

# Submission Review:

## Former Mullumbimby Hospital Site Strategy and Urban Design Protocol

Feedback provided	Council response
<p><b>Land Value / Capture Revenue / Debt repayment</b></p> <p><b>Comments from different submissions about the topic of debt repayment:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If there is an emphasis on providing affordable housing for elderly people and care workers who are low-income earners, then the minister for aged care within the federal government should be approached for funding to repay debt associated with remediation of contaminated land.</li> <li>• I'm worried that trying to recoup such a large debt will affect the affordability of living on the site.</li> <li>• I wonder if debt repayment must be a primary short term or medium term or even long-term goal. If the income stream generated maintains debt repayment this can also be enough to align with best community outcomes.</li> <li>• Residents are aware that Council has entered into considerable debt to pay for the remediation of the old hospital site. In an election year looming it is suggested that Council seek funding from the State Government to help pay for the remediation thus securing the whole of the old hospital site for development for whom it was intended.</li> </ul>	<p>Repayment of debt to be considered at next stage – suggestion noted.</p>
<p>These goals are incredibly limited and generic, so generic as to be meaningless in the case of goals 1, 2 &amp; 4. Goals 3 and 5 are useful starts, but goal 5 as an economic/financial goal in particular needs expansion. Is councils only financial goal to recoup debt as a result of the remediation costs? Where are goals related to the cultural and historical value of the site. Where is an acknowledgement of the physical context or a relationship to wider plans and strategies. Then there is what is lacking because of the incredibly limited and now 4-year-old consultation</p>	<p>Points noted and project goals updated to reflect some of these points.</p>
<p>As a Participant of the Mullumbimby Hospital Site Reference Group, I wish to offer this feedback to the initial strategy. I understand and appreciate the complexity and difficulty required for a project of this nature. It will not be easy to complete the site and fulfill all the potential best outcomes. The following is just one of several alternative pathways.</p> <p>The draft strategy is lacking in detail. The content and make of the type of housing envisioned is not mapped out and is probably still to be decided. However, from the text and your overview it seems you wish to place it all with a CHP and a single housing model. More could be achieved by having a section allotted to social housing while retaining the larger portion of the site for a variety of dwellings and activity/commercial.</p> <p>Best practice master planning suggests a mixture of housing types and demographics usually provide the better outcomes for community liveability. The following is one option for possible steps to achieve the result required by council: affordable housing, social infrastructure and retaining council assets and potential income.</p> <p><b>1. Recouping Debt</b></p> <p>The debt incurred by the asbestos remediation on site needs to be recouped. The freehold sale of the section of land south of Catholic Care and accessed via Reservoir Road would come close to do this. A portion of around 5000 M2, once rezoned, would resolve most of the debt.</p> <p>Council would be best to only sell it to an incoming buyer under condition it be developed for medium density dwellings. The easiest resale to a developer would be for five or six house single lots but that is not the best outcome for the</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Goals have been updated to reflect parts of this.</p> <p>Details of housing mix to come with concept masterplan.</p> <p>Points 1-5 to be considered in the Development Plan and Financing Strategy in next stage.</p>

communities need for more diverse mix of housing. A mix of top end 2/3-bedroom units plus smaller studios is best.

## **2. Financing Remaining Build**

The rest of the site can be valued after rezoning is completed. The valuation of the site is then a suitable security for BSC to gain a 60% commercial loan on the agreed value. This is unlikely to cover 100% of the final build cost so council will need to lobby for grants or loans from Federal or State Government for the shortfall. Failing that option, BSC will still be able to borrow higher than the 60% if also showing rental returns after the completed build.

## **3. Preferred Development Partner (PDF)**

BSC probably does not have the desire or capacity to take this project on as the developer. However, it is not outside an LGAs remit to develop their own property. Ballina Shire, for example, has a long and successful history of developing and managing developments and enjoying revenue from completed assets. This project does offer BSC an opportunity to look at evolving an asset management capacity than can be more entrepreneurial than currently experiencing.

Obviously, Byron Shire has an oppositional history to development and a community that is quick to blame and challenge decisions. The advantage of the PDP model is that council can be an equity partner with the PDP and still maintain some control and input while remaining at arm's length. In between the PDP and BSC there would need to be something like a new advisory volunteer board.

Members could include a councillor or two, council planning staff, an experienced local developer, representative from social services, architect, planner, etc. Since the expert panel is voluntary with no financial conflict of interest should go some distance to satisfying negative voices.

## **4. Social Service Providers**

The balance between conducting community consultation and responding in a timely manner is difficult. Yes, there are many voices who wish to be heard. There are also a rising number of voices who understand the need is dire and decisions need to be made yesterday not in years' time. The new advisory panel would need to liaise with the board managing the Byron Hospital site and work together to ensure there is not an overlap providing social services. After a list of possible social service providers who need premises is drawn up, it can be divided between Byron and Mullum sites.

## **5. Build To Rent**

Once the proportion of Social Housing and Social Service Providers is decided, the rest of the site can offer a mix of equally necessary dwellings and activity spaces. To be noted again: the advice to not take the easy road of handing everything over to Landcom and a CHP. BSC has the opportunity and the challenge to use the site to enhance local amenity as well as create an income stream for the future, while still delivering solutions to some pressing housing issues.

Once building finance is secured, dwelling spaces can be built by council but managed by a normal real estate agent, not a CHP. The PDP and BSC is also able to equity partner with any number of social impact investors who would be happy with this project that will deliver better than bank interest plus substantial ESG benefits.

It could be argued that the demand for housing is also acute for low-income artists, musicians and creatives who have been continually forced out due to rising housing costs. Also, dwellings suitable for key workers. Studio space, live/work, micro-spaces, terraces, co-housing, yoga/gallery/fitness.

<p>There is a widely held sentiment that it is this cohort that makes Byron Shire unique and different.</p> <p>The ideal and achievable outcome is a place which is vibrant, creative and a desirable place to be, while concurrently easing some of our obvious social and housing needs. By including offices and spaces for charity and government service providers, emergency housing, domestic violence refuge, counselling, medical and therapy offices, etc, etc. But providing the later without the former, you run the risk of ghetto-ising and isolating the already disadvantaged and not providing an integrated community.</p> <p>6. Successes</p> <p>The current strategy is not without wins. The idea to <b>increase the height limit to 11 metres</b> is excellent. Also, it is encouraging to hear you are going to discuss the idea of including the Mullum High School land with the idea of swapping it for land on the Lot 22 site. This would be a good outcome as allowing more parking to <b>fulfill the hospital sites potential for density</b>. It would also make a good <b>Emergency Assembly Area</b> in case of future flooding events.</p> <p>Good Luck with this venture. Please be assured that there are many capable and supportive professionals and organisations in the community who would be more than willing to provide input and assistance going forward. There is a large and productive people resource there if you need it.</p>	
<b>Cost recovery</b> and <b>affordable housing</b> should be paramount	This is reflected in the project goals.
Develop <b>on-going revenue</b> as housing provider & control site – or part of, and have revenue stream. Funds could then be used to develop other sites. Work with a private developer (voluntary) to achieve outcomes. When sales made (if any) work with agents to achieve best outcomes – note roundhouse.	Noted – to be considered as part of land development strategy in next stage.
Sales process was very poor – most unusual & one-off sales process ever carried out. Sold at valuers figure (always 10% under market) to 1 <sup>st</sup> in 1 <sup>st</sup> dressed.	Noted – land development strategy to be considered in next stage.
Looks like a real estate cash in again.	Disagree – refer to project goals.
<b>Indigenous Consultation &amp; Collaboration</b>	
Perhaps it might be inclusive of some homes with a proviso that they are <b>leased to Arakwal people</b> who have been dispossessed of their rightful place on this land. It would be good to see a site that is <b>affordable homes for elderly people</b> , not care homes, but something with considered designing to help people age gracefully and comfortably.	SSUDP updated to include these specific land use suggestions where not already included.
More work required with Tweed Byron LALC and Arakwal Corp to <b>ensure culture is protected and celebrated</b>	Noted and agree. Included as key next step.
An integral and long-term part of this work must be respectful and long-term <b>consultation with appropriate Elders and Knowledge Holders</b> . This may reveal valuable insights into the area and play an important role in acknowledging both the area's First Nations and its European history.	Acknowledge as key next step in process.
<b>Community Consultation</b>	
I was on the Reference Group and this is not very relatable to what was discussed then. Also, it does not have any detail of the important points. I think you should bring back the reference group for another meeting or two and discuss the details.	Reference group will be invited to participate in future consultation steps.
Please include the community in development and don't give to to an external developer to profit on	Noted – to be considered in next stage.

Invite the reference group back in for more discussions on this. I am a bit surprised that years have gone past - admittedly with site remediation - but these plans are not further advanced. No drawings, not developer partners????	PRG to be invited to future consultation.
Looking forward to further involvement in this project. It has been a long process - November 2016 I led the Reclaiming our Homes Forum in Mullumbimby. It was roughly May 2017 when I organised the Save our Hospital on site rally and meeting at the Civic Hall with the Mullum Hospital Action Group where the announcement was made by NSW Health that council could purchase the site for \$1. In hindsight not such a great outcome but I think ultimately - eventually - if I live long enough - we will see much needed <b>housing and community facilities</b> and a <b>historical display</b> on this site.	Noted
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan broadly respects the 2018 consultation however; much has happened since. Is the content backing this plan still relevant or adequate?</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggestion</b> - <i>There needs to be a broad new engagement with the community, a "placemaking process" (see attached definition). Where is the understanding or acknowledgement of the New Urban Agenda UN framework, which frames places in three and four dimensions?</i></p> <p><b>Alternative Suggestion</b> - <i>Without a placemaking process, there needs to be an urban design study that models the site in three dimensions attached to the planning proposal for rezoning.</i></p>	Concept Masterplanning process included in next stage
The process of the current draft plan and short feedback period, however well intentioned, is dangerous. It has strong potential to set the council and community at odds because of misunderstanding as happened with similar previous projects.	Concern noted
<b>Affordable Housing</b>	
The site has to prioritise <b>affordable housing for elderly and low to moderate income earners</b> who have been living in the Byron Shire for two or more years and therefore, are invested in and have a connection with the community.	Noted – this is as per the current SSUDP.
<p>The National Agreement on Closing the Gap (the National Agreement) has 19 national socio-economic targets across areas that have an impact on life outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. The below target is number 9.</p> <p>In consultation with Arakwal Native Title holders and Tweed Byron Local Aboriginal Land Council members. <b>Council understands the importance of affordable housing for Aboriginal community members to be able to live on their traditional lands.</b></p> <p>People can secure appropriate, affordable housing that is aligned with their priorities and needs</p> <p><b>Outcome</b></p> <p>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people secure appropriate, affordable housing that is aligned with their priorities and need.</p> <p><b>Target</b></p> <p>9a: By 2031, increase the proportion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people living in appropriately sized (not overcrowded) housing to 88 per cent.</p> <p>9b: By 2031, all Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander households:</p> <p>within discrete Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities receive essential services that meet or exceed the relevant jurisdictional standard in or near to a town receive essential services that meet or exceed the same standard as applies generally within the town (including if the household might</p>	Noted - In consultation with Arakwal Native Title holders and Tweed Byron Local Aboriginal Land Council members. Council understands the importance of affordable housing for Aboriginal community members to be able to live on their traditional lands.

be classified for other purposes as a part of a discrete settlement such as a "town camp" or "town based reserve".)	
As someone who homeless and living on disability pension, I can speak for myself and anyone else in similar circumstances; we need this.	Noted.
maximize <b>affordable housing</b> that may include <b>housing for the elderly</b>	Noted – included in the SSUDP.
<b>Affordable housing in perpetuity</b> can only be guaranteed by creating the proposed Byron Land Trust.	Noted – to be considered as part of land development strategy in next stage.
Low cost <b>Medium to high density housing</b> is desperately needed in Mullumbimby with supporting <b>community spaces</b>	Noted – as per SSUDP.
I believe a <b>hospice</b> and <b>semi independent aged care living</b> units should be included	Noted – to be considered in land use mix.
I was a member of the PRG and am a member of Mullumbimby Hospital Action Group. I am very pleased that the report is closely aligned with the recommendations of the PRG. The highest priority in terms of Council owned land use is <b>housing for retirees</b> , enabling them to remain in their community and putting more family size homes on the market. The other very high priority is <b>affordable housing for essential workers and low income</b> local people. This site has always been a much loved community initiative. The current plan is consistent with the original gifting of the land to the Mullumbimby community over one hundred years ago.	Noted
<p>Current demographics that influence decisions regarding the former hospital site. Byron Shire Council's Residential Strategy (2020) estimates population growth to 2036 will consist primarily of people aged 65 years with approximately 25% of the Shire's population in this category. In fact 'empty nesters' and retirees grew by 4%, between 2011 and 2016, The largest change in age cohorts (BSC Residential Strategy 2020). This foreshadows an <b>increasing demand for smaller well equipped, easily accessible, well designed and appropriate locations for older residents.</b></p> <p>Mullumbimby has historically been a service centre for many generations of residents in the Brunswick Valley. Currently, these residents must leave the area when needing to 'downsize' and move to a more suitable accommodation because of age and associated reasons.</p> <p>The main housing issues for our older population, according to Byron Shire Residential Strategy (2020, page 20) include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "unmet demand for affordable, small, low-maintenance dwelling located close to or within easy access to services in established locations</li> <li>• a predominance of large, detached housing not suitable for 'ageing in place'</li> <li>• a lack of regulatory requirements at state level for adaptable or universal housing</li> <li>• dwellings on steep land making it difficult for them to continue their daily activities</li> <li>• difficult for service providers to access properties for transport to appointment or providing in-home services due to issues such as convenient parking</li> <li>• rental accommodation and some seniors' living options not affordable or even available"</li> </ul>	Noted – additional reference to this added to the document.
Managing the future. The opportunity to 'down-size' but still remain close to 'home' will contribute to the possibility of freeing up houses in the Brunswick Valley suitable for family living. It also fits within the World Health Organisation's definition of health which describes it as not just an absence of disease but a sense of well-being. For many the notion of 'ageing in place', achieved as a result of being able to remain 'within community' and connected to family and friends, contributes to their well-being and the legitimacy of ageing.	Noted – greater emphasis on catering for older residents added to the document.

<p>The physical terrain of Mullumbimby and its proximity to centres in the Brunswick Valley make it ideal for older residents.</p> <p>In order to maximize the residential potential of the old hospital site, as envisaged above, the greater part of the site would be dedicated in perpetuity to <b>housing for older residents</b> and with a percentage of <b>housing that is affordable and accessible</b> for households with low incomes. Design and management of the site would need to ensure that safe access and mobility is available for all residents and users of the site.</p> <p>Appropriate management methods need to be investigated to ensure the site remains in the control of management and available to those for whom it was intended for successive generations.</p>	
<p><b>Community facilities, Public Space - Arts &amp; Culture</b></p>	
<p><b>Comments related to (quantum of) community facilities:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This vision is not aligned with the proposed land use. Only 5% of the build area is for community facility. This is a thinly veiled vision purportedly promising community facilities whilst pushing through over height residential development.</li> <li>• More community facilities rather than personal dwellings.</li> <li>• Too much emphasis on housing, not enough space for community buildings.</li> <li>• I believe we need more community facilities on this site.</li> <li>• The multipurpose facility needs to be aimed at the wider community as well as those living on the site.</li> <li>• The project will ultimately be considered a success if it includes community owned spaces to meet and create collaboratively.</li> <li>• More community facilities over residential dwellings.</li> <li>• Too much housing, not enough for community use.</li> <li>• The more compact the residential use, the more important becomes the supporting infrastructure, this implies that cultural infrastructure must also have an important place in the scheme.</li> <li>• Community infrastructure uses &amp; facilities should be included on an equal footing with residential aims, not as an add-on, afterthought</li> <li>• I believe since the site was a community site with a hospital on it for the local community, that any further development needs to be focused majority at supporting the local community not residential housing.</li> <li>• Whilst acknowledging the need for housing in Mullum this should not be at the expense of community facilities. The amount of space allocated is pitifully small in the current plan. The site was never intended to be a housing development.</li> <li>• Generally the allocation to community infrastructure seems to be grossly inadequate. To have that site, a remaining site of usable land entirely dominated by housing when there are so many other existing community needs, is rather poor strategy. Having more housing when there is already insufficient cultural provisions then creating more demand for these resources does not add up. It just houses people then creates more demands on an under resourced cultural sector</li> <li>• We think the provision of space for community facilities is inadequate, particularly given recent weather events and new needs. The current planning approach misses a huge opportunity to provide much needed facilities for the wider community. <b>Suggestion</b> - <i>We advocate a new type of community facility that is based on a place making methodology. It needs to imagine how the master planning of the lower site can be developed and redeveloped over the next 20-50 years, with a low-cost structure. At the same time, we need to take into account impacts like climate change,</i></li> </ul>	<p>Importance of adequate community facilities noted and SSUDP vision and goals updated to reflect this. Concept masterplan to define quantum's of each land use.</p>

<p><i>changes of technology and natural disaster contingencies. A full engagement with the community and understanding of future council resourcing is essential.</i></p>	
<p><b>Comments from different submissions about the topic of open space needed:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This vision is out date, even four years ago when the original fairly limited consultation was conducted, it was out of date. A vision for a "neighbourhood" is at odds with other key parts of the current plan and in itself is too modest for current community needs or a realisation of the true value of this site. A "neighbourhood" suggests a horizontal suburban configuration, which in this case might have a simple community centre and park located in it. (Note there is no functional on the plan, only protected vegetation on a slope. A functional recreation space would probably need to be located on the flat land in the SE corner).</li> <li>• The corner nearest Azalea St/ Left Bank Rd should be left as <b>public open space</b> - a park for community gatherings and use.</li> <li>• As mentioned previously, I think the park on the bottom corner should be left as open space for public enjoyment and use.</li> </ul> <p>Ideas already on the agenda, for some members of the community, a hydrotherapy pool is on the wish list, and use of the 'horse paddock' is envisioned as the site for a <b>multipurpose community facility</b> for functions available for the whole community.</p>	<p>Points noted - Concept masterplan to investigate further and define quantum's of each land use. Vision and goals updated to reference parts of this feedback.</p>
<p><b>Community Facilities</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The following is a non-exhaustive list of suggested community needs that might be addressed on this site, that have arisen through our community conversations during 2021-22: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Emergency and mobile facilities, such as mobile libraries, medical clinics and disaster/recovery coordination;</li> <li>o Safe emergency gathering and communication space for natural disasters;</li> <li>o <b>Youth, community, health and education facilities</b>, as well as accommodation of new services;</li> <li>o Arts facilities – low cost private studios, performance and rehearsal space, workshop and exhibition space</li> <li>o Community meeting, "culturally appropriate" recreation space</li> <li>o Relocation of some existing facilities such as the Mullumbimby Library or community education spaces</li> <li>o Supplementary <b>semi-commercial facilities</b> such as, a café, food vans and grocery store</li> <li>o <b>Integrated Community Housing</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Points noted - Concept masterplan to investigate further and define quantum's of each land use. Vision and goals updated to reference parts of this feedback.</p>
<p>Could have done with a <b>youth centre</b>. Somewhere for our kids to go.</p>	<p>Will add to land uses to be considered.</p>
<p>Will a procedural document for both the DSS and UDP be accessible to the community? Greater consideration should be given to the "giving back" of some of the site to the community, there has been a tremendous loss to the community in general and a lot of grief over it. Yes, the site is owned now by the BSC, but the site holds a lot of stories, both from living memory and from times forgotten or not even recognized. The strategy at this stage does not offer anything back that can be accessed at all times by everyone. Where is the "bone yard"? Can a place be allocated for a</p>	<p>Noted – to be considered in the concept masterplanning stage.</p>



<p><b>small park</b> as a gesture of a new beginning...the core of the new “bioregional” precinct to evolve from the site.</p> <p>Further consideration should be given to the detailed land use based on the context....lots to explore here...in principal – don’t get caught in the false pretext that “that is the best land to build on” paradigm...you can build on anything, but you cant use any land for open space.</p>	
<b>Arts &amp; Culture</b>	
<p><b>Comments from different submissions about the topic of arts and culture:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please include an arts precinct in the vision.</li> <li>• There is no goal related to art and culture.</li> <li>• Apart from the health needs there is no specific allowance for an art presence (I know it has a public art point indicated), but a place for ongoing creative pursuits and happenings.... a flexible space that generates interest: theatre, concerts, poetry, debate, exhibitions.... This community has many creatives and the opportunities for them to create and show are extremely limited.</li> <li>• Half our children were born at this site. This plan needs to prioritise the provision of community and creative spaces that will nurture our next generation. Whilst we all know the need for residential buildings, we also know that these often fall into the hands of private, external interests, with no benefit to the community.</li> <li>• Will keep it brief: Mullumbimby and our whole shire seriously lack a good Arts Precinct This site offers great opportunity and it would be very compatible with residential planning in place Creative Mullumbimby Inc has developed ideas about how an Arts Precinct can enhance amenity, employment and opportunity for our whole region. Remember this region is characterised as ‘The Creative Region’. Lets make sure we support this idea at LGA level. Please develop this idea. It is desperately needed in this shire. We can jointly develop plans and gain financial support from Arts infrastructure grants and philanthropists. A substantial submission for such an idea was prepared for the old Scout Hall. We can readily share this data with the planning team.</li> </ul>	<p>Points noted – vision and goals updated to reference this aim. Concept masterplanning to progress feasibility of this.</p>
<p>As detailed earlier the current draft site strategy and urban design protocol does not reflect new community needs or reflect any respect for the history and cultural importance of the site. Such as the need for a <b>Community Arts Hub</b>. - This location is a perfect location for such a facility, noting there are no other current suitable options zoned or unzoned.</p> <p><b>Flood free emergency assembly and community facilities.</b></p> <p>Art or Story trails</p> <p>Neither does it fully respect earlier submissions and contributions related to the 2018 consultation.</p> <p>Attached are:</p> <p>2018 Creative Mullumbimby submission</p> <p>2018 SHH submission</p> <p>(Noting these are 2 of 4 only major submissions)</p> <p>Two housing sketch designs commissioned by the Mullumbimby Hospital Trust in 2010</p>	<p>Importance of Art and Culture noted.</p> <p>Earlier submissions now reviewed.</p>
<p>A <b>shared community garden/food growing</b> should be included near the community amenity/meeting building and even within different site precincts. This would help build community cohesion and participation.</p>	<p>To be considered at detailed design stage.</p>
<p>Our community group formed in late 2020 with specific concerns that, despite Mullumbimby being a "creative community", there is a lack of <b>affordable space</b></p>	<p>Noted</p>



<p><b>for artists and creatives</b> to operate in the town. We envisaged a space similar to M-Arts in Murwillumbah as our initial model.</p> <p>We began to lobby council for public land/space where this could occur. In late 2021 we wrote a submission on behalf of Creative Mullumbimby to take over the Mullumbimby Scout Hall for this purpose, but were unsuccessful. By early 2022, it was obvious the old hospital site was one of the only genuine opportunities.</p>	
<p>By early 2022, after the floods, when many of the existing community halls flooded, our vision changed to a new type of <b>community hub</b> including arts, theatre and a <b>flood free community assembly place</b>. We began talking to many from the 2018 hospital reference group and particularly people associated with the original hospital, as well as groups like Byron Youth Theatre. We believe our vision is completely consistent with the current council direction, however the current vision of a "neighbourhood" should be rearticulated as an "urban village" with integrated community hub. We would like to see the current proposal to move from just rezoning to a placemaking process articulating a 20-50 year vision. <b>(See p5 - The Story - Hospital Hill - 2022-2042)</b></p>	<p>Vision and goals updated to reflect this.</p>
<b>Mixed Use Precinct</b>	
<p><b>Comments related to mixed use precinct:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Neighbourhood", conjures up a suburban feel, possibly the use of "precinct" may be included. The precinct design provides for development that responds to local community needs and the wider social context by delivering an <b>appropriate mix of land uses, dwelling types and public spaces</b>. The clause stating "particularly those who have been.....etc" should be removed leaving the emphasis on diverse community. There should be a feeling of community and tenure should be blind so more cohesive socio mix is engendered.</li> <li>• There is an opportunity for a further reaching approach by creating an exemplar for a contextual societal shift for rural village living...A hybridised urban approach within a rural township setting. I am a little unsure in what context the phrase "especially maximising the provision of affordable and attainable housing" is defined. The project has the potential for the precinct to be a vibrant hub that is an attractive place to live, breathe and visit, that as a matter of course provides the required accommodation.</li> <li>• In reality there is an existing nursing home and the plan proposes 11.5m height limit, therefore three stories. This combination and broader community aspirations for art space, creative industry space and sophisticated new types of community and semi-commercial space mean it is an integrated urban setting and should be treated as a dense urban village that is an adjunct to the Mullumbimby town centre and a centre in its own right.</li> <li>• It is framed as a neighbourhood, effectively the vision of a suburban dormitory suburb rather than a living urban village.</li> <li>• I agree with this being a development for locals who have been pushed out of the area due to unaffordability. This means locals with a history of having lived in the area for some time and have a connection to the area e.g. families with children attending local schools, elderly people who have lived in the area for a long time, should be prioritised. There may have to be reassurance in the final draft that council is not building a low rent ghetto, but a vibrant community.</li> </ul>	<p>Vision and goals updated to better reflect some of these comments.</p>
<p>Note: there is now strong potential to <b>mix housing and community facilities</b> on different levels across the site, particularly the lower site.</p>	<p>Noted – plan updated to reflect this.</p>
<b>History – responsive to recognition of</b>	

<p><b>History of the site.</b> The former Mullumbimby Hospital site has been part of the history of Mullumbimby since 1900 when an area of 13 acres (5.26 hectares) was set apart, by the NSW State Government, as Crown Reserve for Public Purpose. The site was then designated, by the State Government as 'Mullumbimby Hospital Reserve' in 1902 when the first trustees were appointed to manage the site.</p> <p>This arrangement continued for the next 115 years with Trustees drawn from the local community. The last Board of Trustees was appointed in 2008, by the State Government, and dissolved by it in 2010. It is important to note that Mullumbimby operated as a separate Municipality, 1908-1980, when forced to amalgamate with Byron Shire. Byron Shire council offices relocated to Mullumbimby in 1990's.</p> <p>Over the years development of the hospital site has always been heavily reliant on funding raised by the community. For example, it took 50 years before enough funding was secured to build the hospital and nurses home which opened in 1968. The Aged Care facility, built by St Vincent De Paul (NSW) and leased on a 33 year contract, recently renewed, was built in 1982, and, later, training rooms were made available for young adults with disabilities.</p> <p>The Birthing Centre was constructed in 1993.</p>	<p>Site history has been updated to reflect parts of this.</p>
<p>There is little acknowledgement of the once "sacred site" of the hospital, birthing unit building or community health centre. All the buildings are gone and there is no evidence they ever existed.</p> <p><i>Suggestion - There needs to be <b>art and historical interpretative storytelling integrated into the design of new facilities and housing</b> on this site. Given the site's status this would be better done to inform the site's development rather than as an afterthought</i></p> <p><i>Suggestion - A public event in early to mid 2023 on site could incorporate a design or place making workshop that celebrates the site's history. This event might include a ceremony like a tree planting to start new process</i></p>	<p>SSUDP updated to better reflect this.</p>
<b>Housing Typologies</b>	
<p>I think a <b>mix of housing types</b>. Not only units in blocks, but also townhouses with courtyards and small gardens.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>The Hospital Site must not be allowed to evolve into another suburban outlier/satellite with singular housing typologies. It must be a precedent for good development practice and design that builds on the strength of our community and contributes to its 'sense of place'. Ad hoc and outdated development approaches must not be tolerated.</p> <p>The Hospital Site is a critically important step forward to creating additional housing close to town. A properly planned outcome must deliver a <b>diverse range of housing</b>, positively respond to the need for <b>walking/cycling access</b> and address the project's impact on current Town Centre <b>traffic and parking</b> issues.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>As noted above, a <b>variety of housing typologies along with different densities</b> must be considered. Ensuring a mix of dwellings suitable for individuals of all ages and larger dwellings for family groups should be a priority. This must be built into any planning controls, particularly the LEP.</p> <p>The potential to 'test' <b>intergenerational housing models</b> within the site must be considered. These should cater for a mix of dwelling structures, household structures and consider culturally appropriate housing.</p>	<p>Vision and goals updated to make sure this is reflected. And LEP and DCP amendments to consider this comment.</p>
<p>Building some individuality of design (not 'ad hoc' design) within community would create the sense of a community and a better aesthetic.</p>	<p>DCP drafting to consider this.</p>
<p>The plan assumes an 11.5m height, this allows accommodation of a target of 120 plus dwellings. This is good, both, in that it raises the potential value of the</p>	<p>Agreed. This is part of the next stage.</p>

land for council, and it is a worthy affordable housing ambition. However, because of a lack of modelling and analysis, it fails to recognise that the site will probably now be predominantly three storey medium density housing and the site can probably accommodate twice as many dwellings, while still providing a great deal of flexibility for the wider community use. <i>Suggestion - There needs to be a site-specific housing strategy with design modelling that articulates <b>diversity of housing types and sizes</b> and break-down of target markets and demographics, that is matched to financial feasibility analysis and at least in broad terms a has development strategy.</i>	
<b>Height Focus</b>	
This height relaxation is not in accordance to current and existing residential development. We have essentially lost a vital community service that was a hospital only to be replaced with over height development that promises to provide affordable housing. Let's be honest unless it is rent capped and build with accessibility for NDIS people and the aged this draft plan does not fulfil the vision. The compromise of liveability with floorplan size reduction, increased height and limited accessibility serves investors and developers only. Many low income and aged residents will have access issues with increased height to 3 levels and lack of car access to dwellings.	Height concerns noted.
Should be dependent on location within the site. Wouldnt support on the higher parts of the site where it would have a visual impact	Noted
3 storeys would mean that many people would have their views and cooling breezes blocked	Noted – this is a future design consideration.
Maximum should be 8.5	Comment acknowledged. Building heights discussed in Council report.
Prefer 2 stories, but some flexibility for rooftop features - decks, gardens, social spaces	Comment acknowledged. Building heights discussed in Council report.
Let's not set a precedence, keep it 2 stories.	Comment acknowledged. Building heights discussed in Council report.
Building height limits should be kept at 8.5m on elevated rear section to limit the visual impact when looking at the reservoir hill ridge-line from the north and east, and also as to not obstruct views from the reservoir lookout when looking out over the top of the development. Over development allowing a 11.5m height limit will also be out of character with adjoining properties, particularly Coolamon Villa which is single storey for that part of the building situated on the crest of the hill.	Noted – to be considered in Concept Masterplan work. And specific design consideration provided in the DCP update.
As a neighbour on the southern side I definitely don't want 3 storey buildings on my northern boundary. Also I just think that's too high a density for what has been a quiet and peaceful neighbourhood rich in wildlife.	Comment acknowledged. Building heights discussed in Council report.
the height of any building needs to remain at 8.5m not 2 storey	Comment acknowledged. Building heights discussed in Council report.
This would be fine if the proposal for quality buildings and design is carried out.	Noted
I think the height increase to 11.5m is absolutely necessary to create the maximum affordable housing outcomes. With appropriate, creative design, a three story building can be beautiful and not imposing.	Comment acknowledged. Building heights discussed in Council report.
Further investigation into the impact of limiting the heights to 11.5 m on portions of the site where gradients exceed a given grade should be undertaken. Provision should be in place to allow significant components of the built form to exceed 11.5 m. Set by percentage limits, sight lines, materials, use etc etc...	Comment acknowledged. Building heights discussed in Council report.

Yes possibly but not over all the site ....there should be a variations and not to the extent that there is a shadowy bloc produced.	Noted – to be considered in Concept Masterplan work. And specific design consideration provided in the DCP update.
Yes yes yes. This should be across the whole site, and if a proposal for a new nursing home some sort of hybrid nursing home, respite centre and private hospital were to emerge in the next 10 years this planning process should facilitate it, otherwise we risk new planning delays of 2-5 years. To reiterate I think this plan fails to understand the full implications of an Urban Design Protocol, on integrated buildings forms, on facilitating complex social/cultural/environmental interactions. But yes the site would be enhanced by 11.5m building height, if you could fight for 13m while arguing a restriction to 3 full stories this would allow flexibility for a range of new types roof top infrastructure and possibly mezzanines and lofts in housing.	Comment acknowledged. Building heights discussed in Council report.
Nowhere in Mullum are there three storey buildings. This is out of character for the neighbourhood. It will disadvantage the neighbours.	Comment acknowledged. Building heights discussed in Council report.
A more detailed urban design analysis is required to <b>identify where three storey buildings might be appropriate</b> . Obviously, this must acknowledge neighbouring properties, shading and neighbourhood amenity. We strongly believe three storey buildings at the top of the hill in the southwestern corner would not be a favourable outcome. They would be an overpowering and dominant form within the landscape.	Agreed. This will be done as part of an Enquiry By Design Concept Masterplan process
Alternatively, there is the opportunity to have a three story 'cascade' down the hill slope. This would blend with the topography, would not overwhelm the site, while offering a <b>variety of housing types</b> to meet diverse community needs. The latter are not possible under current and outdated Byron LEP and DCP controls.	To be investigated as part of the Concept Masterplan and DCP development.
We support a new height limit of 11.5m, although we think that the flat land use map fails to understand the three-dimensional implications and needs an integrated urban design approach.	Concern noted
<b>Accessibility</b>	
If this is to accessible, then there would need to be ramps, or all who anticipated ability challenges in the next few years would have to be housed on the bottom level	Noted – this is a future design consideration.
Accessibility issues for NDIS and aged residents. These people are often low income and require more accessibility. There is already a minimum amount of green space in this plan, increased heights leads to overshadowed green spaces, lack of natural light and general reduction in liveability.	Noted – this is a future design consideration.
<b>Density</b>	
Maximising the provision of affordable housing may be good for the developer but not necessarily comfortable for those <b>living crammed too closely together</b> .	Noted – to be addressed in design responses.
More detail on number of dwellings and general access to these dwellings. Of course this does not have to be detailed floorplans but needs to specify number of dwellings and sqm of each dwelling before land use can be changed	Noted – this will be part of the Concept Masterplanning in the next stage.
Too many proposed dwellings. Not enough infrastructure in mullumbimby town as it is for current residents let alone an increase of potential another 100+ residences	Infrastructure capacity to be assessed in the next stage as part of Planning Proposal process.
Nobody argues the need for "maximising the amount of affordable, attainable and accessible dwellings". It is critical, however without a combination of site specific housing strategy or modelling development densities, the plan fails to understand what is possible and what is needed. Two examples given the three	Noted – to be considered as part of land development strategy in next stage.

stories an 11.5m height allowance provides, more than 250 dwellings could be located on this site. The proposed new street alone could accommodate more than 100 apartments at the 1st and 2nd story levels, while allowing the ground floor to accommodate community facilities, artist studio space etc. The current proposed land use conceives of the site in two dimensions, when it should conceive of it in three and even dimensions. The only other part of Byron Shire that currently has 11.5m high limit is the centre of Byron Bay, all new proposed developments there are vertical integrated and multiple use and they all take many years of testing development scenarios to come to fruition.	
Think we need to ensure diversity of typologies and densities is included	Noted – this will be part of the Concept Masterplanning in the next stage.
<b>Sustainability</b>	
Energy efficient and passive solar design should be built into the goals not only affordability.	Noted. Project goals updated to include sustainability measure.
I think sustainable, energy efficient, prebuilt and assembled onsite, modular buildings should be encouraged/incentivised. Both for affordability reasons and to minimise the time excessive construction is taking place in the precinct. Renew.org.au would be a good nonprofit organisation to advise on these. Also see house plans available from <a href="https://liveatthecape.com.au/house-designs/pre-approved-designs/">https://liveatthecape.com.au/house-designs/pre-approved-designs/</a> and the features in this outstanding development in Victoria. It is also an ideal location to have a community battery to store solar energy generated onsite. As many people need to relocate out of the flood zone help and funding should be sought from the NSW reconstruction authority that may help speed up the development.	To be consider in development strategy.
This site as the only unconstrained council land likely to be developed in the next 10 years should be responding to all the consequences of COVID and the natural disasters in the last 4 years. The need to support and nurture own arts and creative workers. The need for new safe emergency shelter and assembly. The need to relocate some existing and vulnerable community facilities. Etc These goals are so limited, neither reflecting what a hardnosed property development process needs or the complex needs of a community in transition faced with climate change, new technologies, modes of service or new forms of social crisis.	Points noted and project goals updated to reflect some of these points.
The Mullum PPC team sees development of this high-profile site as an opportunity to showcase and incorporate <b>sustainable design</b> principles in the built environment, the green zones and community shared areas. This approach would set a valuable and enduring precedent for the Mullumbimby community and Byron Shire. Future designers and developers of the site must demonstrate appropriate and contemporary planning, building design and landscape concepts. Failure to do so will mean years of work, and an exemplar opportunity, will be lost.	Noted - vision and Goals updated to reflect parts of this.



<b>Road Infrastructure /Carparking</b>	
<b>Road</b>	
Major consideration towards traffic management of an already over used thorough fare needs to be priority	Infrastructure capacity to be assessed in the next stage as part of Planning Proposal process.
<p>Concerned about:</p> <p>(1) parking - provided info says minimal, but residents will definitely require parking spaces. Otherwise will park on busy Left Bank Rd, narrow Azalea St, etc</p> <p>(2) internal roads - more needed than just one from Left Bank Rd across to Azalea. This doesn't seem to have access to those two roads.</p> <p>(3) definitely need a slip road or better access for drivers turning right from LB Rd into Azalea. This is a difficult intersection especially at morning school times, with buses and long traffic queues trying to get onto Dalley St to turn left &amp; right. Bridge is a bottleneck at these times.</p>	Infrastructure provision to be assessed in the next stage as part of Planning Proposal process.
At this point, I am concerned about traffic and safety. There are many people, especially children who use Azalea St for walking to and from school (often shortcutting to Tallowood) and with the increase of traffic, bike paths and footpaths need to be put in place. Also, the intersection of Azalea st and Left Bank Road is already quite dangerous. I have had many near misses as cars drive out of Left Bank Road without looking up or down Azalea st for cars. This needs to be sorted now, and if this development goes ahead, needs high consideration with the amount of increased traffic.	Infrastructure provision to be assessed in the next stage as part of Planning Proposal process.
The Azalea Street/ Jubilee Avenue/Coolamon Scenic Drive <b>intersection is a bottleneck</b> during Shearwater School drop off and pick up times. It can only get worse. As a priority, the next planning and design stages must address how more cars converging on this intersection can be handled from both a <b>traffic management</b> and urban design perspective.	Infrastructure capacity to be assessed in the next stage as part of Planning Proposal process.
<b>Paths</b>	
Foot paths and bike paths need to be installed. Mullum needs infrastructure improvements before increasing population	Footpath and bike path considerations are included in the SSUDP.
<p>Creating a street along the sealed cap would appear sensible, however making it a public road reserve for cars, that divides the site rather than unites is not sensible, is expensive and wastes valuable space, noting all adjacent underground service infrastructure will need to be located 30-35m apart either side of the cap.</p> <p><i>Suggestion - Would it not be better to make it a covered street that is primarily pedestrian, in effect a large public space? We think around 100 small dwellings could be located above this street, leaving the sealed ground floor for community facilities, while car parking could be provided at either end or from behind.</i></p>	To be considered at concept masterplan stage.
<b>Carparking</b>	
<p><b>Comments related to carparking:</b></p> <p>What is your vision for parking, at least 2 car spaces per residence.</p> <p>If suitable parking is provided and not cars strewn all over the neighbourhood as per the rest of town.</p>	Development will need to meet provisions of the Byron Development Control Plan 2014.
I'd like to see the parking arrangements before I would agree.	Noted
<b>Ecological Considerations</b>	
There needs to be more green space left. The paddock area has always been a natural area free of housing and humans therefore it is a wildlife area. Each time land is cleared, animals die. This was evidenced when 5 acres was cleared at the cnr of Poplar St and Azalea st. a number of years ago and I and other	Noted and will be considered by ecology assessment.

neighbours found deceased possums and echidnas in the following weeks as well as the birds fighting for territory.	
I'm concerned about allowing for 11m high buildings. I'm also concerned about wildlife. I see echidnas bandicoots and wallabies regularly in the horse paddock and this will be the end of them.	Noted and will be considered by ecology assessment.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The buffer zone on the south-western edge is smart because it protects a valuable ecology and is a buffer to adjoining housing while potentially creating useful pedestrian and cycle access to the lower site.</li> </ul> <p>The purpose of the central separating space is less clear. These trees are probably important to protect and as a buffer, however it is likely not a useful recreational space or pathway.</p> <p>Without a tree or ecological assessment, it locks in a zone that may have more value protected in other ways on the R1 zoned land. Additionally, there are many other valuable trees on the lower site that should be protected but aren't.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finally, if this site is to have a large resident medium density population it should have <b>"green" open recreational space</b> set aside, the flat South-Eastern corner is the obvious place to do this.</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggestion</b> - Have green space planning informed by a full assessment and needs that arise by design modelling.</p>	This will be considered as part of detailed assessment in next stage.
As a means of connecting with Country, an unbroken <b>green corridor link</b> from a ridge top park down the gully to a park on the Azalea Street/Left Bank Road corner is recommended. In this respect, development of the LEP and site specific DCP should apply the NSW Government Architect's Draft Connecting with Country framework from master planning to detailed design.	Noted. Considered as a part of updates to SSUDP.
Connectivity of vegetation is important. Leaving green areas is not just about landscaping or screening, it's also about honouring the site with native vegetation and creating a corridor for flora and fauna. The green zone of connectivity suggested on the attached plan would also create an important visual aesthetic for the community and the site.	Noted. Considered as a part of updates to SSUDP.
<b>Adjoining Properties</b>	
Residents of Left Bank Rd requests town sewage as part of this development.	Not considered as part of this project scope.
Sewage please.	Not enough information provided to respond to.
<p>Thank you for your support during the demolition and remediation of the site, particularly through liaison with the admirable Mick Crosbie. We support the proposed development of the Mullumbimby Hospital site, providing much needed housing for our community.</p> <p>However, this will have a significant impact on our home. Not only will the construction impact us, but also the final building and occupation will radically weaken both our privacy and the agreeableness of living there. We expect an increase of traffic as well as noise from the activities of everyday life of those living in 120 two story villas.</p> <p>These will likely be concerns of owners of other properties adjoining the site, namely 4, 12 &amp; 16 Left Bank Road.</p> <p>We have two requests to ameliorate some of these losses.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rezone our two lots to R1. Since we will have 8m or perhaps three story high buildings adjacent to us, it would seem fair that we can increase our density.</li> <li>2. Connect us to town sewerage. This would be required for us to use the land for habitation rather than septic infiltration. Obviously there would be a connection to the hospital site.</li> </ol>	This land is part of the Left Bank Road R5 Large Lot Residential area. In June Council resolved to progress Rural Land Use Strategy action 21 to investigate the capacity for re-subdivision of large lot residential areas. A report to the 8 December Council Planning meeting will outline a program for this work to align with the Residential Strategy refresh. This will facilitate an open and transparent consideration of options and issues such as infrastructure capacity. Another consideration will be the suitability for an affordable



	housing contribution scheme to be applied on possible land value uplifts resulting from an urban residential zoning and or further subdivision/densification.
--	---

<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>Our home is directly adjacent to the former Mullumbimby hospital site at number Left Bank Rd. We essentially support the proposed development of this site to provide much needed high-density housing in our town.</p> <p>Our home and 3 others (No's 2,4,12 &amp;16 Left Bank Rd) back directly onto this site and will endure major impacts to our amenity &amp; privacy if 100 - 129 dwelling are built so close to our homes.</p> <p>As such, we formerly and respectfully ask that you also rezone these 4 properties to R1 or R2 in conjunction with the rezoning of the former hospital site which one would think would make sense from a planning and cost point of view. We could then have the potential of adding additional dwellings to our land in the future which would complement your development proposal by providing even more much needed homes to our town.</p> <p>It does not seem fair or equitable to rezone the BSC land and leave our 4 adjoining properties isolated with no avenue for further development and heavily effected by your adjoining development.</p>	See above.
<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>Our home is directly adjacent to the former Mullumbimby hospital site at number 12 Left Bank Rd.</p> <p>We support the proposed development of this site to provide much needed high density housing in our town.</p> <p>Our home and 3 others (No's 2,4,12 &amp;16 Left Bank Rd) back directly onto this site and will endure major impacts to our amenity &amp; privacy if 100 - 129 dwelling are built so close to our homes.</p> <p>As such, we formerly and respectfully ask that you also rezone these 4 properties to R1 Or R2 in conjunction with the rezoning of the former hospital site which would surely make sense from a planning and cost point of view. We could then add additional dwellings to our land which would compliment your development proposal by providing even more much needed homes to our town. These additional homes could then be included in your planning with regard to traffic, walking paths and amenities within your site.</p> <p>It does not seem fair or equitable to rezone the BSC land and leave our 4 adjoining properties isolated with no avenue for further development and heavily effected by your adjoining development.</p> <p>We sent a formal submission (see attached) to BSC in February 2022 asking to be rezoned which seems to have been over looked in favour of rezoning the council land instead.</p>	See above.
<p>I have several concerns about it. Firstly, the sheer number of dwellings seems very high, and secondly being up to three storeys high is concerning. It's going to have a huge impact on what has been a very peaceful area, and aside from disturbing the current amenity values of the neighbourhood I can't see how you will manage the traffic impacts. At school pick up and drop off times the corner of Left Bank Rd and Azalea, as well as the corner of Azalea and Jubilee Avenue are already horribly congested. What happens if you add traffic from all these new residences?</p>	<p>Impacts on amenity: Amenity is comprised of tangible (e.g. traffic, noise, dust, odour and light) and intangible (e.g. reasonable expectations of a neighbourhood) aspects. This project is a redevelopment of a disused hospital site. Hospitals</p>

<p>I understand that we have a need for more housing but three story dwellings in an area like this seem excessive. I can't see you how you can propose 11.5m height limit and also describe it as a 'beautiful green neighbourhood'.</p> <p>I am particularly concerned about the horse paddock which has been a refuge for local wildlife, including wallabies, in the 6 years that I have lived there. I have always thought that it would be more appropriate to use that as a food forest or botanical garden for the whole community to use and provide some food security for locals.</p> <p>Along the top of the ridge is a planting that was done by Landcare as a wildlife corridor. At the very least that should be connected up with the band of vegetation that runs along the back of the hospital fence, but I feel that it could be enhanced by a well-conceived plan for further plantings on the northern face of the ridge.</p> <p>I have to confess I'm particularly concerned about how my house is impacted by what happens in that area, as it is right on the boundary, and that is our northern aspect and main source of light inside the house, particularly in winter. I would hope that whatever happens there, a) an appropriate distance be maintained between my house and any other buildings, and b) that consideration be made to not shade out my house with high buildings or tall trees.</p> <p>Overall the proposal causes me some distress as I'm sure you would understand. I moved there for the peaceful aspect of the site before the hospital closed, and am not thrilled by the idea of living next to a development site for many years. I understand that there is a need for more housing in the area, but I'm very concerned that this will make my property unlivable for myself, and will hugely impact its resale value in the immediate future and whilst the site is being developed.</p> <p>I understand that the other landholders who directly border the site are keen to see our blocks be rezoned to R! or R2 as part of this process, and I agree with their thinking. To leave us as R5 adjacent to a development like this seems illogical and unfair.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing back from you in regards to this.</p>	<p>are 24 hour/7 day a week operation with the above listed impacts and the regular coming and going of staff and patients etc. Whilst acknowledging that there may be short term amenity impacts during the redevelopment stage, when placed in perspective it is considered the proposed development will provide enhanced amenity, above that of living adjacent to a hospital.</p> <p>Noted. The SSUDP has noted wildlife connectivity as important on the site.</p> <p>Noted. These concerns will be dealt with in future stages of the project.</p> <p>See above.</p>
<p><b>Zoning</b></p>	
<p>The planning system drives a strange backward process. Rezoning should follow a detailed understanding of use rather than other way round, or alternatively council should ensure the most flexible zoning possible, which R1 might be. Were zonings like B4 or RU5 considered? If a blanket zoning is followed, the articulation of permitted uses becomes critical and needs consultation.</p>	<p>As per comment above</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are not sure why the 11.5m height or blanket rezoning would not be applied to Coolamon Villas, particularly as it is reaching the end of its useful life and may be redeveloped within 10 years.</li> </ul>	<p>No changes suggested to Coolamon Villas site as its current use is desired to continue.</p>
<p>The current process is backward, even if a single zoning is required, has a B4 or RU5 zoning been tested? And why is the nursing home excluded when, within 10-15 years it may need to be redeveloped as something else? While in a country town, this site is an urban site, the processes that create its zoning should be led by a proper Urban Land Use study with appropriate attention to a broad engaged community consultation, a site housing strategy and development economics. Without more comprehensive investigation you risk locking in zoning and processes that might take 5-10 years to unwind.</p>	<p>B4 not considered appropriate as predominate desired use is residential. There are also uses permitted in B4 that are not envisioned for the site.</p> <p>RU5 not considered appropriate as this is used for unserved rural villages. It also allows for uses that are not envisioned for the site.</p>

	The intention is for the proposed zoning to cover the range of possibilities for the site.
The key to agreeing with the R1 zoning is the usage table. Have you considered B4 zoning which could be more inclusive	<p>B4 not considered appropriate as predominate desired use is residential. There are also uses permitted in B4 that are not envisioned for the site.</p> <p>The exact land use table will be considered at the next stage of the project, and for the preparation of the Planning Proposal.</p>
<b>General Comments</b>	
Sounds beautiful but often these descriptions don't eventuate in reality.	Noted.
Feel that the strategy and design protocols need to be strengthened to measure success appropriately	Noted – more detail added to project goals.
Unsure	Noted.
Until we have the make of the residential and community facilities it is not advanced enough to comment on.	Noted – this will be part of the Concept Masterplanning in the next stage.
The urban design strategy should inform further what this looks like	Noted
Make sure that it has a sound social and environmental plan sustained by economic activity	Noted – this will be further mapped out during the next stages of the project.
<p>1 The document is poorly written and shows no sign of editing. Statements are repeated and issues are raised but no resolution is given, maps are included but without an associated legend just to make it look good!! It would not pass as an undergraduate dissertation. I think we deserve better.</p> <p>2 There is a confusion of ideologies. Speaking personally for one who has a mobility disability so I cannot ride a bike and walking is a bit difficult, to emphasis minimal parking would result in discrimination against those of us who have to rely on cars.</p> <p>Acknowledgement is given to the Bundjalung People but nowhere does the document describe the impact of that acknowledgement. It does say that any development will include the results of consultation but surely consultation should have happened before the document was prepared. Such action implies that any consultation will be ignored.</p> <p>3 There appears to be no geotechnical consideration, the results of which will limit the type of construction, be it roads or buildings. There is also no information on limits defined by the available infrastructure.</p> <p>4 A significant architectural input is emphasised. Surely the first step is seeking the advice of a town planner who could offer the design restraints. It would be up to the individual landowners to comply.</p> <p>5 Until the above constraints are defined, there is little point in asking for any form of input as people's efforts could be nullified by these constraints. There would be more, but the direction of the document is too confusing as it should be dismissed as inadequate for the purpose.</p>	<p>1. Concern noted</p> <p>2. Concern noted</p> <p>3. Part of next stage investigations</p> <p>4. Part of next stage investigations</p> <p>Noted</p>
<b>Mullumbimby Hospital Site Redevelopment Submission Page - 5</b>	
<b>The Story - Hospital Hill - 2022-2042 (refer to submissions)</b>	Process of next steps reviewed and parts incorporated where possible.

<p>There should be strong physical and conceptual '<b>connectivity</b>' to <b>Mullumbimby</b>. The Hospital Site must not become something so different it becomes 'unto itself' and isolated rather than part of the whole town. This element of 'connectivity' could be easily achieved through landscaping design or creative elements within the central town. An example might be the use of the Town Centre's sandstone blocks/shapes in the landscaping areas and community facility. They might even be used as 'markers' along an improved footpath to the Town Centre.</p>	<p>Noted. Site vision updated and principles introduced to better reflect this.</p>
<p>Council clearly has considerably more work to do on this critically important project. As the town's representatives on the PPC we will continue to be a considerate bridge to the community. There are many challenges ahead. Not least of these will be determining how public (Council as landowner) and private (financier, designer and developer) efforts will unite to create an outstanding outcome. This challenge demands a lot more thought.</p>	<p>Noted</p>