From: [redacted]
To: IPCN Enquiries Mailbox
Subject: Objections to Parklands proposal
Date: Friday, 11 January 2019 11:56:17 PM

Hello

This is my response to the state planning document re Parkland proposal in Byron Bay

I am a resident at the edge of the development proposal and I own the house so i am a ratepayer.

I have objected to noise, which seems to be monitored and has improved for 2019 falls festival - will this continue with self monitoring? and no council supervision?

There are some very important areas not being addressed by the State Deponent of Planning.
The DOP has not been seen to monitor or check in during the 5 year trial and may be alarmed at the fire, emergency and policing capacities at the site which they seem to have left to self monitoring by a profit making company.

My big objection is that the local council who we elect has no say in the future of the development once it is granted permanence.Yet we will pick up the bill if there is a major problem with sewerage contamination, we will personally be threatened by fire staring on the site and our pristine environment will be a dumped on and washed into our backyard and ocean.

Initially in the proposal , there was a sewerage treatment works and just a few permanent buildings and a couple of festivals in this development application to state'
The numbers of festivals, days and permanent accommodation have increased double or treble and the promise of sewerage treatment works on site has been changed to "innovative" treatment including spraying the waste on fields after treatment with chlorine.
The is no record of the health department being involved with this major health issue which any other tourist facility would need to cover

as residents we need
- supervision of health department for the "innovation" in toilet waste treatment
- The local council to provide all supervision and planning from now on - it is not ok for Parklands to monitor itself
- a clear definition and monitoring of use of the permanent development - since it has gone this far under "culturally significant site"

The development proposal has gone from a camping festival site to a tourist site with a permanent entertainment venue/bar which seems a sneaky way to put through a high profit tourist development by bypassing the local council under the banner of cultural significance

The site is culturally significant to aboriginal people and there is no consultation about what is sacred on the site nor guarantee how big the tourist facility will become and what it is used for ? Not a casino we hope?

It is also significant as a corridor of vegetation to the ocean for animals and especially a known koala habitat. Residents nearby hear them at night

I would prefer if the whole festival was moved to another site for a commercial company to make profit in a more suitable place and not treat the nearby residents to composing sewerage being sprayed in the tens of thousands of litres from a population that is double the population of the whole shire - so they make money at our expense

Victoria Childa
[redacted], North Ocean Shores