

S.T. CRELLIN


Tumbi Umbi NSW 2261

28 JUNE 20266

SUBMISSION TO IPC :

RE: MINGARA RECREATION CLUB SENIORS HOUSING, TUMBI UMBI (SSD-63475709)

I write **objecting to approval** of this development as presently presented, despite it seemingly carrying positive recommendations from DPHI.

My first concerns were expressed in a letter of 31 January 2024 to Urbis and Mingara Leisure Group, following attendance at a Community Drop-in Session at Mingara Club on 4 December 2023 that failed to offer a constructive review of the documented proposal that had been furnished to residents of Glengara Retirement Village of which I am part.

In that letter I outlined my initial issues, now summarised as follows:

- insufficient consideration of the five storey 86 room hotel then under construction
- unknown effects of the proposed 112-place childcare centre
- excessive land usage, with increased population and aggravated parking issues
- increasing traffic challenges for both access and egress to site
- mockery of claim to be “nestling the buildings within the landscape”
- traffic congestion at nearby road intersections needing a close review

That disappointment of the December 2023 meeting was expected to be allayed by a further Project Information session for Glengara Residents presented by Urbis and Mingara at our Country Club on 5 February 2024. To the contrary, and despite invitation for prior submission of questions (as illustrated by my above said letter), there was arrogance in dismissing contentious items and reluctance to address particular issues with excuse that an EIS would involve considerable review and additional detail.

And subsequently, the EIS seems rather to gloss over the many negative aspects in order to achieve an unrealistic level of acceptability, relying on “conformity” with regulations where such exist, or claiming that in absence thereof restraint is not desirable or necessary.

A good example of this is the public concern with proposed heights of 6 and 7 storeys for 4 buildings, each higher than the 5 storeys Hotel that already dwarfs the adjacent Club premises. And it seems difficult to accept the DPHI interpretation, (*IPC Meeting 10 June 2026*) that bulk and scale of the development is appropriate and offers sympathetic transition with taller buildings at centre of site looking down to lower two-storey villas at the interface of adjoining one to two-storey residential development and Glengara Retirement Village.

Parking for Athletics Field attendees remains an obvious problem, with major questions re suitable hard and overflow grass parking and locations thereof. And one wonders as to the effect on Mingara Recreation Club members seeking parking at peak times with likely increased walking distances for access. Earlier Consent provisions seem to raise many

questions as to continued validity, but current needs and experienced usage should be the ultimate guide.

Traffic concerns seem to be facing considerable challenge with questions as to veracity of data. Certainly the Public Meeting of 22 June 2026 and the sought “Traffix” response did little to allay concerns earlier expressed by our Glengara resident Kenton Moonr and understood by many who experience the local area on a daily basis.

Big questions remain!

Is this recreational club location, with a quality and well presented synthetis Athletics Track allowing frequent and wide growing usage by the Central Coast communities, the most suitable location for a seniors housing project of this nature and dimension?

Will an approval in present form jeopardise the quality of community life in the years ahead and destroy the present benefits that make Tumbi Umbi a pleasant place in which to live?

Whilst Government desire to increase availability of seniors housing might be well understood and agreed, does this particular Tumbi Umbi area of Central Coast require a facility of this magnitude?

Should an over-riding consideration be paid to all proposals or they be reasonably assessed on merit?

Do we need a further review of EIS findings and DPHI considerations before a final decision is countenanced by IPC?

I do not have the expertise to examine all the individual aspects of this proposal, but there is sufficient doubt in my mind to presently offer anything other than;

OBJECTION!

Thankyou

Stan Crellin