

Stan Scanlon

Yelgun NSW 2483

— VERBAL SUBMISSION —

"WITHOUT PREJUDICE"

Re : Modification Request for Cultural Events Site, North Byron Parklands, Yelgun (MP09_0028 MOD 4)

- ① MY NAME IS/ ^{IMMEDIATELY} STAN SCANLON, ^{I AM A SOCIAL WELFARE WORKER} A ~~RESIDENT OF~~ ~~HOME~~ ~~8~~ ~~ROAD~~, OUR PROPERTY ~~ADJOINS~~ ~~THE~~ ~~PARKLANDS~~ ~~SITE~~, ~~YELGUN~~, ~~NSW~~.
- ② In addition to my wife's earlier submission I wish to add the following to non compliance issues.

Illegal Fireworks

- ③ In 2014 the Planning Department issued a penalty infringement to SITG 2014 and ^{also} SITG 2015 for breaching noise levels.

- ④ The Department did not however, issue a penalty infringement for exceeding the event shutdown time of 2 a.m., nor did they issue any penalties for the prohibited fireworks ignited in the campground.

- ⑤ Part of the Parklands site and neighbouring properties are categorised as 'catastrophic' in the FNC Bush Fire Risk Management Plan.

- ⑥ Unfortunately, the use of fireworks has become a regular occurrence during festival events, which potentially threaten the lives of patrons, neighbours and the general community.

- ⑦ LAST SUMMER WAS THE HOTTEST SUMMER I CAN RECALL IN ⁴⁰ YEARS AS A RESIDENT

8 Parklands have stated that they cannot control this problem. This is a major concern and one that needs to be addressed and resolved as a matter of urgency.

9 If Parklands cannot stop fireworks from being brought onto the site, it is difficult to imagine how they could control other dangerous or prohibited items from being smuggled into the site.

12 *CONSENT CONDITIONS -*
I object to Parklands extension because they have failed to uphold many of the PAC's consent conditions.

I do not want my family exposed to loud festival music or other associated noise for a further 20 months (4 festivals).

10 I do not want my family's safety to be placed at risk for a further 20 months.

11 For the past 5 years my family's health and safety has been compromised by Parklands development and we strongly object to being exposed to more of the same for a further 20 months.

12 # Sound Proofing was supposed to take place before SIG 2013 as a consent condition, it is now post SIG 2017 - (C16 'd so call C14) & NO sound proofing

We have cooperated with Parklands in an attempt to reach an amicable solution. We have had an endless stream of Parklands architects, engineers, acoustic experts, builders and Parklands personnel constantly in and out of our home. This at times has been an inconvenience and a loss of our privacy.

13

Engineers, acoustic engineers and builders have advised us that the mitigation works could be done, however, it would require a major retrofit. However, they could not guarantee the works would adequately soundproof our home given that the house was built in 1948, is timber and elevated off the ground.

14

The 2016 PAC approved changes to Parklands original noise criteria, i.e. background+.

15

In the MOD 3 application, the proponent states, "it is important to note that the proposed A-weighted limits would result in both events complying with this criterion, while not increasing A-weighted emissions at sensitive receivers." (sec 2.2. Noise Management 5/15)

16

This is NOT correct.

Parklands own noise consultants, ANE, identify that 65dB(A) will **increase** noise levels by 20 Laeq at our residence between 11.00 am and midnight. They also identify an increase of 15 Laeq from 12.00 midnight - 2.00 am.

17

18 This change effectively rendered the 4 year
attenuation assessment process useless and a
complete waste of time, as all the assessments (there
were many) were carried out in accordance with the
original 2012 PAC noise criteria i.e. background+ .

ONE DOESN'T

19 You ~~don't~~ have to be a rocket scientist to know that if
the soundproofing could not be guaranteed to be
effective with the old noise criteria, then it certainly
would not be effective given the increase of noise
approved in MOD 3.

20 It was Parklands, not us, who moved the goal posts.

21 I strongly object to an extension to the current Trial
because my family's health and safety will once again
be put at risk.

22 I REQUEST THE COMMISSIONERS TO READ OUR
WRITTEN SUBMISSION WHICH IS IN MORE DETAIL.

THANK YOU.