



# Byron Shire Council

## Housing Options Paper Engagement Report

December 2023

## Acknowledgment of country

In the preparation of this document, Locale Consulting acknowledges and pays respects to the Bundjalung of Byron Bay – Arakwal People as Traditional Custodians of the land within Byron Shire, and form part of the wider Aboriginal nation known as the Bundjalung. In addition, Locale Consulting acknowledges and respects the Widjabal and Mindjungbul people as Traditional Custodians within the Byron Shire. Locale Consulting acknowledges the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people who now reside within this area.

localé consulting

T 0419 700 401  
A 1/27 River Street Woolgoolga NSW 2456  
P PO Box 53 Woolgoolga NSW 2456  
E [info@localeconsulting.com.au](mailto:info@localeconsulting.com.au)  
W [www.localeconsulting.com.au](http://www.localeconsulting.com.au)  
ABN 73 140 973 735

### Document Control

Job Number: 2023/795  
Job Name: Housing Options Paper  
Client: Byron Shire Council  
Job Contact: Sharyn French – Manager Environmental and Economic Planning  
Document Name: Housing Options Paper - Engagement Report

Version	Date	Author	Reviewer	Approved
1	29.11.23	Emma Broomfield	Cinnamon Dunsford / Steve Thompson	Emma Broomfield
2	01.12.23	Emma Broomfield	Emma Broomfield	Emma Broomfield

### Disclaimer:

Whilst care and diligence has been exercised in the preparation of this report, Locale Consulting Pty Ltd does not warrant the accuracy of the information contained within and accepts no liability for any loss or damage that may be suffered as a result of reliance on this information, whether or not there has been any error, omission or negligence on the part of Locale Consulting Pty Ltd, their employees or sub-contractors.

# Contents

Executive summary	4
1. Introduction	5
2. Information sessions	6
3. Written submissions	9
4. Next steps	33

# Executive summary

The Housing Options Paper was publicly exhibited between 9 October to 6 November 2023 (inclusive).

Locale Consulting was engaged by Council to assist with the delivery of a range of engagement activities during and following the exhibition period including the preparation of this engagement report. The activities included presentations to Council committees, facilitation of a series of information sessions and review of the written submissions.

This report documents the feedback received through these engagement activities and provides a high-level summary of this feedback to highlight key themes, as well as the different perspectives and views of different communities within Byron Shire.

Overall, 286 submissions were received during the exhibition period and around 85 people attended the four information sessions held across the Byron Shire. Generally, there was broad acceptance that Council needs to provide for diverse housing options to meet the needs of the community. However, the level of acceptance for the extent of proposed change and how that housing should be delivered (i.e. by greater density by infill, release of new land or development of existing residential zoned land) was subject to a wide range of viewpoints which varied from locality to locality.

Despite these varying perspectives, the feedback identified the following core themes:

- The need to ensure any future housing is safe for existing and future residents
- The desire to incorporate more options for housing on rural land as a means to meet the Shire's housing needs
- The capacity of current infrastructure and the importance of planning for, and funding, future infrastructure upgrades to support future growth
- The desire to focus on affordable housing options and to support the delivery of more social housing in the Shire
- The support for more housing options within the Byron Bay CBD, particularly for key workers including creating consistency in heights controls
- The importance of providing Aboriginal people opportunities to live on country
- The need to balance growth with the impact on the natural environment and the liveability and amenity of towns and villages
- The desire to preserve the character and identity of existing towns and villages, and ensure the proposed reduction in the minimum lot size does not compromise this character
- The need to balance urban expansion in significant farmland with food security
- The need to consider the implications of the change to the short-term rental accommodation rules

Specific feedback was received on the areas to be removed, retained and proposed as investigation areas (both in support and in opposition of including these sites for future housing) including the three sites proposed in the Draft Northern Rivers Resilient Land Strategy. Additional sites were also nominated by landowners as being suitable for future housing.

This report will inform Council in the next steps of the refresh of the Residential Strategy.

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Overview of engagement activities

Locale Consulting has been engaged by Byron Shire Council (Council) to deliver a range of engagement activities during the public exhibition of the Housing Options Paper. This includes:

- Presenting to the Byron Centre Town Centre Master Plan Committee and the Housing and Affordability Advisory Committee
- Delivering a series of information sessions
- Reviewing and collating written submissions to highlight the main themes

## 1.2 Our role

In undertaking these engagement activities, our role has been to listen and document the views of the community and to report on these to Council for consideration in its decision-making process. We have not undertaken a review of the merits of the submissions nor does this report make any recommendations to Council about how the Housing Options Paper should progress.

## 1.3 Council's role

Council staff have assisted with the logistics of the engagement activities including:

- Establishing and updating the Your Say page
- Inviting feedback on the Housing Options Paper via its website from 9 October to 6 November 2023
- Communicating about the Housing Options Paper via its communication and social media channels
- Answering questions from landowners and members of the public through the project support team
- Collating written submissions for reporting to Council

## 1.4 Report purpose

This report documents the feedback received through the engagement activities and provides a high-level summary of this feedback to highlight any key themes and views by locality. This report will inform Council in the next steps of the refresh of the Residential Strategy.

## 2. Information sessions

### 2.1 Overview

A total of four information sessions were held during the exhibition period in order to provide information about the Housing Options Paper. This included:

1. Monday, 30 October 2023 – 5.15pm to 6.30pm – Bangalow
2. Monday, 30 October 2023 – 7.15pm to 8.30pm – Byron Bay
3. Tuesday, 31 October 2023 – 5.15pm to 6.30pm – Brunswick Heads
4. Tuesday, 31 October 2023 – 7.15pm to 8.30pm – Mullumbimby

The primary purpose of the sessions was to inform members of the public about the proposed changes. This included a presentation outlining the changes (a copy of which is attached at Appendix A) and a facilitated question and answer session. People could also submit questions online via a QR or via an iPad. People were also invited to provide feedback by locality using feedback frames. Given the lower response rate, this data is not considered robust. In total, around 85 people attended the sessions.

### 2.2 Bangalow

Around 25 people attended the information session in Bangalow. Below is a list of questions asked at the session:

1. Is there an infrastructure review for Bangalow?
2. Will the review cover other infrastructure (e.g. internet / schools)?
3. Does this process include the proposed changes to the B2 zone?
4. What is the timing of the master plans? Will the masterplan process deal with infrastructure needs such as drainage and flood mitigation?
5. Why is Bangalow being asked to shoulder such an excessive amount of housing?
6. Why are there no boundaries for the Northern Rivers Resilient Lands Strategy sites?
7. How does higher density impact heritage?

### 2.3 Byron Bay

Around 7 people attended the information session in Byron Bay. Below is a list of questions asked at the session:

1. Why is Council's housing target bigger than the NSW Government target?
2. Will the deferred matter e-zones be addressed through this process?
3. What is the process for considering environmental impacts when land is rezoned?
4. What are the impacts of the STRA caps on housing?
5. Are the three sites in the Council resolution on the maps? Are they open to consultation?
6. What is happening with infrastructure and knowing whether it will meet future demand?
7. Has there been any consideration of tourism needs?
8. What about affordable housing? Can the NSW Government policy be changed so it is provided in perpetuity?

## 2.4 Brunswick Heads

Around 25 people attended the information session in Brunswick Heads. Below is a list of questions asked at the session:

1. Why is the park and Corso area near Bayside included as a potential investigation area?
2. How will access be provided to the Tyagarah site?
3. When will the community have an opportunity to provide feedback on the Tyagarah site?
4. How did Council come up with a figure that is higher than the NSW Government housing target?
5. Why is there so much infill development in flood prone areas in South Golden Beach, Ocean Shores and New Brighton?
6. If land is developed for dual occupancy, can each site then have a granny flat?
7. With the change in minimum lot size, will there also be a change in floor space ratio, open space and other development standards?
8. Is there any flexibility in the Housing Options Paper given Council has resolved to exceed the NSW Government targets?
9. What does "short-term" delivery mean for the B1 site?
10. Is the Saddle Road development included in the housing numbers? And how will access to the site be provided?
11. Why is the north of the LGA taking a disproportionate amount of housing?
12. Will "expanded dwellings" be included in living differently?
13. How is vacant land developed?
14. Is there a priority list of housing people impacted by floods or fires?
15. How will the change in minimum lot size respect the local character of Brunswick Heads?
16. Will 600m<sup>2</sup> lots able to be developed for low rise medium density? If so, where?

## 2.5 Mullumbimby

Around 25 people attended the information session in Mullumbimby. Below is a list of questions asked at the session:

1. What is a "house" or "home"? Does it include tiny homes or caravans?
2. How will the aspirations of "living differently" align with the definition of a dwelling?
3. What is the process for the development of housing on rural land?
4. Can a new village be created that is on a hill and is on mapped farmland, given the proposed sites in the Draft Northern Rivers Resilient Land Strategy?
5. Will Area 8 be considered for future housing given it floods?
6. What is the plan for providing infrastructure to support new housing (e.g. drinking water, roads and car parking)?
7. How will housing be "safe" if it is on a floodplain?
8. When will the updated flood study for Mullumbimby be released?
9. What will happen with improving the existing drainage infrastructure at Ann / New City Street?
10. Why is the Mullumbimby land the only area identified for potential urban conversion?
11. Will the urban conversion area include subdivision and dual occupancy?

## **2.6 Online questions**

The following questions were submitted online:

1. How will Council ensure adequate housing for key workers?
2. Has any of the housing been zoned to be used for affordable or social housing?
3. Will Council look at sewerage infrastructure for Mullumbimby for infill and other areas (as the system needs upgrading and overflows in flood events)?
4. What does “infill” mean?

The questions raised at the information session or submitted online were responded to by Council staff in each session.



## 3. Written submissions

### 3.1 Overview

During the exhibition period, people could make a submission on the Housing Options Paper via Council's Your Say page. A total of 286 written submissions were received during this period including one from the Department of Planning & Environment.

In reviewing the submissions, we identified:

- the key themes arising from the submissions
- the key themes for each locality
- any specific feedback on sites identified in the Housing Options Paper
- any specific feedback on sites identified for consideration by Council's resolution
- any requests to include additional sites in the future Residential Strategy

The main topics identified in the submissions have been summarised below including:

- submissions from agencies
- feedback on the options in the Housing Options Paper
- feedback by locality including specific sites

Overall, the diversity in the submissions reflects the complexity of the issue and that the proposed changes impact people and localities in different ways.

### 3.2 Submissions from agencies

A submission was received from the Department of Planning & Environment. The submission commends Council on revisiting its strategy approach to deliver housing and strongly encourages it to pursue options within the existing planning framework which will help increase housing supply and ensure Council fulfils its commitments to the Minister for Planning. In particular, the submission notes:

- The refreshed Residential Strategy must be consistent with all relevant State planning policies, plans and directions. Any inconsistencies will need to be justified and documented.
- The Strategy should also incorporate options to increase housing supply and diversity that help support community needs. This includes caravan parks and manufactured housing estates.
- The Strategy should plan for increased density within the existing urban growth boundary to meet the infill targets in the North Coast Regional Plan 2041. This will be critical to establishing new release areas on important farmland.
- Any new investigation areas outside the existing urban growth boundary must be hazard-free and be assessed against the State Guidelines for suitability. Density in these areas must be maximised.
- The Strategy must include a staging and sequencing plan and monitoring program.
- The Strategy should identify key infrastructure works required to support growth as well as further infrastructure servicing strategies that are needed to support future planning proposals.

- The Strategy should recognise recent changes to short-term rental accommodation rules and the impacts this will have on future housing supply, and Council should consider whether certain forms of tourist and visitor accommodation are appropriate in some residential areas to support tourism.
- The Strategy should include an evidence base.
- Consultation with the State agencies should be undertaken before finalising the Strategy refresh.

### **3.3 Feedback on options for way forward**

#### **General**

##### **Policy directions and outcomes**

Multiple submissions noted that they understood the housing situation in the Byron Shire and the need to take action to develop new housing including medium-density options. Generally, there was support for new housing in areas that are flood-free, close to bike trails or the rail trail, close to towns, eco-village structures, with community space and that are family-friendly.

On the other hand, multiple submissions were also received opposing any more housing, with concern that creating more housing will not address the affordability problem in the Shire and that growth conflicts with respecting the character of existing towns and villages. Others submitted that the options have not been comprehensively assessed and therefore cannot be supported, and some felt that there needed to be more consultation about any proposed height increases and a focus on community-led solutions.

##### **Housing targets**

Multiple submissions made specific comments on the housing targets in the Housing Options Paper, in particular noting concern that Council's preferred way forward significantly exceeds the NSW Government target. Some did not agree with Council exceeding the NSW Government target by such a significant amount and submitted the imposed growth targets lacked research and analysis. It was also noted that Council has already supplied more housing than required in the past and the Shire is already above the NSW 10-year average population increase.

Others felt Council's housing target should be reduced to align with infrastructure capacity and that Council should push back on, or reject, the NSW Government housing targets - with a more realistic target being set that reflects the unique nature of the area and potential impacts on the environment and wellbeing.

It was noted it would be helpful to have:

- the total of current number of homes in each locality along with the number of proposed new homes
- details about the assumptions underlying the projected housing numbers
- maps with street names

## Floods

Multiple submissions raised concerns about further fill or housing development on the floodplain, with concerns about how this would impact existing and future residents. It was also felt that the Housing Options Paper does not adequately consider the lessons from the 2022 floods in particular the recommendations in the *2022 NSW Independent Flood Inquiry* and Council's own *After The Floods: Settlement Discussion Paper*.

It was noted that *Floodplain Risk Management Study* needs to be updated with the 2022 flood data levels. It was submitted that any residential development already approved should be reassessed using the 2022 flood data and that there needs to be clarity on how Council's development approval process will be tailored to make approvals contingent on the suitability of the house for the block particularly for flood-prone land.

A number of submissions also identified the need to prioritise housing for flood-impacted people.

## Housing in rural areas

Multiple submissions noted that consideration should be given to the rezoning of rural land to create additional housing supply. This includes:

- innovative co-living arrangements
- alternative housing options (e.g. tiny houses, share houses)
- exploring how small neighbourhood centres could be created within rural areas
- considering the development of one or more new towns
- creating more housing in existing village areas such as Billinudgel, Federal and Ewingsdale
- more terrace style, shop-top and other medium-density housing along the rail trail. Three potential areas between Mullumbimby and Byron were suggested as being suitable:
  - End of Quarry Lane, Ewingsdale
  - 70 Foxes Lane, Tyagarah
  - Dingo Lane/Mcauleys Lane, Myocum
- Council owned and operated tiny villages (similar to existing pod sites) to provide affordable housing at the following locations:
  - Myocum north of Possum Shoot
  - North of Mullum along rail trail
  - Main Arm Road towards Durrumbul
  - Left Bank Road

It was also submitted that the contribution of rural residential housing (other than R5) should be clearer, with a link to the *Rural Land Use Strategy*.

## Infrastructure

Multiple submissions queried whether there is sufficient infrastructure capacity to support the projected housing growth, with particular concern about how infrastructure upgrades will be funded. There is specific concern for:

- sewer infrastructure capacity (e.g. sewerage treatment plants)
- water supply capacity
- stormwater system capacity

- road network capacity
- provision of car parking and public transport

It was suggested that the transport strategy should be adopted concurrently with the refreshed Residential Strategy.

Comments were also received that any infrastructure options such as water supply and sewer should not punish the environment (e.g. problems created by West Byron STP), with new homes being required to have passive solar, water tanks and solar panels to reduce impact on infrastructure in the future.

### **Affordable housing**

Multiple submissions made comments about the importance of the supply of affordable and social housing and submitted that this should be a focus of the refresh of the Residential Strategy. Concern was expressed about whether any new housing would be affordable particularly given land values. Others noted that there is no social housing in the Housing Options Paper and it is unclear how many homes will be rental and to buy housing aimed at the lower end of the market including those with very low incomes. In particular, suggestions were made that:

- A percentage of any new housing supply should be social housing or affordable housing
- New subdivisions should have a minimum of 30% affordable housing contribution
- The Affordable Housing Contributions Scheme should be extended to include new release areas and increased infill areas in Brunswick Heads, Ocean Shores and Myocum
- The development of Council's land is the only way to ensure affordable housing (e.g. model used by Ballina to develop housing)
- Council should advocate to the NSW Government for more public housing
- There must be a focus on housing for essential workers and volunteers

### **Living on Country**

Multiple submissions noted that the Residential Strategy should include consideration of housing for local Aboriginal people as a matter of priority including:

- actions about how Arakwal people can access affordable land and housing particularly additional areas on the East of the Pacific Highway and in the proposed Saddle Road precinct
- need for consultation with Minjungbal people and Native Title holders in the area

### **Environment**

Multiple submissions raised concern about the impact of future housing growth on the natural environment and biodiversity of the Shire. It was noted that the environment is highly valued by those who live in the area and should be protected.

Others noted that the Housing Options Paper does not adequately consider climate change risk and sea-level rise and how this will impact the location of housing in the future. It was felt that there was a need to focus on public awareness about climate change risks and potential hazards.

It was submitted that the Housing Options Paper should be delayed until the NSW Parliamentary Inquiry into the planning system and the impacts of climate change on the environment and communities has been completed.

## Short-term rental accommodation

Multiple submissions made comments about short-term rental accommodation (STRA) and the need to consider the impacts of tourism more generally in the refresh of the Residential Strategy. In particular, this included:

- the Housing Options Paper does not consider the supply of housing to be returned to permanent housing after September 2024 when the new STRA rules start
- Council should ensure any new homes are not converted to STRA including prohibiting STRA in new subdivisions
- Council should audit the use of granny flats to ensure these are not being used for STRA

## Infill

There was mixed feedback about the options relating to infill development. It was noted that Council's assumptions underlying Option 1B need to be spelt out.

Multiple submissions supported the reduction of the minimum lot size to create a mix of housing that better meets people's housing needs including affordability. This includes more one and two-bedroom homes near amenities. There was also support for greater density subject to infrastructure being upgraded to deal with additional demand.

However, other submissions raised concerns that some communities are already at capacity and that the existing character and identity of villages should be respected. It was submitted that reducing the minimum lot size and increasing building heights would not maintain the local character of neighbourhoods and adversely affect amenity.

Specific concerns were raised about:

- increased stormwater runoff from smaller lots and implications for managing stormwater and flooding impact.
- smaller lot sizes, and the creation of apartment-style living, would create "Gold Coast slums" and destroy the natural environment and current way of life, with negative outcomes for people's wellbeing.
- the need to undertake a detailed infrastructure analysis to confirm capacity.
- established homes that have not been designed for infill (e.g. granny flat boom has resulted in noise and parking issues) and that consideration needs to be given to Council's efforts in recent years to increase infill through granny flat development.

## New release

There was mixed feedback about options relating to new release.

Multiple submissions stated support for new investigation areas for housing especially in flood-free areas, areas that are already cleared, are near the rail-trail or close to town. It was noted that there was a preference to create new villages rather than densify existing ones.

However, other submissions were opposed to the use of farmland for housing particularly in Brunswick Heads, Bangalow and Billinudgel or submitted that any use of significant farmland should be very limited, with additional planning controls being developed by Council before rezoning proceeds. It was noted that this land was important for future food security.

Some raised concerns that the proposed investigation areas have not adequately considered constraints and more information is needed about the position of the NSW Government agencies.

Others raised concerns about the development of rural land for multiple occupancies and noted that conversion to community title has been a way to subvert the *Rural Land Use Strategy* and that any more residential development on RU1 and RU2 land should be stopped, other than where there is an existing dwelling. This will help preserve the agricultural capacity of the land.

Others submitted any new subdivisions must:

- Prohibit dogs and cats
- Provide adequate wildlife corridors
- Manage all stormwater and runoff

## **Vacant land**

Several submissions were received about the options for vacant land. There was general support for this option, with particular support for increasing densities on existing zoned vacant land. It was also noted that any increase in density requires detailed consideration of land capability and impacts.

## **Living differently**

Multiple submissions were received in general support of this option with feedback that more information is needed to fully understand this option, particularly incentives. Comments were made that Council should:

- Provide incentives and guidance for living differently including splitting existing homes into a secondary dwelling
- Include granny flats as a way forward
- Acknowledge and explore living in vans / sleeping in cars as a valid low footprint way of living and consider creating designating areas for this type of living
- Consider how to change existing rules to increase underutilised homes and to enable people to age in place
- Re-install the train to provide more options
- Include options to encourage more affordable housing
- Better use existing community assets and buildings
- Consider houseboats, caravans and tiny homes as an option
- Create a house matching service
- Consider new solutions such as a community land trust and rent-to-buy options
- Consider new construction modes such as pre-fabricated, modular homes
- Consider pavilion homes where the kitchen and laundry are communal
- Focus on innovative housing for lower-income groups that are at risk of being marginalised by increasing housing prices
- Encourage the adoption of resilient building codes to future proof housing

Several submissions also noted that this option suggests the way we are living now is inappropriate. Concern was also raised that increasing density by turning a single-family house into a home for multiple residents will not enable Council to capture additional rates for demands on infrastructure. Others noted that it will be difficult to create dual-key housing and ensure that it is not used for STRA.

### 3.4 Feedback by locality - Mullumbimby

#### General

Around 100 submissions related to the proposed changes in Mullumbimby. This included a submission from the Mullumbimby Progress Association. Many of these submissions were about specific sites in the Housing Options Paper, with other submissions providing more general feedback.

A strong focus of the submissions was the need to prioritise the safety of residents and create housing on land that is hazard-free. Others noted the poor condition of the town's infrastructure and raised concerns about its capacity to cope with future growth. Others raised the need to protect the identity and character of the town.

In summary, the feedback primarily related to two key issues:

#### 1. New housing must be safe

Many submissions were opposed to any filling or further housing development on floodplains and in flood-prone areas. Concern was raised that many of the proposed investigation areas are extremely flood-prone and should not be developed for housing. It was noted that people are still traumatised from the 2022 flood events and do not want to see the mistakes of the past repeated for existing or new residents.

Other submissions noted that there is still no updated flood study for Mullumbimby that takes into account the 2022 floods and the *North Byron Floodplain Risk Management Study 2020* is out of date. This is considered essential to understand where will be safe for future housing. It was submitted that housing should be established on land which was not impacted by the 2022 floods and the 2100 flood planning level should be applied to proposed infill areas.

Other submissions noted that there should be no more houses until Council has cleaned out the rivers and drains, especially in Tallowood and Industrial Estate, and that there is support for flood-free housing options close to town to reduce traffic.

#### 2. Infrastructure must be adequate to support future growth

Multiple submissions raised concerns that the infrastructure in Mullumbimby is inadequate and cannot cope with the current population or future growth. Particular concern was raised about:

- the water supply and the plan to access water from Rocky Road Dam, especially during drought
- the capacity of sewerage infrastructure
- the stormwater network
- drainage and flood protection systems
- the need for a town bypass
- the capacity of car parking

There was also general opposition to any new housing at the east end of Ann Street until there is a better understanding of the flooding impact on the existing houses and better infrastructure in place to address these impacts. The main concern is flooding and insufficient drainage in this area.

It was noted that any future infrastructure demands must be properly planned.

## Feedback on sites identified in the Housing Options Paper

71 Main Arm Road, Mullumbimby (Area 1) Lot 1 DP 12221885
<p>This site is identified as a retained investigation area in the Housing Options Paper.</p> <p>One submission was received opposing the inclusion of this site as an investigation area. Another submission noted its inclusion should be reviewed to take into account the 2022 floods.</p>
3 Poplar Avenue, Mullumbimby (Area 2) Lots 76 & 77 DP 755722
<p>This site is identified as a retained investigation area in the Housing Options Paper.</p> <p>One submission was received on behalf of the owners of this site noting that only part of it has been identified as a retained investigation area. However, a planning proposal is currently being prepared that extends beyond the mapped area to appropriate parts of the site that are not significantly adversely affected by flooding or other site constraints.</p>
Old Mullumbimby Hospital site (Area 3) Part of Lot 188 DP728535, Lot 1 DP 1159861 & Lot 138 DP 755722
<p>This site is identified as a retained investigation area in the Housing Options Paper.</p> <p>One submission was received opposing the 11.5-metre height limit for this site due to the impact on adjoining properties and given that the only other area in the Byron Shire with this height limit is the Byron Bay CBD. It was also submitted that if the height limit is to address the housing crisis, then it should be considered for other areas too.</p> <p>One other submission noted that the increased height limit is not supported.</p> <p>Another submission was received that this site is suitable for affordable housing as it is flood-free and accessible to town without driving.</p>
Tuckeroo Avenue, Mullumbimby (Area 4) Lot 32 DP 1169053
<p>This site is identified as a retained investigation area in the Housing Options Paper.</p> <p>One submission was received supporting the inclusion of this site as an investigation area and noting that the site is capable of providing 32-36 townhouses</p>
Multiple Lots in the vicinity of Station St, Mullumbimby (Area 5)
<p>This site is identified to be removed as an investigation area in the Housing Options Paper.</p> <p>No submissions were received on this site.</p>



1660-1634 Coolamon Scenic Drive, Mullumbimby (Area 6)  
Lot 1 & 2 DP748729 & Lot 67 DP 1226493

This site is identified as a potential new investigation area in the Housing Options Paper.

One submission was received opposing the inclusion of this site as an investigation area due to downstream impacts.

Stuart Street, Mullumbimby  
Lot 22 DP 1073165 (Area 7)

This site is identified to be removed as an investigation area in the Housing Options Paper.

One submission noted that this was a sensible decision, but it also calls into question Council's decision to include the adjoining Area 6 as it is flood-prone and important farmland. It is also not part of the 2041 Urban Growth precinct.

1B Ann Street & 20 Prince Street, Mullumbimby (Area 8)  
Part of Lot 1 DP1032298 and Part of Lot 12 DP527314

This site is identified as a retained investigation area in the Housing Options Paper.

Around 20 submissions were received opposing the inclusion of this site as an investigation area due to concerns about flooding and given that adjoining Areas 7 and 9 are proposed to be taken out due to flood hazards. It was noted that this area was the first to flood in 2022 and is a natural causeway. Photography and video evidence were provided about the extent of flooding in 2022 and the heavy rain in February 2023. Submissions noted the personal impacts the event continues to have on people and raised concern that NRMA has declared Mullumbimby as flood-prone and people cannot afford flood insurance.

Concerns were also expressed about infilling the site and worsening the flooding impacts to the existing houses at the eastern end given that there is no drainage infrastructure in place. Concern was expressed that no allowance has been made for sea-level rise. Housing should be built in areas that are higher and not flood-prone.

Other concerns about the development of this site for housing included traffic congestion and environmental impacts.

One submission stated that if this site was developed, any housing should be on higher ground with a nature buffer / causeway between new housing and the existing residents.

50 Prince Street , Mullumbimby (Temporary housing pod site)  
Part of Lot 2 DP1121508

This site is identified as a potential new investigation area in the Housing Options Paper.

Two submissions were received opposing the inclusion of the pod site as an investigation area due to concerns about flooding. It was also noted that NSW Government has stated that the site would be restored to its original state.

**57 Station Street, Mullumbimby (Station Street carpark)**  
**Lot 6, 7 & 8 DP 2772**

This site is identified as a potential new investigation area in the Housing Options Paper.

Two submissions were received opposing the inclusion of this site for housing as it is used daily by residents and there is minimal public transport. It was suggested that a more suitable site would be Council's car park parallel to the railway line or the land that is opposite the car park.

**1897 Coolamon Scenic Drive, Mullumbimby**  
**Lot 4 DP874348**

This site is identified as a potential new investigation area in the Housing Options Paper.

Two submissions were received supporting the inclusion of this site as an investigation area as it is close to town and a convenient place to live and is a single parcel of land that can be developed within existing constraints.

Another submission raised concern about the inclusion of this site noting that a previous development application was refused with extensive community opposition.

**1862 Coolamon Scenic Drive, Mullumbimby**  
**Lot 2 DP 1187038**

This site is identified as a potential new investigation area in the Housing Options Paper.

One submission was received on behalf of the owner supporting the inclusion of this site as a new investigation area and noting that the land will provide for potential urban development in a location within close proximity to existing services and facilities.

Another submission supported the inclusion of this site as it outside the floodplain.

**1982 Coolamon Scenic Drive, Mullumbimby**  
**Lot 10 DP 1132925**

This site is identified as a potential new investigation area in the Housing Options Paper.

Around seven submissions were received supporting the inclusion of this site as an investigation area as it is flood-free, close to town and the rail trail, and native trees could be retained.

**30 Chinbible Avenue, Mullumbimby**  
**Lot 159 DP 755687**

This site is currently zoned R2 and considered "vacant land" for the purposes of the Housing Options Paper.

Two submissions were received opposing the development of this site due to severe flooding in 2022 and concerns about the impact of future housing development on existing properties.

### Proposed urban conversion area

The area marked with the orange outline on Map 1 has been identified in the Housing Options Paper as being suitable for future urban conversion. There was mixed feedback on this proposal.

A request was received to:

- rezone this area from R5 to R1 or R2 so that it is congruous with the development of the Mullumbimby Hospital site
- provide a sewer line to service properties on Mooyabil Ridge, being the north side of Left Bank Road in the 50km zone between the hospital and Tuckeroo Avenue so that this land can be developed for future housing
- include 1A Left Bank Road as it is considered flood-free, and within walking distance of town, schools and other amenities.

Another submission was received from the owner in support of the proposed rezoning and suggesting that:

- a roundabout could be constructed at the corner of Left Bank Road and Azalea Street, and at Jubilee Avenue and Azalea Street
- Tuckaroo Avenue southbound could be extended to connect into a future roundabout at Myocum Road / Coolomon Scenic Drive intersection

Two submissions were received from owners in Melaleuca Drive in support of the proposed rezoning and querying whether the sewerage system can be extended from Tallowood and whether the land can be rezoned to R2.

One submission was received supporting the inclusion of 21 Left Bank Road, Mullumbimby for rezoning so that more housing can be provided in Mullumbimby.

Another submission was in support but submitted the urban conversion area should be expanded to include the upzoning of other R5 zones in Brunswick Heads and Myocum.

One submission was received from an owner of 2 Possum Wood Place, Mullumbimby objecting to the rezoning because restrained urban expansion is already possible on these sites and many live in the area due to the lifestyle afforded by larger lot living.

Another submission was received generally objecting to this option as it effectively urban sprawl.

### Feedback on sites identified for consideration by Council resolution

#### 75 New City Road, Mullumbimby (Area 9) Lot 2 DP 1032298

This site was identified to be removed as an investigation area in the Housing Options Paper. However, when resolving to exhibit the Housing Options Paper, Council resolved that this site should be considered for retention in the Residential Strategy.

Around 35 submissions were received supporting the retention of this site as an investigation area as it is close to town and within walking distance. It was submitted that the removal of this site will impact the development of Area 8 and is likely to create more flooding. It was also noted that previous studies have shown that including this site will allow for a larger land release of Area

8 and will enable planning for stormwater management and improvement of stormwater flooding for existing residents. It is also in the approved affordable housing contributions paper.

Two submissions were received supporting its removal due to flooding concerns.

125 Vallances Road, Mullumbimby  
Lot 1 DP129374 & Lot 1 DP952598

One submission was received about this site noting that neither of the two blocks (sewage works or existing house block) are identified as investigation areas. It is noted that there is a plan of management for the site with affordable housing as one of the recommended land uses, with the housing block being operational land and has been vacant for three years. Concerns were raised that the plan of management has been superseded by a general report and the existing house could be used for housing.

### Requests to include new sites in the Residential Strategy

310 Left Bank Road, Mullumbimby Creek  
Lot 8 DP633976

A request was received to rezone this site to RU5 or to re-instate the site to its previous format of smaller blocks as it has a cleared area suitable for housing, hazard-free, serviced by infrastructure, accessible with road frontage, near the edge of town and schools.

86 Tuckeroo Avenue, Mullumbimby  
Part of Lot 196 DP1281667

A request was received to include the parcel of vacant land to the north of Tallowood sportsfield as an investigation area as it would be able to provide flood-free access and would be suitable for a tiny home site.

## 3.5 Feedback by locality - Bangalow

### General

Around 20 submissions related to the proposed changes in Bangalow. This included a submission from the Bangalow Community Association. Many of these submissions were about specific sites in the Housing Options Paper, with other submissions providing more general feedback.

Generally, it was acknowledged that there is a shortage of residential and affordable housing in the Byron Shire and there is a specific need to create housing for key workers. However, concern was expressed about the extent of the proposed change for Bangalow. Many submissions felt that the village is shouldering an excessive and disproportionate number of houses given its current population and the scale of the new release areas (particularly the two sites in the Draft Northern Rivers Land Strategy) is incompatible with the character of the village and will need significant infrastructure investment.

In summary, the feedback primarily related to two key issues:

### 1. Village character must be respected and retained

Many submissions noted concern about the village doubling in size over the next 20 years and the adverse impact this will have on the small rural village atmosphere. It was submitted that the village atmosphere must be respected and retained as this is why people choose to live in Bangalow. It was noted that this is a small scale community living in a historic village with strong connections to the surrounding farmland. It was submitted that the unique heritage character and context of Bangalow are best maintained by encouraging low-rise medium-density development to reduce urban sprawl.

It was also noted that the mapped farmland around the village is an important part of the heritage and preserving this as green space around the village is important. Concern was expressed about the loss of this farmland, and that this land is likely to be used for supermarkets and out-of-town retail that will adversely impact the village centre.

### 2. Infrastructure must be adequate to support future growth

Many submissions noted concern that the town does not have sufficient infrastructure to support the proposed population growth, in particular:

- Congestion on Byron Street and Bangalow Road
- Insufficient parking
- Future impacts on the road network particularly Bangalow Road to Byron
- Minimal public transport
- Impacts for sewerage, water and power and need for significant upgrades
- Drainage and stormwater infrastructure to deal with flooding impacts
- Inadequate schools
- There is only one grocery shop
- Poor internet coverage

It was submitted that there is a need for an infrastructure master plan to support extra parking and to upgrade traffic intersections, water and sewerage and improve the drainage system as well as plan for a second primary school and a small shopping centre.

## Feedback on sites identified in the Housing Options Paper

68 Rankin Drive, & Granuaille Crescent, Bangalow (Area 11)  
Part of Lot 261 and 262 DP 1262316 & Lot 348 DP 755695

This site is identified as a retained investigation area in the Housing Options Paper.

One submission was received noting that this is the best short-term opportunity to deliver genuine long-term social housing. Several others noted this area is suitable for future housing.

Either side of Ballina Road, Bangalow (Area 12)  
Multiple lots

This site is identified as a retained investigation area in the Housing Options Paper.

One submission was received supporting the development of this land for future housing, noting that some parts of this site could deliver early housing gains.

Another submission received from the owner within the area supporting the inclusion of this site as a new investigation area (E2023/114599).

**31 Ballina Road, Bangalow (Area 13)  
Lot 2 DP 1260751**

This site is identified as a retained investigation area in the Housing Options Paper.

One submission was received supporting the development of this land for future housing.

**201 Lismore Road, Bangalow (Northern Rivers Resilient Land Strategy site)**

This site has been identified in the Draft Northern Rivers Resilient Land Strategy and is shown as the yellow dot in Map 3 of the Housing Options Paper.

One submission was received on behalf of the owner in support of including this site as a new investigation area as it is considered suitable for residential development and has been identified in the Draft Northern Rivers Resilient Land Strategy as suitable for housing. The submission includes an indicative layout and yield for the site. There is support for the delivery of housing under either Option 2B or 2C in the Housing Options Paper and a desire from the owner to develop the site in the short-term.

Two submissions were received opposing the rezoning of mapped significant farmland.

**12 & 16 Ballina Road, Bangalow (Area 12) &  
14 Ballina Road, Bangalow (Northern Rivers Resilient Land Strategy – site B2)  
Lot 3 DP 1164722, Lot 1 DP 614715, Lot 3 DP 702168, & Lot 1 DP 931195**

Part of this site is identified as a retained investigation area in the Housing Options Paper, and part of this site has been identified in the Draft Northern Rivers Resilient Land Strategy and is shown as the orange dot (B2) in Map 3 of the Housing Options Paper.

One submission was received from the owner supporting the inclusion of this site as a new investigation area. It was noted that this site is close to the village centre and was previously included in the Strategy. It has now been identified as a short-term delivery site in the Draft Northern Rivers Resilient Land Strategy. Another submission was received on behalf of the owner supporting the inclusion of this site as a new investigation area.

Two submissions were received opposing the rezoning of mapped significant farmland.

Another submission noted that it is difficult to meaningfully comment as the site boundaries are not shown but given the acute housing crisis in the Byron Shire, the site should be further investigated. Any development for housing must manage the flood and infrastructure constraints and should incorporate a master planning process. Consideration should also be given to retaining some of this site for food security and provision of affordable housing.

## Requests to include new sites in the Residential Strategy

18 Pioneers Crescent Bangalow & 1270 Hinterland Way Bangalow  
DP1154192 & Lot 1 DP1155012

A request was received on behalf of the owners to include this site as a new investigation area. It was submitted that the site is suitable for large lot residential development given its topography and its proximity to other residential zoned land and essential services.

900 Bangalow Road, Bangalow  
Lot 100 & 101 DP 1158494

A request was received to include this site as a new investigation area as it is within walking distance of the Bangalow town centre and sporting fields, and its size is not viable for agricultural purposes.

## Feedback on other sites

54 Parrot Tree Place, Bangalow  
Lot 33 DP1223152

This site is not specifically identified in the Housing Options Paper.

One submission noted that this is approved for housing and awaits development.

## 3.6 Feedback by locality - Brunswick Heads

### General

Around 80 submissions related to the proposed changes in Brunswick Head. This included a submission from the Brunswick Heads Progress Association, Bayside Residents Association and Saddle Ridge Local Area Management Planning Association. Many of these submissions were about specific sites in the Housing Options Paper, with other submissions providing more general feedback.

Overall, there was concern about the extent of the proposed change for Brunswick Heads, in particular the proposal to reduce the minimum lot size and create the new Saddle Road precinct. Generally, it was felt that Brunswick Heads was taking on a disproportionate share of housing for the whole Shire and that the population increase would adversely affect the village atmosphere. It was felt that Brunswick Heads is at capacity and there was concern expressed that infrastructure is not adequate to support future growth. A key issue raised in Brunswick Heads was the intersection of the new STRA precincts and the proposal to reduce the minimum lot size.

In summary, the feedback primarily related to three key issues:

#### 1. Village character must be respected and retained

Many submissions were opposed to infill development, with concern this would ruin the liveability, character, environment and economy of the town (i.e. it is a heritage fishing village). It was felt that the village was already at capacity with an increased population from the temporary pods and van

packers. Some existing residents did not want the village to become another Lennox Heads or Gold Coast.

It was noted that many lots already have secondary dwellings and many garages are also being used for accommodation creating an overflow of parking in lanes and in streets and impeding emergency access.

Many felt that more housing on existing blocks would exacerbate existing problems, impact the amenity of the town and cause more social issues. Concern was also raised about the adverse impacts on the environment including sensitive coastal areas, with some submissions stating that any new infill development should mitigate the impact on trees, manage car parking on site, be well-designed and be supported by infrastructure.

In addition to concern about the implications of reducing the minimum lot size, many submissions also stated that the addition of the Saddle Road precinct will adversely impact the village atmosphere and there are insufficient services, infrastructure and facilities to cater for the population increase, particularly in Bayside where there are no community open spaces or community buildings.

## **2. Infrastructure must be adequate to support future growth**

Many submissions raised concerns that the capacity of existing infrastructure will not support further housing and population growth. Key infrastructure issues include:

- Adequacy of drainage and stormwater
- Adequacy of sewer system
- Demand for car parking is already at capacity
- Laneways are overcrowded and poorly maintained, with emergency access often impeded
- Lack of community facilities and sportsgrounds due to illegal campers
- Primary school is at capacity
- Safety of traffic intersections including Tweed Street and Bayside Way
- Need to provide footpaths and bike paths to provide better connectivity including along Terrace Reserve

Concerns were also raised about whether Council has sufficient funds to provide and maintain the infrastructure required to support the increase in population.

It was submitted that there is a need for a master plan for the village including a plan for public transport, car parking (including option for paid parking) and a traffic management study. The master plan for car parking and infrastructure on South Beach Road and South Beach Lane also needs to be implemented.

## **3. Impacts of STRA need to be considered**

Multiple submissions provided feedback about the implications of STRA. It was submitted that Council should consider excluding the STRA precincts from the change to minimum lot sizes and consider the creation of a heritage conversation area for the original village to protect the character.

Others raised concerns about the ongoing impacts of STRA and the impact that tourism has on existing services and facilities. It was submitted that the changes to the STRA rules will free up more housing soon and Council should enforce the rules about the use of granny flats and make sure



these are not being used for STRA. To address this issue in the future, it was also suggested that Council should consider imposing a holiday-bed tax to manage infrastructure demands.

### Feedback on sites identified in the Housing Options Paper

#### 94 Kingsford Drive, Brunswick Heads (Temporary housing pod site) Lot 71 DP 851902

This site is identified as a potential investigation area in the Housing Options Paper.

One submission was received on behalf of the owner supporting the inclusion of this site as a new investigation area and any proposal to increase densities and diversity of housing within existing urban areas.

Three submissions were received opposing the inclusion of this site as an investigation area as this land (together with Lot 69) are the only spaces that facilitate community and social cohesion in the Bayside area. The site is the only parcel of land zoned E1 (Local Centre) in Bayside and the only area that offers multiple ingress and egress roads. The Bayside area is also doing the 'heavy lifting' to meet housing targets and future development will include low-cost and affordable housing particularly when granny flats are added to new homes.

#### Lot 69 DP 851902 (The Park)

This site is identified as a potential investigation area in the Housing Options Paper.

Around five submissions were received opposing the inclusion of this site as an investigation area as this land (together with Lot 71) are the only spaces that facilitates community and social cohesion in the Bayside area. The site is the only centrally located green space for community gatherings and recreation. The community has also been promised that the park (which is currently used for temporary housing pods) would be returned in an equal or better state after the emergency period.

#### 125 Tweed Street, Brunswick Heads (Temporary housing pod site) Former STP site – Lot 1 DP 560486

This site is identified as a potential investigation area in the Housing Options Paper.

Around five submissions were received opposing the inclusion of this site as an investigation area as it should remain part of the foreshore parklands of Brunswick Heads and open space for public recreation. Concerns were also raised about flood and bushfire hazards and that pods were only meant to be a temporary housing solution.

A request was also received by the Native Title owners to include this site and the surrounding area that is subject to native title as an investigation area.

**15 Torakina Road, Brunswick Head (Wallum DA)  
Lot 13 DP1251383**

This site is identified as vacant land for the purposes of the Housing Options Paper.

Around ten submissions were received that this site is not suitable for housing due to the environmentally sensitive heathland and that it is home to vulnerable and endangered species.

**New Saddle Road precinct (multiple lots including Northern Rivers Resilient Land Strategy - site B1)**

This site is identified as a potential investigation site in the Housing Options Paper. This includes the B1 site identified in the Draft Northern Rivers Resilient Land Strategy and shown as the orange dot on Map 3 in the Housing Options Paper. There was mixed feedback on this site.

Around 20 submissions were received opposing the inclusion of this area as an investigation area due to concerns about:

- lack of safe access (particularly the Saddle Road / Mullumbimby Road intersection)
- traffic impacts and the need to upgrade the road network (particularly Gulgan Road)
- the lack of public transport
- it is a vital wildlife corridor (particularly for koalas) and there will be adverse impacts on the environment
- there are many permanent springs around the ridge and development will impact estuaries and waterways
- the area is a scenic escarpment and the natural beauty should be preserved
- the slope of the land makes it unsuitable for housing
- there will be an adverse impact on the quality of rural lifestyle for existing residents
- the area is significant farmland and should be preserved for food security
- the lack of facilities without driving everywhere (e.g. shops)
- the area is not connected to town water or sewer
- the area is subject to native title claims
- lack of affordability of future housing due to land value
- the previous rejection of this site by Council and the NSW Government
- the development of the precinct is too much change, too fast

It is noted that around ten submissions that opposed this site, also favoured the inclusion of Area 9 in Mullumbimby.

Other submissions:

- opposed the closure of the southern end of the road
- noted that any new release areas should have footpaths and mandatory on-site parking
- noted that this site is a new settlement, and therefore the ratio of 85/15 homes in existing areas v rural is incorrect.
- submitted that the estimates for future housing supply seem to be under-estimated given this area will include smaller lot sizes, larger FSR and higher height controls
- submitted that the area should only be rezoned after access, affordable housing, stormwater infrastructure, density and impacts on the environment and Aboriginal heritage have been properly considered

- o supported the rezoning subject to pro-active master planning on access, road network, height limits, domestic pets, infrastructure, footpaths & car parking
- o supported the rezoning but were concerned about increasing density

Multiple submissions were received from owners or residents in the area supporting the inclusion of the land as an investigation area.

Several other owners were in support, but this was conditional on further planning processes being undertaken first, the area all being rezoned at once or ensuring the provision of affordable housing for the Arakwal people.

A submission was also received from the Traditional owners stating this site is of deep spiritual, historical and cultural significance to the Arakwal people and they should be considered a major stakeholder in its development, with 20% of housing allocated for Aboriginal housing.

### Requests to include new sites in the Residential Strategy

#### 73 Bashforth's Lane, Brunswick Heads

Lot 6 DP 844554 Lot 5 DP 844554 Lot 11 DP 844553, Lot 109 DP 755692 Lot 108 DP 755692

A request was received to include some or all of this site as a new investigation area as the site directly adjoins the potential new release areas on the western side of the highway, has cleared areas that are hazard and constraint-free and is close to the township of Brunswick Heads.

#### 66 The Saddle Road, Brunswick Heads

Lot 2 DP 1159910

A request was received by the owner to extend the proposed investigation area to include land in the southwest part of the site because it has low development constraints. The inclusion of the site in the Draft Northern Rivers Resilient Land Strategy is also generally supported.

#### 251 The Saddle Road, Brunswick Heads

Lot 1 DP859817

A request was received by the owner to include this site as a new investigation area as it neighbours the proposed Saddle Road precinct. It was submitted that the site has the potential to provide an alternative long-term road access to Mullumbimby Road that is safer with part of the site also likely to be suitable for housing.

## 3.7 Feedback by locality - Byron Bay / Suffolk Park

### General

Around 45 submissions related to the proposed changes for Byron Bay and Suffolk Park. Many of these submissions were about specific sites in the Housing Options Paper, with other submissions providing more general feedback

Most of the feedback was centred on the need to create consistent height limits across the CBD and to provide for more housing in the town centre. There was minimal feedback on the proposed development standard review, with one submission raising concern about the impact on local amenity, character and the environment, intersection safety and that it would be preferable to consider further urban conversion in Ewingsdale than increase density in this area. It was suggested that the “environmentally sensitive zone” identified in this area should be excluded from further infill.

In summary, the feedback primarily focused on two key issues:

### **1. There should be a consistent height limit across the whole CBD area**

Many submissions were received about the inconsistency in the height controls in the CBD area. It was noted that there are two areas in the CBD which have a 9.00 metre height limit and these need to be adjusted to match the 11.5 metre height limit. It was submitted that:

- this would be consistent with Council’s approach at the Mullumbimby hospital site, Mullumbimby car park site and the new Saddle Road live / work precinct
- this is long overdue and is a recommendation from the Byron Bay Town Centre Master Plan
- the change is quite modest when considering comparable Town Centres like Cabarita and Kingscliff to Woolgoolga to Yamba or Nambucca Heads
- Lawson Street should be included as it is close to the centre of town

### **2. There needs to be more opportunities for housing in the town centre**

Multiple submissions noted that there should be more opportunities for housing in the CBD. For example, shop-top housing and apartments. This included the need to create more affordable housing, particularly for seasonal workers. It was submitted that:

- increasing housing in the town centre will reduce transport and infrastructure load on the town
- Council should consider increasing the floor space ratio in the CBD to increase density and provide more housing options in town
- the development control plan should be amended to prohibit rooftop swimming pools

### **Feedback on sites identified in the Housing Options Paper**

There was no specific feedback other than on 64 Corkwood Crescent, Suffolk which is discussed below.

### **Feedback on sites identified for consideration by Council resolution**

64 Corkwood Crescent, Suffolk Park  
Lot 285 DP 119 8641

This site was identified to be removed as an investigation area in the Housing Options Paper. However, when resolving to exhibit the Housing Options Paper, Council resolved that this site should be considered for retention in the Residential Strategy.

One submission was received from the owner in support of including the lower part of this site as an investigation area as it is considered suitable for R2 – Low Density Residential zoning and would provide further land suitable for housing.

Around eight submissions were received opposing the inclusion of this site as an investigation area due to environmental and ecological considerations. It was noted that the dual occupancy development on the site has already impacted the environment and wildlife and further development will adversely impact the scenic escarpment.

### Requests to include new sites in the Residential Strategy

214 Balraith Lane, Ewingsdale  
Lot 100 DP 1294837

A request was received on behalf of the owners to include this site as a new investigation area. The site is currently zoned RU2 – Rural Landscape and it is adjacent to the R5 - Large Lot Residential area. It is submitted that it is relatively unconstrained and would be suitable for future housing.

139 Bangalow Road, Byron Bay  
Lot 22 DP 549688

A request was received to include this site as a new investigation area as it is considered to provide a unique opportunity for residential development in Suffolk Park due its size, layout and location.

Tallow Beach Road, Byron Bay  
Lot 452 DP48493

A request was received by the owner to include this site as an investigation area as it adjoins the area proposed for the review of development standards.

Land surrounding Red Devils, Bangalow Road, Byron Bay  
Lot 1 & 2 DP1275809 & Lot 438 DP729107

A request was received by the owner to include this site as an investigation area. It is noted that part of the site is Crown land leased to the rugby club and another part of the site is managed by Council.

1 & 5 Broken Head Road, Byron Bay (Old Byron Bay STP and neighbouring holiday park)  
Lot 1 & 2 DP573835 & Lot 9 DP708338

A request was received to include this site as an investigation area to determine whether it is suitable for conversion to residential zoning in the future.

#### Land zoned R5 – Ewingsdale (multiple lots)

A request was received from an owner that the minimum lot size for this area be changed to 4,000m<sup>2</sup>. It was submitted that the vast majority of lots in the R5 zone are already 4,000m<sup>2</sup> or less and this change would provide for an estimated 12 additional flood-free lots.

#### 94-106 Broken Head Rd, Suffolk Park Lot DP408810

A request was received from the owner to include this site as an investigation area as it is considered suitable for greater density given its location. It is noted that the site has approval for the creation of four lots.

### Feedback on other sites

#### 62 Broken Head Road, Byron Bay (Byron Bay Golf Course) Lot 11 DP1200712

This site included in the urban growth boundary but is not included as a specific investigation area in the Housing Options Paper.

Around five submissions were received opposing the redevelopment of this site for housing due to its environmental benefits, concerns over loss of green space, contribution to the local economy and lack of consultation with members.

One submission noted that this site was an obvious choice given its proximity to town, but the Rugby League Ground and Byron Recreation Grounds should also be considered as these are better options.

## 3.8 Feedback by locality - Ocean Shores, South Golden Beach & New Brighton Beach

### General

Around four submissions related to the proposed changes in Ocean Shores, South Golden Beach and New Brighton Beach. This included submissions from South Golden Beach Residents Association and the Friends of Capricornia Canal resident's group.

It was noted Map 5 in the Housing Options Paper only has one area marked as "approved for residential" which suggests that Council has not yet explored this area in depth to devise strategies appropriate for each village. It was also noted that the villages have different topography and flood risk and should not be lumped together.

In summary, the feedback primarily focused on three key issues:

#### 1. New housing must be safe

The submissions noted that localised flood risks must be properly considered in the provision of any future housing. Concern was raised that infill development in this area is not appropriate given the

flood risks and submissions highlighted the impact of cumulative filling due to past residential development, noting that approved development has been inappropriate for a floodplain.

It was noted that the *North Byron Floodplain Risk Management Study 2020* has not been updated since the floods and this should be completed to properly inform the directions in the Residential Strategy.

It was also submitted the entire Marshall Creeks Floodplain should be designated as a no fill area, and that any areas in a designated flood-plain or in recognised flood-prone areas should not have any further infill development.

## **2. Village character must be respected and retained**

The submissions also raised concerns about the proposal to reduce the minimum lot size. It was felt that this would adversely affect the amenity and character of the neighbourhood, which is a key reason why people choose to live in these villages. Concern was raised about the reduction in green space and impervious surfaces.

## **3. Infrastructure must be adequate to support future growth**

The submissions noted that the South Golden Beach community has ongoing concerns about flood mitigation efforts, maintenance of drains and other infrastructure. This concern has only been exacerbated after the 2022 floods.

It was noted that it is unclear whether the existing infrastructure in this area can handle the expected increase in density from infill development.

## **Feedback on sites identified in the Housing Options Paper**

There was no feedback received on any specific sites.

## **Requests to include new sites in the Residential Strategy**

**8 Shara Boulevard, Ocean Shores**  
**Lot 4 DP 880917**

A request was received by the owner to include some or all of this site as an investigation area as there are no new release areas identified in Ocean Shores. It is submitted that much of the site is free from constraints such as flooding, biodiversity values mapping, steep slopes and important farmland and is in proximity to existing villages.

### 3.9 Feedback by locality - Tyagarah

#### Feedback on sites identified for consideration by Council resolution

29 Buckleys Road, Tyagarah  
Lot 1 & 2 DP1126204

When resolving to exhibit the Housing Options Paper, Council resolved that this site should be considered for inclusion in the Residential Strategy. There was mixed feedback received about this site.

Around ten submissions were received opposing the inclusion of this site as a new release area. This included a submission from the Tyagarah Residents Association. It was submitted that:

- the road is not suitable for increased traffic (Grays Lane)
- the proposed development would adversely affect the amenity of existing residents and the natural environment
- it is a quiet rural area with extensive wildlife
- the development is unlikely to result in affordable housing
- there is no infrastructure to service the proposed development
- there were concerns about the safety of entry and exit with floods and fire.
- the site has previously come before Council and the Joint Regional Planning Panel for rezoning and has been rejected
- inclusion of the site is contrary to the *North Coast Regional Plan*.

A petition was also received with 20 signatures objecting to the inclusion of this site as an investigation area. The reasons for objection include proximity to wildlife sanctuary, general impact on the environment and specific impact on koala regeneration corridors near Grays Lane, conflict with existing land care processes, lack of infrastructure, bushfire and flood safety concerns with entry and exit and private agenda.

Several submissions noted support subject to this being developed as an eco-village with a maximum of 80 houses.

Around 25 submissions were received in support of including this site in the Residential Strategy as it will provide additional housing, connect villages, reduce reliance on cars, reduce congestion and create diverse housing options for the community. It was also submitted it would create lower-cost housing with access to a regular train service. The site is also flood-free, would be low-impact development and would enable the return of train services to the train line. A submission was also received from the owner supporting the inclusion of the site.



## 4. Next steps

This report was prepared at the end of the exhibition of the Housing Options Paper. It documents and summarises the feedback received during the exhibition period, specifically feedback provided at the information sessions and via the written submissions. This report will be provided to the elected Council to inform its decision-making with respect to the refresh of the Residential Strategy.

# localé consulting

**T** 0419 700 401

**A** 1/27 River Street Woolgoolga NSW 2456

**P** PO Box 53 Woolgoolga NSW 2456

**E** [info@localeconsulting.com.au](mailto:info@localeconsulting.com.au)

**W** [www.localeconsulting.com.au](http://www.localeconsulting.com.au)

