

Name: .....

Address: .....

Date: .....

Mr Glenn Hammill  
Assessment Manager, Town Planning  
Moreton Bay Regional Council  
PO Box 159, Caboolture QLD, 4150

Dear Mr Hammill,

**RE: OBJECTION TO UNITS AND COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT AT NEWPORT MARINA**

**Development Application No.:** DA/ 2019 / 38402 / V2L - MCU  
**Property Location:** 156A, 156 (Common Property) & 158 Griffith Road, Newport  
**Property Description:** Lot 34 SP 105124, Lot 0 SP 111814 & Lot 21 SP 297765  
**Development Type:** Material Change of Use - Development Permit for Multiple Dwelling (54 dwellings), Shop, Food and Drink Outlet, Office and Marine Industry

I / We object to this six storey apartment and food and drink outlet development on the following grounds:

1. The Application is in conflict with Moreton Bay Regional Council's (MBRC) overall outcomes of the Industry Zone Code, Marine Industry Precinct and the strategic outcomes of the Strategic Framework which applies to 2031. The application does not provide sufficient grounds to alter the carefully considered and developed Code, Precinct and Strategic Framework.
2. The community of Newport does not want the proposed height, massing and site cover, that offers a visual bulk of 1600 m<sup>2</sup>. The development is not viewed as valuable, meaningful or contributory to the lifestyle of Newport and its surrounding communities. Apartments are a glut on the market – in May 2019, 200 apartments were listed for sale on the peninsula. The development does not represent the lifestyle or behaviours of the people in Newport, and does not enhance our lives - we do not want it.
  - It should be noted that concept of Publicly Accessible Spaces in the DA is misleading. It is privately owned and will be subject to the whim/s of future property owner/s and tenants to determine whether the public can access the area..
  - It should also be noted that the DA claims continually that this is a 'unique' site. This is NOT a unique site, it is typical of an Australian Marina site which MBRC recognised in its zoning of the area
  - The DA's assumption that residences located on the other side of the canals surrounding the Marina will not be impacted is flawed. There is no object lying between the proposed development and these properties which could block the sound, sight or effect of this building. It is to be noted that the Canals lie below water level so immediate proximity as referred in the DA does not adequately reflect the reality of the situation and thus the major negative impacts.
  - It should be further noted that the assumption that retired members of the community will sell their existing homes to move into the proposed apartments is flawed. Retired members of the community keep their larger homes so that they can accommodate their visitors and not have them staying elsewhere.
  - The density stated in the DA is half the true density. The DA applies the 54 apartments over the **entire** site, not the half of the site shown for the apartment building. The remainder is ripe for further similar development if approved.
  - The DA applies to the whole site, yet the apartment building occupies only half of the site. The future loss of any Marine Industry land uses would be in jeopardy of future Development Applications like the current one.
3. Visual Amenity and Privacy
  - The bulk, scale and height of the proposed building does not align with current zoning and is not in keeping with the surrounding dormitory suburb of typically 1-2 storey residences. It will **shade** some nearby residences for at least 2 hours and cause a **lack of privacy** in many residences within a 600m radius. The building would dramatically and negatively change the character of the area, dwarfing the surrounding neighbourhood and overlooking the private homes of Newport. The sense of space now enjoyed by Newport residents will be severely impacted. The open space in the heart of our waterside suburb will be lost.
  - The visual dominance of 1600m<sup>2</sup> profile of the building would impact the tranquil beauty of Newport as a suburb and block views and sunlight. Particularly impacted will be those properties facing the building (60m away across open water) and those members of the greater community who enjoy the view from Kay Cottee Bridge over the marina to the Glasshouse Mountains. The beautiful picture of Newport commented upon by so many will be lost forever.
  - The height and bulk of the building will also block breezes that residents rely on in summer.
  - The DA identifies that properties to the east of the Development will experience premature sunsets starting from 12.00noon. This is unacceptable. They go on to comment that these properties will have access to 3 hours solar energy per day. This is unacceptable in Newport.
4. Noise
  - The noise impact of the development is not adequately addressed by the DA. The DA does not recognise that there will be significant noise generated by the activities in, operations of and patrons and vehicles travelling to and from the food and drink outlets. The DA outlines a lengthy Noise Management Plan which is reactive in nature and in reality unable to be policed successfully. Its assumptions are not reflective of itinerant visitor behaviours nor those of people who are out for the evening wanting to enjoy themselves. The resultant noise levels amplified over water will be significant. This is why MBRC has designated other, more viable, zoned locations on the Redcliffe Peninsula for enterprises such as this.
  - The proposed operating hours between 6am to 9pm will have a significant impact on the families surrounding the Marina site and further down the canals. Staff and patrons' arrivals and departures, delivery vehicles etc, and normal commercial operations taking place during those hours when most families should be enjoying the peace and quiet of normal family life will be significantly impacted. School children and their parents need their sleep. Living within the vicinity of a commercial centre will not guarantee that they will get that.
5. Traffic and Parking
  - The DA Traffic Report shows that on two days in winter, peak hour traffic on Griffith Road was measured at over 90% capacity, in fact on a winter's Saturday lunch hour it was 97.9% capacity. Living in the area, we know that traffic increases significantly in the seasons other than winter. Currently, all residents are experiencing difficulty accessing Griffith Road in peak hour periods. The DA proposes 54 apartments, 184 Marina Berths, and various retail and food and drink outlets. The traffic caused by this will cause a bottleneck at

the entrance to the site, which will impact the existing traffic flow and of course it has major safety implications. Griffith Road, being a sub arterial Road has a capacity of 12,000 vehicles per day, this being the case, peak hour traffic could be expected to be 10% of this at 1200 vehicles per hour in peak hour. With 1175 cars already using the road on a winter's Saturday,(ref DA/36656/2018/V2L) the addition of 54 unit owners and their various vehicles, coupled with retail outlet employees and their customers' vehicles is not adequately reflected in the current DA report. Griffith Road's capacity will be exceeded. Traffic congestion which will form at the intersection of Griffith Road and Boardman Road at the access to Stockland's development will be clearly evident and will become even more exacerbated when all of the homes on the Stockland development have been settled. Griffith Road is already nearly at capacity. The cost to the lifestyle of the community and to the MBRC will be untenable and permanent. The pressure on our community of heightened traffic congestion is already an issue.

- The DA halves the 222 carparks currently available for marine industry and the current 184 marina users and their visitors. This marina does not fit the precepts and definitions of the Next Generation Neighbourhood and therefore the DA should not be considered using that zoning. The proposed uses of the retail outlets and the apartment building (only 1.5 per 2, 3 and 4 bedroom apartment) defy the assumption that only 111 carparks are required. Parking will spill onto surrounding streets and the marina carparks. This poses a danger to the families living in these streets, to the cyclists and pedestrians who MBRC encourages to use the streets, and in particular the many children who currently experience a freedom of movement not found around multistorey developments. The resultant congested streets should not occur in a suburban neighbourhood on Redcliffe Peninsula.

#### 6. Community Safety

- Apart from the obvious dangers posed by the increased traffic and poor parking solutions offered by the DA, the pedestrian shared access road is of considerable concern. Delivery trucks, retail pleasure seekers (often exuberant in their behaviour), apartment dwellers and visitors entering and exiting along a narrow access driveway which is to be shared by pedestrians is a recipe for disaster. Consider an emergency fire situation – patrons and apartment dwellers all leaving the site to a safe muster point will conflict with emergency vehicles attempting to access the site. People panic in an emergency. Consider an ambulance or police emergency vehicle attempting to enter the site. What would likely happen is of major concern.

#### 7. Construction

- No consideration has been given to the construction impacts on the local residents, their homes and foundations of the effects of heavy equipment, construction noise, pile driving, dust, vehicles (both passenger and industrial).
- Homes surrounding the site were not constructed to withstand the engineering works that this development will require. The cost of damage to surrounding properties from these activities must be a concern.
- It is highly unlikely that marina berths will be able to be accessed through a construction site.
- Where will the site workers park? Will they occupy the remaining 111 marina carparks, or park on the streets?
- The viability of constructing substantial buildings on fill, on top of unconsolidated wetlands has not been addressed in the DA and is a significant oversight! The assumption that the DA makes that all of this can be considered after the DA is approved is not acceptable given the clear risks of building on a site such as this.

#### 8. Relevant Comments

- MBRC was wise in its original zoning choices for the Region. Consultation was encouraged in the lead up to the MBRC Strategic Plan of 2016. Newport residents supported the zoning of the Marina as Marine Industry Precinct. Residents' viewpoints and support of this zoning has not changed. This particular DA is not wise. It is not reflective of community expectations
- The population of Newport is estimated to grow by 170% . It is not unreasonable to expect a proportional increase in boat ownership and demand for Marine services. A Marina is just not berths adjoining the site, it is the land that is central to it. There are many Marine Services which would comply with the requirements of Marine Industry Precinct that could be established on the site. Just 55 m<sup>2</sup> is allowed for marine industry services in this DA is not reflective of the expectations of the community for this site.
- Whilst we appreciate the importance of job creation in our Region, sensitivity to zoning requirements and the local neighbourhood must take a priority.

#### Further Comments If any:

Yours faithfully,

Signed: ----- Name: -----