

IPC Submission Diane & Troy Field

To: The Independent Planning Commission (IPC), NSW

Re: Objection to the Uniting Kingscliff Redevelopment – DA Ref: Uniting Kingscliff Seniors Housing Development

From: Diane and Troy Field, [REDACTED]

Date: 16/10/2025

Introduction

We are long-term residents of [REDACTED], Kingscliff, where we have lived for 12 years. We chose this home because of its peace, small-town atmosphere, and sense of community. Kingscliff has always been a quiet coastal town where residents could enjoy the tranquility of the beachside lifestyle. When we learned that Uniting proposed a large-scale redevelopment directly behind our home, our hearts sank. We fully appreciate that progress and renewal are part of modern living, but the **scale, height, density, and location** of this proposal are entirely inconsistent with the existing residential character of Kingscliff and the amenity of those living nearby.

We have reviewed the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (DPHI) assessment report and wish to make this further submission to the IPC, as the Department has failed to adequately address our concerns and those of many other affected residents.

1. Traffic and Local Amenity Impacts

The Department's report concedes that *"increased vehicle movements are anticipated along Lorien Way and adjacent streets"* yet concludes that *"the existing local road network has capacity to absorb the projected traffic."*

This statement is **deeply disconnected from lived experience**. Lorien Way already struggles with congestion and on-street parking pressure. With the new hospital, developments at Casuarina, and increasing tourism, traffic volumes have risen sharply in recent years. The Department's analysis relied on **desktop modelling** and did not reflect actual on-the-ground conditions during peak times. Not to mention the buses that use Lorien Way on a daily basis. Which are 12 buses a day both ways. How are we to reverse out of our drive way in a safe manner, especially when there is already parking on the side of the road blocking our view.

Residents know that even modest increases in daily traffic make Lorien Way dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists, particularly children and older residents. The Department has not proposed any enforceable **traffic-calming measures or parking controls**, nor has it accounted for **construction traffic impacts** over the 2-3 years of building activity — a period during which we will face daily dust, noise, vibration, and disruption.

Not to mention that we now have to deal with traffic coming and going to the Tweed Valley Hospital. That I feel has not been addressed in Uniting Documentation.

2. Overdevelopment and Incompatible Scale

The Department claims that the proposal *"represents an appropriate renewal of an aging seniors housing facility"* and that its scale *"responds to the strategic objectives of increased housing choice."*

However, this justification ignores the fact that the proposed development is **grossly disproportionate to its surroundings**. Multi-storey blocks rising above existing homes are not "renewal" — they represent **overdevelopment**. The density far exceeds what the local Kingscliff built form can accommodate without undermining the area's coastal character.

Kingscliff's charm lies in its **human scale and coastal simplicity**, not in "strategic objectives" that would better suit urban centres like Tweed Heads or Kings Forest. By approving this scale of development in the middle of a low-rise residential precinct, the Department effectively transforms the area into a high-density enclave out of step with every planning principle of contextual fit and community harmony.

How would you enjoy looking at your window directly into a 4 storey apartment building. Now we see beautiful blue sky and birds.

In the Uniting proposal it states that there is a 9 m set back from the boundary fence, that backs directly onto our property. Unfortunately they are putting car parking directly on the boundary fence. So the noise that we will have to deal with the coming and going will have a huge impact on

our mental health. As we currently have no noise. We live in the first floor looking directly over the Uniting Facility. So that noise will come directly into our living area.

3. Flooding and Drainage Risks

We have personally experienced two major flood events in the past five years, during which Lorien Way and the adjoining Uniting site both held significant water. The Department's report acknowledges *"the site is subject to flooding constraints"* but concludes that *"suitable mitigation can be achieved through engineering design."*

This vague assurance fails to recognise that the site already functions as a **natural flood basin**. Increasing hard surfaces and underground parking will only worsen runoff for adjacent properties like ours. No detailed hydrological modelling of extreme events or cumulative impacts on nearby residential lots has been made publicly available.

Flood risk mitigation "through design" is not a guarantee — it is a hope. Residents who live here and have waded through floodwaters understand the consequences far better than consultants behind a desk. We urge the IPC not to rely on theoretical mitigation without fully considering **the lived flood experience of the Kingscliff community**.

The last flood which was only 2 yrs ago, when we looked over the fence to United Buildings it was flooded up to our fence.

We have have had 2 major floods in the last 5 years, so not at all the once in 500 yrs as per Unitings document.

4. Building Height and Visual Impact

The Department notes that *"the proposed height exceeds local planning controls but is acceptable given the topography and surrounding context."* This is a **fundamental misrepresentation** of the actual setting. Lorien Way and the neighbouring residential area are **predominantly single-storey homes**.

Allowing building heights well above these limits will dominate our views, overshadow gardens, and permanently alter the skyline of our peaceful suburb. The height "variation" may be acceptable to bureaucrats, but it is **visually oppressive** to those who must live directly beneath it.

Our backyard will no longer open to the sky — it will sit behind a wall of development. This is not compatible with the existing built form or the intent of Kingscliff's height controls, which were introduced precisely to protect its seaside village feel.

5. Stress on Community Infrastructure and Amenities

The Department concludes that *"local services and facilities can accommodate the additional population."* Yet residents are already witnessing strain on basic amenities — parking, medical services, and open space.

Kingscliff is a small town, not an urban hub. Infrastructure designed for a coastal community cannot simply absorb a sudden, concentrated influx of residents from a large institutional project. The Department's position seems to prioritise **housing yield over livability**.

As long-term locals approaching retirement, we chose Kingscliff for its quiet pace and natural beauty. The thought of spending our later years behind a **giant, sprawling complex for affluent retirees** — complete with multi-level structures, constant traffic, and years of construction — fills us with distress. It is not the community we moved to or wish to age in.

6. Construction Impacts and Mental Health

The Department acknowledges potential construction impacts but dismisses them as *"temporary and manageable."* For residents living mere metres away, 2-3 years of dust, noise, heavy vehicle movements, and loss of privacy are not "manageable" — they are **life-altering**.

These impacts will cause immense **mental and emotional strain** for residents like us, who value peace and health. Our daughter suffers from asthma, and the anticipated dust will pose genuine health risks. No amount of "construction management planning" will mitigate the daily stress of living behind a major building site for half a decade.

Conclusion and Request to the IPC

We respectfully request that the Independent Planning Commission **refuse or significantly reduce** the scale and intensity of the Uniting Kingscliff Redevelopment.

The Department's assessment fails to adequately address the lived realities of local residents, underestimates the cumulative impact of traffic and flooding, and accepts height and density variations that are completely out of character with Kingscliff.

We love our home, our street, and our community. We are not opposed to thoughtful redevelopment — but we are opposed to **inappropriate overdevelopment** that destroys the very qualities that make Kingscliff special.

We ask the IPC to stand with residents and preserve the peace, charm, and human scale of our town for current and future generations.

Yours sincerely,
Diane and Troy Field

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Diane and Troy Field.