

## Summary of Community Submissions

Issue	Detail	Assessment Comment
Increased flooding risk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased risk of flooding in the Picton shopping precinct due to the fact that all runoff from hard surfaces and dwellings will flow into Stonequarry Creek. This relates to the need for parking for the 80 rooms, and tourist buses, conferences and conventions, requiring over 100 hard surface car parking spaces creating more run off into our creeks which do not have the capacity to deal with the amount of run off we have had up to now. This will put great pressure and expense on Council &amp; residents.</li> <li>The flooding situation in Picton seems to have already been worsened by runoff from the Jarvisfield development and other developments in Picton. To allow further development without a plan to safeguard the Picton shopping precinct from flooding could make council liable if businesses are once again destroyed. There is also the loss of more shopkeepers as occurred after this last flood.</li> <li>The section of road before the Barkers Lodge Road and Argyle Street intersection is very narrow and in poor condition and is prone to damage should flooding occur in future.</li> </ul>	The potential flooding issue has been identified by Council's engineers. Should the planning proposal proceed to the Gateway and receive approval then a specialist study would be required to address potential flooding and stormwater management issues.
Traffic impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased traffic flow at the Barkers Lodge Road and Argyle Street intersection as well as the Argyle Street and Picton Road intersection. These intersections are already a major traffic choke point most of the day and any increase in traffic flow would only make life more difficult for the community as well as impacting on road safety. There may even be a need for traffic lights in the future at great expense to the community.</li> <li>The section of road before the Barkers Lodge Road and Argyle Street intersection is very narrow and in poor condition and added traffic flow as well as the possibility of regular tourist bus</li> </ul>	The cumulative traffic impact from planning proposals around Picton Town Centre has been identified as a major issue. It is currently being assessed as part of the Picton Town Centre Transport Management Plan. The management plan will form a basis for determining transport infrastructure requirements and potential development contributions to assist in providing the necessary transport infrastructure.

	<p>traffic would only accelerate road wear and damage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More houses means people and more cars. Picton can't handle the traffic now and it is worse when Prince Street Bridge is not available. New traffic lights have made traffic worse particularly on afternoons and Saturday lunch time.</li> </ul>	
Poor infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing public infrastructure is not capable of servicing the site, there is no public transport, no rail, no pedestrian access, no bike lanes, no close access to major transport roads, and the section of Barkers Lodge road at this location is in a fragile condition.</li> </ul>	<p>The site is not located near existing public transport. Should the proposal be supported, consideration would need to be given to the potential for provision of a shared pedestrian/cycle path from the site to Picton Town Centre.</p>
Density of development incompatible with rural setting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed 12m building height will allow 3 to 4 storey buildings and with 80 motel rooms would be inconsistent with a rural environment and the proposed working farms and agricultural experience being proposed. The number of function rooms, restaurant, cafe, accommodation rooms and building heights being proposed seem more like a large motel development than a tourist farm stay facility.</li> <li>• The proposed tourist facility is inappropriate for a rural setting, and is more like a convention centre suited to weddings rather than farm stay.</li> <li>• This is a rural area and should be kept rural. This beautiful area is getting butchered by developers who want to make a quick buck and do not care what we the residents want.</li> </ul>	<p>The potential impact on the scenic and rural character in this area from the proposed building height and extent of development is a concern that would require further investigation.</p>
Noise and light pollution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in noise from increased traffic flow of both cars and possibly buses as well as the increase in light pollution from such a large development in a rural setting.</li> </ul>	<p>Controls on the operation of any future tourist facilities in terms of noise and lighting would be necessary.</p>
Does not meet Strategic Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council's own <i>Growth Management Strategy</i> (GMS) does not identify the site as a location for residential growth, and it is well short of the scale required as per the <i>Draft South West District Plan</i>.</li> <li>• The <i>Plan for Growing Sydney</i> mentioned by the applicant requires "world class job opportunities" and "world class</li> </ul>	<p>The site has not been identified in the GMS for residential growth and the proposed rural-residential part of the planning proposal is not supported.</p>

	services and transport" and this cannot be demonstrated by the applicant.	
Viability of tourism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mowbray Park is near the site so another farm stay facility may damage their business which does not appear to be booming.</li> <li>• How many tourist resorts are needed as there's supposed to be one at Stonequarry estate (golf course) and another at Stonequarry gardens.</li> <li>• The only concern is that the stage of the residential development, being the final stage, does not change when the proposal becomes a full DA. This has happened before in the shire (Stonequarry golf course is one example).</li> </ul>	The viability of the proposed tourism facility is a concern particularly as the residential component is apparently necessary to provide financial backing. As noted there have been issues with some developments having progressed residential development while tourism facilities have had difficulties in getting off the ground.
Increase in non-rural uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allowing the rezoning would also in the future open up the door for other uses, for example, churches &amp; schools which is an issue that has had a great deal of conflict in the past with other local councils.</li> <li>• I hope this is not another case where a developer applies for one use and then once approval has been granted uses the site for a completely different purpose.</li> </ul>	It is not evident that allowing tourist facilities would stimulate the development of other uses. Schools and churches are currently permissible in the RU2 zone along with a range of other non-rural type uses.
Increase in social problems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When the fad passed at Stonequarry Gardens, it became a hangout for trouble makers drinking, smoking dope and doing donuts in their cars and the police are not interested</li> <li>• The areas getting bigger but there are a quarter of the police we use to have so we don't want another fad stuck in our area.</li> <li>• We have lived in the area for nearly 50 years and came here to get away from urban social problems.</li> </ul>	Council has expressed concern to the NSW State Government at police levels. It is not evident that any future tourist facility would create social problems although controls would need to be put in place to ensure that any future facility is operated responsibly.