



Glengara Village Residents Association inc. Residents Committee

SUBMISSION BY GLENGARA VILLAGE RESIDENT'S COMMITTEE, INC., (GVRC) TO THE INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION (IPC) CONCERNING MINGARA RECREATION CLUB SENIOR HOUSING, TUMBI UMBI (SSD-63475709) FOLLOWING THE PUBLIC MEETING HELD BY IPC ON 22/06/2026

27th June 2026

Authors: Rob Fulcher and Ken Moon, Village residents

Rob Fulcher – Retired Civil Engineer, General Manager and Environmental Scientist

Rob's background includes:

- Having tertiary qualifications in Science (U of Syd), Civil Engineering (U of Syd), Natural Resources (UNE) and Business Management (CSU)
- Five years as an engineer with DMR including one heavily involved in assessment of development applications
- Seven years with Sutherland Shire Council as a senior engineer
- Fifteen years as Uralla Shire Council as Shire Engineer
- Fifteen years with Uralla Shire Council as General Manager
- Seven years with Wyong Shire Council as a senior manager
- Chairperson of Local Traffic Committee and member of Regional Traffic Committee
- Chartered Professional Engineer (retired)
- Fellow of the Institute of Engineers (retired)

Ken Moon – Retired Land Use Planning and Assessment Manager Sydney Region for RTA/RMS

Ken's background includes:

- Having qualifications in Land and Engineering Survey drafting and Transport Planning Management and control (UNSW)
- 40 years' experience in traffic engineering with DMR/RTA/RMS
- Attended Civil, Land and Environment Courts and Coroners Court as an expert witness.
- Represented RTA on various Traffic Committees including Regional Traffic Committee.
- Prior to retirement he was the Land Use Planning and Assessment Manager for the Sydney Region. This position involved managing a team of Town Planners and Engineers to assess development applications forwarded to the authority under SEPP 11 and to provide comments/recommendations on traffic matters to the relevant approving authorities.
- Chaired the Sydney Regional Development Advisory Committee.

1. INTRODUCTION

Thank you for the opportunity to attend and address the Public Meeting on Monday.

On behalf of the GVRC and with its authority, we wish to make some comments after the applicant addressed some questions by the Commission at the meeting and also to attach some earlier documents that we sent to The Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (DPHI). Our understanding from DPHI is that our original submission concerning the development application has been sent to the IPC. However, our subsequent submissions relating to the Response to Submissions and the Amended Application have not been submitted. As a result, am attaching those documents with this submission.

2. POINTS MADE BY NAOMI, THE PLANNER FOR THE APPLICANT

(a) The development consent conditions relating to car parking at the athletics track

The applicant seems to rely on a legal opinion regarding some possible errors made by council officers in stamping various plans that have “redefined” the intention of the original conditions. Council has advised DPHI that the applicant will need to comply with the consent conditions. The applicant argues that those conditions are “ambiguous” and, as a result, the applicant has not amended those conditions and that it complies with the past consents. We request the IPC examine the history and make its own determination as to whether the current application does meet the consent conditions.

We are also disappointed that none of the debate has focused on the merits of the parking provisions to service a Regional facility. This decision should be made on sound planning grounds and not by legal opinion.

(b) The guidelines in the Housing State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP)

We understand that these Policy guidelines concerning building heights and Floor Space Ratio are not prescriptive. But they are there for a reason. It is unreasonable that an applicant can exceed the guideline without at least justifying the variation. The applicant avoided the question about justifying the variation with the response that it “designed a contextual response”. It must be said that the idea of choosing a contextual response with the hotel building is a surprise. The building is not well regarded in the local community who generally refer to it as “that ugly brown box”.

3. Points made by Ben from TRAFFIX

The consultant made some challenging and highly contested comments in the presence of people who know the track and club facilities well and with which we disagree, as follows:

- The claim that seniors housing residents are low traffic generating, while our own independent traffic counts provide alternative factual evidence, seems also to ignore that fact that such complexes are serviced by staff, contractors and delivery vehicles as well as the residents all of the day.
- That local traffic intersections will retain their current levels of service, ignoring the fact that the intersection of Wyong Road and Mingara Drive is already at full capacity and is painfully slow at peak times

- That only six large athletics carnivals occur each year after many speakers had provided information as to how busy and well attended the facility is.
- That the peak traffic demand occurs between 6pm and 7pm on a Friday night, when locals know that even though that period is busy, such demands occur at any time on any day at this highly successful multipurpose facility. The gymnasium and pool are busy from 6.00am, as is the childcare area and the dining facilities. A few days ago, the Club was visited by the Federal Treasurer during the middle of the day and the car park was full.

3. THE LOCATION OF THE PROJECT

We are aware of the professional qualifications and experience in landscape architecture and place management of both of the commissioners who attended the public meeting.

As a result, we wish to raise the matter of the visual element of the surrounding landscape, the view of which from the public domain will be lost by the size of the proposed buildings. This matter was not raised in our address to the public meeting because of the time limitations. It is an issue that GVRC has raised before in our submissions to DPHI that seems to have been trivialised and not supported.

We would like to take this opportunity to ask the commissioners to assess our case themselves.

GVRC argues that the most significant visual element of the surrounding landscape in this generally flat terrain is the major ridge to the west of the site.

GVRC is of the opinion that the aesthetic value of a landscape is closely linked to its beauty and uniqueness. It believes that the aesthetic value attached to a place is always subjective and that people are drawn to places for many reasons. It argues that the ridge surrounding the Tumbi Umbi area is indeed a beautiful and unique site that many people admire.

Wikipedia advises that "the term "Tumbi Umbi" is an Aboriginal expression that likely means "place of tall trees". It refers to a suburb on the Central Coast of New South Wales, Australia. The name reflects the area's historical landscape, which was once characterized by dense bushland and tall trees".

GVRC is of the opinion that the encircling wooded ridge contains remnants of the "tall trees" and contrasts beautifully with the flat ancient flood bed terrain of Tumbi Umbi. The proposed development gifts the traditional Tumbi Umbi view of that ridge line permanently and exclusively to a small number of proposed residents on the western side of the development.

We believe that the views to the ridgeline from the broader Club precinct are considered important and should result in a built form that retains those views for the public.

We have recommended in our earlier submissions that an independent visual impact and landscape consultant should be engaged to report on the value of the views of the ridgeline and the loss thereof. That recommendation has not been accepted by either DPHI or the applicant. We ask the IPC to consider such a request through the expertise of its own commissioners.

4. FURTHER INFORMATION ON TRAFFIC MATTERS

Owing to a lack of transparency from Mingara's traffic consultant TRAFFIX, to provide supporting information on the retirement villages used in their report on traffic generation, Glengara's Village Residents Committee (GVRC) commissioned Austraffix to undertake traffic counts at the three entrances to Glengara Retirement Village Tumbi Umbi.

These counts were undertaken between Saturday 29th November 2025 and Friday 5th December 2025. The results of these counts have been summarised in the following tables.

While Glengara Retirement Village comprises 313 independent living units (ILU's) with 70 Care apartments, to give as close assessment of traffic generated from Glengara with that of the proposed Senior Housing Development by Mingara, the traffic generated from the Jaeger Road site (66 ILU's) was not included in the assessment although the traffic generated from the Jaeger Road is shown in Table 4.

Table 1 shows that the combined Hansens Road and Mingara entrances generated an average of 892 vehicles per day on weekdays and 528 on weekends for the 247 ILUs and 70 care apartments, with 6.8% classified as heavy or commercial vehicles.

The traffic report prepared by TRAFFIX states that the AM peak does not coincide with the AM network peak and therefore they did not include any traffic generation figures for the network AM peak. It can be seen from Table 1 there were on average 111 trips generated during the AM network peak with 90 trips during the PM peak on weekdays from Glengara. These figures put serious doubt in the accuracy of the assumptions made by the consultant in determining the traffic generation by the proposed Development.

I believe that these figures would be similar to what could be expected to be generated from this development should it be approved and therefore should be used in calculating the traffic impact on the nearby intersections.

As mentioned in our previous submission, TRAFFIX has assumed that 70% of traffic generated by the proposed development will arrive and depart to the north (towards Tuggerah), with 30% to the east (towards Shelley Beach). GVRC believes that a more appropriate split would be 40/60 respectively. I base this on the fact that the nearest shopping centres are located at Killarney Vale and Bateau Bay with Bateau Bay having the three major supermarkets, banks, specialty shops and medical facilities.

From the traffic count done at the Mingara entrance the average weekday traffic was 122 veh/day while the Hansens Road entrance was 770 veh/day. These figures represent a 14% generation to the north with 86% to the east via Hansens Road. Even if an additional 20% of traffic using Hansens Road entrance were to travel north towards Tuggerah, there would still be 66% of traffic travelling east. (It should be noted that of the 122 movements per day using the Mingara gate entrance not all would be travelling to Tuggerah as a number of Glengara residents use this access to attend Mingara Recreation Club.)

Once again the GVRC questions the accuracy of the traffic report prepared by TRAFFIX and is of the opinion that TRAFFIX should be asked as part of the DPHI assessment process, to comment on the data in the GVRC traffic counts and reprocess their modelling to take into account this new data in a review of the impact of the proposed development on traffic flow in and through the Mingara car park and the local traffic network and therefore the need for any intersection upgrading. I do not agree with their statement that this development would have minimal impact on the surrounding road network and that they should not be contributing to any upgrades and that it is the responsibility of both Central Coast Council and the State Government.

TABLE 1				
Combined Hansens Road and Mingara gate Entrances.				

	Inbound	Outbound	Total	Average
Weekday	2237	2223	4460	892
Weekend	525	531	1056	528
Combined	2762	2754	5516	788
AM Peak (two way) combined.			558	111
PM Peak			474	90
% Heavy / commercial vehicles			6.80%	
(Note. AM peak 7.00am – 9.00am PM peak 4.00pm – 6.00pm)				

TABLE 2				
Hansens Road Entrance				
	Inbound	Outbound	Total	Average
Weekday	2034	1815	3849	770
Weekend	452	401	853	427
Combined	2486	2216	4702	672
AM Peak (two way) combined.			474	
PM Peak			391	
% Heavy / commercial vehicles			8.40%	
Busiest weekday. Monday 1st Dec.			804	vehicles
Quietest weekday. Wednesday 3rd Dec			729	vehicles

TABLE 3				
Mingara Gate Entrance				
	Inbound	Outbound	Total	Average
Weekday	203	408	611	122
Weekend	73	130	203	102
Combined	276	538	814	407
AM Peak (two way) combined.			83	
PM Peak			60	

% Heavy / commercial vehicles	5.20%	
Busiest weekday. Thursday 4th Dec.	171	vehicles
Quietest weekday. Friday 5th Dec.	84	vehicles

TABLE 4				
Jaeger Road Entrance				
	Inbound	Outbound	Total	Average
Weekday	474	492	966	193
Weekend	91	98	189	95
Combined	565	590	1155	165
AM Peak (two way) combined.			111	
PM Peak			100	
% Heavy / commercial vehicles			5.00%	
Busiest weekday. Tuesday 2nd Dec.			247	vehicles
Quietest weekday. Friday 5th Dec.			176	vehicles

5. CONCLUSION

We stand by our request to the public meeting that the application not be approved in its current form