



Ocean Shores
COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION

SUBMISSION TO THE INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

NSW GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT

IN SUPPORT OF APPLICATION NUMBER SSD8169 FOR

THE CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF THE NORTH BYRON PARKLANDS CULTURAL EVENTS SITE

FROM THE OCEAN SHORES COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION INC. P.O. Box 83 Ocean Shores NSW 2483.

DECEMBER 10TH 2018

The Ocean Shores Community Association (OSCA) has supported the concept of an events and cultural site at North Byron Parklands Tweed Valley Way Wooyung/North Ocean Shores from the beginning.

At the previous hearing of the Planning Commission on February 13 this year, OSCA put in a 2700 word submission in support of the Parklands development. We dealt with the major issues raised at the time and wish that document and the support it expressed for Parklands to be taken into account now, as well as just a few things we would like to add.

1. The commissioners met with us in our beautiful town of Ocean Shores, in our community centre. **Ocean Shores is the largest residential town in the Byron Shire.** Residents will be celebrating the 50th birthday of the town this year throughout 2019. One third of the Parklands development is in the town of Ocean Shores, within the town's northern borders, south of Jones Road. . The Parklands front gates are in Ocean Shores. Our shopping centre which is the only civic centre we have, is five minutes' drive away from Parklands.
However, there is no mention of Ocean Shores in the Parklands Development Consent. **The same applies to the village of Billinudgel, heritage frontier town, industrial estate and the rural hinterland population it represents. Between the two of us, we add up to a quarter of the shire's population, nearly 8000 people.** Does the Secretary of the Department of Planning only want to order benefits for the minority groups who objected to Parklands? Does the Secretary not deign to take into account the majority in the north who support this development? **Ocean Shores and Billinudgel representatives should be included in any management committee or community consultation regarding Parklands.**
2. The \$1 levy will be given to the council twice a year, an amount up to \$120,000.
"Contributions to be managed generally in accordance with the Draft Byron Voluntary Visitor Fund, with funding focussed in areas north of the Brunswick River (and including Brunswick Heads) to the northern local government area boundary", which is Wooyung Road.
"Contribution funding to be expended on infrastructure projects that support the community and tourists that visit these areas." **Any decision making panel regarding these funds**

should be balanced, to include supporters as well as opponents, and include at least OSCA and the North Byron Business Chambers representatives.

3. Ocean Shores and Billinudgel will be left out unless there is fair representation on the decisions making panel. “It is anticipated that funds generated from this arrangement would be expended in the northern part of Byron Shire with the expenditure of such funds guided by the proposed panel type approach.”
4. **We request that the Planning Secretary changes this clause and whatever structure is set up to manage this money, it should be clearly stated that representatives from the Ocean Shores Community Association and the North Byron Business Chamber should be on the levy funding panel.**
5. D35 Social Impact Management Plan. Supporters of Parklands should be included in the formation of this plan as well as opponents. There has been disproportionate representation of objectors on these council appointed committees to date.
6. Community Engagement Plan: Here again, no mention of the majority of residents in the North Byron area. “Consult closely with surrounding land owners in relation to outdoor events on site” This seems to restrict the future controlling consultation to only three property owners on Jones Road? Again, no mention of the citizens of Ocean Shores or Billinudgel/The Pocket, those who live south of Jones Road. Ocean Shores should have voices on these consultation groups. In the past, consultation has been limited to people who oppose the Parklands development. There should be at least equal representation or as in any democracy proportional representation. Consultation committees membership should at least be limited to those who live within 5 kms of Parklands. Long standing community organisations should say a say.
7. Regulatory Working Group “maintain the RWG including community representatives to oversee and advise on the performance of the events.” **The RWG should at least include a representative from the Ocean Shores Community Association and the North Byron Business Chamber or sporting groups such as Shores United Soccer on a rotational basis To date, no representative from the majority organisations who support Parklands have been appointed to the RWG.** These organisations speak for the majority of the residents of the Greater Ocean Shores area. At present the RWG is controlled by opponents of Parklands. It is essential that a fairer share of participants should be appointed to this important group. There should at least be equal representation by supporters as well as opponents.
8. **“Continue to EMPLOY an environmental representative, community advocate and a community manager before during and after each large and medium event.”** How are these positions appointed? And Who are they? Again, OSCA believes these appointments may not be not balanced nor truly representative of the wishes of the community. They should be even handed and fair officers chosen for their impartial expertise, not their bias. **It is our request that OSCA and North Byron Business Chamber should be on any committee appointing people to these positions.**

- 9. The requirement to “maintain asset protection zones APZ’s of at least 10 metres to unmanaged bushland on site” is unprecedented in rural management practice. This is not APZ’s to nature reserves, just unmanaged bushland! Every farmer in the shire should start ringing alarm bells at this imposition. **This clause should be deleted. It will give the RWG and the other oversee groups great power to intervene and cause unreasonable distress.****
- 10. Comment:** A number of the speakers at the Community consultation claimed the Parklands site to be a wetlands, with wetlands gazettal imminent. It is not a true wetlands because it has been artificially created by manmade blockages of the four local creeks preventing flood waters from running off naturally to the ocean via the sandunes. Roads by sandminers and bulldozing by Council have prevented flood waters from escaping. Floodwaters therefore back up through the entire area, even into Billinudgel. A huge wall 400 metres long and at least 6 metres high and 6 metres wide was constructed by Public Works in the 1960’s along the entire opening of Readings Bay/Marshalls Creek onto the Brunswick River. There is now only 30 metres for floodwaters to escape. The floodwaters then push back during flood and head back north to residential areas in the towns and villages. In 1987 after some activist groups achieved wetlands protection for the area now known as Parklands, the Environment and Planning Minister Bob Carr revoked the wetlands status stating that “the designated wetlands area had been mistakenly included in the gazettal of the original area.” In 2018, the residents of Ocean Shores and area have called on the authorities to remove the blockages to the local creeks allowing floodwaters to escape once again naturally to the ocean, and for the walls blocking Marshall’s Creek to be removed.

11th January 2019.

Ocean Shores Community Association Inc.

P.O. Box 83 Ocean Shores NSW 2483.