

Questions in response to the Draft Master Plan for the Dalmeny Bush

To Eurobodalla Shire Council,
Can you please provide further information on:

1. **The consultation process**
2. **Ongoing costs**
3. **Sewage**
4. **Loss of open space for recreation**
5. **Traffic**
6. **Waterways**
7. **Habitat**

Current Dalmeny population:

2021 census = 2194 permanent residents

Additional

480 lots @ 2.5 /dwelling = 1200 residents

300 lots @ 2.5 / dwelling = 750 residents

For comparison: The Dalmeny Campground has a capacity of 600 people

- locals know what impact this many extra people has on our village over Christmas

Community Consultation- will ESC listen?

1. Will ESC commit to contacting all non-resident ratepayers to inform them of this Draft Master Plan as soon as possible?
2. The ESC webpage on the Dalmeny Bush states that "*We are refining the draft masterplan for public exhibition, but we expect it to be very similar*".
Is ESC open to making changes to the Draft Master Plan as a result of community consultation prior to Public Exhibition and after? What are the limitations on changes ESC will consider, if any?
3. Can ESC demonstrate any ways that the feedback received from the community, listed on the Community Engagement [webpage](#), has been used in the making of this Draft? For example feedback about loss of access to walking tracks, concerns for wildlife, about traffic increasing on quiet streets, loss of privacy and amenity, and the need for an upgrade to services to name a few.

ESC Community

Consultation Survey

50% of residents surveyed were generally opposed to the development

Ongoing costs: maintenance, restoration, public services and infrastructure

1. What ongoing costs has ESC budgeted for as a result of the Proposed Dalmeny Development?
 Can the community expect upgrades to local roads leading to the development?
 Upgrades to roads and parking at IGA and Dalmeny beach beach? New public toilets, improved playground and boat ramp facilities? An upgrade to Dalmeny shops opposite IGA? Adequate Child Care places for residents? How will additional need for public school enrollments, GPs, Allied Health services and public transport be catered for?
2. How will any areas of retained bushland, retained trees and riparian zones be managed into the future?
 Who will own them?
 Will provision for restoration works come from ESC or developer contributions? For example restoration works required as a result of any runoff/ sewage overflow issues from the development into Mummaga Lake.
3. Who will be responsible for bush fire management of edges and retained areas?
4. What restoration works does ESC envisage for retained bush, particularly EEC's and wetlands post development?
5. Who will be responsible for bush fire management of edges and retained areas?

Why will maintenance costs increase?

- **Weed control** on bushland edges and in riparian zones- the bushland is currently in good condition and intact. With the construction of new roads and disturbance from development weeds will invade
- **Riparian zones** affected by construction will require restoration works
- **Erosion control**
- **New walking tracks** should be constructed or it is likely residents will make their own, subject to erosion and weed invasion, and these will need restoration works

Sewage

1. Where are ESC planning to locate any additional sewage pumping stations and will this impact existing residents?
2. Can ESC provide more detail on how EEC's and wetlands could be protected during construction of new sewage works and other service infrastructure?
3. Can ESC explain how The Kianga Sewage Treatment Works will be upgraded to cope with the increase in population?

In recent years there have been many more **sewage spills into Mummaga Lake** than the 1 in 5 years prediction because of increasing storm events.

The Treatment Works is designed to cater for 8000 equivalent persons. It currently services around 6,800 permanent residents across Dalmeny, Kianga, North Narooma and Narooma. An additional 1,000 residents will take it to 7,800 equivalent persons - close to its design capacity. During holiday peak periods it will be expected to operate well above capacity.

Loss of open space for recreation and wellbeing

1. The Draft Master Plan has not responded to community requests for the walking tracks close to existing homes to be retained. Can ESC amend the Draft Plan to ensure there is no loss of public open space that can be used for recreation?

Prior to the sale of the area of public land in 2021, residents had access to over 40 hectares of bushland with walking tracks.

There are a variety of walking tracks, including flat, wide paths suitable for a range of ages and abilities, in the bushland area close to existing homes. These are accessible from a number of locations meaning that residents in many parts of Dalmeny had easy access to this public amenity.

This well used and valued area is one of the main 'developable areas' in the Draft Master Plan and would see a net loss of over 40 hectares of open space for residents.

The area proposed for retained public open space on the Draft Master Plan is steep land, with several riparian zones and is unsuitable for bushwalking for most abilities.

Traffic

1. Would the proposed development be built in stages, and if so how would this affect traffic in terms of
 - Additional cars on local roads and construction related traffic i.e. heavy trucks and machinery?
 - Emergency evacuation routes?

We are aware that in the Broulee development, intersections and collector roads that appear on Plans have never actually been built and there is no indication as to when this will occur, which is seriously increasing traffic on local roads including trucks.

2. When does ESC expect Dalmeny to be part of ESC's footpath priority program? Would the increase in traffic on local roads mean that Dalmeny would be provided with safe

footpaths? Currently many locals walk on the road edge on quiet streets however this would become a dangerous situation if the development were approved.

Waterways

1. Has ESC conducted any assessments or studies into how the proposed development may affect Mummaga Lake, since it was revealed that the recent Management Plan for Mummaga failed to consider this?
2. If there becomes a need for clean up or restoration works on Mummaga Lake resulting from the proposed development, who would be responsible for this and would it represent a (potentially onerous) cost to ESC?

such as pollution, excess nutrients or sewage overflow
3. How does ESC plan to monitor the effect of any clearing, development and construction of new roads on the water and habitat quality of catchment area creeks and Mummaga Lake?
4. Have the wetland areas and riparian zones marked on the Draft Master Plan been confirmed by actual surveys? They appear much smaller than in reality and 'developable areas' and proposed roads adjoin and even cover them.
5. Who would have ownership and responsibility for retained riparian and wetland areas into the future? Would this ongoing cost fall on Council? If responsibility would be that of the current land owners, what requirements for ongoing maintenance or restoration would be placed on them and how would ESC enforce this?

Habitat

1. Can Council comment on how the [Yellow-bellied Glider Policy](#) has been applied to this Draft Master Plan?

"In the absence of a Shire-wide policy for the conservation of the Yellow-bellied Glider on the coastal plains of the Eurobodalla, this policy will be used by Council officers to assist in assessing development applications and proposed activities for land on the coastal plains of Eurobodalla Shire containing suitable Yellow-bellied Glider habitat"

Yellow-Bellied Glider policy 2022

In particular:

2. Why are areas known to; comprise core Glider habitat, contain Glider sap trees and provide corridors for Gliders moving from their home den to their sap trees placed within the areas marked as 'developable' in this Plan?

3. How would ESC propose to meet the 'key objectives' of 'retaining existing trees and hollow bearing trees within the developable areas' when Asset Protection Zones require the maintenance of a low fuel area?
4. Given that tree roots are unfavorable for roads, how does ESC propose to retain existing and hollow bearing trees (key objective) near proposed roads, in particular where roads are proposed next to Endangered Ecological Communities?
5. Can ESC show that clearing around EEC's will not endanger them?
6. The large 'developable area' on the former ESC land is where threatened Glossy Black Cockatoos feed on allocasuarina. How does ESC propose to protect this threatened species' habitat?
7. Has ESC examined how any necessary future fire management regime on retained bush areas would affect their habitat value, particularly for the threatened species present?