

Summary of written submissions received during public exhibition – 20 August 2018 – 24 September 2018

SUB No	ITEM	SUBMISSION SUMMARY COMMENT	PLANNING COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
1	1	Generally support the draft documents as exhibited, however a number of matters should be amended in light of information provided to Council by Gales and ongoing investigations, particularly BAM assessment and discussions between parties with respect to determining a development/conservation footprint.	Further to Council's resolution of the 7th December 2018 with regards to E-Zone and offset options in the west Kingscliff area, Council Officers have been progressing negotiations with Gales and their consultants, in specific relation to vegetation classification and redefinition of development envelopes. Gales and their consultants are currently preparing a biodiversity assessment method (BAM) over all Gales Holding sites and are awaiting appropriate seasonal timeframe to undertake fauna surveys, which will inform the bio-diversity value across the Gales holdings sites. Outcomes of this BAM, along with identified urban footprint areas, will inform options for balancing areas to be cleared against areas requiring offset planting. This process has now been ongoing since at least December 2017. Whilst there has been advancement in achieving negotiated positions across a substantial portion of Gales Holdings land, there are a number of sites, including land to the east of Tweed Coast Road, land adjoining Turnock Street roundabout and land adjoining Quigan St, in addition to lands to be nominated for offset planting, which remain unresolved.	Given Council's intent to proceed with the finalisation of the dKLP&DCP and the current absence of a consensus position between Council staff and Gales Holdings, in terms of identified lands for environmental protection and offset planting, a further report is recommended as warranted in order to provide Council with options on how to proceed with resolving the outstanding issues.
1	2	Turnock St Precinct - Text and figures 3.2 do not note the potential for development on relatively unconstrained zoned land between Quigan Street and east west drain. Request to add text: <i>"To investigate opportunities for further urban development on unconstrained land and the relocation of the drain to the south to form a boundary to urban development."</i> The concept plan for the Turnock St Precinct should reflect the further development opportunity.	Whilst it is acknowledged Council is currently in receipt of a current development application (DA17/0554) for filling over this site, this land falls within the Coastal SEPP Mapping, is constrained by flooding, is constrained by proximity to endangered species habitat and a substantial flying fox colony.	See item 1
1	3	Business and Knowledge Precinct – Land shown as environmental bushland is irregular and will not facilitate an efficient development pattern. The opportunity to rationalise this boundary with an adjacent area that would be available for rehabilitation should be identified in the document.	See item 1	See item 1
1	4	Gales believes that the 20m vegetated buffer to Tweed Coast Road is excessive and presents an unnecessary impediment to the viability of future mixed use development. Refer to submission prepared by LFA.	The intent of the KLP to embed a vegetative screen along this edge draws on broader linear landscape characteristics travelling along Tweed Coast Rd. By way of example, Casuarina has a landscaped edge (average 20m wide) to Tweed Coast Road which establishes a strong landscape character to that part of Tweed Coast Road. The landscape buffer is broken at key intersections where the business uses are revealed and can be identified. The landscape buffer would also service to visually screen less attractive car park and building elements including back of house, loading bays, garbage refuse areas etc. Further the nominated 20m width mirrors the width of the band of vegetation already established along this road frontage.	No change

1	5	<p>Business and Knowledge Precinct (Pg 66,67,68)</p> <p>Request to add text to: <i>The development and conservation footprints will be determined by BAM assessment, and consideration will be given to rationalising the shape of this area potentially enabling a more efficient development footprint with reduced edge effects and setbacks to be achieved as shown by the indicative dashed line on figure 6.5.</i></p>	See item 1	See item 1
1	6	<p>Request to amend text in Vol 2 Precinct Plan – Business and Knowledge Precinct – Item 8 (Page 66) to:</p> <p><i>Create a landscape edge to Tweed Coast Road frontage providing opportunities to plant feature trees and understorey vegetation to soften the built form whilst providing exposure of commercial features to passing traffic and allowing views to the west from the Business and Knowledge Precinct.</i></p>	See item 4	No change
1	7	<p>Request to amend text to Vol 2 Precinct Plan - West Kingscliff Precinct – Strategy 2 dot point 5 (Page 76) to:</p> <p><i>“Provision of open space adjoining the north-south drainage corridor and the provision of a local park appropriately located sized, planted and embellished to meet the passive local space needs of future residents.”</i></p>	<p>The suggested rewording removes reference to the provision of a local park to the east of this precinct on land which directly adjoins the Turnock St roundabout.</p> <p>The intent of this park location was to provide a green edge to this development precinct. Further, due to the proposed Turnock Street extension alignment, this part of the site would be difficult to develop for residential purposes due to the narrowing width. Notwithstanding it is acknowledged that the detailed design of this precinct would be undertaken as a master plan at a future point in time. As such it is suggested to include the word “investigate” as part of that strategy.</p>	<p>Suggested rewording of strategy in relevant parts of the plan to:</p> <p><i>“Investigate the provision of passive open space adjoining the north-south drainage corridor and a local park which adjoin the Turnock St roundabout to the east to be appropriately sized, planted and embellished to meet the passive open space needs to the local residents resulting in a green edge to the precinct.”</i></p>
1	8	<p>Request to amend text to Vol 2 Precinct Plan - West Kingscliff Precinct – Strategy 4 (Page 76) to:</p> <p><i>“Reinforce the extended Turnock Street as the principle connector road which will connect Cudgen and Tweed Coast Road with the Kingscliff Township.”</i></p>	<p>The suggested rewording includes reference to the Turnock St extension connecting Cudgen which is implied by Cudgen’s access to TCR via Crescent St and then TCR to Kingscliff via the extension. The current wording however indicates this extension as a principle connector where it would form part of the broader road network that includes other connector roads. As such there is opportunity to reword to reflect this.</p>	<p>Suggested rewording of strategy in relevant parts of the plan to:</p> <p><i>“Facilitate the extension of Turnock St as a connector road providing a more direct linking between Tweed Coast Road, Cudgen and the Kingscliff township by...”</i></p>
1	9	<p>Request to add a further dot point to Vol 2 Precinct Plan - West Kingscliff Precinct – Strategy 4 (Page 76) to state:</p>	<p>The inclusion of this dot point is generally supported. Given the identified need of this Turnock Street extension is directly related to future greenfield development, a relevant strategies will be</p>	<p>Support additional dot point in relevant parts of the plan to read:</p>

		<i>"Design Turnock Street to achieve an appropriate intersection location with Tweed Coast Road that provides for an efficient and safe road link to Crescent Street and Altona Road."</i>	amended to nominate road and intersection design are to be developer initiated and funded.	<i>"The developer initiated and funded design of the Turnock Street extension is to achieve an appropriate intersection location with Tweed Coast Road that provides for an efficient and safe road link to Crescent Street and Altona Road."</i>
1	10	Request to amend Figure 7.3: <i>"Show the more realistic alignment of the Turnock Street extension and adjust the residential and conservation precincts to reflect the new alignment as illustrated."</i>	Council staff acknowledges and generally supports the preliminary Turnock Street extension road alignment (27301-ALL-P002 Amend A) submitted by way of correspondence dated 27th August 2018 provided that details of the Draft Development / Conservation Footprint (GHD dated 18 Apr 2018 (ref: 22-19265 Rev B) are updated to reflect the nominated conservation area footprints generally consistent with Council's resolution of the 24th January 2018. Notwithstanding the in principle support for the preliminary road alignment and intersection location, comments relating to detailed design including road pavement design and cross sections including fill levels, batters, drainage, integration of shared pathways and intersection design and potential impacts on the adjoining development is deferred to a more detailed review process.	Amend the indicative structure plan to illustrate the road alignment to be generally consistent with 27301-ALL-P002 Amend A.
1	11	Cudgen Precinct Request to amend Figure 11.1: <i>"Figure 11.1 Cudgen Village indicative structure plan has omitted the approved route of Altona Road. Altona Road provides access to the waste water treatment plant and the two sand quarries and will be an important consideration in the road and land use planning for this precinct. Gales has provided advice to Council with regard to the preferred future location of this road. Land use precincts and the indicative sports fields should be repositioned to suit the alignment of Altona Road. The introduction of Altona Road to the intersection of Tweed Coast Road and Turnock Street extension will require consideration of a realignment to Crescent Street."</i>	The alignment of Altona Road has previously and currently been the subject of a major project (Cudgen Lakes Sand Extraction Project P05_0103) of which the DP&E are the consent authority. The indicative structure plan will be updated to reflect the approved road alignment.	Update Figure 11.1 to reflect the approved Altona Road alignment project (Cudgen Lakes Sand Extraction Project P05_0103) at the time of writing.
1	12	Request to amend Vol 2 Precinct Plan - West Kingscliff Precinct – Strategy 4 dot point 01 (Page 104) to state: <i>"Detailed design and location of the intersection of Altona Road with Tweed Coast Road and the Turnock Street extension to consider the potential need to realign Crescent Street. The alignment of Altona Road to be considered as part of a future Planning Proposal or Concept Development Application."</i>	As per previous discussions with Gales Holdings, the ultimate road alignment of Altona Road, Crescent St and the intersection with Tweed Coast Road is dependent on alignments approved as part of the major project. The intent of strategy 4 is to facilitate the future development of the developable portion of R1 lands (Lot 1 DP 828298). This strategy notes that the road alignment / intersection design should be considered as part of a developer initiated master plan process which would then be used to inform any subsequent planning proposal and development application.	Amend wording of strategy 4 dot point 01 to state: <i>"Detailed design and location of the intersection of Altona Road with Tweed Coast Road and the Turnock Street extension to consider the potential need to realign Crescent Street."</i>

1	13	<p>Green Edge Precinct</p> <p>Gales believe that the 20m vegetated buffer to Tweed Coast Road is excessive and presents an unnecessary impediment to the viability of future mixed use development. As noted in item 3, the KLP should provide a degree of flexibility so that the communities' expectations are managed and the commercial realities of development are accommodated.</p> <p>Request amend Figure 12.1 and Strategy 4 dot point 01 (page 112) to state:</p> <p><i>"Create a landscape edge to Tweed Coast Road frontage providing opportunities to plant feature trees and understorey vegetation to soften built form and provide a green gateway to the Tweed Coast. The width and density of planting will consider the quality of the built form proposed and the desirability / need for exposure to passing traffic."</i></p>	See item 4	No change
1	14	<p>Request to amend Figure 2.3 and 2.13</p> <p><i>"The KLP precinct plans identify potential greenfield housing opportunities between Crescent Street and the proposed lake. The DCP should be consistent with the precinct plans."</i></p>	<p>The precinct plan does not identify potential for greenfield housing in this location. The strategy within the precinct plans (Page 104) states:</p> <p><i>"Investigate future opportunity to establish a holiday park or 'eco-village' accommodation adjoining the future artificial lake as part of the precincts concept or master plan process to address key opportunities and constraints including flood constraints."</i></p> <p><i>The corresponding strategy within the DCP (Page 83) states: "Investigate future opportunity to establish a holiday park tourist accommodation adjoining the future artificial lake (private recreation) as part of the precincts concept or master plan process to address key opportunities and constraints including flood constraints."</i></p> <p>Investigations of this site for these potential 'tourist accommodation' uses directly relate to the location and extent of the lake and cessation of sand extraction operations in addition to a detailed consideration of the sites constraints including flood impacts.</p>	<p>For consistency, amend the strategy within the precinct plans and DCP to state:</p> <p><i>"Investigate future opportunity to establish a holiday park tourist accommodation adjoining the future artificial lake (private recreation) as part of the precincts concept or master plan process which should also address key constraints including flood impact."</i></p>
1	15	<p>Turnock St Precinct</p> <p>The text and figure 2.17 do not note the potential for development on relatively unconstrained zoned land between Quigan St and the east west drain.</p> <p>Request to add text to Vol 03 2.13.2 Planning & Design Principles (Pg 68) to state:</p>	See item 2	No change

		<p><i>"P.11 Investigate opportunities for further urban development on unconstrained land and the relocation of the drain to the south to form a boundary to urban development."</i></p> <p><i>Amend Figure 2.17 to reflect.</i></p>		
1	16	<p>Vol 3 DCP 2.14 West Kingscliff Precinct</p> <p>Request to amend text in item P1 dot point 7:</p> <p><i>"Provision of passive open space adjoining the north-south corridor and the provision of a local park appropriately located, sized, planted and embellished to meet the passive local space needs of the future residents."</i></p>	<p>The suggested rewording removes reference to the provision of a local park to the east of this precinct on land which directly adjoins the Turnock St roundabout.</p> <p>The intent of this park location was to provide a green edge to this development precinct. Further, due to the proposed Turnock Street extension alignment, this part of the site would be difficult to develop for residential purposes due to the narrowing width. Notwithstanding it is acknowledged that the detailed design of this precinct would be undertaken as a master plan at a future point in time. As such it is suggested to include the word "investigate" as part of that strategy.</p>	<p>Suggested rewording of strategy in relevant parts of the plan to:</p> <p><i>"Investigate the provision of passive open space adjoining the north-south drainage corridor and a local park which adjoin the Turnock St roundabout to the east to be appropriately sized, planted and embellished to meet the passive open space needs to the local residents resulting in a green edge to the precinct."</i></p>
1	17	<p>Vol 3 DCP 2.14 West Kingscliff Precinct</p> <p>Request to amend text in item P4 dot point 1:</p> <p><i>"Remove reference to widened drainage swale. A swale will be provided if needed, and otherwise would unnecessarily increase the cost of the road, force the road southwards, or reduce the developable area. If required the area would be better provided on the ecological (south) side."</i></p>	<p>A widened drainage swale may not necessarily be required in this location in lieu of other drainage arrangements which would be documented as part of a more detailed road reserve and alignment design process. Specific reference to a widened drainage swale can be removed.</p>	<p>Remove reference to widen drainage swale to state:</p> <p><i>"Design Turnock Street as a tree lined boulevard to provide a high level of visual and landscape amenity."</i></p>
1	18	<p>Vol 3 DCP 2.14 West Kingscliff Precinct</p> <p>Request to add additional dot point in item P4:</p> <p><i>"Design Turnock St to achieve an appropriate intersection location with Tweed Coast Road that provides for an efficient and safe road link to connect existing and future Cudgen developments via Crescent St and Altona Rd."</i></p>	<p>The requested addition of a principle referencing the new intersection with Tweed Coast Rd is generally warranted however the proposed wording pre-supposes that there will be additional future developments within Cudgen.</p> <p>As per previous discussions with Gales Holdings, the ultimate road alignment of Altona Road, Crescent St and the intersection with Tweed Coast Road is dependent on alignments approved Altona Rd alignment as part of the existing sand extraction major project application. The road alignment / intersection design should be considered as part of a developer initiated master plan process which would then be used to inform any subsequent planning proposal and development application.</p>	<p>Add additional dot point to state:</p> <p><i>"Detailed design and location of the intersection of Turnock St extension with Tweed Coast Road and Altona/Crescent St to the west of Tweed Coast Road be considered as part of a developer initiated master plan process and or as part of approvals sought for the Sand Extraction major project."</i></p>

1	19	<p>Vol 3 DCP 2.14 West Kingscliff Precinct</p> <p>Request to Amend Figure 2.20</p> <p><i>"Show the more realistic alignment of the Turnock St extension and adjust the residential and conservation precincts to reflect the new alignment as illustrated below."</i></p>	<p>Council staff acknowledges and generally supports the preliminary Turnock Street extension road alignment (27301-ALL-P002 Amend A) submitted by way of proponents correspondence dated 27th August 2018 provided that details of the Draft Development / Conservation Footprint (GHD dated 18 Apr 2018 (ref: 22-19265 Rev B) are updated to reflect the nominated conservation area footprints generally consistent with Council's resolution of the 24th January 2018. Notwithstanding the in principle support for the preliminary road alignment and intersection location, comments relating to detailed design including road pavement design and cross sections including fill levels, batters, drainage, integration of shared pathways and intersection design and potential impacts on the adjoining development is deferred to a more detailed review process.</p>	<p>Amend the indicative structure plan to illustrate the road alignment to be generally consistent with 27301-ALL-P002 Amend A and adjust the residential and conservation areas accordingly.</p>
1	20	<p>Vol 3 DCP 2.16 Business and Knowledge Precinct</p> <p>Request to Amend text in item P9:</p> <p><i>"The Development and Conservation footprints will be determined by BAM assessment, and consideration will be given to rationalising the shape of this area potentially enabling a more efficient development footprint with reduced edge effects and setbacks to be achieved as shown by the indicative dashed line on figure 2.24."</i></p>	<p>See item 1</p>	<p>See item 1</p>
1	21	<p>Vol 3 DCP 2.16 Business and Knowledge Precinct</p> <p>Request to Amend text in item P10:</p> <p><i>"Create a landscaped edge to Tweed Coast Road frontage providing opportunities to plant feature trees and understorey vegetation to soften built form whilst providing exposure of commercial features to passing traffic and allowing views to the west from the Business and Knowledge Precinct."</i></p>	<p>See item 4</p>	<p>No change</p>
1	22	<p>Vol 3 DCP 2.17 Cudgen Precinct</p> <p>Request to Amend text in P7 to be consistent with Vol 2 Precinct Plans of the KLP:</p> <p><i>"Investigate opportunities for holiday park tourist accommodation and/or expansion of a residential land use into part of Lot 21 DP 1082482 and Lot 2 DP 216705 through an integrated concept or master plan planning proposal process to achieve a balance and mix of housing types including low density residential and medium density residential housing."</i></p>	<p>See item 11 See item 14</p>	<p>See item 11 See item 14</p>
1	23	<p>Vol 3 DCP 2.17 Cudgen Precinct</p> <p>Request to add additional dot point in item P11:</p> <p><i>"Detailed design and location of the intersection of Altona Road with Tweed Coast Road and the Turnock Street extension to consider the potential need to realign Crescent Street. The alignment of Altona Road to be considered as part of a future Planning Proposal or Concept Development Application."</i></p>	<p>See item 18</p>	<p>See item 18</p>
1	24	<p>Request to amend Figure 2.25 Altona Road alignment.</p>	<p>See item 11</p>	<p>See item 11</p>

1	25	<p>Vol 3 DCP 2.17 Kingscliff Town Centre</p> <p><i>"Figure 3.2 does not note the potential for development on relatively unconstrained existing zoned land between Quigan Street and the east west drain."</i></p>	See item 2	See item 2
1	26	<p>Vol 3 DCP 4.8 Cudgen Village</p> <p>Request amendment to 4.8.2 objective 2 to state:</p> <p><i>"To facilitate opportunity for a mix of low rise, medium density housing types over the greenfield development site to the north of the existing settlement bordered by Tweed Coast Road and Crescent Street and to investigate expansion opportunities to the west of Crescent Street."</i></p>	<p>The requested amendment to this objective seeks to facilitate the additional consideration of land to the west of Crescent Street for residential purposes. As stated in item 14 above this land was identified as having potential to investigate tourist accommodation in association with the future artificial lake.</p> <p>However investigations of this site for these potential 'tourist accommodation' uses directly relate to the location and extent of the lake and cessation of sand extraction operations in addition to a detailed consideration of the sites constraints including flood impacts.</p>	<p>Amend wording to 4.8.2 objective 2 to state:</p> <p><i>"To facilitate opportunity for a mix of low rise, medium density housing types over the greenfield development site to the north of the existing settlement bordered by Tweed Coast Road and Crescent Street and to investigate expansion opportunities to the west of Crescent Street for tourist related accommodation in associated with the future artificial lake at the cessation of sand extraction operations."</i></p>
2	27	<p>Vol 1 Context and Locality Wide Strategies</p> <p>Use of land post extraction to benefit from amenity created by lake and new open spaces. Include opportunity for long term future residential north of Cudgen Village after sand extraction complete.</p> <p>Requested amendment:</p> <p><i>Include future green field development on Figure 4.5 Future locality urban structure plan (p125).</i></p>	<p>See item 26 above.</p> <p>Figure 4.5 nominates the site as potential future open space and having a future artificial lake. In the context of the future open space and lake opportunities the notation could be expanded to reference potential opportunity for future tourist accommodation uses which is consistent with strategies within Vol 2 Precinct Plan and Vol 3 DCP.</p>	<p>Update notation on Vol 1 Page 125 Figure 4.5 to state:</p> <p><i>"Future Open Space Opportunity to expand the localities active and passive open space facilities. Existing DA for sand extraction will create a water body which may present opportunities for private recreation (RE2), water based recreational activities and associated tourist accommodation."</i></p>
2	28	<p>Provide a geometry suitable for road design responding to existing land holdings, topography, Turnock Street extension and conservation areas.</p> <p>Requested amendment:</p> <p><i>Include realignment of Altona Road on Figure 4.5 Future locality urban structure plan (p125). Include on realignment of Altona Road on Figure 6.1 - Kingscliff locality road network (p151).</i></p>	See item 11	See item 11

2	29	<p>Tweed Valley Hospital site not shown. Future development to support Tweed Valley Hospital and related services.</p> <p>Requested amendment:</p> <p><i>Show site for Tweed Valley Hospital on Figure 4.5 Future locality urban structure plan (p125).</i></p>	<p>Relevant diagrams will be updated to indicate the site currently being investigated for the Tweed Valley Hospital. At the time of writing the dKLP & DCP the TVH site had yet to be confirmed State Government. In terms of acknowledging the broader implications of the regional hospital the locality plan makes provision to facilitate a range of land uses including residential, business and education uses within the broader catchment which would be able to broadly meet the needs of an expanded allied health industries, workforce and resident base. Similarly the Tweed Road Development Strategy will be reviewed to acknowledge to increased vehicle movement volume on the local road network.</p> <p>Council staff have also been liaising with both NSW Health with regards to planning and urban design issues related to the hospital site to inform the planning and design phases and with the Department of Planning in relation to the development of the Tweed Head Action Plans which has included a specific Hospital Precinct study. Council will be continuing to liaise with DP&E particularly with regard to the broader land use planning implications including measures to ensure the protection and safeguarding of the remainder of the Cudgen plateau state significant farmland.</p>	<p>Given the significance of the Tweed Valley Hospital as a major land use, and social and economic anchor, it will be necessary to review the dKLP&DCP to ascertain the influence and flow-on effects throughout the locality and subregion. Whilst the dKLP&DCP foreshadowed the development of a hospital on an alternate site, a further review of the hospital in terms of dKLP&DCP would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of the Tweed Valley Hospital site; • Inclusion of the Tweed Valley Hospital in narrative across each of the KLP&DCP documents particularly in terms of locality wide strategies, economic, employment and social context; • Inclusion of the hospital site and narrative within the Kingscliff Hill Precinct; and • A review and discussion of land uses on immediate adjoining sites. • Ongoing consultation with NSW Health and the DP&E with regards to hospital planning and design issues.
2	30	<p>Vol 02 Precinct Plans and Vol 3 Development Control Plan Kingscliff Town Centre Precinct:</p> <p>Extent of maximum building heights for Kingscliff Town Centre Precinct in Planning Proposal inconsistent with KLP and previously exhibited building heights. Amend maximum building heights to reflect the maximum heights in the draft KLP 2016.</p> <p>Requested amendment:</p> <p><i>Amend maximum building heights to reflect the maximum heights in the draft KLP 2016 of 16.6m.</i></p>	<p>Comments requesting the reinstatement of proposed building heights as exhibited at the Kingscliff shopfront exhibition are noted.</p> <p>At Council's meeting of the 16th March 2017 Council resolved to nominate building heights to be integrated into the draft Kingscliff Locality Plan and DCP including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11.0m to Marine Parade; • 13.6m to other business zones; and • 12.2m to R3 medium density zones <p>Following this resolution, the dKLP documents were updated to reflect these building height nominations.</p>	<p>There is a need to undertake a more detail review of building height feedback to more fully aggregate the results of the exhibition period (round table and written submissions) to document the alternate suggestions and options presented by submitters for Councils consideration and direction for the final drafting of the KLP&DCP.</p>

2	31	<p>Minimum FSR - Section 3.6.3 Control C1 limits logical incremental development if there is no provision for staged development. E.g. In the situation that development of ground floor retail is viable, however development above ground floor it is not viable, the FSR of 1:1 will not be achieved.</p> <p>Amend Section 3.6.3 Control C1 to allow a staged DA to satisfy this control.</p> <p>Requested amendment: <i>Insert wording in square brackets in DCP Section 3.6.3 Control C1 'Development on any site within the Kingscliff Town Centre Precinct is not to exceed an FSR of 2:1 and is to have a minimum FSR of 1:1 [unless it can be demonstrated that the minimum FSR can be achieved with further development of the site].'</i></p>	<p>The requested amendment to the minimum FSR control (Section 3.6.3 Control C1) recognises that in some instances development is staged and therefore the minimum FSR may not be initially achieved. However, the suggested amended wording relies on an applicant's demonstration that the FSR could be met without necessarily being linked to a staged development approval.</p> <p>As such more appropriate wording could include: <i>C1 'Development on any site within the Kingscliff Town Centre Precinct is not to exceed an FSR of 2:1 and is to have a minimum FSR of 1:1 [unless it can be demonstrated that the minimum FSR can be achieved <u>through a staged development application</u>].'</i></p>	<p>Update the wording to state: <i>C1 'Development on any site within the Kingscliff Town Centre Precinct is not to exceed an FSR of 2:1 and is to have a minimum FSR of 1:1 [unless it can be demonstrated that the minimum FSR can be achieved through a staged development application].'</i></p>
2	32	<p>Section 3.6.3 Control C2 – required community benefits apply to different sites/landowners which means not all community benefits can be achieved in single application.</p> <p>Re-word Control C2 to avoid interpretation issues at DA stage.</p> <p>Requested amendment: <i>Insert wording in square brackets/ remove wording with strike though in DCP Section 3.6.3 Control C2 '...where the applicant prepares a Voluntary Planning Agreement with Council that would provide, at a minimum, [one or more of] the following community benefits.'</i></p>	<p>Comments related to interpretation noted.</p> <p>For clarity update wording to state: <i>C2 '...where the applicant prepares a Voluntary Planning Agreement with Council that would provide, the following community benefits where relevant to the development site:'</i></p>	<p>Update wording to state: <i>C2 '...where the applicant prepares a Voluntary Planning Agreement with Council that would provide, the following community benefits where relevant to the development site.'</i></p>
2	33	<p>Kingscliff wide civic uses such as multipurpose community building, library, incubator workspace and preschool are more appropriately provided in the Business and Knowledge Precinct so that they can serve as a catalyst for the development of that precinct rather than additional traffic and parking pressures being placed on the Kingscliff Town Centre. The Kingscliff Town Centre should focus on providing for neighbourhood and tourist needs. Provide flexibility for location of civic uses. Undertake further investigations to determine the most suitable location for civic uses as part of Gales master planning/ planning proposal.</p> <p>Requested amendment: <i>Insert wording in square brackets in order to provide flexibility as to the final and best location of future community facility: "Integrate a new multi-purpose community building within this precinct [or the Business and Knowledge Precinct, subject to further studies to determine the most appropriate location] to include a community centre, library, community meeting rooms, incubator workspace, preschool and early childhood facilities." (KLP Vol2 p12) "Integrated community facilities - opportunity for this central park to be co-joined with community based uses which may include a community centre, library, community</i></p>	<p>Comments in relation to undertaken a review to determine the best location for a multi-purpose community facility and library are noted.</p> <p>However given the significant amount of greenfield development opportunity within the Turnock St precinct, this precinct presents to date the best opportunity to collocate important community and town centre uses. Despite additional development opportunity within the proposed business and knowledge precinct, the Kingscliff town centre will continue to remain the community and business heart of the locality.</p> <p>The final location of required community infrastructure is best pursued through more detailed developer led master plans in consultation with Council's Community and Cultural Services Unit.</p>	<p>No change</p>

		<i>meeting rooms, incubator workspace, preschool and early childhood facilities [or to locate such facilities in the Business and Knowledge Precinct, subject to further studies to determine the most appropriate location].” (KLP Vol2 p30)</i>		
2	34	<p>The indicative costs in Table 8 of DCP do not appear to include land value. As a new or amended section 7.11 (former s.94) Plan has not been exhibited, it is unclear whether the section 7.11 plan will levy new development in the Kingscliff locality to provide for both the cost of land/lot dedication and the cost of major civic improvements. It is also unclear whether parking provided in items 2 and 3 of Table 8 of the DCP would serve the parking requirements/needs for the community centre. Include land value/acquisition in Section 7.11 Plan.</p> <p>Requested amendment:</p> <p><i>Council exhibit a new/amended S7.11 Plan and DCP which provides for community facility to be provided either in the Kingscliff Town Centre or in the Business and Knowledge Precinct.</i></p> <p><i>Council to clarify parking requirements associated with a new community facility and incorporate requirements into the plan. Defer DCP Section 3.18 (KLP Vol 3 p124-127) subject to adoption by Council of a Section 7.11 Plan for Kingscliff.</i></p>	Land values are not assigned in the indicative cost column of Table 8 Kingscliff Town Centre Public Domain and Civic Improvements as the as land would either be held in public ownership (works within road reserve), land held in private ownership (such as Kingscliff Shopping Village) or land which would be dedicated to Council as part of a broader master planned subdivision (such as open space and a site for a library / community centre facility).	Given the schedule of public domain, civic improvements and community facilities, an implementation plan would be required which set out mechanisms to procure prioritised public domain items either through voluntary planning agreements or via a new or amended 7.11 plan.
2	35	<p>There is inadequate information or analysis included within the KLP and DCP to determine the form and location of WSUD initiatives, the unqualified requirements for swales is not supported. Provide flexibility to enable the most suitable form of Water Sensitive Urban Design for each Precinct.</p> <p>Requested amendment:</p> <p><i>Amend caption to ‘Figure 2.8 - Land forming - Utilise roads to interface filled development areas with natural areas and integrate swales edged with landscape for drainage, flood mitigation as well as enhancing landscape and visual amenity [where appropriate]’. (Vol 3 p39)</i></p>	Integration of WSUD measures within the new greenfield development sites is a key strategy to manage stormwater runoff in a more environmentally sensitive and aesthetic way. The illustrated swales provide one option which could be explored that would both manage stormwater and provide a landscaped buffer between Turnock Street and future development to its north. As such, the inclusion of the wording ‘where appropriate’ in the caption of Figure 2.8 rather than mandating swales is appropriate in this instance.	Update wording in the caption of Figure 2.8 to state: <i>‘Figure 2.8 - Land forming - Utilise roads to interface filled development areas with natural areas and integrate swales edged with landscape for drainage, flood mitigation as well as enhancing landscape and visual amenity where appropriate.’</i>
2	36	<p>Turnock St Precinct</p> <p>Development footprint does not reflect discussions in relation to modification of DA17/0554. Gales DA records that the area proposed for developed and parkland is zoned R1 General Residential, is slashed grassland and is not Ecologically Significant. KLP figures currently indicate this area as Ecologically Significant. Refer to Attachment A - concept showing development of land south of Turnock Street in line with a modification of DA17/0554 following discussions with Council. The area adjacent to the Turnock Street roundabout as</p>	See item 2	See item 2

		<p>conservation area and a park for passive recreation south of the extended development footprint, with a tree lined boulevard connecting through to Turnock Street, to provide an enhanced urban design outcome by way of connectivity and access to open space.</p> <p>Requested amendment:</p> <p><i>Amend Vol 2 Figure 3.0 (KLP Vol 2 p29) and Figure 3.2(KLP Vol 2 p35) and DCP Figure 2.17 (KLP Vol 3 p67) to show extended development footprint towards Quigan Street and possible recreation area in accordance with Attachment A.</i></p>		
2	37	<p>The maximum building height reductions for 'medium density areas' is not justified with sufficient rationale and evidence. Furthermore the reduction in building height will cause reduction in potential density which is undesirable given that Kingscliff will be the main town servicing the Tweed Coast, close to Kingscliff TAFE, High School and the new Tweed Valley regional hospital.</p> <p>Increase maximum building height heights to reflect the maximum heights in the draft KLP 2016 in accordance with the principles of Figure 3.7 of DCP which proposes stepped building height maintaining beach view.</p> <p>Requested amendment: <i>Increase maximum building height to reflect the maximum heights in the draft KLP 2016 of 16.6m.</i></p>	See item 30	No change
2	38	<p>There is inadequate information or analysis included within the KLP and DCP to determine the form and location of WSUD initiatives. There is inadequate information or analysis included within the KLP and DCP to determine the form and location of WSUD initiatives.</p> <p>Requested amendment: <i>Amend DCP section 2.13.2 Planning and Design Principle P2 to remove wording with strike through: "-designing Turnock Street as a tree lined boulevard with widened drainage swale to provide a high level of visual amenity and ecological habitat"</i></p>	<p>Refer comments in Item 34 above. Removal of specific reference to widened drainage swales is appropriate.</p> <p>Suggested rewording:</p> <p><i>DCP section 2.13.2 Planning and Design Principle P2 "- designing Turnock Street as a tree lined boulevard with a landscaped buffer to future urban development and integrated WSUD measures where appropriate."</i></p>	<p>Update wording in <i>DCP section 2.13.2 Planning and Design Principle P2 to state:</i></p> <p><i>"Designing Turnock Street as a tree lined boulevard with a landscaped buffer to future urban development and integrated WSUD measures where appropriate."</i></p>
2	39	<p>Business and Knowledge Precinct</p> <p>Maximum building height limits opportunities in precinct. Amend maximum building heights to reflect the maximum heights in the draft KLP 2016.</p> <p>Requested amendment: <i>Increase maximum building height to reflect the maximum heights in the draft KLP 2016 of up to 20m.</i></p>	Refer item 37 above. The Council resolved building height as it applies to the Business and Knowledge Precinct would be 13.6m for business zones and 12.2m for R3 Medium density zones.	No change.

2	40	<p>Landscape buffer 10m (Vol3) / 20m (Vol 2) to Tweed Coast Road. Tree retention is acknowledged as being important, however the specification of depth is unnecessary. Additionally visibility to the Business and Knowledge Precinct from Tweed Coast Road is essential for viability of development in the Business and Knowledge Precinct.</p> <p>Remove numerical landscape buffer while still providing well defined landscape character along Tweed Coast Road.</p> <p>Requested amendment:</p> <p><i>Insert wording in square brackets/ remove wording with strike though amend P9 (Vol 3 p80):</i> <i>'[Where appropriate] create a 10m-wide vegetative buffer to Tweed Coast Road frontage providing a 'green edge' to the site with opportunity plant out with large street trees and understorey vegetation.'</i></p>	See item 6	See item 6
2	41	<p>Cudgen Precinct</p> <p>Use of land, post extraction to benefit from opportunities created by lake, relocation of Altona Road and new open spaces. Include opportunity for long term future residential north of Cudgen Village on Sand quarry site.</p> <p>Requested amendment:</p> <p><i>Volume 2 Section 11.5 Cudgen Precinct draft strategies point 4 - Insert the words "and Lot 2 DP216705" after "part of Lot 21 DP 1082482" as the planned residential development will extend onto Lot 2 DP216705 (KLP Vol 2 p104).</i> <i>Include in DCP 2.15.2 Planning and Design Principles (KLP Vol 3 p82) reference to these lots (above) and acknowledgement for potential residential adjacent to the artificial lake as noted in the KLP.</i></p>	<p>The requested amendment seeks to facilitate the additional consideration of land to the west of Crescent Street for residential purposes. As stated in item 14 and 26 above this land was identified as having potential to investigate tourist accommodation in association with the future artificial lake.</p> <p>However investigations of this site for these potential 'tourist accommodation' uses directly relate to the location and extent of the lake and cessation of sand extraction operations in addition to a detailed consideration of the sites constraints including flood impacts. As such it is currently premature to consider the likelihood of the site as being suitable for residential investigations.</p>	No change
2	42	<p>Realignment of Altona Road. Proposed modification to extraction approval and investigation into road geometry have identified that the alignment of Altona Road from the Waste Water Treatment Plant to Turnock Street may be designed to provided benefit for downstream flooding and avoid intersection geometry issues on Tweed Coast Road whilst still providing active sports fields.</p> <p>Requested amendment:</p> <p><i>Include alignment of Altona Road in accordance with mark-up of Volume 2 Figure 2.24 Cudgen Village Indicative Structure Plan (KLP Vol 2 p105 shown in Attachment B).</i></p>	See item 11	See item 11

3	43	<p>Building height</p> <p><i>The above studies (referencing EbD and shopfront exhibition) and community consultation showed significant support for, and certainly no overwhelming community objection to, increasing building heights. The KLP should contain a clause recommending that an independent study be done to objectively recommend on allowing increased heights in the Turnock Street Precinct and the Business and Knowledge Precinct.</i></p>	<p>Comments requesting an independent review of building heights are note.</p> <p>At Council's meeting of the 16th March 2017 – rather than pursue a building height workshop / community consultation option as reported, Council resolved to nominate building heights to be integrated into the draft Kingscliff Locality Plan and DCP including: 11.0m to Marine Parade; 13.6m to other business zones; and 12.2m to R3 medium density zones</p> <p>Following this resolution, the dKLP documents were updated to reflect these building height nominations.</p>	No change
3	44	<p>Location of community facilities:</p> <p><i>The LFA submission (p4) states 'Kingscliff wide civic uses such as multipurpose community building, library, incubator workspace and preschool are more appropriately provided in the Business and Knowledge Precinct...'</i></p> <p><i>This should rather refer to 'Tweed Coast civic uses...'. If the multipurpose community building is meant to be accessible to Tweed Coast residents, as opposed to Kingscliff residents within walking distance, the B&K Precinct has better access and will avoid adding to traffic and parking problems in the Turnock Precinct.</i></p>	<p>The dKLP nominates sites either in the Kingcliff town centre and or Turnock St as being able to accommodate new facilities given the availability existing greenfield development sites and good proximity to the town centre. Collocating community, civic, retail and businesses uses together would contributing to the town centres vitality function and role.</p> <p>Council will soon be commencing the community infrastructure network plan which will identify what community facilities are needed both now and into the future and where the best locations for new infrastructure will be. As part of that process the strategies will be reviewed and revised if more suitable sites are identified.</p>	No change
3	45	<p>Service station relocation:</p> <p><i>KLP Vol 2 p34: Investigate opportunity to relocate town centre service station to a new site fronting the Turnock Street roundabout which could be colocated with other retail tenancies or small scale commercial workspace.</i></p> <p><i>Gales does not support a service station on its land in this location.</i></p>	<p>Gales objection to the location of a service station within proximity of the Turnock Street roundabout is noted. The nomination of this site s in recognition of the long terms desire for the existing service station to be relocated from its current Pearl St frontage location. The alternate location along Tweed Coast Rd within the Cudgen precinct may offer a more practical and easy to access location.</p>	Delete specific reference to a service station within the Turnock Street precinct but retain opportunity for a small 'mixed use' development site on this key corner.
3	46	<p>Aboriginal cultural heritage assessment:</p> <p>Reference: KLP Vol 2 p50 (map on p53):</p> <p><i>Gales is not aware of any Aboriginal Cultural Heritage matter affecting this land. Gales seeks clarification as to "the known and potential occurrence of ACH sites" on Gales lands, and why this is mapped on Gales land. Incorrect mapping, also in regard to ecological significance, misinforms the community and has resulted in hostility towards personnel and towards Gales plans, characterising Gales as a rapacious developer.</i></p>	<p>Council's Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Plan which included a comprehensive mapping of the Shire for Known and predicative sites has been undertake and endorsed by Council following an extensive consultation process. The North Kingscliff Precinct is mapped in part as a predictive site. As such any proposed works or approvals sought would firstly need to undertake appropriate due diligence reporting and assessment to the significance and value of the site in consultation with the TBALC and secondly determine how to avoid and or mitigate any potential to damage.</p>	No change

3	47	<p>West Kingscliff local park See Morton's Submission: Reference KLP Vol 2 p76:</p> <p><i>Provision of passive open space adjoining the north-south drainage corridor and a local park which adjoin the Turnock St roundabout to the east to be appropriately sized, planted and embellished to meet the passive open space needs to the local residents resulting in a green edge to the precinct. [See (1) in Figure 7.3 p77].</i></p> <p><i>While the amount of passive open space required will increase with building height, the location of such space should be determined by concept development application.</i></p>	<p>Refer item 6 above.</p> <p>The intent of this park location was to provide a green edge to this development precinct. Further, due to the proposed Turnock Street extension alignment, this part of the site would be difficult to develop for residential purposes due to the narrowing width. Notwithstanding it is acknowledged that the detailed design of this precinct would be undertaken as a master plan at a future point in time. As such it is suggested to include the word "investigate" as part of that strategy.</p> <p>The location, size and type of park will ultimately be nominated as part of a more detailed master plan over this precinct.</p>	<p>Suggested rewording of strategy in relevant parts of the plan to:</p> <p><i>"Investigate the provision of passive open space adjoining the north-south drainage corridor and a local park which adjoin the Turnock St roundabout to the east to be appropriately sized, planted and embellished to meet the passive open space needs to the local residents resulting in a green edge to the precinct."</i></p>
3	48	<p>Passive recreation uses associated with conservation lands:</p> <p><i>As discussed at the meetings and on-site inspections with Gales and Council, it is Gale's strong preference that conservation lands permit passive recreation use so that such areas can be enjoyed and appreciated by the public. We understand that Council is supportive of this position.</i></p> <p><i>The KLP should include a clause that passive recreation uses in conservation lands where appropriate is supported.</i></p>	<p>Previous Council advice by letter dated 19 September 2018 indicated that nature based recreation would be permissible through identified conservation areas. This may include walking trails, elevated pathways, and some furniture (bench seats etc).</p>	<p>Various relevant sections of the dKLP will be updated to indicate promotion of 'nature based recreation' including walking trails and other environmental education uses which may be sought as part of a more detailed master planning process. Noting however the envelope of cleared areas to make way for these uses would be included as part of any BAM assessment.</p>
3	49	<p>Compensatory planting rate:</p> <p><i>Vol 2 p76 and p104: Identification of lands to be dedicated for onsite compensatory planting as a result of any vegetation clearing which may be nominated for removed from part of the identified development site as part of the concept/master plan process. A compensatory rate of 12:1 will generally be applied.</i></p> <p>Submission notes BAM assessment is currently being undertaken to determine development and conservation footprint and the compensatory planting required, on site where possible.</p>	<p>See response to Submission 1 Item 1 above.</p>	<p>Item 60 above.</p>
3	50	<p>Service lane</p> <p><i>KLP Vol 3 3.17.3 Controls C3 provides for "A single service lane for co-ordinated access across adjoining sites is to be provided off Turnock Street servicing the existing Kingscliff Shopping Village site and future town centre expansion area west along Turnock Street." (p122 and Figure 3.29 below).</i></p>	<p>Collocating a larger service lane between the existing Kingscliff Shopping Village and greenfield land to the west will rationalise access points along Turnock Street and provide access to any future Town centre development land across the land to the immediate west. Whilst this greenfield site is currently zoned R1 general residential, the dKLP proposes that this site be zoned B4 Mixed use. Whilst it is acknowledge a legal agreement is in</p>	<p>No change</p>

		<p><i>It should be noted that Gales and Chen Yu entered into a legal agreement in December 2013 which requires Chen-Yu to construct an acoustic fence approximately in the area shown in yellow highlight on Figure 3.29 below in the case of residential development on Gales land.</i></p> <p><i>KLP Vol 3 should replace "is to be provided" with "should be considered" and note that provision of the Service Lane can only be done with the agreement of the Chen Yu and Gales owners consistent with any existing legal agreement between the parties.</i></p>	place for an acoustic fence, residential development is not the preferred primary land use across this site.	
4	51	<p>Salt Precinct (Lot 169 DP 1075495 and Lot 930 DP 1079118):</p> <p>Amend the Salt indicative structure plan to nominate potential for B4 mixed use to portion of land fronting Bells Boulevard and to maintain R1 General residential over a larger portion of the combined site fronting Barrel St.</p>	The intent of the proposed rezoning part of this site to B4 mixed use was to encourage a broader retail and commercial offer at the lower level with opportunity for either tourist or residential accommodation to the upper level. As the suggested in the submission, fronting B4 to the Bells Boulevard frontage with an R1 zone retained to the southern portion of the site transitioning to the existing residential areas to the south is a more appropriate outcome.	Amend the Salt indicative structure plan to nominate potential for B4 mixed use to portion of land fronting Bells Boulevard and to maintain R1 General residential over a larger portion of the combined site fronting Barrel St.
4	52	Retain the 13.6m height limit for medium density housing in Salt.	Building height within the Salt Precinct which is zoned SP3 Tourism would retain a building height of 13.6m.	No change
5	53	<p>Building height changes:</p> <p>Agree with Beach front precinct reduction of building height by 1.4m and Town centre precinct reduction of building height by 2.5m.</p>	Comments in relation to proposed building height changes noted.	No change
5	54	<p>Police station building height and land use changes:</p> <p>Object to proposed building height increase on Police Station site having a negative impact on views from Kingsway apartments thereby reduce amenity and property values. Object to the mixed use nomination given the site is within a residential precinct within 100m of the bowls club and an existing struggling retail unit on Marine Parade. The immediate street network cannot cope with any more traffic and on street car parking.</p>	The site is zoned R3 medium density residential which can accommodate a range of medium density housing types including shop top housing which is permissible with development consent. The existing building height over this site is 13.6m which is proposed to be lowered to 12.2m. On review there is no need for this site to be rezoned to B4 mixed use as the desired range of uses are accommodated in existing R3 zone.	Amend plan to remove reference to proposed change to B4 mixed use.
5	55	<p>Building height</p> <p>Support the gradation of the building height in the town centre from 13.6m down to 11.0m.</p>	Comments relating to reduction of building height in the town centre (Marine Parade) are noted.	No change
6	56	<p>Building height: Seaview and Sutherland St intersection</p> <p>Concern that given the slope of the site (existing 4-7m retaining walls) that future development permitted on the natural ground level could result in a building in the order of 20m high.</p>	Building height is measured above existing ground level. As such, if the site is already excavated then the excavated height is the 'existing ground level' from which building height is measured.	No change

6	57	<p>Traffic – Sutherland St and feeder streets</p> <p>Traffic grown dramatically in last 16 years, Sutherland St is now a main north-south connector including construction traffic ignoring load limits. When TVH construction commences, even more traffic will use Sutherland St to avoid Cudgen Rd upgrade. Access improvements including the extension of Turnock St need to be instigated prior to any further development and existing load limits need to be managed and monitored.</p>	<p>Comments relating to increased traffic and concerns about further traffic impacts from the TVH are noted. The TRDS has recently reviewed existing and likely future road network requirements. Strategies to build additional road connections will result in a broader distribution of traffic flows and volumes across the locality.</p>	No change
6	58	<p>Additional Village – northern precinct</p> <p>Development of a knowledge precinct and significant expansion of housing to the north of Kingscliff – near Wommin Bay Rd would justify the inclusion of a further, small retail precinct in this location, to support walkability for residents and visitors at this end of town and reduce the need for repeated vehicle movements along Marine Parade and Kingscliff Street. The extension of Elrond Drive, to connect to Wommin Bay Road should also be expedited.</p>	<p>Comments relates to support for a small retail precinct to service the north of Kingscliff are noted. Existing opportunity on land opposite the Cudgen league club (5-7 Wommin Bay Rd zoned B2) could provide for retail/commercial land uses. Further the plan identified opportunity for properties 246-254 Marine Parade to become mixed use give largely freehold title, proximity to Terrace St intersection, rear land access and public car park in foreshore reserve opposite. Addition retail in this location would also improve walkable access to retail and commercial uses from surrounding medium density catchment.</p>	No change
7	59	<p>Appreciative of the overall intent of the new plan to keep the village feel including the building height restrictions along Marine Parade and medium density zones, preservation of green space, desire to link with paths.</p> <p>Imperative that Kingscliff retain its most important quality, its community feel. We'd like Kingscliff to grow organically; suburbs that grow organically tend to have more of a mix of residential styles, along streets which follow the curve of the terrain with plenty of curb and street space.</p>	<p>Comments relating to character and, topographic subdivision design and mix of housing types noted.</p>	No change
7	60	<p>Concern about the proposed rezoning of the police station from a medium density to B4 mixed use allowing a higher height restriction of 13.6m than surrounding residences whilst also introducing retail outlets to the area. We ask Council maintain its existing residential areas and honour the proposed height restrictions, keeping the feeling consistent with what has attracted so many to the area in the first place.</p>	<p>The site is zoned R3 medium density residential which can accommodate a range of medium density housing types including shop top housing which is permissible with development consent. The existing building height over this site is 13.6m which is proposed to be lowered to 12.2m. On review there is no need or purpose for this site to be rezoned to B4 mixed use.</p>	Amend plan to remove reference to proposed change to B4 mixed use.

8	61	<p>More protection of bush stone curlews and fining of people who don't have their dogs on leads.</p> <p>More protection for the birds including pelicans in Cudgen Creek.</p> <p>Promotion and more action on the straw-no-more campaign.</p> <p>More planting and protection of native plants in the beachfront.</p> <p>Blocks of units either need composting education or they need to be allowed to be part of the kitchen green waste to the green bin collection.</p> <p>Push information on plastic debris and waterways.</p> <p>Education and signs on migrating shorebirds to not unsettle them after flying thousands of miles.</p> <p>Osprey population could do with some more nesting posts.</p> <p>Please think of the environment and its protection. Kingscliff would not be as nice if we didn't have a few green spaces and it would be great to have more.</p>	<p>Comments relating to birds, waste and composting noted but largely unrelated to the KLP. Comments referred to NRM and WO Units.</p>	<p>No change</p>
9	62	<p>Concerns about the future development of the Kingscliff police station. The addition of commercial shops with height restrictions being lifted will take the serenity away. Proposed height will be detrimental to obstructing the beach views and limiting ocean breezes, therefore negatively effecting the value and comfort of out properties.</p> <p>Changing the zoning to commercial/residential use will also impact the immediate residents in this area through the increase in traffic and noise. If anything the other end of Kingscliff (northern caravan park) would benefit from a few shops.</p>	<p>See response to Submission 7 Item 60 above.</p>	<p>Item 60 above.</p>
10	63	<p>Object to the proposed rezoning of the police station site to mixed use, it is inappropriate to have the zoning anything but residential. Shop fronts and businesses only a short walk from the police station site. The need for car parking for this proposed rezoning would only add to other car parking issues.</p> <p>Additional concern is that the height for this type of development is to be 13.6m whilst other residential height restrictions are to be 12.2m. The extra 1.4m is not in keeping with neighbouring buildings and will lead to view warfare with affected residents. If anywhere needs shops and restaurants, it is the northern beachfront area that would benefit from this type of development.</p>	<p>See response to Submission 7 Item 60 above.</p>	<p>Item 60 above.</p>
11	64	<p>No high rise hospital on food producing prime agricultural land of state significance.</p> <p>Maintain the current 3 storey (or equivalent) height limit in the town.</p> <p>Maintain our niche spot in the locality market of being the place to eat sleep and play. We don't need to become a health or education hub, we don't need big employer, we offer lots of opportunities for a diverse range of small businesses.</p>	<p>Comments relating to the hospital noted, however the site selection and design of the hospital is a separate processes being co-ordinated by the NSW State government.</p> <p>Comments relating to maintaining 3 storey height limit noted.</p> <p>Comments relating to not wanting to pursue health and education, and larger employment noted however achieving economic and employment diversity is a key strategy not only for Kingscliff but broader subregional catchment. Similarly achieving greater housing diversity to appeal to a broader</p>	<p>No change.</p>

		<p>Emphasis on units and apartments but don't try and rid us oldies of the stand-alone house on block with backyard – that ought to always remain a choice for us while ever we can maintain it. Link up the flora / green spaces. Would like a mural on the water tank.</p>	<p>demographic (including those existing residents wishing to down size) is a key strategy. Comments relating to linking green spaces noted. Comment relating to mural on water tank noted and referred to Water Unit.</p>	
12	65	<p>We feel that the planning process has been high jacked by a vocal minority who have not considered the consequences of placing strict rules and removing the flexibility to consider proposals that may be outside the limits set. The belief that relaxing planning rules will set precedents and the integrity of the plan is then lost is blatantly wrong, as good governance mechanisms can protect the integrity.</p> <p>We are particularly concern that enshrining of a blanket mandatory 3 storey (reduced) height limit in any form of legislation will greatly inhibit the development of Kingscliff as per the plan presented. We believe that there should be flexibility to accommodate certain developments to have the capacity to be greater than 3 stories (but say no greater than 5 storeys) that will provide community benefits such as extra car parking in town, relocation of the library to make it both more accessible and become more of a community hub offering other services. In addition the capacity to build up to 4 or 5 stories on land that is not immediately on the beachfront areas should be considered as the slope of the land would not impact the building line.</p>	<p>Comments relating to perception of process and governance noted.</p> <p>Comments objecting to 3 storey blanket height limit and comments supporting building height flexibility (up to 4 or 5 storeys) back from the beach is also noted.</p> <p>Proposed buildings heights within the draft KLP are in accordance with Council resolution 16th March 2017.</p>	No change.
13	66	<p>Kingscliff mini school are half way through a massive extension and it has come to a standstill as they have no more money. School turns down over 200 kids every year. Any advice or guidance on funding would be appreciated.</p>	<p>Comments in relation to funding Kingscliff mini school and inability to enrol children is noted and referred to Community Services unit.</p>	No change.
14	67	<p><i>Note: This submission largely focusses on observations made during the round table consultation events.</i> The consultation should have been held earlier as was envisioned in March 2017 which would have given plenty of time for ongoing consultation. People robbed of opportunity to be informed, educated and or refreshed at what a LP is, stemming from brilliant approach to full consultation via the shopfront consultation that was to my mind a 'whole of community approach'. (In terms of the round table event) the noisy ones overshadowed the quite ones. This is why the shopfront worked well – quite people, hearing impaired, physically limited were seen, assisted, accommodated and heard. (Would have been more beneficial) if each of the areas where presented from the front and people stayed at the one table.</p>	<p>Comments in relation to the round table event is noted and referred to the communications team. Comments relating to preference for previous plan (prior to Council resolved building heights) noted.</p>	No change.

		<p>Each of the assisting staff should have had a series of questions written by senior planner rather than proceeding with their own style and interpretation of the areas which led to loaded questions and statements from the staff.</p> <p>The presence of the mayor and participation at the tables was highly irregular and smacked to political interference. Written contributions from these tables should be discounted, if not the entire workings of session 4 should be discounted.</p> <p>Many round table participants focussed on the here and now without meaningful regard to the future.</p> <p>Many participants treated the employment, economy and infrastructure section flippantly with the overriding impression that most didn't want anything overall. General observations from the table included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sand extraction will be an ongoing venture - More semi industrial - Knowledge and education precinct a no-go - Happy for younger to travel outside of the area for work <p>Believe the original Draft KLP and DCP (pre Council endorsement of March 2017) is the best way forward.</p> <p>The 'squeaky wheel has done a good job of blinding some people that anything over 3 stories is high rise.</p> <p>Outcome will be big squat boxes, urban sprawl, little green context, no consideration of the young or aging population, lack of diverse employment opportunities, grown locally jobs, cheek to jowl living, lack of affordability and diverse housing types and next to nothing in the provision of s.94 funds.</p>		
15	68	<p><i>Concern that a new road linking Elrond to Sand St will become a new thoroughfare and increase traffic along Sand Street which is not the designated main thoroughfare. Concerned about additional traffic through this residential area.</i></p>	<p>The new road linking Elrond Drive with Sand Street is identified within the Tweed Road Development Strategy (TRDS). This new northern south connector road in the future would also intersect with a new east-west road connecting to Tweed Coast Road. The opening up of multiple accesses road would serve to distribute traffic across the locality and provide more direct access between key nodes. The road network would also be supplemented with improved pedestrian and cycling paths.</p>	No change
16	69	<p><i>My concerns are about the development at Kingscliff North and existing residents backing onto the redevelopment. Flood water and storm water in low areas. A number of photos of the 2017 flood have been attached to the submission illustrating flood height relationship with existing dwelling. Anecdotal statement that height got to same level as 1974 flood. Images indicates that land to the rear (North Kingscliff greenfield development site) would only need to be filled to the height of the picket fence to be out of flood water. If this site was filled to the height of Sand St estate, this would create a 3-4m high wall at the interface of property (10 Pacific St) then on top of the fill a building to 12.2m.</i></p>	<p>Comments and concerns in regards to flood levels, potential fill levels, and stormwater and flood mitigation strategies are noted and have been referred to Council's Roads and stormwater Unit.</p> <p>Whilst the greenfield development site fill levels have not yet been determined, and only would be as part of a more detailed master plan / subdivision design, a number of land forming objectives and controls are specified in KLP Vol 3 DCP which states:</p> <p>Objective 4: Adopt an overall bulk earthworks strategy that seeks to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. limit modification of site levels at boundaries to maintain amenity to adjoining properties; 	Amend plan update wording to control 2 as per planning comment.

	<p><i>What is the proposed height of fill to go into this area and is there a proposed open space area between filled area and existing properties0 to help alleviate impact on existing properties.</i></p> <p><i>Would also mean my place could become a ditch for any overflow of water to pool and sit in my property.</i></p> <p><i>Can Council guarantee me that flooding on these properties would go no higher than the 2017 flood after this development is complete.</i></p> <p><i>If the paddock is filled in storm water drain (at back of my property) needs to be addressed with no outlet points near my property.</i></p> <p><i>Consideration of three options:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. Fill all low lying land which is expensive – where does the water that was in these low lands go?</i> <i>2. Build a levy to 2017 water levels restricting water from going onto the low lands.</i> <i>3. A spillway (at least the width of a two way road) from the Tweed River across to the beach somewhere on the Fingal peninsula between Fingal and the Highway.</i> 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> ii. integrate flood mitigation and drainage works within the overall land forming and subdivision design; iii. to ensure site modifications, retaining walls and engineered elements do not adversely impact on adjoining existing settlement areas or the streetscape character; iv. ensure that fencing on top of retaining walls does not adversely impact amenity of neighbouring properties or de-stabilise retaining walls. <p>Control 02 states:</p> <p>C2. Where greenfield development sites directly interface with existing settlement areas, fill levels shall be consistent where both are above design flood level. Where existing settlement sites are below design flood level heights, new development areas are to be constructed at design flood levels. Interface retaining walls/batters are to be stepped with the integrated landscape at boundary interfaces to reduce the visual impact of retaining walls and level differential.</p> <p>This could be amended to:</p> <p><i>C2. Where greenfield development sites directly interface with existing settlement areas, fill levels shall be consistent where both are above design flood level. Where existing settlement sites are below design flood level heights, new development areas are to be constructed at design flood levels. Interface between new and existing and settlement areas <u>are to be carefully designed to not result in any exacerbated flooding and drainage issues to the existing settlement areas and level differentials are to be appropriately setback, landscaped and/or retained on the development site to reduce the visual and amenity impacts of retaining walls and level differential.</u></i></p>	
--	---	--	--

<p>17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36</p>	<p>70</p>	<p>20 letters received from residents of Beach St area all with similar themes / issues.</p> <p><i>Concerned about R3 medium density buildings 12.2m behind Beach St and impacts including overshadowing, privacy, airflow and sunshine, community liveability and impact on natural flora and fauna.</i></p> <p><i>Also concern about water drainage once buildings are complete due to huge amounts of water that builds up here during rain events and flood.</i></p> <p><i>Propose a more suitable location for the R3 is the top left (north-west) as this would not back onto or be directly across from any low density residential properties.</i></p> <p><i>Additionally consider building a minimum distance of 3-5m from the back fence.</i></p> <p><i>R2 behind Beach St would be more suitable for R3.</i></p>	<p>The north Kingscliff site is currently zoned R1 enabling a wide range of residential housing types (including residential flat buildings) and has a building height of 13.6m. This height would be reduced to 12.2m as a future LEP amendment as a strategy within the exhibited KLP. As a note, prior to the TLEP 2014, this site was zoned 2(c) Urban Expansion under TLEP 1987 and TLEP 2000, and had a designated building height of 3 stories. This site was also identified in DCP No.9 West Kingscliff as medium density housing. As such, this site has been identified as a medium density development site with a 3 storey height limit for a substantial period of time.</p> <p>The key strategies within the DKLP seeks to encourage a range of both low density and low rise medium density housing across this site to facilitate additional housing diversity to appeal to a wide demographic range. Given the development potential to the immediate west (Business and Knowledge Precinct) and opportunity for a road connection from north Kingscliff west to the Tweed coast road, this greenfield development site presents a substantial residential housing supply opportunity.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the long standing zoning and building height associated with this site, the dKLP would require that the process of development this site would firstly need to undergo a developer led structure and master planning design process to determine potential flood impacts, flood and stormwater mitigation strategies, site design and fill levels required, road network, nomination of housing types, open space and infrastructure amongst other considerations. As such, the indicative structure plan within the dKLP may not be the final structure plan.</p>	<p>To address or mitigate potential interface issues raised between the residents of Sand St and the development site, there a number of options which warrant further exploration and Council direction in a further report, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retaining the existing zoning and development standards including height, but mandate the need for appropriate setbacks or buffers to the existing low density interface allotments as part of the sites master-planning and subdivision design process; • Nominate the site as R3 Medium density but impose a 9.0m height limit to encourage a variety of low-rise medium density housing typologies; • Nominating a combination of both medium density development to 12.2m but also low-rise medium density with a building height of 9.0m adjoining existing low density interface allotments; • Nominate the site as R2 low density residential (effectively back zoning) and impose a height limit of 9.0m.
---	-----------	---	--	---

37	71	<p>A letter purported to be on behalf of all residents who signed letters with regards to Beach St.</p> <p><i>Concern about land in front of storage shed on Elrond Drive being considered for affordable housing. Not a suitable location due to the lack of green space in the area which will be exacerbated after developments take place in the Kingscliff north precinct. Residents are also concern with increased traffic which will inevitably flow down Beach St. Residents also concern that when developments for affordable housing are situated in one complex issues can be amplified.</i></p> <p><i>Items for considerations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Currently zoned RE1 Public recreation zone stay the same;</i> • <i>Propose that this space is enhanced by making this usable green space with a park which could include a dog park;</i> • <i>Foreshore is busy on weekends with tourists, with proposed housing in north Kingscliff, this park as open space will be highly desirable;</i> • <i>Increase affordable housing options in the new Kingsforest development.</i> <p><i>Inconsistency of information:</i> <i>KLP Vol 1 pg 95 refers to site as informal open space;</i> <i>KLP Vol 2 pg 53 states undertake an aboriginal cultural heritage study;</i> <i>KLP Vol 3 pg 75 states undertake an aboriginal cultural heritage study</i> <i>KLP Vol 2 pg 77 states investigate residential land use options for affordable housing over unembellished open space;</i> <i>KLP Vol 3 Pg 71 states investigate residential land use options for affordable housing over unembellished open space;</i> <i>KLP Vol 3 Pg 27 illustrates the area coloured pink (indicating low density on the indicative Kingscliff Masterplan).</i></p>	<p>The site which this submission is referring to Lot 36 DP 793925, Lot 45 DP 830193 and Lot 56 DP 840688 which is Council owned and currently zoned RE1 Public recreation but currently unembellished.</p> <p>Whilst the embellishment of this land as a park would improve walkable access for residents of Elrond Dr and Beach Street, a review of existing casual open space within Kingscliff indicated that there is an oversupply of passive open space against the current and projected populations. The benchmark of 11.16 is exceeded by 51.27 hectares based on a rate of 1.13 ha per 1000 people. This is largely on account of the expansive coastal foreshore areas which is within a 500m walking radius of most of the North Kingscliff precinct and the capacity of greenfield development sites to further add to the open space network by way of neighbourhood parks, active open space and connecting pathways.</p> <p>Based on this current casual open surplus and unembellished nature of this land, and in pursuit of Council's interests in delivering more affordable housing types, this land was identified as being a potential candidate site for investigating affordable housing. Affordable housing could take many forms ranging from low density residential subdivision to a more multi-unit development where a proportion would be subsidised as affordable accommodation managed by an affordable housing provider.</p> <p>If pursuing affordable housing was Council's preferred approach over this site, there would be a number of stages to facilitate including reclassifying the site from community to operational land and rezoning the site for residential purposes and opportunity for specific community consultation as part of those processes.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the identified overall casual open space surplus within the locality, Council's draft Open Strategy indicates that residents in West Kingscliff (in the vicinity of Elrond Ave), north of McPhail Ave and the south end of Sand St, Kingscliff are undersupplied with quality neighbourhood playgrounds. In recognition of this, there is merit in retaining this site as open space to be embellished to an appropriate level in the immediate future.</p> <p>In reference to comments made about 'inconsistency' within the documents, the various descriptions and representations of the subject site have been reviewed with no inconsistency identified. By way of example, the site is accurately defined as being informal open space within Vol 01, is accurately defined as being a known place of aboriginal significance within Vol 01,02 & 03</p>	<p>Seek further Council guidance on whether to retain land for open space or pursue site for affordable housing.</p>
----	----	---	--	--

			(which does not necessarily preclude future development) and identifies a strategy to investigate affordable housing within Vol 02 & 03. Dependent on Council's preference, there is opportunity to add a descriptive note to illustrative plans nominating the strategic intent (i.e. either open space or housing).	
38	72	<i>Concern about rezoning of Shell Street and the western side of Sand Street to R3 medium density residential. This will impact existing residents by way of increased congestion and impacts from increased building height on surrounding residences in sands, eddy and Yao Streets.</i>	<p>The strategy to investigate the rezoning of properties fronting Kingscliff Street (western side), Shell Street (southern side), and Sand Street (western side below existing R3 zone) in the North Kingscliff precinct to R3 with a 12.2m building height relates to these properties frontage / proximity to Kingscliff St being a main connector road / public transport corridor and proximity to the north Kingscliff sports fields and coastal foreshore.</p> <p>In relation to Kingscliff St it is noted that the eastern side is currently R3 Medium density with a building height of 13.6m, however the western side north of Ozone St is R2 with a 9.0m building height. As part of the precinct plan investigations it was identified that most of the allotments on the western side of Kingscliff St had similar lot sizes to the eastern side with many comprising older housing stock single detached dwellings. Given the nature of the older housing stock, lot size and favourable location (two streets back from the coastal foreshore) it is reasonable to deduce that many of these properties will be redeveloped in the near future. Applying a broader residential zone (R3) would provide flexibility for a broader and more diverse range of housing types similar to the low rise medium density housing that has been developed at No. 88 Kingscliff St. It is noted that this form of low rise medium density has a 9.0m building height limit which reduces potential impact to properties to the rear (overshadowing, overlooking, compatible building form and scale).</p> <p>The key difference however is the allotments on the western side of Kingscliff St would not be serviced by a rear laneway and there would be potential interface issues between R3 12.2m housing types (RFBs) fronting Kingscliff St with R2 low density 9.0m housing types directly to the rear. In doing so mitigating design and amenity related issues and applying the principles and guidelines of the Apartment Design guideline (ADG) at this interface would be important.</p> <p>In relation to Shell Street, the strategy to investigate transitioning these allotments from R2 to R3 relates to the direct proximity to the north Kingscliff sports fields. However, upon review of the 10 properties which front Shell St, 4 properties are dual occupancy strata titled which back onto a number of other dual occupancies in Eddy Avenue and Woram Place. As such there is already a degree of housing diversity within this immediate area. Given the lack of ability to provide a rear access laneway,</p>	This will be the subject of a further report to Council to review the options of height and density in this location which may include retaining reference to investigate the rezoning of properties on the western side of Kingscliff street as R3 but within a low rise medium density context and amending the KLP to delete reference to properties from Shell St as being candidate investigation sites for R3.

			<p>achieving larger medium density housing types within this precinct would be problematic without site amalgamation.</p> <p>In relation to identified properties on the western side of Sand Street it is noted that an existing R3 zone applies to land to the immediate north which is then adjoined by land zoned B2 local centre (undeveloped). Of the properties identified to be investigated as R3 medium density, No 24-30 form part of the existing Christian City Church (of which Lot 36 DP249808 is already zoned R3). An existing dual occupancy (strata title) and a single detached dwelling which then directly adjoins undeveloped RE1 Public open space to the south. These properties back onto an undeveloped tract of land which is heavily vegetated also owned by the Christian City Church. As such there would likely be negligible amenity based issues to surrounding existing development if low rise medium density housing were to be pursued across these sites.</p>	
39	73	<p><i>Concern about plans to develop rural space between Ozone St and Beach St and rezoning of land in the Sand St, Shell St and Yao St area.</i></p> <p><i>Concern about increased traffic with new connection between Elrond and Sand St which will increase traffic in our area and pose a hazard to children and elderly.</i></p> <p><i>Concern with regards to the filling of the rural space and increase risk of flooding to the area.</i></p> <p><i>The rezoning of the north end of Sand St, Shell St and Yao St to R3 Medium density residential will significantly impact the future of our area. Do not want to see potential large scale development of units in our area.</i></p>	<p>With regard to land between Ozone St and Beach St, this land is currently zoned R1 with a 13.6m height limit. Whilst currently undeveloped it is not zoned rural.</p> <p>In terms of the proposed road connection between Elrond Dr and Sand St, this connection has been identified within the Tweed Road Development Strategy (TRDS). Given the development potential to the immediate west (Business and Knowledge Precinct) there would also be a road connection from this Elrond-Sand St connection west to the Tweed Coast Road. The opening up of multiple connecting road would serve to distribute traffic across the locality and provide more direct access between key nodes. The road network would also be supplemented with improved pedestrian and cycling paths.</p> <p>Comments relating to flood concern are noted. As part of the dKLP, there are flood related strategies which would require the developer demonstrate compliance with the provisions of DCP A3 – Development of Flood Liable Land and the Tweed Valley Floodplain Risk Management Strategy. This would include undertaking site specific flood modelling to determine appropriate design flood (and fill) levels and assess potential impacts on surrounding areas.</p> <p>In relation to comment objecting to investigating R3 zoning over certain lands in the North Kingscliff Area, refer to submission 38 item 71 above.</p>	<p>No change to structure plan indicating potential future road connections which are supported by the TRDS.</p> <p>No change to flood provisions within the dKLP.</p> <p>Changes to R3 strategies as noted above.</p>

40	74	<p>This individual submission contained a number of different themes and subject matters as raised by a local business operator with feedback from customer base:</p> <p><i>Roads need to be improved – Marine Parade breaking up</i> <i>Need TSC guidelines on building height to be enforced</i> <i>Decisions made on how many apartments are being constructed in new complexes</i> <i>Make sure there is enough car parking for new developments; Important that people can see the beach.</i> <i>Why are parks being overtaken with signs? Underused parks with much closed off for bird life.</i> <i>Need to clean up the dunes – Safety issues - Homeless people living in dune bushland.</i> <i>Clean up park land reserve.</i> <i>More beach access for people with disabilities.</i> <i>More platform (viewing) areas close to the beach.</i> <i>More lighting over footpaths.</i> <i>More events in parkland – kites in Kingscliff.</i> <i>Let people use parkland without areas being fenced off.</i> <i>Enforcing car parking along Beach St and Zephyr St.</i> <i>Enforce people walking dogs off leash.</i></p>	<p>Many of the comments within this submission relate to operational matters rather than strategic planning matters. The submission will be referred to relevant Council divisions for consideration.</p>	No action
41	75	<p><i>Round table event lack the 18-40 demographic.</i> <i>Online engagement more useful in engaging people with limited time to attend meetings with a small incentive (gift, prize) to lift participation rates.</i> <i>Structure questions based on options within the proposed locality plan to seek more targeted feedback – avoid general questions, the more specific the question the more useful the data gathered.</i> <i>Opportunity to use polls, surveys and online and app participation platforms for targeted feedback.</i> <i>Presenting detailed information is best delivered by interspersing the detail with specific questions to avoid confusion and information overload.</i></p>	<p>These comments largely relate to a critical review of the round table consultation event and provides a consideration of other engagement techniques which are available rather than strategic planning matters. Valuable critique in the context of planning future community consultation.</p>	No action
42	76	<p><i>Information often vague (at round table) and extent of zoning changes not clearly explained.</i> <i>A scaled model would help the community to visualise concepts.</i> <i>Concern about the extent of the R3 zoning through North Kingscliff which over time will resemble an overcrowded housing commission estate with increased flood risk to residents.</i></p>	See response to Item 70 above.	See item 70
42	77	<p><i>High levels of angst and confusion now existing within the community with the proposed hospital site by the state government impacting a small community by doubling its population and enabling 5 storey development.</i></p>	See response to Submission 2 Item 29 above.	See item 29

43	78	<p><i>Agree strongly with cycle path alignments along casuarina Way and Tweed Coast Rd and extra vegetation along Wingsong Way in Casuarina. Other opportunities for improvement include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adult exercise facilities in Seaside precinct parks,</i> • <i>Path along south side of Windsong Way,</i> • <i>Vegetation or sound buffers for traffic noise along casuarina Way,</i> • <i>More exercise equipment along the coast walk/cycle path south of Cudgen Creek.</i> 	<p>Whilst the comments relate to some of the open space opportunities within the KLP, most of the suggestions are more relevant to Council's current draft Open Space Strategy which is in development. The comments will be forwarded to Recreation Services for more detailed consideration in the context of that plan.</p>	No change
44	79	<p><i>Kingscliff is a small Seaside village atmosphere, a village grown by natural progression, organic growth that gives it its charm a feature which should be retained – not departing from the present height limits will help maintain this charm. The statement that Kingscliff has the potential population up to 14000 needs to be questioned. Weekends and holidays population numbers increase. Increasing population numbers runs the risk of deterring those who find congestion uncomfortable. Difficulty in seeing the ocean view through triple line of parked cars.</i></p>	<p>This submission largely correlates the planning population increase with a potential loss to the existing character and charm of Kingscliff. Kingscliff is a subregional town with significant service and infrastructure facilities combined with greenfield development sites. As such the growth of the locality, as it has done in previous decades is likely to continue into the foreseeable future. The dKLP&DCP however seeks to embed key considerations of character into the planning framework. This includes reducing building heights and introducing strategies to improve the coastal character design and pedestrian amenity particularly within the town centre.</p>	No change
44	80	<p><i>Inadvisable to develop the lowlands (Turnock St) for housing if this is the existing stormwater runoff area. Additional population may prejudice the charm and ambience which are the main features of Kingscliff.</i></p>	<p>Any future master plan or subdivision design of this land (zoned R1) would need to address stormwater and flood mitigation issues.</p>	No change
45	81	<p><i>Parking is a real problem in Kingscliff particularly during the school holidays. Some of the vacant land west of Pearl St needs to be reclaimed, sealed and made available for free parking.</i></p>	<p>Comments relating to perception of car parking as an issue is noted. The land referred to as 'vacant' whilst undeveloped is privately owned land and the subject of ongoing master plan design processes. The dKLP&DCP has a number of car parking strategies which seek to increase car parking supply in and around the town centre.</p>	No change
46	82	<p><i>Happy with: Height limits, green spaces, corridors, habitat retention, park redevelopment/improvements, dune restoration and native planting, buffer zones, retaining village atmosphere, streetscaping and planting, pedestrian friendly zones, business and knowledge zone, retain library position and cycle ways. Not so happy about: Housing density at the back of Pearl and Turnock St, proposed location of skatepark – better positioned at the north end of town. Very unhappy about: Impact the hospital will have on character and amenity of the town, lack of government consultation and consideration of the adverse impacts.</i></p>	<p>Comments relating to the values and concerns associated with the dKLP&DCP will be collated and aggregated with feedback from the roundtable events.</p>	Aggregate comments with consultation evaluation report.

47	83	<i>Many boutique type businesses, cafes, restaurants have struggled to pay rent and historically commercial floor areas has been slow to be taken up. When considering new commercial premises with housing on top you consider the ability for commercial tenants to be able to afford the rents per sqm due to returns required by developer/investor to construct couples with ongoing rates and land tax bills.</i>	Comments relating to business rent affordability and development keeping in step with market need and business affordability are noted. Encouraging a diversity of retail and commercial floor areas is an important consideration in the future expansion of the town centre and business and knowledge precinct.	Review strategies to ensure there is guidance around the provision of a range of retail and commercial floor area tenancies in new development to meet operator and market need.
48	84	<i>Advising of the presence of peat moss on Gales Holdings land, and risk to future buildings if it caught fire.</i>	Comments in relation to the potential presence of peat moss and fire risk is noted and has been referred to Council's Natural Resource Management Unit.	No change.
48	85	<i>Advising of the presence of Burrowing legless lizard, Mitchell Rainforest snail, Coolman Trees and old cycads on Gales Holdings land – unique habitat that needs looking after, not building on.</i> <i>Advising of the presence of springs that supply swamp land with fresh water, contribute to flooding of swamp areas, puts land in category of 'Sensitive Protection Environment' and should not be built on.</i>	Comments relating to local fauna, springs and suggestions that land is environmentally sensitive are noted and have been referred to Council's Natural Resource Management Units. Protection of valued environmental assets is an important consideration in the future expansion of Kingscliff, and is also being carefully considered under a separate E-Zone review process.	No change
49	86	<i>Submission expresses concern over where and how the sand that replenishes the beach at Kingscliff is sourced from.</i>	Comments relating to sand extraction and relocation are noted but are largely unrelated to the KLP. Comments referred to NRM and Eng Units.	No change

51	87	<i>Building Height – not opposed to some increase in height in some areas to facilitate efficient development, reduction of urban sprawl, encourage development.</i>	<p>Comments regarding proposed building heights as exhibited at the Kingscliff shopfront exhibition are noted.</p> <p>At Council's meeting of the 16th March 2017 Council resolved to nominate building heights to be integrated into the draft Kingscliff Locality Plan and DCP including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11.0m to Marine Parade; • 13.6m to other business zones; and • 12.2m to R3 medium density zones <p>Following this resolution, the dKLP documents were updated to reflect these building height nominations.</p>	There is a need to undertake a more detail review of building height feedback to more fully aggregate the results of the exhibition period (round table and written submissions) to document the alternate suggestions and options presented by submitters for Councils consideration and direction for the final drafting of the KLP&DCP.
	88	<i>Car parking – increasing commercial and residential buildings needs consideration of more parking. Multi- level car parking must be included.</i>	<p>The dKLP nominates sites either in the Kingcliff town centre and or Turnock St as being able to accommodate new facilities such as car parking given good proximity to the town centre.</p> <p>Comments relating to increased traffic and concerns about further traffic and parking impacts from future development are noted. The TRDS has recently reviewed existing and likely future road network requirements. Strategies to build additional parking facilities will result in a broader distribution of parking within the locality, and the facilitation of 'park once and walk' approach to town centre distribution of people and cars.</p>	No change
	89	<i>Pedestrian amenity, connectivity and safety are essential. Current shopping centre site needs to be enhanced. Request entire plan be reviewed in context of hospital.</i>	<p>Comments on pedestrian amenity, safety and connectivity are noted. The dKLP proposes measures to achieve this.</p> <p>The dKLP encourages redevelopment of the shopping centre site. Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments in relation to hospital, see Submission 2 Item 29.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>See response to Submission 2 Item 29 above</p>
52	90	<i>Seeks inclusion of the TVH in the plan given the anticipated impacts as a significant social and economic driver</i>	See response to Submission 2 Item 29 above.	See response to Submission 2 Item 29 above

53	91	<p><i>Submission supports design principles for town centre, activating street frontages, creation of precinct space on shopping centre site, sports precinct in North Kingscliff, inclusion of skate park opposite leagues club on Wommin Bay Road.</i></p> <p><i>Submission also proposes options for development of Jenner's Corner and other areas of Chinderah.</i></p>	<p>Comment regarding support for dKLP noted.</p> <p>Regarding Jenner's corner and Chinderah, these areas are outside the boundary of the dKLP. Council resolved at its meeting on 5 October 2017 to prepare a locality plan for Chinderah, once the KLP is complete.</p>	No change.
54	92	<p><i>Submission requests the KLP be 'delayed until the future site of the Hospital is known before the planning proceeds'.</i></p>	<p>Comments relating to the hospital noted, however the site selection and design of the hospital is a separate processes being co-ordinated by the NSW State government.</p> <p>See response to Submission 2 Item 29 above.</p>	See response to Submission 2 Item 29 above
55	93	<p><i>Submission raises the following:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. Keep special village vibe</i> <i>2. No large chain stores</i> <i>3. Retain 3 storey building height</i> <i>4. No more infrastructure</i> <i>5. No traffic lights</i> <i>6. Build a skate park</i> <i>7. Protect the little halls and church on marine parade</i> <i>8. Keep some history</i> 	<p>All comments are noted.</p> <p>Comments relating to maintaining 3 storey height limit noted. See response to Submission 51 above.</p> <p>Comments in relation to traffic lights noted. The TRDS has recently reviewed existing and likely future road network requirements, including where additional traffic control devices may or may not be necessary.</p> <p>Comments related to skate park noted – forwarded to Recreational Services Unit.</p> <p>Heritage listing of certain sites is a separate process largely unrelated to the dKLP, however comments have been noted for consideration in any future heritage assessment of the Kingscliff locality.</p>	No change.
56	94	<p><i>Submission highlights lack of attention given to planning in Murwillumbah as a locality in preference to Kingscliff.</i></p>	<p>All comments are noted.</p> <p>The order and priority of strategic locality planning projects is determined by resolution of Council and such priorities flow into the adopted implementation and delivery plans. A locality plan for Murwillumbah is not included in the adopted delivery plan at this time.</p>	No change.