

EUROBODALLA SHIRE COUNCIL

PUBLIC FORUM

All members of the community who have registered have been advised that they have a **maximum of five minutes** to put their case.

Ordinary Meeting of Council on 23 June 2015

Name	Subject/Comments
Agenda Items – 10.00am	
Paul Bradstreet	GMR15/04 Fit for the Future - Council's Improvement Proposal.
Linda Chapman [2 items]	PSR15/019 Planning Proposal and Development Control Plan Amendments for Land at Broulee IR15/029 Tender – Construction of Concrete Bridge at Candlagan Creek, Broulee
Michelle Mitchell	PSR15/019 Planning Proposal and Development Control Plan Amendments for Land at Broulee
Ross Hayward	PSR15/019 Planning Proposal and Development Control Plan Amendments for Land at Broulee
Andrew Bain	PSR15/019 Planning Proposal and Development Control Plan Amendments for Land at Broulee
Daniel Lloyd Jones	PSR15/019 Planning Proposal and Development Control Plan Amendments for Land at Broulee
Liza Lloyd Jones	PSR15/019 Planning Proposal and Development Control Plan Amendments for Land at Broulee
Anthony Knobel	PSR15/019 Planning Proposal and Development Control Plan Amendments for Land at Broulee
Anthony Mayne	PSR15/019 Planning Proposal and Development Control Plan Amendments for Land at Broulee
Martin Tye	PSR15/019 Planning Proposal and Development Control Plan Amendments for Land at Broulee
Suzanne Gillan	PSR15/019 Planning Proposal and Development Control Plan Amendments for Land at Broulee

ADDRESS BY PAUL BRADSTREET
TO ORDINARY MEETING OF EUROBODALLA SHIRE COUNCIL
TUESDAY 23 JUNE 2015

Good morning councillors. I'm Paul Bradstreet from Surf Beach. I'd like to talk to you about report GMR 15/014 which recommends a response to council's obligation to provide an "improvement program" to IPART by 30 June to allow that agency to assess whether it will recommend to the state government that the shire is "fit for the future" - whatever that means. Let me say at the outset that this matter is the most important that council has had to consider for a long time and, accordingly, requires very careful thought and much more community consultation than has occurred or is proposed. It is an existential issue for the future form of local government in Eurobodalla. With the government poised to make structural decisions by Christmas you have but one chance to get it right.

Back in December last year, in the lead up to its decision to seek a special rates variation, council released this document, its Long Term Financial Plan 2015-2025. Among other things, this comprehensive and helpful plan informed the community that even if the 8% SRV proposed at that time was approved council staff could see no hope of the general fund returning to surplus by 2025. Indeed, the modelling showed that the general fund would remain in deficit over the next 10 years and in 2024/25 the deficit would still be \$4.414m. This number underlined council's general message to the community that because of past neglect of assets urgent repair of the operating budget was required. We were told that the financial outlook was bleak and, realistically, there was no other option than an increase in rates to finance a highly leveraged program of infrastructure maintenance and renewals.

At the time I was hearing earnest words like responsible behavior and care for the next generation being bandied around by those councillors supporting the SRV.

By contrast the document you are being asked to adopt today tells a dramatically different and much more optimistic story. It suggests that if the improvement program is adopted the operating budget returns to the black as early as 2017/18 and stays there for the following 8 years. A turnaround of this magnitude in just six months is nothing short of miraculous, some would say unbelievable.

So how can the sudden improvement in the shire's financial outlook be explained, should it be believed and, importantly, will the credibility of the new estimates prejudice IPART's and, more importantly, the state government's view of the submission? And, given the magnitude of the change why has the community not been consulted?

This improvement plan is predicated on the assumption that council has already demonstrated to the satisfaction of the authorities that the shire has the scale and capacity to continue to operate in its current form and within its present boundaries. The emphasis is on improved financial performance directed at demonstrating achievement of the seven criteria set by IPART. It is a difficult document to interpret because it omits important information, particularly the make up of the components of future revenues and expenses and their contributions to the improved budget positions. And the underlying strategy has to be inferred from the mass of detail provided. In the short time I have had to study it it looks like you are being advised to rejig your depreciation practices to allow an immediate and ongoing large improvement in the general fund bottom line and to build on this new foundation by improving your revenue base by investing in profitable businesses and to contain your costs through a continuation of current reform programs. The intention seems to be to invest all surpluses in the new infrastructure fund and, in those years in which estimated surpluses are not achieved, to increase borrowings to allow the higher planned levels of infrastructure investment to be maintained. Future rate rises are not anticipated, but neither are they ruled out. Community consultation has been delayed until next year.

Apart from the dramatic change in the depreciation method, nothing much is new in the improvement proposal. Rather old initiatives, such as the internal reviews of services, which have yet to yield significant savings, will grind on and life in Eurobodalla will hardly change for anyone. Despite this, council staff are now confident they will achieve what they have failed spectacularly to achieve in the past - a return to and maintenance of a responsible operating surplus.

Well I don't believe in fairy tales, although others in this room clearly do.

More importantly, our local state member is looking wider than this document and any IPART recommendation on it to decide whether the council is fit for the future. I have attended recent meetings where he could not have made it clearer that senior ministers of the government have their eyes on Eurobodalla and their pens poised to redraw the boundaries of adjacent shires at the Moruya River. The reason he gave for this unwelcome attention is that he is over the long line of what the general manager is now calling "legacy issues" of poor governance and management arising from the council's entrenched culture. He has advised us that the Minister for Local Government and his colleagues are looking for an assurance that the council has addressed the underlying issues and has adopted a credible plan for improved future management which has demonstrated community support.

Now, you can dismiss Andrew's views as political posturing if you like. But I would have thought, given his senior position in the government and his excellent knowledge of Eurobodalla Shire's performance over the past ten years, that they deserve some serious attention. In particular, I am dismayed that his current attitude to council is prejudicing council's access to the bonanza of infrastructure funding becoming available on the back of the Sydney real estate boom.

So, it seems to me that today if you are inclined to support the submission you should ask the staff to do a number of things to bolster its detail and its public acceptance. First, immediately issue the revised long term financial plan on which it is based. Second, acknowledge explicitly in the text the problems of the past and explain management actions proposed to overcome them. Third, undertake some urgent survey research into community attitudes to the proposed strategy and the possible abolition of the shire.

Finally, the merits of the strategy need to be argued politically to senior cabinet ministers, particularly Andrew. Perhaps I missed it, but a lobbying effort over the next few months does not appear to be part of the implementation plan. If abolition of the shire is to be avoided support from the local member for the way forward is crucial and second only to demonstrated community support.

It is said that a pending execution concentrates the mind. You should not let the opportunity for the fit for the future process to be a catalyst for change to pass. Eurobodalla shire doesn't need a plan written by creative accountants for other accountants which simply endorses the status quo but rather a councillor driven, community supported improvement plan to do less and to do it better.

Thank you.

Planning Proposal and Development Control Plan amendments for land at Broulee & Candlagan Bridge

I speak to request that Council postpone a decision on sending the Planning Proposal and Development Control Plan amendments for land at Broulee to the State government for Gateway Determination until there has been proper community consultation.

I want to be clear that I am not opposed to medium density development and I accept that the land subject to development will be developed. Given that this land is to be developed I think there is a great opportunity to do something really unique and creative that would sit well with the community and retain at least a small vestige of the original vegetation characteristics of the site.

However, I have the following questions and concerns:

It has come as a real surprise to discover that council now propose a development that, it would seem, will necessitate a clear felling of the present vegetation and see an increase of 60% of the population of Broulee. This is an increase in dwellings and population that is at least 30% more than that proposed by the Settlement Strategy. It is not what was suggested at the time of the bio-certification decision. So,

- Why take this development proposal to the state government as a Gateway determination? Why can it not be dealt with by Council?
- Why were the Broulee Mossy Pt Community Association not consulted on this proposal for a change to the LEP with increased density? In fact it was only on the 17 June, less than a week ago, when a resident noticed the council press release and sent it to BMPCA, that the community became aware of it.
- Is this the right place for medium density development? Surely medium density development is best placed in the Shire's town centres. The council's press release says that the plan will 'potentially' provide 'some' affordable housing options. Words such as 'potentially' and 'some' are vague. Nevertheless, I suggest that the best place for affordable housing – which is desperately needed – is in and around the town centres where there is access to services. We know that public transport is limited in this Shire; that those who are financially disadvantaged either do not own a car or where they do can struggle to pay for fuel and car maintenance. This can mean that people become stranded when fuel money is short and/or the car breaks down.
- The proposal makes other vague statements such as 'habitat trees will be protected where possible.' However it seems unlikely that given the development proposes medium density that will be possible.
- Where are the details of this development? Given that, if approved under the Gateway Determination, this will be a done deal then it will be too late for the community to raise particular concerns. For instance how wide is the, 'so-called'

Wildlife corridor – which I note is alongside a busy road- not the best place for wildlife.

- And some questions in relation to the new bridge for Candlagan Ck. Are the community to be consulted on its design? I seem to recall that such consultation was promised? Is there any Environmental Impact study to be done in regards to its construction?

Finally, I suggest that the community needs far more of the 'collaborative' and 'connected' approach that the council suggests is the way things are done. Might it not be possible to deliver a really imaginative and creative development that truly does retain some of the characteristic of Broulee? It is hard of course to comment given no detailed plans however my real concern is that we will see another urban expansion that maximises dwelling size on small lots leaving no room for vegetation; an urban area in other words that is characterised by wall to wall dwellings in the type of coastal urban sprawl that we too often see along the east coast.

Hello,

My name is Michelle and I'm a mother of 2. I work as a local GP and community volunteer.

I moved to Broulee just over 2 years ago. We were attracted by its uniqueness – beach lifestyle with a bush setting; its pristine beaches and friendly community. The habitat corridor is a beautiful area that is used for recreation and local habitat. I will be sad to see it go.

In my work, I am an advocate for the public's health. And what is health? Health is a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease. The environment around us has an enormous role for the health of us individually and as a community. Urban landscapes, especially ones with higher density, have the potential to negatively impact community well-being and health. Especially when dense urban development does not have the benefit of city services.

I understand that this area has already been zoned for residential purposes, so I will not stand here and argue against it being developed. However, I want to advocate for a development that considers benefits for all the community, not just profits for developers and the council.

We are at a great crossroads here – a time where we must act on climate change now and help rewind some of the impacts of industrialization before it is too late for our children and their future. This council has the opportunity to be leaders into this century and the next, by creating sustainable communities across the Eurobodalla shire. I would like you to consider the following criteria for this development:

- Creating a 'green' development with housing to meet a stricter minimum environmental standard
- Including infrastructure that supports forms of active transport such as walking and cycling
- Setting aside an area for a shared community gardens and a centre which can help to involve and integrate all ages of the community including our senior citizens
- Maintain maximum amount of greenery and habitat where possible for aesthetic purposes but also to protect from noise pollution, wind and air pollution from George Bass Hwy
- Ensuring local native trees are planted along all nature strips
- Investing more into local services for the community including an upgrade for the local park and an indoor pool.

I think this proposal would help some of us objectors feel more positively about the development of our community and its land for all to enjoy into a prosperous, healthy and green future.

Michelle Mitchell

Submission to ESC Public Forum 23/6/2015
Re: DCP amendments for Broulee Land

- **Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD)**
Council has been deficient in implementing this concept.
I question whether it will be provided in the next stage of Broulee land development.
- **Population**
The hefty increase in population to 3700 will impact on the character of the village.
This action is a bolt from the blue and undermines the community's trust in Council.
- **EZ Zone**
Management and funding of the Bangalay Sand Forest south of Broulee Rd is not discussed.
This is intrinsic to development of this land.
- **Public Consultation**
Preparing a draft report can involve council planner(s) having numerous meetings with proponents to discuss their aspirations, possibilities and probabilities.
The discussion ensuing allows questioning, cajoling and persuasion.
Written public submissions several stages later in the process lack the effect of personal presentation.
It's the reason political lobbyists are so successful.

Requested that this item be deferred for public consultation.

Ross Hayward

LEPs are important long term planning instruments. People should be able to rely on them and they should not be modified lightly at the behest of one interest group. The LEP currently applying to Broulee sets the base for:

- Local land values
- Investment decisions by residents
- Infrastructure decisions and their consequential impact on the community
- Social and liveability attributes of the village

The original proposal prior to these proposed amendments raised considerable concern in the community and I believe the claim that it was largely supported is incorrect. These concerns included:

- The degrading effect a major population increase would have on Broulee as a close knit coastal village
- Concern about the use of public land under the Bio-certification process for the sole benefit of a few developers
- Loss of environmental and related social amenity. A real attraction of Broulee is that it allows people to live in a village environment and not a simple extension of Batemans Bay suburbia.

The proposed LEP amendment permitting a 60 percent increase in planned population, minimal public space, very small block size and low income housing is now greatly concerning the community.

There is little evidence that there is a significant unmet need for more housing development in Broulee. If there was we would expect increases in land prices. A review of UCVs, land prices or house prices all suggest there has been little or no unmet demand in Broulee in recent years. A substantial increase in housing land availability will most likely further depress or hold down local land values.

I worked with Council to help establish a vision for 2030. Part of this vision was that the Shire should not have a one size fits all approach to urban planning. There is a strong case to plan for a range of differing styles of social amenity. Broulee has a semi-rural village flavour with a strong community ethic and links with the local environment. This is what the community wants. It is already being eroded by uniform suburban development but this change to the LEP threatens to be the nail in the coffin.

This proposal to amend the LEP should not go ahead to the gateway stage without prior consultation with the local community. To go ahead without consultation will create the belief that Council has made a pre-emptive decision. For this reason we propose that Council defer consideration to allow this consultation to happen. Such consultation could well lead to outcomes that benefit both the developer and the community.

My name is Daniel Lloyd Jones I am a Broulee resident, father of 3 and small business owner based in Broulee.

Today I am talking on behalf as my role as Secretary of the Broulee Mossy Point Community Association.

We found out about this proposal on Friday which I think is unacceptable. I sent out an email to our members and since then I have been inundated with concerns. Many residents, said they would like to attend today but are unable to given the short notice. This proposal will be a very contentious development and one which **could** divide the community if not handled properly. And my sense at the moment is that people feel angry at the perception council is trying to sneak this major development through. We would ask that you postpone today's endorsement so that we can fully inform our members about this proposal.

The following questions are a snapshot of concerns I have received from our members since Friday.

- The underlying theme of this report is that small block sizes and medium density houses increase "social diversity" by providing affordable housing. Only the positive aspects of such a change are covered in this report. Does council have any experience in dealing with the negative impacts that grouping large quantities of low cost housing together? Such as increased crime, drug problems (specifically Ice usage) and other anti-social behaviour? This is a concern to many of our members especially given the close proximity of the proposed developments adjacent to our schools. Given the increased population growth from this development does Council envisage improving Policing to cope with these inevitable problems?
- The proposal states¹ positive benefits of this development is the growth of services, specifically schools. Council should be aware that Broulee Public school is at 100% capacity with no available land to expand. How does council envisage to increase the size of the school to cope with the 60% increase in population. Why does the planning proposal not identify this as a risk?
- Even now the Council is regularly contacted by our local schools with regard to traffic safety concerns on Train street in particular bus parking and the bottle neck caused by school pickups. Given the increased population, and traffic in this precinct, has any consideration been given to the safety of school children being further put at risk by this proposal?
- The proposal states² that this plan will "minimize overdevelopment", however the plan is seeking to reduce minimum block size, increase housing density and increase the population of the village by 60% to

¹ On page 43 of Agenda

² On page 43 of Agenda

3700. The ESS states that Broulee area was only ever planned to sustain 3000 people yet this development is designed to significantly increase number. Can you explain your definition of overdevelopment?

- The proposal mentions³ the short term employment opportunities from this development in the building industry. What consideration has been made to the long term employment opportunities for our 1700 new residents? R3 zoning is well suited to locations near “large business and shopping centres with a range of employment opportunities”.
- The NSW planning website states that R3 Medium Density zoning is well suited to areas “near good public transport”. Can you provide what public transport improvements will be available to this development?
- The proposal states⁴ “the rezoning of the land to Medium Density and the reduction of the minimum block size”, are “NOT the direct result of a strategic study or report”. In light of this admission, can council state how these contentious recommendations came about? Were they solely put forward by the developers to maximize the number of blocks and their profits?
- Other than increase in rates collection what motive does Council have in supporting such a massive development?
- Does the Council's depreciation cost increase when you assume ownership of the development's Infrastructure assets⁵? Does adding new assets to Council's books, have a negative impact on today's announcement regarding the Fit for the Future criteria?
- Broulee is a very popular holiday destination. Has the negative impact on Tourism been considered in relation to this removal of endangered forest and urbanization of Broulee. Will the combination of urbanization and the introduction of lower cost housing result in a reduction of house values for existing residents?
- Why are the costs of the management of the E2 conservation zone not being covered by the developers? The proposal makes mention that this is part of the offset of the Biobank certification, for which the developers should be covering the cost, not fragmenting this responsibility to the residents of the proposed affordable housing.
- Why are the financial interests of 3 developers being put ahead of the interests of the wider community

³ On page 43 of Agenda

⁴ On page 5 of the attachment (Page 49 of Agenda)

⁵ Fit For Future report (Page 30 of Agenda)

- Given there will be a significant increase of stormwater to be released onto South Broulee beach, based on your experience on other beaches in Batemans Bay how many days per year does Council envisage that Broulee beach will be closed due to stormwater pollution?
- How does this development meet the Council obligations around their GreenHouse Action Plan and addressing climate change. Specifically the clearing of so many trees.
- The proposal states⁶ that council will be “Encouraging retention of habitat trees where possible”. Can you explain how this achievable given the proposed reduction in block size and medium density housing are at odds with keeping established trees. This is a very weak statement, how will council enforce that there is not just a clear felling of the area?
- The Proposal states⁷ that the area is not identified as Flood Prone. Yet the council is midway through a flood study and your own website states that “The residential areas of Broulee are located in the catchment and are potentially exposed to a flood risk”. Why does this the planning document not make reference to your own yet completed Flood study.
- The proposal states⁸ that it will protect an “indicative habitat corridor”. How many of the endangered animals do council believe will survive this development. How wide is this corridor and how is it measured in relation to the road shoulder of George Bass Drive. Will it be protected from further pruning/clearing as part of road maintenance?
- The Council press release states that “**some** of the vegetation is to be cleared to make room for housing”. This infers that it will be a small clearing. What % of vegetation does council expect to be cleared as part of this development?
- How many submissions during biocertification were in favour and how many were against? The proposal seems to imply⁹ there were more in favour?
- It is stated that the “proposed amendments address the issues raised in previous consultation”. Can you provide how they have been addressed, feel free to refer to specific pages in Planning document:
 - Concerns of urbanization
 - Concerns of traffic increase
 - Concerns of increased noise
 - Loss of wind and noise barrier
 - Impact of over-use of existing facilities

⁶ On Page 41 of Agenda

⁷ On page 10 of the attachment (Page 54 of Agenda)

⁸ On Page 7 of the attachment (Page 51)

⁹ Page 42 and 43 of Agenda

LIZA LLOYD JONES

4 years ago my husband and I chose to move out of the suburban sprawl of Sydney to live in Broulee and raise our children here. We wanted to show our children what it meant to belong to a community such as Broulee.

I do not and cannot support this development proposal as it stands.

- No consideration for the effects on local tourism
- The focus on medium density cheap housing
- The reduction to tiny 450m2 blocks
- additional pressure on community services such as the local public school
- less safety and security for our children with so much added traffic and people in the area.

A development of this scale needs to involve the community at the earliest stage possible.

We are not afraid of moving forward. We are involved people, who want to be involved. We create sporting clubs, playgroup, environmental groups, hold community markets, build bike paths for **all** the community to enjoy. I believe we are more than capable of working with the developers and council if given the chance.

We are a community that represents the perfect model for the Eurobodalla "nature coast" which our Tourism depends upon. Lets embrace that and take pride in it. And not take for granted what we have.

Council I urge you today to think on behalf of your community and your public relations to truly consider what is right and responsible.

My name is Anthony Knobel. I am a resident of Broulee along with my Wife and Daughter. We decided to settle in Broulee in 2005 when we purchased a parcel of land in old Broulee. The attraction of living and raising a family in a small seaside community, closely aligned with the surrounding natural environment was at the forefront of our decision to settle here. I am also an Architect, and have since established an architectural practice in Broulee, so I acknowledge that I am likely to benefit from this proposed growth in my backyard.

In an ideal world we wouldn't want Broulee to change from its sleepy seaside village atmosphere, however we understand that growth is inevitable. I am not necessarily against growth in the area, however I strongly believe the proposed 60% growth on the table will have a detrimental effect overall on Broulee as a community.

Is it really necessary to push for reduced minimum plot sizes of 450 m² and tack medium density residential on the back of a small village? It seems to me as though it's a consequence of trying to over-compensate for lost development land now devoted to the planned re-zoned bio-corridor along George Bass Drive. I am in support of the bio corridor, however I believe it doesn't go far enough. I believe the scheme needs to further support conservation measures which in turn will minimise overdevelopment.

Proposed Broulee Subdivision Issue

Anthony Mayne

Mossy Point resident and ratepayer since 2001.

I believe that Council is to be acknowledged for their engagement re the Bio certification process in regards to the Broulee subdivision.

The long awaited development for this parcel of land is now able to progress.

I speak with the concern, that today Council will vote for this development to go to the State Government as a Gateway Determination. My concerns arise out of the surprise upon reading only last week Council's media release that seems to support a rezoning of this land to R3 medium density. The concern is that this will result in a 60% increase in population and will, as a consequence, probably see the clear felling of the remaining vegetation. I recognise that there is also a plan to rezone a thin strip to E2, however this seems inconsequential in light of

My other concern is that, whilst I recognise that following a gateway determination, community consultation is required, nevertheless, it seems odd that the community association most interested in this case, Broulee/Mossy Point Community Association, only found out about this change of plans by happenstance; by other words, without consultation by Council.

My concerns are principally about the change of zoning, meaning a greater than 30% increase upon the original Settlement Strategy, a 60% increase to the Broulee population, and the lack of consultation prior to this vote today with the community. And I therefore seek a postponement of this vote today pending further community consultation.

Let me begin by acknowledging the need for sustainable development; affordable housing, social housing and the related employment opportunities.

However, the proposed subdivision we are discussing today is a change of some significance. Change of such significance to the LEP plus the design and layout of the Village warrants community engagement.

Council communications last week, as below, suggest that this matter has clearly moved along and has quasi Council support; as demonstrated by the Council media release titled: **Plans support more housing choice in Broulee**

Good morning! Five hundred new dwellings are on the cards for Broulee if Eurobodalla Shire Council's plans to help land owners develop approximately 35 hectares of residential land behind George Bass Drive are given in-principle support by the NSW Government. Councillors will vote next Tuesday on whether to proceed. Full media release and map attached.

So why am I surprised by this news? While we knew that the subdivision, post bio certification, would go ahead, we were not at that time informed, or made aware, that this present possibility, mainly R3 zoning, would be the reality. What has changed?

Further questions:

Why is Council seeking a Gateway Determination, rather than handling this itself?

What is it that makes Broulee suitable for medium density? Surely, the town centres, with their access to services, present a more viable option for a concentration of population, including social housing?

It seems as though Council is already advocating for this change in zoning to go ahead prior to community consultation. Is that the case?

Why will consultation appear to be only with neighbours; what about the wider community?

Where is the supporting documentation, or proofs, to substantiate issues such as Aboriginal heritage? If you deal with it at the time, isn't it already too late by definition?

Why was the proposed change to the LEP not identified at the time of the sign off for the bio-certification?

Is this now a template from Council for future DA activity, and if not, then why has this approach been undertaken in this instance?

I note that in the following report,

ORDINARY COUNCIL OF EUROBODALLA SHIRE COUNCIL ON TUESDAY 24 JUNE 2014
PSR14/036 BROULEE BIODIVERSITY STRATEGY
ATTACH 2 2013 BROULEE BIOCERTIFICATION COUNCIL REPORT O13/143 AUG 13,

that the Council Reports states: "a Broulee development control plan will be drafted to ensure sensitive design principles are applied in the planning of subdivision layouts and future developments."

So given that the term "sensitive design" has been used in relation to this development, how could Council ensure such an outcome in light of its proposed rezoning?

In the spirit of community engagement and consultation I note the following framework and guidelines from the Eurobodalla Community Strategic Plan

OBJECTIVE 3 Sustainability states:

OUR COMMUNITY AND ENVIRONMENT ARE IN HARMONY. That we:

- 3.1 Encourage respectful planning, balanced growth and good design
- 3.2 Respond to our changing environment
- 3.3 Value, protect and enhance our natural environment

I also note that Objective 7, Collaborative, states:

WE ARE AN ENGAGED & CONNECTED COMMUNITY

- 7.1 Encourage an informed community
- 7.2 Enable broad, rich and meaningful engagement to occur
- 7.3 Build on our sense of community

OBJECTIVE 8:

WE WORK TOGETHER TO ACHIEVE OUR GOALS

- 8.1 Build strong relationships and shared responsibilities
- 8.2 Work in partnership to plan for the future

I acknowledge that I may have missed a level of communication. However, it appears that the Broulee and Mossy Point Community Association also have been caught unaware of this change.

In the interest of further enhancing an environment of greater engagement and a more connected community, built on consultation and the foundation created within the Community Strategic Plan, I would encourage Council to delay a vote on this motion.

I therefore seek that Council enter into further consultation with the community so that a more informed decision can be made and a wider representation of views elicited in order to achieve a more representative outcome.

Property Development

This speech is presented by Martin Tye (Broulee resident) to the Eurobodalla Shire Council in relation to the proposed "development" of the Bangalay Sand Forest adjacent to George Bass Drive (from Broulee Road to Train Street) 23/6/2015- it focusses on the fundamentally flawed economic basis for such developments.

Introduction:

I would like to thank council for the opportunity to speak & I am pleased that you are willing to listen to, & hopefully act on, sound economic reasoning as well as the wishes of the overwhelming majority of local residents.

Why the property developers economic arguments just don't stack up.

It is long overdue that councils challenged the misconception that "property development brings a net economic gain", when in reality, the reverse is true.

If the developers' claims had substance, we would see massive employment opportunities & economic benefits in regions like western Sydney & S.E Qld. as rapid population growth accompanied by the developer's bulldozers expands relentlessly into what was previously prime agricultural land or native bushland. Bushland, by the way, that was habitat for our wildlife and much valued by the local community for its natural beauty & recreational value.

But, the reality in these, and all other regions which have fallen under the developers spell, is the exact opposite. They demonstrate all the usual symptoms of a population growth rate out of balance with sustainable economic carrying capacity. Problems such as: unemployment, crime, drug addiction, mental health issues, homelessness, and of course, on-going environmental degradation, are all on the rise. This should set the alarm bells ringing, as a warning to councils about falling for the false & self-serving economic claims made by the property development industry.

Here is an example of why the "populate to prosperity" argument just doesn't work-

A typical property development of say 500 houses requires population growth of around 2,000 people (assuming 2 adults & 2 children per dwelling). So ask; "What will drive long term employment for an extra 1,000 (& eventually 2,000) adults? And... without a solid employment and tax revenue base, how will we

fund the infrastructure & government services required by these extra people, over the medium to long term?”

Dr Jane O’Sullivan from Queensland University estimates “that each new person requires well over \$100,000 worth of publicly funded infrastructure, to enjoy the same standard of living provided to existing residents”. This is an up-front infrastructure spend to be funded by existing taxpayers. We must then factor in the on-going maintenance, running costs and ultimate replacement of that infrastructure. This largely explains our current ‘infrastructure crisis’.

‘Growth’ reliant on population growth & property development will never generate sufficient wealth to fund vital services. The ability to fund and build supporting infrastructure lags ever further behind the continuously growing demand. Hence we see government bodies at all levels, across the country scratching their heads and wondering why the economic panacea promised by the property development lobby is always “just one more development away”.

Property development does provide a very short term cash injection & boost to employment (during the construction phase) but in doing so, it creates medium to long term employment & infrastructure demands which far outweigh any short term benefits.

Often, such demands are met by calls for further bulldozing & building, but each time the scale of the development must increase to provide employment for the existing people plus the new arrivals. This is known as a ‘Ponzi-scheme’. Its appeal lies in the allure of short term cash grabs, **but it is totally unsustainable, creates more problems than it solves and is, (like all Ponzi-schemes), destined to collapse.**

Eventually, government at all levels will be left with the unenviable task of explaining to our children, how they got it all so horribly wrong.

Meanwhile, the economic beneficiaries typically head down the highway with their profits to build a new life, or pursue further business opportunities elsewhere.

A quick word on ‘housing affordability’-

Due to the current housing affordability crisis, the property development lobby is now pushing for an increase in supply (more property developments). However they are careful to ensure that demand always exceeds supply to drive property prices ever higher. Their profit making models are heavily

reliant on endlessly higher property prices- thus driving the greatest property bubble and home affordability crisis this country has ever seen.

They have cleverly re-branded the law of demand & supply as the law of 'supply only'. They lobby strongly for boosted demand through foreign ownership of Australian real estate & record breaking population growth via unprecedented migration levels... while they continue with misinformation about the overall economic benefits of their business model.

So, for property developers to make the claim that they are working to solve the very problem which they have created & continue to feed off, is the ultimate act of disgraceful hypocrisy.

Conclusion

In summary, the claimed economic benefits of this illusory form of 'economic growth' are nothing more than a 'smoke & mirrors' misrepresentation of reality propagated by people with a major financial interest in promoting their business schemes and who have little regard for the medium to long term consequences of their actions.

So please, do not be deceived into approving any further property subdivisions beyond the economic capacity of the region to support the population with sustainable employment opportunities.

If you approve this development proposal, you will be digging yourselves into an ever deeper hole & be guilty of being blinded by a short term cash grab which has extremely negative long term strings attached.

You will be complicit in the downward economic spiral that an over-reliance on this sector of the economy will bring to the community of Broulee & the local region.

SUZANNE GILLAN BROULEE LAND OWNER
“IDENTIFIED AS FRASER LAND” BROULEE BEACH ESTATE

In reference to the development control plan for Broulee.

Mayor, Councillors, General manager, Council Staff and members of the public.

It has been another year since the approval of the biocert agreement. We have been working with the Eurobodalla Shire Council and our neighbouring landowners to develop a master plan for Broulee, so that the most desirable development outcome can be achieved for the environment, community and us as land owners. Having a greater range of block sizes will create affordable housing in Broulee which in turn has the potential for a healthier and more sustainable community.

We have recently invested substantial funds in a sewer pump station and electricity infrastructure and are ready to purchase our bio cert credits and therefore proceed with development.

This DCP presented today and the master plan that will flow from this document is the final stage in a 32 year development program. There seems to be some confusion in the community that this dcp will create a new urban zoning. It does not. The area in question has been zoned urban since 1984 and the final environmental constraints were solved via the bio cert agreement last year. This dcp seeks to fine tune this existing urban zoning so that the best possible development outcome can be achieved. It is hard to believe that it is 32 years since our land was first zoned urban and development consent granted. My father Ian Fraser entered into a legal agreement with the Eurobodalla shire council in the form of our 1984 Deed. This set down the responsibilities of both parties. This deed stated that

we must subdivide the land in accordance with the dcp no26 and not use the land for any other purpose. This dcp is based on the original approved master plan for the area which was submitted in 1983. The deed also dictated what infrastructure and costs we must provide in order to comply with the conditions of the deed. Conditions included building Train Street and upgrading water and sewer systems, and setting aside land for Broulee Primary School these have been enjoyed by the community as a whole. We have honoured our side of the deed at great financial cost and are excited to be able to finally get on with our development goals and create some much needed investment and expansion in the Eurobodalla Shire.

We would like the councillors to support development in the shire and through approval of the dcp send a message that the Eurobodalla is a vibrant exciting area to invest and live in.

Thank you for your time and consideration today.