From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

12/08/2018 9:57:42 PM DA Submission Mailbox Online Submission

12/08/2018



## RE: Mod2018/0327 - 79 Cabbage Tree Road BAYVIEW NSW 2104

This DA should be rejected. This is because the land is considered "Environmentally Sensitive land" according to the SEPP and as such it is classified as "Geo-Tech Hazard" land, Flood Prone Hazard land and in a riparian zone.

In addition this will destroy many of the last standing 100+ year old trees, flora and fauna which should be protected to ensure green-space of this nature exists for future generations.

Under the Department of Planning's recent announcement to invest in greenspace, this particular land should be protected on that basis.

As this is zoned R2 Rural Landscape and Seniors housing it is not allowed under RU2 zoning. A portion of the Department of Plannings fund announced should be allocated to compulsorily repurchase this land and turned into a national park fringe area or high value biodiversity offset area. This is critical to ensure the future of the habitat for 14 threatened species and species who have migrated into this area.

The biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 transition period (6 months from 25 August 2017) has finished and the full act should now apply to any DA which is new or which is old but requesting amendment.

SEPP overrides and outdated land and environment court determinations should not overrule common sense. Its time to think big picture for future generations. There are other ways Seniors Housing can be delivered to the

community without destroying our very special environmental ecosystem that makes Australia the great place to live that it is.

If an applicant tries to use an old or existing DA for a mod (sec96) then they MUST prove that it is still substantially the same development and has not changed to be something else which is not the same anymore in 'essence'.

In the case of Aveo Peninsular Gardens, the big DA/S96 wants to chop down a whole chunk of forest near their border with Cabbage Tree Road.

The test would have to be whether the proposal they made, is still substantially the same as the proposal they made back in 1982 when that very old DA was approved. O this basis it should be rejected. Please keep my name email and mobile confidential Thank you.