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Waterlily Ridge Community Submission 11/1/2019

We are immediate neighbours of Parklands, to the north west on DP1034998. We represent 9 dwelling entitlements, including sensitive receivers R17 and R18. Our Multiple Occupancy was approved in 1991 and our Community Title was approved in 2011.

In the executive summary of the EIS (p.vi), Parklands say “the proposal is able to comply with applicable noise limits...with the exception of two receivers on Jones Road, which have noise agreements with Parklands.” R18 is located on an elevated site 200m from the main stage amphitheatre with the speakers pointing directly towards our site. (We note that with many of the maps, the dot denoting our location is often placed incorrectly, suggesting we are further away than it is in reality, eg Figure 5.2 in the Acoustic Assessment, p.101. The correct location is adjacent to the property boundary as shown in Figure 2.1 of the same document, p.31). The receivers referred to on Jones Road are at least 500m from any of the smaller stages and none of these stages have speakers facing Jones Road. On this basis we believe we are the most affected by amplified noise. Contrary to Parkland’s modelling, our measurements of noise levels show Parklands does not comply to noise limits at R18. We agree with many of the presenters at the public meeting on December 10th 2018, to have noise monitoring conducted independently.

A 4.3ML water tank is shown on Figures 3.1, 3.2 and 3.8 of the EIS. The sheer size of the tank and lack of landscaping detail lead us to believe it could impact on our visual amenity. The road as drawn does not correspond to the existing road and it appears that significant earth works would be required to realign the road and accommodate a tank of this size. This road also appears in the BEEP as an access road for emergency vehicles, which requires a passing lane or turning circle in that location to comply with Bushfire regulations. Due to the steepness of the surrounding land, the passing lane/turning circle can not be relocated.

Further to the issue of the local emergency road network, it would appear that these roads have not been adequately assessed or ground-truthed. Another example in Appendix U of the EIS - Bushfire Emergency Evacuation Plan appears in Figure 4 ‘Local Emergency Road Network’ on p27. This Figure shows one of the western emergency roads passing directly through our house site at R18. We imagine even a cursory assessment would have identified that going through a house site would not comply with bushfire regulations.

We hope that the Commission will take these points into consideration in the final recommendations.