

Dear John,

We are writing as members and residents of the Bayswood community in Vincentia, to express concern on Stockland's application to delay the construction of access road A, as applied for in the Coastal Village Project Approval Modification 9 (Application number 06_0058 Mod 9). This delay will result in road access B (the existing access) supplying the only access point to the Western Village and up to 400 residential lots. Our concern is primarily based on the safety aspects of such a proposal. Currently there are under 50 houses in the estate (which includes the display homes), the use of a single road for up to 400 lots will have a noticeable impact on community safety. The following paragraphs/points will detail our concerns.

1. In the period of 3 weeks over Christmas (during light traffic), we observed several cars travelling down the wrong side of the road. These roads are only 3.74 m in width from curb to gutter and due to the vegetation on both sides of the road do not facilitate the ability for vehicles to pull over. Should this scenario occur when the road becomes the only major access, it is possible that there could be a head on collision between vehicles.
2. Turning circles available for residents on Bayswood Ave to turn into the opposite side of the road are small and the view available to observe incoming traffic through median strip vegetation is limited due to the vegetation growth. This will only grow thicker as time passes. Increasing the traffic, by having the road service 400 lots will also increase the risk of collisions and reckless risk taking, compromising the safety of road users.
3. It is reasonable to assume that 400 residential lots in a development such as Bayswood would contain an average of 3 persons per household, equating to 1200 residents in the area. Noting the bushfire zoning in some areas of the estate, the provision of only a single access road to serve the community will result in an increase risk to community safety should there be a bushfire disaster. Single road access will not take into account the emergency requirements of residents or emergency vehicles.
4. The section of Halloran St (in the process of being built), which will join the two villages, spans across the lower lying areas of the village (across the existing draining run off pools). In a similar manner to the bushfire risk, should heavy rainfall cause the park lake areas to overflow, it is likely that this area of the road will also become covered in water, flooding this area of the road. This would compromise safety and isolate residents in the western village. Again, a single road access will not take into account the emergency requirements of residents or emergency vehicles.
5. The design of the curb side along Bayswood Ave means that visitors are unable to park up onto the nature strip. Whilst not ideal, it is possible for vehicles to park half on the strip and half on the road, leaving a small gap for local traffic to pass by. By making Bayswood Ave the only road to service the increase in residents, this scenario will increase the likelihood of accidents and compromise the safety of all residents and road users. The existing vegetation on the median strip is currently right up against the road. This will only get thicker as time passes and present a further hazard to local traffic. A hazard that will increase when the road will be used by so many.
6. While we were unable to find an Australian standard for the width of roads, we believe that the proposal would possible re-classify the roads original intended use possibly making the existing width unsuitable for its new use. Data presented in the traffic report presented with the Stockland submission does not appear to take into account the visitors into the estate who can reasonably be expected to visit residents, nor does it appear to take into account the wider local area community who enter the estate to make use of the parkland area or visit the display homes. These traffic numbers will only increase as time passes.
7. Bayswood Ave, Halloran St residents, and adjoining street properties will be exposed to an unacceptable noise levels as the estate grows, not only because of the additional cars, but due to the additional trucks which are associated with all facets of construction and moving.
8. The community feeling of the Bayswood estate means that it already experiences regular foot and cyclist

traffic. Should the traffic increase to 4000 vehicles per day (based on the calculations in the Shoalhaven City sub division code (10 per household)), the current pedestrian crossings will not meet the (safe crossing) requirements.

While the above examples may appear small to some, it is the quantity and the fact that they concern community safety that make the proposal a significant issue . As a conclusion, Stocklands have consistently delayed and made changes to their development at Bayswood. Based on this history, it is not unforeseeable that if their modification is approved, they will push right further down track, if at all. We have the opportunity to prevent such incidents in the future. As a user of the roads and resident in the estate, the scenarios I have describe above can easily be predicted, purely based on 2 months of observations (with less than 50 houses in the estate).

Whilst these scenarios are not based on a report which we have paid a third party to complete, they are based on common sense, which come from actual observations of community members living in the estate. (rather than a model). The Stockland proposal appears to be a cost saving corporate strategy that will ultimately place community safety at risk.

We would appreciate a follow up on this email. If you have any questions or would like to discuss our concerns, please call us on either 0405147231 or 0431094901.

Regards,

Simon and Amanda Lam

6 Bayswood Ave

Vincentia NSW 2540

Amanda Lam Simon Lam

amanda.lam@defence.gov.au simon.lam@defence.gov.au

Ph: 0405 147 231 Ph: 0431 094 901

John Phillpott - Fwd: Public Comment in relation to Vincentia Coastal Village Project Approval; Modification 9 (number 06_0058 Mod9)

From: Simon Lam <simonlam@iprimus.com.au>
To: <john.phillpott@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 27/02/2011 9:18 PM
Subject: Fwd: Public Comment in relation to Vincentia Coastal Village Project Approval; Modification 9 (number 06_0058 Mod9)

John,

I am not sure where the update on Modification 9 sits and I am not sure whether or not these will help. The enclosed photos show what I meant by the width of the road and suitability for it being the main thoroughfare. The pictures show a parked truck which rendered the road unsuitable to pass. As such, to get to our home, my wife had to reverse, drive around the block and then up the wrong side of the road. I hope that these pictures bring some clarity to the email I sent earlier in the year. Thank you for your time.

Regards

Simon and Amanda Lam





Begin forwarded message:

From: Simon Lam <SIMONLAM@IPRIMUS.COM.AU>
Date: 23 January 2011 9:09:01 PM AEDT
To: john.phillpott@planning.nsw.gov.au
Cc: amanda.lam@defence.gov.au, simon.lam@defence.gov.au
Subject: Public Comment in relation to Vincentia Coastal Village Project Approval; Modification 9 (number 06_0058 Mod9)

Dear John,

We are writing as members and residents of the Bayswood community in Vincentia, to express concern on Stockland's application to delay the construction of access road A, as applied for in the Coastal Village Project Approval Modification 9 (Application number 06_0058 Mod 9) . This delay will result in road access B (the existing access) supplying the only access point to the Western Village and up to 400 residential lots. Our concern is primarily based on the safety aspects of such a proposal. Currently there are under 50 houses in the estate (which includes the display homes), the use of a single road for up to 400 lots will have a noticeable impact on community safety. The following paragraphs/points will detail our concerns.

1. In the period of 3 weeks over Christmas (during light traffic), we observed several cars travelling down the wrong side of the road. These roads are only 3.74 m in width from curb

to gutter and due to the vegetation on both sides of the road do not facilitate the ability for vehicles to pull over. Should this scenario occur when the road becomes the only major access, it is possible that there could be a head on collision between vehicles.

2. Turning circles available for residents on Bayswood Ave to turn into the opposite side of the road are small and the view available to observe incoming traffic through median strip vegetation is limited due to the vegetation growth. This will only grow thicker as time passes. Increasing the traffic, by having the road service 400 lots will also increase the risk of collisions and reckless risk taking, compromising the safety of road users.

3. It is reasonable to assume that 400 residential lots in a development such as Bayswood would contain an average of 3 persons per household, equating to 1200 residents in the area. Noting the bushfire zoning in some areas of the estate, the provision of only a single access road to serve the community will result in an increase risk to community safety should there be a bushfire disaster. Single road access will not take into account the emergency requirements of residents or emergency vehicles.

4. The section of Halloran St (in the process of being built), which will join the two villages, spans across the lower lying areas of the village (across the existing draining run off pools). In a similar manner to the bushfire risk, should heavy rainfall cause the park lake areas to overflow, it is likely that this area of the road will also become covered in water, flooding this area of the road. This would compromise safety and isolate residents in the western village. Again, a single road access will not take into account the emergency requirements of residents or emergency vehicles.

5. The design of the curb side along Bayswood Ave means that visitors are unable to park up onto the nature strip. Whilst not ideal, it is possible for vehicles to park half on the strip and half on the road, leaving a small gap for local traffic to pass by. By making Bayswood Ave the only road to service the increase in residents, this scenario will increase the likelihood of accidents and compromise the safety of all residents and road users. The existing vegetation on the median strip is currently right up against the road. This will only get thicker as time passes and present a further hazard to local traffic. A hazard that will increase when the road will be used by so many.

6. While we were unable to find an Australian standard for the width of roads, we believe that the proposal would possible re-classify the roads original intended use possibly making the existing width unsuitable for it's new use. Data presented in the traffic report presented with the Stockland submission does not appear to take into account the visitors into the estate who can reasonably be expected to visit residents, nor does it appear to take into account the wider local area community who enter the estate to make use of the parkland area or visit the display homes. These traffic numbers will only increase as time passes.

7. Bayswood Ave, Halloran St residents, and adjoining street properties will be exposed to an unacceptable noise levels as the estate grows, not only because of the additional cars, but due to the additional trucks which are associated with all facets of construction and moving.

8. The community feeling of the Bayswood estate means that it already experiences regular foot and cyclist traffic. Should the traffic increase to 4000 vehicles per day (based on the calculations in the Shoalhaven City sub division code (10 per household)), the current pedestrian crossings will not meet the 'safe crossing' requirements.

While the above examples may appear small to some, it is the quantity and the fact that they concern community safety that make the proposal a significant issue. As a conclusion, Stocklands have consistently delayed and made changes to their development at Bayswood. Based on this history, it is not unforeseeable that if their modification is approved, they will push right further down track, if at all. We have the opportunity to prevent such incidents in the future. As a user of the roads and resident in the estate, the scenarios I have describe above can easily be predicted, purely based on 2 months of

observations (with less than 50 houses in the estate). Whilst these scenarios are not based on a report which we have paid a third party to complete, they are based on common sense, which come from actual observations of community members living in the estate. (rather than a model). The Stockland proposal appears to be a cost saving corporate strategy that will ultimately place community safety at risk.

We would appreciate a follow up on this email. If you have any questions or would like to discuss our concerns, please call us on either 0405147231 or 0431094901.

Regards,

Simon and Amanda Lam

6 Bayswood Ave

Vincentia NSW 2540

Amanda Lam Simon Lam

amanda.lam@defence.gov.au simon.lam@defence.gov.au

Ph: 0405 147 231 Ph: 0431 094 901

VINCENTIA RATEPAYERS AND RESIDENTS
ASSOCIATION INC.

**PO BOX 149, VINCENTIA,
N.S.W. 2540.**

**PRESIDENT : BRIAN SAUNDERS
SECRETARY: ELIZABETH TOOLEY**

October 7, 2010.

The Director-General
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY 2000

Attention: John Phillpott

Copy: The General Manager, Shoalhaven City Council and Ward 2 Councillors.

Dear John

**Section 75W Modification of Concept Plan Approval (MP06_0060) and Project Approval
(MP06_0058) – Modification No. 9
Vincentia Coastal Village & District Centre, Corner of Wool Road and Naval College
Road, Vincentia – Western and Central Villages**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the abovementioned modification.

We note that this also refers to Modification 10 but we cannot see details of this on your website. However we understand it relates to a display village in the Central Village. We do not know if this is in addition to or replaces the existing village. Assuming the latter is the case we see no reason to object. This modification is for the convenience of Stockland to aid their marketing efforts and should not be used as an excuse to increase the number of lots in the Western Village.

We do however object to increasing the allowable lots in the Western Village by 21, particularly as these lots are located very close to Naval College Road. We see no reason why Stockland should be given a bonus of 4% on the lot yield at the expense of community amenity. Further the original Concept Plan was approved on the understanding that Bayswood would essentially nestle into the countryside with a buffer zone of natural vegetation between the development and Naval College Road.

The proposal appears to reduce this buffer zone of the Western Village between it and this busy main road, from around 40 meters to about 7 meters and as a result there is much discussion of a need for an acoustic fence and a mound to protect the new lots. Even so the traffic noise will

continually cause friction between the lot owners and the Shoalhaven City Council (Council), probably leading to speed restrictions or additional sound barriers at the community's expense. We are surprised to see that the proposed acoustic solutions refer to two storey dwellings when we understood Bayswood was a single storey development. The rear view of two storey dwellings close to Naval College Road would be unsightly and completely out of character with the rural area on the other side of the road.

As Council have pointed out the proposal would restrict options for road realignment which we believe will become a necessity as the Shopping Centre develops. This is already a very busy section of road and will become even busier. Safety will become a major issue. It seems from the drawings that the overhead power lines would have to be relocated close to the road, another safety negative. In addition Council refuses to accept responsibility for maintenance of the buffer zone. Whilst we agree with Council that it should not be a burden on the ratepayers, we fear that given Stockland's performance to date in other parts of the site, the buffer zone will become a desolate, weed infested strip.

This brings us to the issue of the roundabout and at entrance "A". We see no reason why Stockland should be allowed to renege on their obligation to construct this access when they start developing the Western Village. Commitment 53 made by Stockland is quite clear that the roundabout and access must be built before the subdivision of the Western Village. The new proposal would route traffic through narrow suburban streets currently used by cyclists and children playing. This traffic would include concrete trucks and other large vehicles delivering building materials for sites under development as well as new residents.

In conclusion we see no merit in the proposed modification 9 and we respectfully request that it be refused by your Department.

Yours sincerely,

Elizabeth Tooley,
Secretary, VRRRA

From: Lee Carmichael <lee@allenprice.com.au>
To: "john.phillpott@planning.nsw.gov.au" <john.phillpott@planning.nsw.gov.au...>
Date: 21/01/2011 3:52 pm
Subject: Bayswood - Vincentia Distric Centre - Modification 9.

Dear John,

I write to you to express my concerns as a resident of Bayswood (Ketch Lane) with the proposed deferral of the construction of the round-a-bout / vehicular access for the western precinct off Naval College Road.

Firstly, I am not going to unreasonable about this. I can understand why Stockland want to defer the construction of the access as proposed - i believe they have provided reasonable justification.

The proposal however will push a considerable amount of more traffic into the central precinct road network which suffers from poor visibility in parts, narrow single car width lanes and is generally a little ambiguous for users not familiar with it. I doubt that the DOP would have approved the style of road network in the central precinct if it knew this modification application would be lodged.

Can we reach a compromise here?? How about the NSW DOP consider approving the deferral of the round-about construction until 400 lots are occupied in the western precinct, however still require the construction of a new intersection at the current approved location for the western precinct without the requirement for a round-a-bout.

Hardly any residents in Bayswood knew about this modification until just recently. We were not notified at all. Our neighbours told us about this proposal last night. Stockland may have a lot of unhappy customers to deal with if this is approved.

It would be appreciated if you could call me to discuss my idea or respond to my e-mail. Is there any chance that another exhibition period be provided so that concerned residents can voice their concerns?

Kind regards

Lee Carmichael

Lee carmichael - associate & Town Planner
02 4421 6544 (w) | 02 4422 1821 (f) | <mailto:lee@allenprice.com.au>

Allen, Price and Associates - Land Development Consultants

This message is intended for the addressee named and may contain confidential information and/or copyright material of Allen, Price & Associates or third parties. If you are not an authorised recipient of this email, please contact Allen, Price & Associates immediately by return email or by telephone on +61 02 4421 6544. In this case you should not read, print, re-transmit, store or act in reliance on this email or any attachments and should destroy all copies of them.

Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.
THIS NOTICE SHOULD NOT BE REMOVED

From: "Stephen & Nyree Cornelius" <stevenyree@bigpond.com>
To: <john.phillpott@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 19/01/2011 11:19 pm
Subject: Bayswood Resident Submission/Public Comment in relation to Vincentia Coastal Village Project Approval Modification 9 (Mod Application Number 06_0058 Mod 9)

John,

I am a current resident of Bayswood Estate Vincentia and I am writing to express my concern wrt one of the approvals being sought by Stocklands in Vincentia Coastal Village Project Approval Modification 9, Mod Application Number 06_0058 Mod 9, Assessment Type: Part3A.

The proposal I am extremely concerned about is the request at paragraph 4.2.2 Statement of Commitment No. 53. The current approved commitment requires Access A to be completed prior to the release of the subdivision certificate for Stage 9 and Stockland are seeking approval to delay completion of Access A till the release of the 400th residential lot.

I am concerned about the huge increase in road traffic that will consequently occur on the route from Access B to the Western Precinct, and in particular the increase in road traffic past my residence at 27 Halloran St. As a resident who purchased land and built in Stage 1, I chose and purchased my residential lot from Stocklands based on the fact that road traffic past my home on Halloran St would predominantly be limited to other residents in the Central Precinct and not those in the Western Precinct (with the exception down the track of any travel they make to and from the proposed shopping village). Delaying development of Access A will result in an increase in traffic and will impact on the quality of life that we "purchased" based on the originally approved Bayswood Matserplan and traffic access plans it would also impact on resale value if we were to sell prior to Access A being opened.

Other points:

- The application also states that the early development in the Western Precinct will be at the northern end of the western precinct however this is not true. Mod 9 seeks approval for 21 lots on the southern edge of the Western Precinct, the new yet to be approved application for a display home area is central in the Western precinct/village (Mod 10) and the latest advertised Bayswood land release (as detailed at page 7) of the attached link:
<http://www.makeyourmovenow.com.au/webdata/flyers/NSW%20Illawarra%20and%20South.pdf> (Bayswood Campaign Release) is also reasonably central in the Western precinct/village area (directly behind proposed display home area in Mod 10).

- Opening up Access A would provide immediate access to the display home sites that approval is sought for in Mod 10 and will also limit/reduce the current 'tourist/potential home/land buyer traffic' in the central precinct.

- The traffic report at Attachment 3 only considers whether delaying Access A is viable from a road capacity viewpoint, the acoustic report at attachment 5 only discusses the 21 lots proposed as the other part of the Mod 10 submission and does not discuss the acoustic impact of increase road traffic wrt current residents on the main route from Access B to the Western Precinct/Village

- Whilst residents have the opportunity to review all Stockland applications to modify extant Bayswood approvals via the nsw planning website, Stockland have failed to actively consult with current Bayswood residents that may be impacted by the proposal to delay development of Access A as they know there would be further objections apart from myself (I only stumbled upon it when researching where the planning towards the Vincentia Shopping/District centre is at wrt progress).

I provide this for consideration in the hope that agreement to delay development of Access A will not be provided to Stocklands and seek your feedback on my submission.

Regards,

Nyree Cornelius

0438219451

27 Halloran St

Vincentia NSW 2540

From: "Cornelius, Nyree LCDR" <nyree.cornelius@defence.gov.au>
To: <john.phillpott@planning.nsw.gov.au>
CC: <stevenyree@bigpond.com>, "Cornelius, Stephen MR 1" <stephen.cornelius1@...>
Date: 20/01/2011 12:59 pm
Subject: Further detail wrt Bayswood Resident Submission/Public Comment in relation to Vincentia Coastal Village Project Approval Modification 9 (Mod Application Number 06_0058 Mod 9) [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

John,

After reading the Mod 9 application further I note that 4.2.2 states:
"To date, stages 1, 2 and 3a (Central Village) have been completed or are nearing completion providing 133 lots. Stage 3 and the retirement living site comprise the remainder of the Central Village. The timing of the retirement living site is independent of the residential subdivision staging, and therefore Stockland intends to proceed with the subdivision of the Western Village."

Therefore, if this mod 9 application is approved, this will mean that all road traffic from residents and visitors to the Western Precinct (326 lots at this stage however the four super lots may lead to even further residential traffic) will pass my home at 27 Halloran St and use the Bayswood Avenue and Halloran St intersection and Access B.

Using the highest figure from figures 1 and 2 within the Road Access to Bayswood Development Report at Attachment 3, this means that at peak periods in 2016 an additional 192 vehicles to the 129/130 vehicles already predicted will use Access B and all 192 of these vehicles will pass my home and also use the Bayswood Avenue and Halloran St intersection. This figure of 192 also does not take into account the future additional traffic along Halloran St between the Western Precinct to the District Centre which according to attachment 3 "In practice it is expected that the first stage of the District Centre would be completed within about two years". Therefore from 2012 onwards peaking in 2016 the traffic and associated noise along Halloran St will be even greater than the additional 192. From a resident's viewpoint this is an unacceptable increase in road traffic and road noise.

Finally, the Attachment 3 report fails to address the increased traffic (Level of Service) at the intersection of Bayswood Avenue and Halloran St. This intersection needs analyses wrt LOS, vehicle safety (looking at visibility at the intersection) and pedestrian safety (noting that the extant footpath along Halloran St which crosses Bayswood Avenue is used by approx half of all residents in the central precinct to access the main community park/reserve area within the estate (playground/BBQ area/kickabout area) and needs to take into account Western Precinct traffic coming to and from Access B and also the Western Precinct traffic to and from the District Centre.

Regards,
Nyree Cornelius
0438219451

From: Stephen & Nyree Cornelius [mailto:stevenyree@bigpond.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 19, 2011 11:19 PM
To: 'john.phillpott@planning.nsw.gov.au'
Subject: Bayswood Resident Submission/Public Comment in relation to

Vincentia Coastal Village Project Approval Modification 9 (Mod Application Number 06_0058 Mod 9)

John,

I am a current resident of Bayswood Estate Vincentia and I am writing to express my concern wrt one of the approvals being sought by Stocklands in Vincentia Coastal Village Project Approval Modification 9, Mod Application Number 06_0058 Mod 9, Assessment Type: Part3A.

The proposal I am extremely concerned about is the request at paragraph 4.2.2 Statement of Commitment No. 53. The current approved commitment requires Access A to be completed prior to the release of the subdivision certificate for Stage 9 and Stockland are seeking approval to delay completion of Access A till the release of the 400th residential lot.

I am concerned about the huge increase in road traffic that will consequently occur on the route from Access B to the Western Precinct, and in particular the increase in road traffic past my residence at 27 Halloran St. As a resident who purchased land and built in Stage 1, I chose and purchased my residential lot from Stocklands based on the fact that road traffic past my home on Halloran St would predominantly be limited to other residents in the Central Precinct and not those in the Western Precinct (with the exception down the track of any travel they make to and from the proposed shopping village). Delaying development of Access A will result in an increase in traffic and will impact on the quality of life that we "purchased" based on the originally approved Bayswood Matserplan and traffic access plans it would also impact on resale value if we were to sell prior to Access A being opened.

Other points:

- The application also states that the early development in the Western Precinct will be at the northern end of the western precinct however this is not true. Mod 9 seeks approval for 21 lots on the southern edge of the Western Precinct, the new yet to be approved application for a display home area is central in the Western precinct/village (Mod 10) and the latest advertised Bayswood land release (as detailed at page 7) of the attached link:
<http://www.makeyourmovenow.com.au/webdata/flyers/NSW%20Illawarra%20and%20South.pdf> (Bayswood Campaign Release) is also reasonably central in the Western precinct/village area (directly behind proposed display home area in Mod 10).

- Opening up Access A would provide immediate access to the display home sites that approval is sought for in Mod 10 and will also limit/reduce the current 'tourist/potential home/land buyer traffic' in the central

precinct.

- The traffic report at Attachment 3 only considers whether delaying Access A is viable from a road capacity viewpoint, the acoustic report at attachment 5 only discusses the 21 lots proposed as the other part of the Mod 10 submission and does not discuss the acoustic impact of increase road traffic wrt current residents on the main route from Access B to the Western Precinct/Village

- Whilst residents have the opportunity to review all Stockland applications to modify extant Bayswood approvals via the nsw planning website, Stockland have failed to actively consult with current Bayswood residents that may be impacted by the proposal to delay development of Access A as they know there would be further objections apart from myself (I only stumbled upon it when researching where the planning towards the Vincentia Shopping/District centre is at wrt progress).

I provide this for consideration in the hope that agreement to delay development of Access A will not be provided to Stocklands and seek your feedback on my submission.

Regards,

Nyree Cornelius

0438219451

27 Halloran St

Vincentia NSW 2540

Attention: John Phillipott

Vincentia Coastal Village Project Approval – Modification 9

With reference to the above application that has been received by the Department of Planning (DOP) for the creation of 21 new residential lots and an amendment to Commitment No. 53 relating to the timing of a required roundabout on Naval College Road we as landowners within the affected land release wish to lodge an objection to the proposed modification for the following reasons:

1. No public notification of the current application: Existing private landowners within the central precinct of the land release have not been advised of the current application and proposed changes. It is considered that the changes being sought, specifically the changes to the access arrangements, will have an adverse impact upon all current landowners as the existing lots have been purchased based on the current approval/lot layout and related statement of commitments. It is considered that the current application is not a 'minor amendment' and at minimum all existing landowners should have been notified and allowed the opportunity to make a submission.

A minor amendment would be the modification to the location of a pathway, or the creation of an additional landscaped area ie. changes having minimal impact upon landowners. However, the amalgamation of lots to create 4 superlots which have the potential to allow for higher density development and therefore increasing housing densities (Modification 8), or the deferment of access works which have the potential to impact upon every lot within the existing land release are not considered minor and as such should have been publicly notified. In this regard, all private land owners within the current land release area should be notified as the current amendments have the potential to impact upon their amenity and their asset. While it is acknowledged that the DOP places these applications on its website, the general public would have limited knowledge of this and would be unaware that an application to modify the current approval has been received.

In regard to notification requirements, I also note your assessment of Modification 8, Clause 3.2 whereby the Director was able to determine the modification under delegated authority as there were less than ten (10) public submissions received. This is highly misleading as there was no notification undertaken, providing little opportunity for residents to advise of concerns. Contrary to the lack of notification, two submissions were received highlighting the need to notify amendments to major projects.

2. Increased vehicle traffic: The *Road Access to Bayswood Residential Development Report* prepared by Halcrow that forms part of this application has provided little assessment of the impact the proposed change to Commitment No.53 will have on the internal road network and its capability to cater for the additional traffic loads that will result. The submitted report does not detail whether the increased traffic flows that will be generated by the new shopping centre/district centre (i.e. that is to be developed on the adjacent land to the east), construction traffic associated with development on the

residential lots within the western precinct, vehicle movements associated with the proposed new display village (Modification 10) and the width of the existing road network that is proposed to be used, have been incorporated into their model/assessment. In addition, the traffic forecasts provided appear to be very low.

With the development potential of 157 lots in the central precinct (excluding the land area for the retirement dwellings) and 326 lots within the western precinct a deferment of the access requirement to the 400th residential lot can potentially mean that 243 lots are created within the western precinct (or 75% of the maximum permissible development within this area) without the need for a separate access point onto Naval College Road. It should also be noted that 4 of the proposed lots have the ability given their size to be developed for 'multi dwelling housing' which will further increase traffic movements given densities will be greater in these lots.

The narrow width of the existing road network that will be used to provide access is considered insufficient to allow safe traffic flow given that road side parking is permissible. The parking of a vehicle on one side of the road will not allow two moving vehicles to pass (refer to **Attachment 'A'**). The proposal will also result in additional traffic being diverted down adjoining narrow side streets to bypass bottlenecks that will result in Bayswood Avenue or Halloran Street.

The creation of an additional 243 lots within the western precinct will, based on the Roads and Traffic Authority Guide to Traffic Generating Developments, result in excess of 2,187 vehicle movements along Halloran Street and Bayswood Avenue on a daily basis. This is considered excessive and has not been given due consideration in the submitted traffic report. In addition the proposed amendment to Commitment 53 does not provide any certainty in terms of a physical timeframe (i.e. reasonable date) as to when access will be provided. The 400th lot may never be registered and may not be created for 5 years or more.

4. Safety concerns: The provision of one formal access point into and out of the western precinct via Halloran Street raises both bushfire/evacuation and pedestrian safety concerns. With reference to bushfire/evacuation concerns all adjoining land is identified as bushfire prone. As outlined above the existing road network (i.e. Halloran Street) does not currently allow two way traffic movement at all times. Deferment of the requirement to provide Access A onto Naval College Road will mean that during a fire event the existing road network servicing the western precinct will only have one way in and one way out which will clog and potentially delay response times for emergency services and evacuation of residents.

In terms of pedestrian safety, increased vehicle movements along Halloran Street will increase the safety risks to pedestrians (both adults and children) who will be accessing/utilising the only common/usable open space area in both precincts.

In addition, Naval College Rd is a high use, high speed rural road servicing the Jervis Bay area and the deletion of the roundabout will create safety issues. It is our understanding that the roundabout was designed to slow traffic flow along this road at this particular location.

5. Number of lots created: The Don Fox Planning (DFP) submission outlines that the additional 21 lots that are proposed under Modification 9 will result in a total of 603 lots. While it is acknowledged that this figure represents the actual physical lots that will be created, no consideration has been given to the housing densities that will be created. Modification 8 which approved the creation of 4 large residential lots can and

most likely will be used for 'multi dwelling housing' which will result in densities in excess of what was approved under the original concept approval. The creation of the additional 21 lots will only further increase densities. It is also questionable, given the noise attenuation measures that have to be incorporated into the design of dwellings on these lots whether the location is suitable for residential development.

6. Visual impact: The submission from DFP has had little regard for the visual impact the proposed 21 additional lots will have when viewed from the adjoining Naval College Road Reserve Area. Although there is landscaping proposed (specific details in terms of quantities and pot sizes have not been provided) there is a concern that the landscaping will be maintained in a poor state as per the existing landscaping adjacent to central precinct adjoining Naval College Road (refer to **Attachment 'B'**). In some sections it has not even been provided even though the adjoining lots have been registered and sold (refer to **Attachment 'B'**). It is unclear as to who's responsible for this area (i.e. developer or Council) and at present appears to be a no mans land.

Providing a similar landscaped area in closer proximity to Naval College Road adjacent to the 21 new proposed lots with only low level landscape treatment will present poorly as the acoustic fence proposed will be visually prominent. In addition, given that minimal existing vegetation is being retained within either the future road reserve areas or lots that are currently being created within the western precinct (refer to **Attachment 'B'**) to maximize development within the existing land release, it is considered that the retention of existing vegetation along the road reserve area should be maximized so as to provide a natural visual buffer to the development.

Just because the land is currently zoned R2 Low Density Residential does not mean that it should be developed for residential purposes nor to the maximum capacity.

6. Non-completion of current works: The developer has not undertaken all required works as specified on the existing approval. For example, the roads servicing the central precinct of the approved development have not at this time had a final seal applied (refer to **Attachment 'C'**). While it is acknowledged that an agreement between the developer and Council may be in place (i.e. provision of a bank guarantee), it is considered that altering the current access arrangements will further delay these works and create additional damage/ maintenance issues.

At present when it rains all water that falls within the road area (i.e. travel lanes) is unable to access the adjoining gutters and associated drainage infrastructure.

For the reasons above, it is considered that the DOP should not support Modification 9 in its current form. Specifically, the postponing of Commitment No. 53 relating to the timing of a required roundabout on Naval College Road will not only create safety issues within and external to the land release but will also create adverse impacts on the amenity of the existing landowners who have purchased with the understanding that an alternate access would be provided upon creation of the Western precinct.

If the DOP is to support this application it should be at the very least a requirement that the access be created prior to the registration of say the 150th lot rather than the extremity of the 400th lot as there is no certainty that the full creation of lots will take place in the immediate future or at all.

Regards

Andrew and Kristie Lissenden

From: Gemma Thornton <teblgem@hotmail.com>
To: <john.phillpott@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 8/02/2011 11:09 am
Subject: bayswood access A

8 Bayswood Ave

Vincentia 2540

2/2/11

Dear Mr Phillpott

We are writing as concerned residents of Bayswood, regarding the delay for Access A to the western village to be completed into the Bayswood village.

We have a number of valid concerns:

One entrance/exit means in times of disaster eg bushfire the one entrance /exit road will become extremely congested and blocked leading to the risk of harm and possible death as residents rush to escape. This was witnessed during the 2000/01 bushfires in Sussex Inlet. In this situation residents were forced to retreat to the far southern end of the village. There is no such refuge place in Bayswood.

One entrance/exit into and out off Jervis Bay Rd increases the traffic flow and as a consequence the risk of accidents which would again block access. As a resident of Bayswood Ave, I am concerned about the significant increase in traffic. When we purchased this block of land we did so on the understanding that traffic flow would be shared with the 2nd entrance/ exit.

The houses are close to the street which will mean occupants will be affected by increasing traffic noise disrupting the chosen, quiet community lifestyle promoted by Stocklands. This will also impact on resale values.

Bayswood Ave is a narrow, curbed, divided road and was never designed to take heavy traffic flow. There are few places for residents or visitors to pass or stop, even turning into driveways causes a delay. Impatient or inattentive drivers could easily have an accident further blocking the road. Even a minor accident would cause delays or road closure for a considerable length of time. Imagine not being able to get to work or pick up children because of a minor accident. As well as the cars involved in the accident there may also be tow trucks and ambulances causing further mayhem. A second entrance, constructed quickly will reduce this problem significantly.

The risk of such an accident is being increased by the narrow, vegetation covered turning circles which allow access to other side of Bayswood Rd and also at O'halloran St. The travellers driving east and west along Bayswood Ave are unaware of a vehicle turning at the break in the median strip. I have witnessed numerous near accidents and the heard the subsequent verbal abuse.

There is limited parking for visitors and because Bayswood Ave is curb and guttered they have to park on the nature strip (which is illegal) or the main access road into Bayswood is blocked.

The quiet family lifestyle has been promoted to young families and grandparents, by Stocklands and this will be compromised by unnecessary high traffic flow if there is only one entrance/exit.

Stocklands has a history of making changes based solely on cost cutting rather than quality of life. We believe that a second entry/exit should be constructed as soon as possible rather than delayed. This second entry/exit has to be built anyway so it may as well be immediately, before they are forced to because of increased traffic flow and accidents that could have been prevented or there are deaths caused by congestion and confusion in an event such as a bushfire.

Regards

Gemma Thornton

Jordon Dank