

PCU017914

Name:

Address:

Grant Boudie

26 A Flower Dr Catherine Hill Bay 2281

Department of Planning
Received

17 DEC 2010

Scanning Room

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

**The reasons for my objection are as follows:
POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant." They also recommend that

"any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area..." The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages. I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the 'standard template'. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented "if required", both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.

4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.


Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a 'right' to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around 'Slack Alley'.

Signed: _____



Name:

Address:

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

The reasons for my objection are as follows:

POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a

single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant.” They also recommend that “any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area...” The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages. I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the ‘standard template’. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented “if required”, both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.

4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.

Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a ‘right’ to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around ‘Slack Alley’.

Signed: _____



Name:

Address:

PETER CAMERON
75 SKYE POINT RD, COAL POINT NSW 2283

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

The reasons for my objection are as follows:
POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the

spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant.” They also recommend that “any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area...” The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages . I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the ‘standard template’. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented “if required”, both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.

4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.


Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a ‘right’ to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around ‘Slack Alley’.

Signed: _____



Adrianne & Terry Hannan
12 Harvey St Parramatta 2150

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay. My reasons for objection include:

First and foremost, the local community has opposed such development in the area for the better part of seven years. Not only that, Lake Macquarie council rejected development of this land and the State Government had this area as one of the very lowest priorities for development only two years ago. It seems that the only reason that this development proposal is proceeding is the direct result of the undemocratic nature of the 3A planning legislation that simply grants the planning minister the right to favor big developers. The result of this is that the voice of the local community is silenced.

It is extraordinary that the unique status of an original town set in tranquil bush-land is under such imminent threat. It is simply outrageous and insulting to the local community and those that visit to suggest they consider such a development when the town is listed as a place of historical importance by the State Heritage Register and which has had strict rules governing the nature of additions and renovations to existing dwelling to ensure that this historically significant town remains a unique site.

I would like to bring your attention to some extremely serious concerns for the safety and wellbeing of local residents. Firstly Flowers Drive is a narrow coastal road, never designed to sustain more than local traffic. To increase the population by approximately fourfold will place such a strain on existing roads that the resulting traffic would generate a whole range of negative impacts on the township. Child safety concerns, noise-pollution, car accidents and pedestrian accidents would be increased as a result of the development.

Additionally on close inspection of the current development plans, the residential property at number 2 Flowers Drive has been omitted, as has the naturally occurring freshwater creek on its northern side. If such gross omissions have been made in basic surveying how can one be asked to give an opinion on a development proposal with many more complex issues at stake.

Further reasons for my objection are as follows:
POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OC89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant." They also recommend that "any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area..." The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages. I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.
2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the 'standard template'. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented "if required", both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.
3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.
4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land

management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.

Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a 'right' to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around 'Slack Alley'.

Signed: _____

Sharonne Hannan

William van

Name: Simon Rathlou
Address: 56 Flowers Drive Catherine Hill Bay

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

**The reasons for my objection are as follows:
POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a

single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant." They also recommend that "any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area..." The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages. I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the 'standard template'. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented "if required", both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.

4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.


Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a 'right' to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around 'Slack Alley'.

Signed: _____


15-12-2010

Name: ANDREW NOTTING
Address: 6/10 JAROCIN AVE GLEBE 2037 NSW

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

**The reasons for my objection are as follows:
POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant." They also recommend that

"any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area..." The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages. I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the 'standard template'. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented "if required", both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.

4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.


Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a 'right' to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around 'Slack Alley'.

Signed: _____



Name: STEVE NOWAKOWSKI

Address: 3 ROBERTSON RD CATHERINE HILL BAY

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

The reasons for my objection are as follows:
POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant." They also recommend that

"any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area..." The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages. I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the 'standard template'. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented "if required", both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.

4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.


Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a 'right' to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around 'Slack Alley'.

Signed: _____



Name: SHELAGH BOETT
Address: 6/10 JAROCIN AVE CLEBE

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

**The reasons for my objection are as follows:
POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant." They also recommend that

"any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area..." The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages. I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the 'standard template'. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented "if required", both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.


4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.

Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a 'right' to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around 'Slack Alley'.

Signed:  _____

Name: Roberta Marie Stanborough
Address: 3 Crosswinds Close North Wharf 2281

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

The reasons for my objection are as follows:
POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a

single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant." They also recommend that "any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area..." The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages. I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the 'standard template'. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented "if required", both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.

4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A are not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.

Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a 'right' to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around 'Slack Alley'.

Signed: _____

M. J. Stamborough
M. J. Stamborough

Name: C Bowen
Address: 44 Lertera St Fingal Bay NSW 2315

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

**The reasons for my objection are as follows:
POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a

single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant." They also recommend that "any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area..." The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages. I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the 'standard template'. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented "if required", both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.

4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.

Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a 'right' to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around 'Slack Alley'.

Signed: CB Owen

Name: O.M. MyNRD
Address: 6/2-4 REED ST GREMORNE NSW 2090

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

The reasons for my objection are as follows:
POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a

single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant." They also recommend that "any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area..." The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages. I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the 'standard template'. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented "if required", both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.



4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.

Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a 'right' to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around 'Slack Alley'.

Signed:  

Name:

Address:

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Sandra Kay
5 Crangan Bay Road, Nords Wharf
2281

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

**The reasons for my objection are as follows:
POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the

spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant.” They also recommend that “any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area...” The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages . I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the ‘standard template’. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented “if required”, both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.

4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.

Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a ‘right’ to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around ‘Slack Alley’.

Signed: _____

Sandra Kay

Name: Jacqui Green
Address: 151 Cambar Road, Gwandagan NSW 2259

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

**The reasons for my objection are as follows:
POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the

spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant.” They also recommend that “any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area...” The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages . I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the ‘standard template’. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of *RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy*), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented “if required”, both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.

4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.


Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a ‘right’ to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around ‘Slack Alley’.

Signed: _____



Name: Jeanette Grant
Address: 6 Mooran Close Martinsville 2265

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

**The reasons for my objection are as follows:
POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the

spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant.” They also recommend that “any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area...” The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages . I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the ‘standard template’. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented “if required”, both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.


4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.

Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a ‘right’ to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around ‘Slack Alley’.

Signed: 

Name:
Address:

RAY SHORT
184 FREEMAN'S DR. MORISSET
2264

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

The reasons for my objection are as follows:
POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the

spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant.” They also recommend that “any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area...” The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages . I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the ‘standard template’. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented “if required”, both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.

4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.


Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a ‘right’ to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around ‘Slack Alley’.

Signed: _____



Name: Hazel Short
Address: 184 Freeman's Dr Murrumbidgee 2264

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

**The reasons for my objection are as follows:
POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the

spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant.” They also recommend that “any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area...” The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages . I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the ‘standard template’. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented “if required”, both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.

4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.

Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a ‘right’ to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around ‘Slack Alley’.

Signed: A Short

Name: Russell Kay
Address: 5 Crangan Bay Road, Nords Wharf

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

**The reasons for my objection are as follows:
POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the

spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant.” They also recommend that “any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area...” The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages . I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the ‘standard template’. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of *RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy*), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented “if required”, both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.

4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.


Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a ‘right’ to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around ‘Slack Alley’.

Signed: _____



Name:

Address:

Sam Kany
5 Crangard Bay Rd North Wharf

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

**The reasons for my objection are as follows:
POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the

spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant.” They also recommend that “any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area...” The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages . I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the ‘standard template’. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of *RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy*), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented “if required”, both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.

4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.


Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a ‘right’ to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around ‘Slack Alley’.

Signed: _____



Name: ADAM CAVANAGH.
Address: 32 MACQUARIE ST.

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001
ARCADIA JALE 2283.

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

The reasons for my objection are as follows:
POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the

spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant.” They also recommend that “any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area...” The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages . I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the ‘standard template’. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented “if required”, both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.

4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.


Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a ‘right’ to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around ‘Slack Alley’.

Signed: _____



Name: Suzanne Knight
Address: 18 GLADE ST. ARCADIA VALE 2283

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

The reasons for my objection are as follows:
POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the

spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant.” They also recommend that “any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area...” The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages . I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the ‘standard template’. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented “if required”, both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.


4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.

Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a ‘right’ to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around ‘Slack Alley’.

Signed:  _____

Name:

Address:

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Robyn Cavanagh
32 Macquarie St
Arcadia Vale 2283.

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

The reasons for my objection are as follows:

POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the

spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant.” They also recommend that “any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area...” The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages . I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the ‘standard template’. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented “if required”, both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.

4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.

Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a ‘right’ to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around ‘Slack Alley’.

Signed: _____

Rm Cavanagh.

Name:

Address: PAT LLOYD
127/157 MACOMI RD. BONNELL BAY 2264. NSW

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

The reasons for my objection are as follows:

POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the

spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant.” They also recommend that “any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area...” The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages . I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the ‘standard template’. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented “if required”, both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.

4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.

Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a ‘right’ to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around ‘Slack Alley’.

Signed: _____

Patricia Lloyd

Name: Roland Kay
Address: 10 Gibson Street, Belmont 2290

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

**The reasons for my objection are as follows:
POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the

spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant.” They also recommend that “any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area...” The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages . I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the ‘standard template’. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of *RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy*), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented “if required”, both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.

4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.

Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a ‘right’ to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around ‘Slack Alley’.

Signed: Roland Kay

Name:

Address:

Norma Kay
10 Gibson Street, Belmont

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

The reasons for my objection are as follows:

POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the

spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant.” They also recommend that “any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area...” The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages. I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the ‘standard template’. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented “if required”, both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.

4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.

Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a ‘right’ to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around ‘Slack Alley’.

Signed: Nanna Kay

Name:

Address:

Vanessa Clark
a Simmons close, Wja Pt

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

**The reasons for my objection are as follows:
POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the

spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant.” They also recommend that “any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area...” The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages. I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the ‘standard template’. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented “if required”, both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.

4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.


Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a ‘right’ to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around ‘Slack Alley’.

Signed: _____



Name: Janette Brown
Address: 107 Yarra Wonga Park Road, Yarra Wonga Park

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

**The reasons for my objection are as follows:
POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the

spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant.” They also recommend that “any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area...” The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages . I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the ‘standard template’. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented “if required”, both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.

4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.


Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a ‘right’ to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around ‘Slack Alley’.

Signed: _____



Name:

Address: Ken Brown
107 Yarrawonga Park Road, Yarrawonga
Park

Director, Strategic Assessments

Department of Planning

GPO Box 39

SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

The reasons for my objection are as follows:
POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the

spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant.” They also recommend that “any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area...” The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages. I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the ‘standard template’. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented “if required”, both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.


4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.

Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a ‘right’ to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around ‘Slack Alley’.

Signed: 

Name: Sharon Downey
Address: 31 Richardson Rd Raymond Terrace

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

**The reasons for my objection are as follows:
POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the

Name:

Address:

Patricia Morrissey Brown
18A Croydon Street, Mayfield 2302

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

The reasons for my objection are as follows:
POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the

spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant.” They also recommend that “any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area...” The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages . I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the ‘standard template’. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of *RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy*), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented “if required”, both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.

4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.

Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a ‘right’ to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around ‘Slack Alley’.

Signed: _____

P. Morrissey Brown

Name: Stephen Lambert
Address: 79 Princess St Kew VIC 3101

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

The reasons for my objection are as follows:
POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a

single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant." They also recommend that "any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area..." The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages. I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the 'standard template'. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented "if required", both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.

4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.

Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a 'right' to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around 'Slack Alley'.

Signed: *Mark H. H. H.*

Name: Christine Bowen
Address: 49 ROBERT ST WILLOUGHBY 2068

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

The reasons for my objection are as follows:
POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a

single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant." They also recommend that "any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area..." The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages. I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the 'standard template'. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented "if required", both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.

4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.

Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a 'right' to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around 'Slack Alley'.

Signed: Christie Bowen

Name: ANNE BOWER
Address: 8 FLOWERS DRIVE, CATHERINE HILL BAY NSW 2281

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

The reasons for my objection are as follows:

POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant." They also recommend that

"any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area..." The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages. I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the 'standard template'. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented "if required", both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.

4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.

Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a 'right' to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around 'Slack Alley'.

Signed: _____

A.M. Bower

Name:
Address:

R Young
6/36 MACQUARIE ST SPERS POINT

Director, Strategic Assessments
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

RE: COAL & ALLIED SOUTHERN ESTATES PROPOSAL FOR MIDDLE CAMP AT CATHERINE HILL BAY, specifically:

- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SOUTHERN ESTATES): CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)**
- **MIDDLE CAMP RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SOUTHERN ESTATES: MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)**

I object to all of the above Coal & Allied Southern Estates proposals in relation to Middle Camp at Catherine Hill Bay.

**The reasons for my objection are as follows:
POTENTIAL STATE SIGNIFICANT SITE (2010)**

The strategic justification for the project cited in the State Significant Site Listing Report is inadequate. Contrary to the statement on page 2 of the SSS Listing Report (Nov 2010), the proposed development for residential purposes is not "crucial in achieving the State Government's objective of securing major conservation corridors". Nor does the proposed listing "provide a robust long-term outcome" as suggested. The development of new housing in CHB does not address the housing needs of the Hunter region in a sustainable way. It is remote from services, jobs and will rely on private car ownership. The increase in population will not sustain viable public transport. Much of the application is inadequate or misleading.

The application is contradictory in relation to what is actually being proposed. In the Executive Summary and on p2, the Report states that the proposal is to develop 28.2ha for residential purposes with a maximum yield of 222 lots and that the balance of the site is proposed to be dedicated to NSW Government for conservation purposes. However this is contradicted elsewhere in the Report. Reference is made to other future uses: 1.6ha is to be dedicated to Lake Macquarie City Council for recreation purposes; and a substantial area of land is to be retained by Coal & Allied, with zoning proposed as E4. The E4 zoning is intended to 'provide for low impact residential development...' albeit on min. 6000sqm allotments. This type of development is arguably the worst possible outcome for such a significant site. Note that the proposed E4 development is in direct contradiction to the recommendations of the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panel (IHAP) that clearly and repeatedly stated that this area (then 'Precinct D') should **not** be developed.

The documentation suggests that the current application is likely to be only the first of a series of development proposals. The first is for 222 dwellings on two sites but subsequent applications are likely to be the development of the proposed pocket parks and the E4 environmental zone. This current application does not "provide a robust long-term outcome".

CONCEPT PLAN (MP10_OO89)

Objections to the detail of the current proposal:

1. The significance of Catherine Hill Bay has been acknowledged through its inclusion on the State Heritage Register. The expert IHAP regard the Middle Camp village and its setting as representing "a precinct of exceptional aesthetic, landscape, social and cultural landscape heritage significance... it is unique, representing a largely intact 19th Century mining village characterized by development along a single street with single storey cottages sited on either side. In addition to the cottages themselves the spaces between the cottages and the landscape setting are also significant." They also recommend that

"any development in the vicinity of Middle Camp should not prejudice the scenic, aesthetic and cultural heritage qualities of the area..." The large area on the eastern side of Middle Camp proposed to be zoned E4 is in direct conflict with this recommendation as the object of E4 zoning is to enable residential subdivision and development in an area which historically has been an open public common and green space dotted with a few unfenced miners cottages. I believe that this area should be zoned E2 which would preserve its environmental qualities.

2. The application incorrectly addresses the impact of traffic on the Heritage village and on the safety and amenity of its residents. Flowers Drive clearly has the characteristics of a local road. The RTA standards have been posited in response to urban conditions but this rural context does not fit the 'standard template'. Given that the characteristics of Flowers Drive accord with a local road classification (see Table 1.2.5 of RTA Design Guide – Factors for Implementation of Road Hierarchy), acceptable traffic numbers and acoustic standards are exceeded. Also, studies carried out on behalf of Coal & Allied show that there was a 40% increase in traffic on the weekend but only 10% has been allowed in their calculations. The acoustic study by Renzo Tonin was based on an estimated 40km speed, yet nothing in the application commits to any traffic calming measures. Indeed, current road configuration encourages the current 50km/hr speed limit to be frequently exceeded. While the Statement of Commitments does suggest that LATM would be implemented "if required", both traffic and acoustic reports incorrectly argue that nothing is required.

3. It is important that the buffer zone along Flowers Drive be 30m wide in order to adequately screen the proposed 2 storey new housing and to retain the significant rural character of the treed entry into the heritage township. The application is confused and misleading. It quotes figures varying of between 15-30m for such a buffer zone. While the SSS Listing Report commits to a 15m buffer zone on page 37, other experts suggest that the landscaped buffer is 23 – 30m wide (refer p32). The Concept Plan refers to a 20m buffer zone. I believe that a 30m buffer zone is essential to retain the existing mature trees and screening.

4. From their reports, it appears that Coal & Allied see the heritage significance of the State Listed Heritage Township only in terms of streetscape and fail to understand the relational nature of heritage places and their settings. It is absolutely necessary that the land known as Slack Alley and the common land behind the houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive be owned and managed by either DECCW, NPWS or the Lake Macquarie City Council. While this land is retained by Coal and Allied, its future is uncertain. Clearly C&A is not a conservation land management organization and it is only a question of time until they come back with the proposal to develop the area for housing. Other viable alternative land management options include a Trust established under the Nature Conservation Trust Act or a Voluntary Conservation Agreement with NPWS.

Over many decades, C&A have drawn very substantial profits from mining the land at Middle Camp. It can reasonably be concluded that they have an obligation to remediate the land both underground and above ground at their own cost. The current development proposals aim to reduce their remediation expenditure via returns on residential development. This is an unreasonable expectation and avoidance of obligations associated with mining despoliation.

5. The Complying Development Codes SEPP was developed largely to facilitate the building of project homes in metropolitan Sydney. Catherine Hill Bay and its setting are areas of major scenic, built and environmental heritage significance. The Complying Codes should not be applicable in the isolated, environmentally sensitive areas that are the setting for Middle Camp. Further, the Urban Design Guidelines proposed in the application are totally inadequate (they provide guidance predominantly on road design) and are incapable of delivering a sympathetic built outcome. I suggest that a detailed Development Control Plan is required to set higher standards for design of roads, parks and buildings.

MIDDLE CAMP SOUTHERN ESTATES (VPA)

As mentioned above under point 4, C&A have drawn very substantial profits over many decades from mining the land at Middle Camp. The VPA is inadequate as it fails to take the remediation obligations into account and presumes a 'right' to develop and profit from despoiled land despite unacceptable impacts. The Statement of Commitments inadequately addresses the need to ameliorate the traffic impacts on existing residents and the conservation of common land behind houses on the eastern side of Flowers Drive and the land around 'Slack Alley'.

Signed: _____

