

---

**Sent:** 19/03/2018 2:10:39 PM  
**Subject:** FW: BAYVIEW GOLF CLUB - 95 dwelling apartment proposal  
**Attachments:** Sydney M.docx; March 18.docx;

**From:** Warren Wallamulla [mailto:warrenmoss07@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, 19 March 2018 1:57 PM  
**To:** Council Mailbox  
**Subject:** BAYVIEW GOLF CLUB - 95 dwelling apartment proposal

To whom it may concern,

The following media article is by SMH, and in Pittwater Life magazine in March there is another item on the same topic.

The applicants Bio-diversity expert seems well qualified, but the report ( as described in the Pittwater Life magazine ) is incomplete as it details the " wildlife corridor " thru the Bayview Golf Course only not the " WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT " approach implied by the Chief Government Scientist Report 2016.

It requires a " WHOLE OF GOVT " response, and currently that is NOT being done by " sections of the Northern Beaches Council management team.

The residents listed in the SMH news story are talking about multiple species ( of Native Fauna ) but the story FAILS to provide the " detail " of how much is " sustainable habitat " within the GOLF COURSE SITE and the " SUSTAINABLE HABITAT " .

The " Local Government " may have a Conflict of Interest ? by approving the proposed development by FAILING to provide a " viable " Wildlife Corridor thru Bayview Golf Course ( and then linked into a wider network, because the " sustainable Habitat needs " of native fauna was enhanced by linking fragmented bushland patches together.

The AVEO retirement Centres business was subject to a FAIRFAX + ABC TV Four Corners investigation in 2017, so the need for an increase in the " URBAN DENSITY " in Bayview could be for the " benefit " of the AVEO business model, and a less than adequate " NATIVE FAUNA " management in the Northern Beaches area, with the example of a REFUSAL to support a SUSTAINABLE RECOVERY of the LISTED POPULATION of Koala ( in Pittwater ) that is in reality EXTINCT, despite the Former NSW PLANNING MINISTER, agreeing that the example of the Victorian Govt's 70 years plus expertise in Trans-location of Koalas has assisted in a " almost total extinction in Mainland Victoria " being changed to multiple " recovery sites " of living Koala Populations, and a STATE that does not have a " Threatened with extinction Listing " .

or a STATE GOVERNMENT that still is seeking to allow " clearing of private lands with Koala Populations " , that was assessed by NSW Land and Environment Court as " invalid " .

# Sydney's northern beaches divided over proposed retirement village on golf course

By Andrew Taylor

16 January 2018 — 5:17pm

- [Share on Facebook](#)
- [Share on Twitter](#)
- [Send via Email](#)

Normal text size Larger text size Very large text size

30

[View all comments](#)

The tree-lined fairways of Bayview golf course are usually peaceful except for the sound of woods and irons hitting golf balls.

But a proposal to build a retirement village on part of the golf course on Sydney's northern beaches has put Bayview Golf Club on a collision course with its neighbours.

An artist's impression of the proposed retirement village on Bayview golf course. A spokesman for residents opposed to the development, Christopher Fletcher, said it would destroy an important wildlife corridor.

"Apart from a wide variety of flora, there are at least eight species native to the site listed as endangered or vulnerable including the powerful owl, black cockatoo and [a] microbat colony," he said.

Christopher Fletcher with other residents opposed to the proposed retirement village.

*Photo: Wolter Peeters*

The \$84 million development submitted by Waterbrook Bayview Pty Ltd proposes seven buildings up to four storeys high housing 95 apartments plus basement parking for 186 cars off Cabbage Tree Road in Bayview.

The retirement village, which is intended to be built on land sold by the golf club for \$10 million, also features a cafe, restaurant, winery, hair salon and gym, with nursing services provided to residents.

The proposed development seeks to reconfigure the golf course to accommodate the retirement village and raise sections of the course to improve "playability" and reduce the risk of flood.

It also proposes the removal of more than 150 trees, mitigated by "significant revegetation" of the site.

A retirement village housing 95 apartments has been proposed on part of Bayview golf course on Sydney's northern beaches.

*Photo: Wolter Peeters*

Residents of the retirement village would be given membership of the club, which opened in 1929.

David Stone, the general manager of Bayview Golf Club, said the "real purpose" of the development "is to provide the resources to do things that a not-for-profit northern beaches, locals golf club could not hope to afford".

The powerful owl is one of the species that opponents of the proposed retirement village fear will be affected.

*Photo: Wolter Peeters*

It comes after the club was put in a "fragile financial position" after its board decided in 2007 to build a new clubhouse at a cost of \$7.2 million.

"The decision to divert the club's resources to a new clubhouse, in combination with the financial losses the club incurs annually from lost playing days resulting from inclement weather and poor drainage and floor mitigation, has left it in a fragile financial position," according to the development application.

Mr Stone said the northern beaches had a growing population of people over the age of 65, yet an undersupply of seniors living accommodation – a claim disputed by Mr Fletcher who said the area already had a number of aged-care facilities.

Mr Fletcher also said the development should be knocked back because the area's "existing infrastructure is already at breaking point".

An online petition calling on the NSW Planning Minister, Anthony Roberts, to ban development on the site to protect vulnerable species has attracted more than 3500 signatures.

A letter attached to the petition and addressed to Mr Roberts and two of his ministerial colleagues states: "There are no benefits at all for the local community, other than a financial benefit for the private golf club members."

A website created by opponents states the golf course is the wrong place to build a retirement village: "The Liberals' one-size-fits-all approach to planning the growth of our city fails to take into account the unique character of areas like Bayview.

"We need a planning system that allows these unique areas to flourish with appropriate development, without being lost in a sea of high-rise apartments."

The proposed retirement village has been plagued with controversy – the NSW Department of Planning and Environment refused to give the development the green light in 2015 because of issues associated with building design, flooding and ecology.

A revised proposal, which reduced building heights and the number of apartments as well as taking account of environmental concerns was approved by the DPE in 2016, which issued a site compatibility certificate under the State Environmental Planning Policy for Seniors Housing.

The Liberal member for Pittwater, Education Minister Rob Stokes, expressed concerns about the proposed development in 2017, telling the *Manly Daily*: "It is not an appropriate place for multistorey residential apartment buildings." However, Mr Stokes, a former planning minister, said in a statement to the *Herald* that he expected concerns about the development to be "carefully examined".

"Whilst a number of changes have been made since the original proposal, I appreciate that concerns remain regarding the placement and height of the proposed buildings," he said.

The development application is on public exhibition until February 12. It will be assessed by Northern Beaches Council, which will provide a report with recommendations to the Sydney North Planning Panel.

**March 18 - 24, 2018: Issue 352**

## **NSW Government Reintroduces Land-Clearing Law Knowing It Will Accelerate Wildlife Habitat Destruction**

**March 10, 2018: NSW Nature Conservation**

The NSW Nature Conservation condemns the NSW Government's reintroduction of land-clearing laws that the Land and Environment Court ruled invalid last Friday.

"By [waving these laws through a second time](#) without even pausing to consider the consequences, Premier Berejiklian has gone against the wishes of voters and the advice of leading scientists," NCC CEO Kate Smolski said.

"Ms Berejiklian has also squandered an opportunity to give the state's 1000 threatened species a fighting chance of survival.

"The government's action is disappointing but sadly not surprising given its terrible record on the environment and seemingly callous indifference for nature.

"These laws are literally a matter of life and death for native animals and should have been redrafted to include significantly stronger environmental protections before they were introduced.

"The government's own experts have warned 99% of koala habit on private land is left exposed to clearing by these laws and that there would be a spike in tree loss of up to 45%.

"As the state's peak environment organisation, we will continue to do everything we can to expose the damage of land clearing and will not stop until we have laws that give nature the protection it deserves."

Visit: [Berejiklian Government Allows Open Slather On Wildlife](#) by Sue Arnold This week's Issue

## **Nominating A Species, Ecological Community Or Key Threatening Process Under The EPBC Act**

Any person may nominate a native species, ecological community or threatening process for listing under any of the categories specified in the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act).

### **[Nomination and listing process](#)**

An overview of the nomination and listing process is provided in the nomination process flowchart.

**An invitation to nominate is extended by the Minister each year ahead of a new assessment cycle.** Nominations submitted within the advertised invitation period and that satisfy the EPBC Regulations are forwarded to the Threatened Species Scientific Committee (the Committee), who prepare a Proposed Priority Assessment List (PPAL) of nominations for consideration by the Minister. The PPAL may include species that are nominated by states and territories through the common assessment method process.

Developing the proposed priority assessment list of nominations

The Minister considers the PPAL developed by the Committee and may make changes. The Finalised Priority Assessment List (FPAL) is published on this website and nominators will be notified of the outcome.

Nominations included in the FPAL are assessed by the Committee within the timeframe set by the Minister. The Committee will invite public and expert comment on these nominations during the assessment period.

#### [Finalised priority assessment lists](#)

Comment on nominations

The Committee's advice is forwarded to the Minister, who decides whether the species, ecological community or key threatening process is eligible for listing under the EPBC Act.

For a comprehensive understanding of the provisions relating to nominations and listing, please refer directly to the EPBC Act and Regulations.

Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999

Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Regulations 2000

#### [Making a nomination](#)

Nominations are now invited for threatened species, threatened ecological communities or key threatening processes to be considered for listing under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999. **Nominations may be submitted until 5 pm on Friday 30 March 2018.** For further information regarding the call for nominations, email [EPBC.nominations@environment.gov.au](mailto:EPBC.nominations@environment.gov.au). The priorities for assessment will be determined in July 2018, and the assessment period for the prioritised nominations will commence 1 October 2018.

#### **Before submitting a nomination**

Please note and use the nomination forms and guidelines provided [here](#). Before you submit a nomination for a species, ecological community or key threatening process, please check to see if it is 1) already listed on a current EPBC Act list, 2) currently under assessment, 3) previously assessed and found to be ineligible, 4) data deficient species, 5) removed from the EPBC Act lists, 6) not prioritised for assessment or 7) disallowed from the EPBC Act lists. For ecological community nominations also refer to the list of potential gaps in national protection identified in the report of the National Threatened Ecological Communities Strategic Workshop