

FILLING OUT THE ONLINE FEEDBACK FROM ON THE EXHIBITED PLANS OF MANAGEMENT FOR THE HOLIDAY PARKS IN BRUNSWICK HEADS. – For Your Consideration

As part of the changes in the Crown Lands Act our public lands can be sold. Consequently, it is important when responding to the exhibited Plans of Management for the Massy Greene and Ferry Holiday Parks that thought be given to how you want these foreshore lands to be used into the future?.

The online SurveyMonkey feedback form requires all questions to be answered. The questions are limiting and we encourage respondents to make further comments at the end of the surveys. Dot points below can be used to frame responses.

The “neither agree nor disagree” response is made because we don’t agree with the premises of some questions. This can be explained in the written section at the end.

Only responses on the SurveyMonkey forms are accepted by Reflections Holiday Parks.

Hard copies of these can be requested from Reflections Holiday Park by emailing

POM.MassyGreene@ReflectionsHoliday.com.au

POM.FerryReserve@ReflectionsHoliday.com.au

Or posting a request for hard copies of the survey form to Reflections Holiday Park PO Box 212 Carrington NSW 2294

Responses to the POM close on 6.1.19

1. MASSY GREENE

Question 11 – Neither agree nor disagree

Question 12 – Strongly disagree

Question 15 – Slightly unsatisfied.

Question 17 – Areas of improvement

- (a) **Northern boundary** setback of 7m + 3m is supported conditional that
 - i. picnic tables, which will be used primarily by campers, are installed within the 3m buffer zone, not within the 7m foreshore setback.
 - ii. Planting out the of the whole of the 3m buffer zone is reduced to leave clients with a clear view of the river and to create a sense of openness along the foreshore but wide enough to stop the ‘spill over’ effect of the park’s clients extending their sites.
 - iii. the surface of pathway to be hailstone in keeping with other pathways in Brunswick Heads and to allow for tree root movement
- (b) **Western boundary** is supported conditional that
 - (i) the interface with the boat harbour development provides for two-way vehicular and trailers to the non-powered watercraft launching ramp
 - (ii) Parking is provided for vehicles and trailers used for canoes/paddleboards near the Old Pacific Highway and to support the launching ramp.

(iii) Question 12 references a children's playground in the green coloured area to the south of the proposed western entry. It is reasonable to state this will principally be for the benefit of the park's clients. A children's playground is proposed on the western side of the boat harbour for general public use. It will be located in a safer place than what is proposed on the western side of Massy Greene.

(iv) The launching ramp is configured in a manner which makes it impossible for it to be used to launch powered boats e.g. tinnies, thus ensuring it is used for its intended purpose.

(v) the access route is gazetted as a road and is outside the operational area of the holiday park.

(vi) the surface of the pathway to be hailstone in keeping with other pathways in Brunswick Heads

(vii) a traffic study needs to be done in conjunction with the Boat Harbour Masterplan and the maximum permissible development of the 3,500sqm of freehold land to determine whether or not the entry/exit to the holiday park is best located on the west or east of the park. The survey questions have omitted any reference to the western entry and with the proposed development of the Boat Harbour it is important the traffic issue is serious consideration in decision making.

(c) **Eastern boundary** is supported conditional that there is no further reclamation of Tweed Street road reserve for the proposed pathway. The pathway needs to be hailstone in keeping with other pathways in Brunswick Heads

(d). **Southern boundary** is supported

(e). The refuse collection is within the boundaries of the caravan park and not outside as proposed

(f). The vegetation plan is endorsed by Council in promoting biodiversity

(g) Fencing, its style and siting is put aside pending consultation with the community

2. FERRY HOLIDAY PARK.

Question 11 - Strongly disagree

Question 12 - Strongly disagree

Question 13 - Strongly disagree

Question 17 - Strongly disagree

Question 18 – These are all positive outcomes in the exhibited POM

(a) The eastern boundary is supported

(b) The western boundary is supported

(c) The southern boundary is supported

Questions 19 – areas of improvement are:

- a. Public amenities and outdoor shower are needed to support the use of the public boat ramp. This will also stop the proposed public area becoming, by default used with any sense of comfort principally by caravan park clientele who will have ready access to such amenities.

- b. The vegetation plan restores the koala wildlife corridor and is supported by Council in promoting biodiversity
- c. A sound wall needs to be built to mitigate the impact of highway noise onto the caravan park, particularly from across a water surface.
- d. The land along the foreshore opposite Nos 1-6 Riverside Crescent is in urgent need of rehabilitation and excludes vehicles and trailers.
- e. Fencing, its style and siting is put aside pending consultation with the community.

At Question 20, please consider the following points to support and add to your responses

Question 11 - Reasons for strongly disagreeing are:

The northern boundary (7m + 3m) is not supported as it reduces the amount of open foreshore space for general public use.

- (a) The width of the existing grassed foreshore area varies from 20m to 30m along the Brunswick River. The exhibited Plans of Management reduces this to 7m representing a loss of public space and reducing the area of foreshore by over 55%.
- (b) The northern boundary to the holiday park needs to be aligned with the northern side of the existing road formation, known as Riverside Crescent (i.e. the bitumen and gutters) with a 3m setback from that. This means that all the grassed foreshore area between the road formation and the river remains outside the operational area of the caravan park for general public use which includes the caravan park's clientele.
- (c) No formalized hard surface pathway/cycle way along the foreshore as, by law it will require fencing

Question 12 – Reasons for strongly disagreeing are:

- (a) This response is directly linked to the response to Question 11. The creation of the public park appears to be compensation for the appropriation of the foreshore parkland
- (b) This children's playground will be used predominantly by park patrons not the public.
- (c) The area designated is overstated as it includes a sewer pump station and the need for road access to it.
- (d) The statement that the new park area is 'within the holiday park' is not consistent with what is shown on the map Fig 4.9 Public Realm Plan.

Question 13 - Reason for strongly disagreeing is:

- (a) The off-leash dog walking area is primarily for the benefit of park patrons. Ferry is a dog-friendly holiday park.

Question 17 – Reason for strongly disagreeing is:

- (a) – the loss of over 55% of the area of the existing grassed foreshore from general public use

