

**CENTRAL COAST COUNCIL**

Division .....

**Received 11 JUL 2023**

File No .....

Doc ID .....

126 Main Street

Penguin

Tasmania

7316

Phone 0408556592

[janeenlillas@gmail.com](mailto:janeenlillas@gmail.com)

9/7/2023

I wish to make a representation regarding the proposed development at 6 Johnsons Beach Road, Penguin. As I understand it, LPS 2022003 refers to the amendment of use from caravan park to a facility featuring short to term holiday apartments with a café/restaurant and function centre.

I also understand that DA22107 refers to the specifics of the demolishing of existing structures and construction of new facilities.

On LPS 2022003, am very concerned that the caravan facility is being removed entirely as Penguin has signage encouraging van use. It's the perfect spot for caravans, small cottages and tent campers. It has become a location that low-income people have been able to afford to live and any change in that seems heartless. What responsibility does the council have for these people? I think there is a responsibility that a community can support a reasonable amount of itinerant or low-income families. The Penguin community Op shop is an amazing example of the support given by the community. Where do you think the people living in cars/vans should reside? Are you offering your driveways? The caravan park definitely needs an upgrade, and that would draw people to using it. At the moment, the owners have let it become very run down; probably intentionally and national reviews are bad. The viability of this type of holiday accommodation is very questionable in Wintertime. Tourists aren't seeking the beach in 3 out of 4 seasons in Tasmania.

I also think that with the construction of the coastal bike path we need to consider that biking holidays of the North West could be a tourist drawcard. Where will these people be able to camp if the caravan park is gone? The Penguin/Cradle Trail starts in Penguin and many hikers come with expectations to camp their way. A coastal town like Penguin definitely needs a campground of its own. The current owners bought it as a campground, and it should stay as a campground.

I have major reservations regarding aspects of the development outlined in DA22107, namely: Under item 29.4, Development Standards for Buildings and Work, section 29.4.1 A1 states clearly that "Building height must not be more than 10 metres".

The plans submitted clearly show that the proposed four story, 40-unit apartment block has a maximum height of 16.55 metres. The developers appear to be claiming an exemption to this regulation using the argument that as the proposed building is near sea level, its height will appear no more than a two-storey house across Preservation Drive and 4 metres higher in elevation. They also claim that the siting of said apartment block next to a tall rocky outcrop will lessen the impact of this structure than if it were in a more exposed location such as the commercial centre of Penguin on Main Street.

To claim that a tall building is no higher than a shorter building in an elevated location seems rather facile. As if a ten-storey structure is no higher (above sea level) than a one storey structure at a 20-metre higher location.

Additionally, my other concern is that if an exemption to planning regulations is made for this development, then assurances that it will only apply to this development on land zoned Open Space and that it will not apply to land zoned Residential or Commercial fail to impress.

I feel that once a 16-metre-high structure is permitted anywhere in Penguin then it will serve as a precedent to pressure the local council to permit structures of this height or even higher in other areas of the town.

Another concern is that the access road is not designed for this type of traffic. It's a public road and used by beach goers, dog walkers, picnickers, skate park enthusiasts, boaters etc. The amount of traffic on this minor road will be beyond its design. I think the project should access their Development off the main road like the new Vineyard in Penguin does. I would be very angry increased traffic meant that the community who access the beach, are disadvantaged with extra fencing and less parking, which has already been reduced due the bike path.

I expect the same rules with apply with the distance to the fence that Tasrail demand for new projects. I expect the same standards as the rest of the community must endure otherwise it is discriminatory. The plan does not show the fencing between the park and the railway line. Watcombe Beach has approx. a 10 m buffer between railway line and fence, and this proposal should have the same standard applied.

Another concern is that the access road is not designed for this type of traffic. It's a public road and used by beach goers, dog walkers, picnickers, skate park enthusiasts, boaters etc. The amount of traffic on this minor road will be beyond its design. I think the project should access their Development off the main road like the new Vineyard in Penguin does. I would be very angry increased traffic meant that the community who access the beach, are disadvantaged with extra fencing and less parking, which has already been reduced due the bike path.

I expect the same rules with apply with the distance to the fence that Tasrails demand for new projects. I expect the same standards as the rest of the community have to endure otherwise it is discriminatory. The plan does not show the fencing between the park and the railway line. Watcombe Beach has approx. a 10 m buffer between railway line and fence, and this proposal should have the same standard applied.

I am very aware that the Caravan Park in the previous years have illegally reclaimed extra land and in doing so have destroyed natural coastline and Penguin habitats. That a council that allowed this to go ahead without penalty doesn't fill me with great hopes that the right thing will be done to our precious coastline and lifestyle. People taking photos of the illegal landfill were verbally threatened not to make a fuss. I can only hope that the council of today are not being intimidated into accepting this proposal in its entirety and will consider the greater good for the community and its beautiful natural assets. Already the advertising that is in tourists brochures and on buildings shows outdated pictures of the Penguin coastlines. Let this be a chance to demand better of the people wanting to change the relaxed Penguin atmosphere into a mini Gold Coast.

*J.M. Lillas*