

COFFS HARBOUR JETTY FORESHORES PRECINCT

GHD Community and Stakeholder Consultation Outcomes Report.

Flawed and misleading conclusions

Incorrect pro-development conclusions.

| |
|--|
| <p>The GHD report states “almost 2/3 support low to medium-rise development...”.</p> <p>This statement does NOT agree with the statistics in Step 5 (see table below) of the report. It ignores the consistent results obtained in previous steps. Depending on the area, between 75% and 90% DO NOT SUPPORT low-medium rise. Between 21% and 53% support some low-rise development.</p> |
| <p>“The community was broadly in favour of well-planned development in parts of the Precinct...” (Based on Chart 1 in the report). This conclusion has a false emphasis. In fact, the Chart in the report states “some development is acceptable provided it is well planned”.</p> <p>A fair statement would say “the community was broadly in favour of low-rise community type development in parts of the precinct”.</p> |

Step 5 Survey – GHD states there were “inconsistent results” gathered in the previous steps therefore they designed a second on-line survey which targeted Facebook users and ignored all previous respondents even though GHD had a large email database. The Step 5 survey formed the basis of the conclusions to the GHD report. GHD states that the Step 5 survey gave it “a high level of confidence that the broader community’s interest had been captured”.

In fact, the results of all previous stages are reasonably consistent (see below for pinpoint survey results) and clearly show **significant support for enhanced and improved public facilities/open space and little support for commercial development or accommodation.**

The GHD report correctly states “there was very little appetite for high-rise development (greater than 7 stories) across the precinct”. This option was excluded from the Step 5 survey.

The GHD report makes misleading and incorrect statements about support for “low-medium” rise.

| <u>The GHD report states:</u> | <u>The GHD figures when correctly stated are:</u> |
|--|---|
| Area A (Marina) “63% support low-medium rise” | 90% do not support low-medium rise 53% support low rise |
| Area B (North of Marina Drive) “60% support low-medium rise” | 75% do not support low-medium rise. 35% support low-rise |
| Area C (West of Jordan Esplanade – North end) “64% support low-medium rise” | 78% do not support low-medium rise. 42% support low-rise |
| Area D (West of Jordan Esplanade – South end) “64% support low-medium rise” | 76% do not support low-medium rise. 40% support low-rise |
| Area E (between Jordan Esplanade and beach) “28% support low-medium rise” | 93% do not support low-medium rise. 21% support low-rise |
| Area F (Fishing Club and boat ramp) “61% support low-medium rise” | 78% do not support low-medium rise. 39% support low-rise |

Step 5 Survey – specific questions. The answers to the questions (see box below) suggest that the respondents were not a reliable cross section of the community who use the precinct on a regular basis. They do not appear to be well informed about specific issues. This unrepresentative Facebook group appear to be a different group to all prior interested parties. Nevertheless, this group did not support medium rise development.

| |
|--|
| <p>42% said “Parking is an issue at all times”. This is clearly nonsense. It is a problem during weekends and events.</p> <p>36% said the 12 or 13 access points to the beach were not sufficient. The response is unreasonable.</p> <p>73% agreed with a double barrel question “Some development is acceptable provided it is well planned” but the term “development” is undefined. “Development” includes playparks, public facilities, cafés, restaurants.</p> <p>“Development” does not simply mean multi-storey commercial/accommodation.</p> |
|--|

COFFS HARBOUR JETTY FORESHORES PRECINCT

GHD Community and Stakeholder Consultation Outcomes Report.

Flawed and misleading conclusions

Social pinpoint study. The GHD report essentially ignored the detail of this important study and gave only a superficial analysis of the results. 562 people made a total of 1,600 ideas and comments and voted for or against ideas 11,912 times. The GHD report used the information to help develop broad “themes” but not assess the support for or against specific proposals or broad based concepts.

An analysis of the social pinpoint study shows:

- High level of support for improved and new public facilities and spaces – amenities, picnic tables, sporting facilities, pathways, playgrounds, recreation, shade etc
- A significant majority do not support any medium/high rise commercial development, accommodation, hotels or development east of the railway line.
- About 50% would accept some low-rise development (includes community type development)
- Good support for better and more cafés and food outlets.

First On-line survey. This survey assumed “development” was the key topic but the word “development” was not defined. Question 1 was about the location of development and question 2 was about the types of development. Poor design of question 1 meant that not all people answered the question. There was no opportunity to vote on development types in select areas.

The GHD report concluded that a majority “would support development... provided it was thoughtful [and in an] appropriate location”. This conclusion is of little help in determining community opinions.

Question 2 identified that the majority would support public facilities.

Whilst the majority supported some type of “development”:

76% supported leisure, heritage, boating or recreational development

72% did not support residential, tourism or commercial development.

21% preferred “no development whatsoever”

This is broadly consistent with the pinpoint study results.

Themes. GHD used the above surveys to identify “key themes and subcategories of community feedback”. No attempt was made to assess the weight of opinion for or against particular themes or subcategories.

Of the 7 key themes the most commented upon were “Active Recreation” (394) and “Open space and facilities” (338). “Development” had the lowest number of comments (100).

The main subcategories (over 100 comments) nominated by respondents were Parking, Accessibility, Playgrounds, Open Space (no development), Cafes/Restaurants, Yacht Club and the Environment.

Community related themes and subcategories represented about 68% of the feedback whilst development, culture and tourism facilities represented about 32% of the feedback.

Again, this is very consistent with previous surveys.

Planning Objectives. Planning Objectives – GHD used a provided framework of objectives for the planning process but, Property NSW says the objectives were developed as a result of the GHD community consultation? Why the confusion?

Nevertheless, the Planning Objectives are materially deficient. The objectives demonstrate a failure to understand the current usage and to recognise the current importance of the precinct to the community and the future demand as the population grows. The GHD study did not address all the objectives.

Objective F is “Put the community at the centre of the decision making process through broad, inclusive and transparent consultation.” It is questionable whether the GHD report satisfies this objective.