust to serve the day to day needs of residents • A full traffic report has been submitted which finds all roads to be within permissible standards. Every effort has been made to direct traffic away from the existing village. • Development is not visible from the existing village
nited Residents Group for the Enviro of Lake Macquarie		Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ob ect to Lower Hunter Strategy process • Community nomination of national park treated with contempt • Impacts on conservation corridor • Impacts on village • Employment • Misinformation • Visual separation of village 	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All development has been removed from the existing village and from the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • Impact on Catherine Hill Bay village has been minimised • There has been no misinformation in the process
EDO		Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flora and Fauna Assessment • Compliance with EPBC 	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional flora and fauna studies are underway to supplement information for the EPBC Act • DECC have agreed all offsets
Melanie Symington		Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevance of Lower Hunter Strategy • Open space on site lacking • Traffic impacts • Foreshore access • tilities and social infrastructure • se of State Significance 	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gwandalan's current S94 plan acknowledges an abundance of open space and requires embellishment works rather than land. These embellishment works are funded by the contributions agreement proposed. • Public transport is catered for in the design services will only be viable with greater population • Road infrastructure is adequate according to a comprehensive traffic study • There is no waterfront land in the proposal • tilities will be upgraded • A full SIA was provided with the EA
2730	31/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lifetime labour supporter. View with increasing unease the State Government's approach to environmental issues, which is all too often subsumed to developmental concerns. • Catherine Hill Bay (like Currawong Beach) through quirks of history and ownership – 	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All development has been removed from the existing village and from the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible.

			<p>have been largely protected from development. It is our collective responsibility to retain that legacy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do not want this area so rich in social history and comparatively environmentally untouched to have large chunks of most unattractive bits cherry picked and sold off for development, at the expense of the environment and local residents and tourists such as myself, who visits rarely but treasure such a place. • The guardianship and protection of this area for future generations is the responsibility of local and state governments. The local government has said no to this development. I sincerely hop the State Government can see equal reason to re ect the proposal. 		
2731	29/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catherine Hill Bay is a unique heritage village on the east coast • Building on coastal headlands is bad planning • Catherine Hill Bay is a loved destination for surfers, divers, fishermen and tourists. They go theref ro what Catherine Hill Bay doesn't have – not what id does have • Why destroy such a beautiful place We should be redeveloping the developed areas, not destroying a unique coastal village. • Everywhere else has been spoilt, leave this alone. • Any new development should be less than 300 houses that can't be seen from the villages or the sea (600 of the proposed new houses are overlooking Moonee Beach, where there are currently no houses) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage • Visual impact • Consistency with Government Policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All development has been removed from the existing village and from the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • Impact on Catherine Hill Bay village has been minimised • Amenities for surfers and other beach goers will be enhanced. Rose Group is prepared to discuss providing funding for a new surf club at Catherine Hill Bay as part of its developer contributions plan
2732	29/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catherine Hill Bay is a unique heritage village on the east coast • Building on coastal headlands is bad planning • Catherine Hill Bay is a loved destination for surfers, divers, fishermen and tourists. They go theref ro what Catherine Hill Bay doesn't have – not what id does have • Why destroy such a beautiful place We should be redeveloping the developed areas, not destroying a unique coastal village. • Everywhere else has been spoilt, leave this alone. • Any new development should be less than 300 houses that can't be seen from the villages or the sea (600 of the proposed new houses are overlooking Moonee Beach, where there are currently no houses) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage • Visual impact • Consistency with Government Policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All development has been removed from the existing village and from the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • Impact on Catherine Hill Bay village has been minimised • Amenities for surfers and other beach goers will be enhanced. Rose Group is prepared to discuss providing funding for a new surf club at Catherine Hill Bay as part of its developer contributions plan
2733	31/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catherine Hill Bay is a unique heritage village on the east coast • Building on coastal headlands is bad planning • Catherine Hill Bay is a loved destination for surfers, divers, fishermen and tourists. They go theref ro what Catherine Hill Bay doesn't have – not what id does have • Why destroy such a beautiful place We should be redeveloping the developed areas, not destroying a unique coastal village. • Everywhere else has been spoilt, leave this alone. • Any new development should be less than 300 houses that can't be seen from the villages or the sea (600 of the proposed new houses are overlooking Moonee Beach, where there are currently no houses) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage • Visual impact • Consistency with Government Policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All development has been removed from the existing village and from the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • Impact on Catherine Hill Bay village has been minimised • Amenities for surfers and other beach goers will be enhanced. Rose Group is prepared to discuss providing funding for a new surf club at Catherine Hill Bay as part of its developer contributions plan
2734	31/10/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catherine Hill Bay is a unique heritage village on the east coast • Building on coastal headlands is bad planning • Catherine Hill Bay is a loved destination for surfers, divers, fishermen and tourists. They go theref ro what Catherine Hill Bay doesn't have – not what id does have • Why destroy such a beautiful place We should be redeveloping the developed areas, not destroying a unique coastal village. • Everywhere else has been spoilt, leave this alone. • Any new development should be less than 300 houses that can't be seen from the villages or the sea (600 of the proposed new houses are overlooking Moonee Beach, where there are currently no houses) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage • Visual impact • Consistency with Government Policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All development has been removed from the existing village and from the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • Impact on Catherine Hill Bay village has been minimised • Amenities for surfers and other beach goers will be enhanced. Rose Group is prepared to discuss providing funding for a new surf club at Catherine Hill Bay as part of its developer contributions plan
2735		Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently seeking funding mechanisms to contribute towards conserving this land. • Development should not occur in such a hodge podge way. There is no town planning logic to this development. • Easy place for fires to break out from motor cycle trails. Threats should be minimised through good planning. • Most of landscape is highly fire prone and this creates a dangerous fire hazard – with pocket development that is unlikely to be saved in time by the fire brigade. • An acceptable risk is created by the development pockets proposed at Catherine Hill Bay which are surrounded by bush. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bushfire • Development footprint • Visual impacts • Location of schools • Social status of Gwandalan • Zoning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No additional funding is required • All development has been removed from the existing village and from the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. • Fire risks will be carefully managed via internal APZs • Fire risk is one reason it is important tp provide mains water • Concept Plan complies with RFS Guidelines • The impact of construction on residents will be minimal and comparable to

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about shape of settlement which will engulf existing settlement. Great tensions between new and old settlements. Proposal will create an unreasonable disturbance to community of mostly elderly peoples who want calm in their final years. Proposal will impact on beach experience. Visual intrusion is an important issue. Children will be located long distances from schools Concerned about precedent for mine camp areas to the north is this precedes. Jetty is unviable in the long run. Gwandalan is a pretty dead town. It is seriously disadvantaged like Nords Wharf and other close by places. Development in this location will further disadvantage the town. There is erosion potential along the Lake. Visual impact will impinge on the State Rec area alongside. Expects to have a substantial amount of money and will be seeking purchase of the land early next year and will be happy to donate to NPWS. Would like to work with the two Councils to purchase the land back and clean it up – perhaps turn into a future caravan park. Restrictive zoning on this area should be developed 		<p>the mine operations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A visual impact statement is provided, impacts are minimised A school is located in Nords Wharf Stormwater will be managed in such a way as to avoid erosion Rose group has no intention to sell the land
2736	02/11/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ob ect to the development of the Gwandalan site. Needs to be considered in tandem with Coal Allied development proposed for Middle Camp Increase in dwelling will have significant impact on number of cars Contradictory traffic access to Pacific Highway Too many dwellings proposed (600houses 9 shops shoptop housing tourism accommodation apartments in Bin Building 	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic and service issues have been examined on a cumulative basis Impact on Catherine Hill Bay village has been minimised Traffic will be within applicable standards and efforts are being made to minimise the impact on the existing village by routing traffic from the development in and out via Montefiore Street Accesses to the Pacific highway are being negotiated ointly with RTA Development complies with MO
2737	05/11/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ob ect to the development of the Gwandalan site. Needs to be considered in tandem with Coal Allied development proposed for Middle Camp Increase in dwelling will have significant impact on number of cars Contradictory traffic access to Pacific Highway Too many dwellings proposed (600houses 9 shops shoptop housing tourism accommodation apartments in Bin Building 	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic and service issues have been examined on a cumulative basis Impact on Catherine Hill Bay village has been minimised Traffic will be within applicable standards and efforts are being made to minimise the impact on the existing village by routing traffic from the development in and out via Montefiore Street Accesses to the Pacific highway are being negotiated ointly with RTA Development complies with MO
273	05/11/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ob ect to the development of the Gwandalan site. Needs to be considered in tandem with Coal Allied development proposed for Middle Camp Increase in dwelling will have significant impact on number of cars Contradictory traffic access to Pacific Highway Too many dwellings proposed (600houses 9 shops shoptop housing tourism accommodation apartments in Bin Building 	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic and service issues have been examined on a cumulative basis Impact on Catherine Hill Bay village has been minimised Traffic will be within applicable standards and efforts are being made to minimise the impact on the existing village by routing traffic from the development in and out via Montefiore Street Accesses to the Pacific highway are being negotiated ointly with RTA Development complies with MO
2739	01/11/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Catherine Hill Bay unique heritage village Benefit to National Park disproportionate to development of housing in areas of high visual and environmental impact No scientific analysis on offset lands or assessment of development's best siting 600 new houses overlooking Moonee Beach, which has no houses Development on coastal headland which is inconsistent with NSW policy Local gourps oppose the development CHB destination for recreational users 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage Environmental 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All development has been removed from the existing village and from the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. Impact on Catherine Hill Bay village has been minimised Amenities for surfers and other beach goers will be enhanced. Rose Group is prepared to discuss providing funding for a new surf club at Catherine Hill Bay as part of its developer contributions plan
2740	05/11/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Catherine Hill Bay unique heritage village Benefit to National Park disproportionate to development of housing in areas of high visual and environmental impact No scientific analysis on offset lands or assessment of development's best siting 600 new houses overlooking Moonee Beach, which has no houses Development on coastal headland which is inconsistent with NSW policy Local gourps oppose the development CHB destination for recreational users 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage Environmental 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All development has been removed from the existing village and from the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. Impact on Catherine Hill Bay village has been minimised Amenities for surfers and other beach goers will be enhanced. Rose Group is prepared to discuss providing funding for a new surf club at Catherine Hill Bay as part of its developer contributions plan
2741	02/11/2007	Ob ect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Catherine Hill Bay unique heritage village Benefit to National Park disproportionate to development of housing in areas of high 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage Environmental 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All development has been removed from the existing village and from the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the

			<p>visual and environmental impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No scientific analysis on offset lands or assessment of development's best siting 600 new houses overlooking Moonee Beach, which has no houses Development on coastal headland which is inconsistent with NSW policy Local groups oppose the development CHB destination for recreational users 		<p>development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on Catherine Hill Bay village has been minimised Amenities for surfers and other beach goers will be enhanced. Rose Group is prepared to discuss providing funding for a new surf club at Catherine Hill Bay as part of its developer contributions plan
2742	19/09/2007		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full copy of submission provided. 	•	
2743	25/10/2007	Object	<p><u>Catherine Hill Bay</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area has been identified for at least 6 decades to the maintenance of air quality for two major cities (Sydney and Newcastle). Eastern seaboard is slumping at an increasing rate and so coastal villages are doomed in the long term. Coastal villages as proposed do not fit into the spirit of coastal policy, as legislated by the Minister for the Environment which embraced no further development from mean high tide to a distance of one kilometre west inland. Proposed coastal villages should be moved at least one kilometre westward to a more inland site. Proposed urban sanitisation of this landscape should not be undertaken by Rosecorp for a one off gain for a few company players, but this land should remain in public ownership, to protect the broader coastal landscape into the future. Moonee area contains very environmentally valuable, essential hind-dune wetlands and these need significant scientific research and evaluation and a Plan of Management for a minimum of 20 years, before any considerations can be made on the future of this area. <p><u>Gwandalan</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is only one ingress-egress roadway and any further populations in this area would be at a high fire risk without alternate access routes. Drains into Lake Macquarie and government bodies are already hard pressed to maintain the status quo with the health of this large water body, without having to cope with the extra burden of bulldozing for development which will create a massive soil disturbance. Stockland (Wallarah Peninsula) has set the benchmark – anything less than this is unacceptable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Air Quality Coastal erosion Coastal policy Environmental sensitivity Bushfire Water quality Development standard 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Concept Plan is the only mechanism available to secure the buffer The proposed development complies with the coastal policy The site of development coincides with the despoiled areas and is in keeping with offsets requested by DECC There are three access points proposed to the Gwandalan development which complies with RFS guidelines The drainage of the site will be such that there is no adverse impact on the lake The development at Murrays beach would be unviable in this location and would be unlikely to comply with RFS guidelines
2744	11/9/2007		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have lived in Swansea and holidayed in Lake Macquarie on many occasions. This is a beautiful, fragile and sensitive area. Concerned that 70% of this area will be cleared to make way for high density development. Will degrade coastline, Tuggerah Lakes and Lake Macquarie. Lake Macquarie and Tuggerah Lakes ecosystems are struggling to stay viable with the present amount of urban development around them. Adding development will severely reduce the water quality and further impair struggling ecosystems. Opposed to development that seeks to maximise profit at the expense of the environment. Development should not be approved in its current form. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Water quality Environmental impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0% will be preserved There will be no high density development There will be no adverse impact on water quality
2745	07/11/2007		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to the development of the Gwandalan site. Needs to be considered in tandem with Coal Allied development proposed for Middle Camp Increase in dwelling will have significant impact on number of cars Contradictory traffic access to Pacific Highway Too many dwellings proposed (600houses 9 shops shoptop housing tourism accommodation apartments in Bin Building 	•	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All development has been removed from the existing village and from the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. Impact on Catherine Hill Bay village has been minimised Amenities for surfers and other beach goers will be enhanced. Rose Group is prepared to discuss providing funding for a new surf club at Catherine Hill Bay as part of its developer contributions plan
2746	07/11/2007		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Catherine Hill Bay unique heritage village Benefit to National Park disproportionate to development of housing in areas of high visual and environmental impact No scientific analysis on offset lands or assessment of development's best siting 600 new houses overlooking Moonee Beach, which has no houses Development on coastal headland which is inconsistent with NSW policy Local groups oppose the development CHB destination for recreational users 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage Environmental 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All development has been removed from the existing village and from the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible. Impact on Catherine Hill Bay village has been minimised Amenities for surfers and other beach goers will be enhanced. Rose Group is prepared to discuss providing funding for a new surf club at Catherine Hill Bay as part of its developer contributions plan

2747	0 /11/2007		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Catherine Hill Bay unique heritage village• Benefit to National Park disproportionate to development of housing in areas of high visual and environmental impact• No scientific analysis on offset lands or assessment of development's best siting• 600 new houses overlooking Moonee Beach, which has no houses• Development on coastal headland which is inconsistent with NSW policy• Local gourps oppose the development• CHB destination for recreational users	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Heritage• Environmental	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• All development has been removed from the existing village and from the headland. The impact on the coast has been ameliorated by basing the development on a McHarg landscape analysis to ensure that it blends in to the surrounding landscape as much as is possible.• Impact on Catherine Hill Bay village has been minimised• Amenities for surfers and other beach goers will be enhanced. Rose Group is prepared to discuss providing funding for a new surf club at Catherine Hill Bay as part of its developer contributions plan
------	------------	--	---	--	--