

North Manyana Focus Group, RHVA

Meeting - Thursday 28th February, 2019

Venue: 8 Curvers Dr, Manyana

Meeting opened: 5.15pm

Attendees: S Mawson, C Klupiec, J Cleary, Jenny Whitmarsh, John Whitmarsh, J Lowrey, P Bartlett, N McGuckin

Apologies: F Logge

Last Thursday 22nd February, Shoalhaven City Council (SCC) advised the new owners had submitted a revised Planning Proposal (PP) for "North Manyana".

The document was reviewed by the focus group members, leading up to tonight's meeting to discuss.

A list of issues raised regarding the PP was formed:

- The PP lacks detail and some reports are not available with many pages simply stating "Requires Further Consultant Advice" incl. Stormwater and Water Quality, Traffic & Movement, Servicing – Water, Wastewater, Electricity.
- A new NE corner block of development is proposed with an extra approx. 100 dwellings, according to the "Indicative Concept Layout" drawing. (Nowhere in the document are lot numbers quantified.) The last proposal lists the number of lots to be 250-320. This new PP appears to have much more (approx. 420??). There should be no increase in footprint or lot numbers.
- The overwhelming sentiment of the group was that the third building area proposed (NE corner) is too close to the beach and would have diabolical repercussions if allowed to proceed. This community has always strongly objected to housing East of (inline with) The Promenade and SCC has supported that.
- The satellite block of houses in the NE corner has only one road in and out. It would require two - or a much wider road.
- The required 25 metre Asset Protection Zone (APZ) around all housing areas increases land cleared.
- A good portion of the 76ha comprises one of several threatened ecological communities (Bangalay Sand Forest, Swamp Oak floodplain, Swamp Sclerophyll forest.)
- The original proposal listed many threatened to critically endangered species of fauna, recorded in or adjacent to the site (Including: Eastern Bentwing Bat, Eastern False Pipistrelle, East-coast Freetail Bat, Gang Gang Cockatoo, Glossy Black Cockatoo, Greater Broad-nosed Bat, Hooded Plover, Little Bentwing Bat, , Little Lorikeet, Osprey, Pied Oyster Catcher, Sooty Owl, Sooty Oyster Catcher, Square Tailed Kite.) If allowed to proceed, this development would not only remove habitat but increase populations of people and pets, with detrimental effects for these species.
- We had two critically endangered hooded plovers fledge from Inyadda Beach this year (out of only 7 for the whole of NSW). This development would have direct repercussions on the future of this species.
- There is only one road in and out of Manyana from the Princes Highway, which is in very poor condition, and there have been multiple accidents including fatalities at the highway turnoff. More houses = more traffic.
- Heavy vehicular traffic necessary for the development would further deteriorate the Bendalong Road.

- The proposed two roads off Inyadda Drive into the development would be unsafe, with hills creating blind spots for drivers and pedestrians.
- Infrastructure to support this level of development is lacking – we have effectively no shops, services, fuel, schools, medical facilities, etc.
- Visual impact - from Inyadda Beach and whilst out in the water at Inyadda Beach, you would see houses if the NE corner block was allowed.
- Visual impact - coming into Manyana along Inyadda Drive, you would see houses.
- Visual impact - from the houses and streets in Manyana, you would see houses.
- Consider the increased amount of people who would access Inyadda Beach - a dangerous beach for swimming which is unpatrolled.
- Residents would undoubtedly cut the shortest route to the nearest beach - across fragile sand dunes and through ecological communities, which are supposed to be protected.
- Housing supply in Manyana already outstrips demand with “Manyana Beach Estate” (MBE) only selling 13 of their 182 lots (according to current information on their own website).
- A housing glut may devalue existing properties
- Smallest possible lot sizes have been proposed with provision for dual occupancy. Page 26 of the proposal states 500sqm would be the minimum lot size – previously 600sqm was the minimum.
- Community has compromised on this development in the past. Why would we compromise on a compromise?
- RHVA wrote to council last year asking them to consider large sized lots instead - as a point of difference and more in keeping with a Coastal Village character. Local agents said 1,000 – 2,000sqm lots would sell at a good price quickly compared to small blocks which are difficult to move. There are precedents set in the Shoalhaven for the proven success of this type of development.
- SCC’s Growth Management Strategy describes Manyana as a coastal village. The Community wishes to retain the coastal village atmosphere and amenity.
- People move and visit here to get away from cheek to jowl urban style estates. If we keep turning all of the special places into suburbia, there will be nowhere special left!
- Feel we have been “hailed over the coals” as a community and have made our feelings clear to Council on many previous occasions. It is a continued stressor having this hanging over our head.
- Storm water run off. Into local creek then out to sea?
- How will sewerage be handled?
- According to surveys by the original proponents studies, the NE corner of the land is prone to sea level rise
- Aboriginal artefacts have been found on site and their importance disregarded
- Fragmentation of revegetation; green corridors would be greatly eroded.
- Building on sand and in flood plain – possible insurance issues? Would Council be accountable if they allowed building in susceptible areas?
- Rural Fire Service (RFS) are struggling to recruit young volunteers and in future RFS may not have the capacity to safely protect the RHV area with an extra approx. 600 houses (between this development and MBE’s 182 lots.)
- Climate change makes conditions more unpredictable re bush fires; we are very similar to Tathra (remote small coastal settlement, down the end of a long road with little protection and services).
- A local National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) employee advises that NPWS has had budget cuts, which have dramatically impacted on NPWS’ capacity to maintain the already struggling adjoining Conjola National Park – an area the new homeowners would use.

- There is an extremely high vacancy rate in the area, which has historically prevailed. Given there are no higher order amenities (and barely any low level ones!) in the area, (so people would have to travel to work, to shop, for healthcare, etc.) it does not relieve any housing crisis. Ours is not the best area to earmark for development.
- Setbacks from existing properties as agreed to in the last round of negotiations seems to be maintained, as is the tree lined buffer along Inyadda Drive to preserve the visual amenity on approach to Manyana.

We resolved to:

Continue to encourage people, via email and social media to sign up to SCC's "Get Involved" page so they get updates first hand: <https://getinvolved.shoalhaven.nsw.gov.au/inyadda-drive-planning-proposal-manyana> and to fill in the survey with their own views at:

https://getinvolved.shoalhaven.nsw.gov.au/inyadda-drive-planning-proposal-manyana/survey_tools/inyadda2019survey

Action: JL

Write to Council requesting they extend the time frame the community has to comment by a month, especially considering there is Clean Up Australia Day this weekend and an election the following.

Action: JL

Plan another public meeting. Saturday March 9th 3pm Yulunga Hall or Saturday April 20th (Easter Saturday) at 3pm in Yulunga Hall if we can get an extension to the deadline.

Action: JL to print flyers

JC to put flyers up around town and remove afterwards

JC and PB to plan and set up public meeting, JL to chair

Continue working on Google document where we can share and update comments on aspects of the PP.

Action: CK

Meeting closed: 6.30pm

Attachments:

1. Current North Manyana "Inyadda Drive" PP (Proponent Urban Design Strategy December 2018 Inyadda Drive PP.PDF)
2. Public Meeting Easter Saturday 2019 flyer