

Submission #	Support	General	Vision / structure plan.	Urban design principles.	Sustainability and natural environment	Street and movement network.	Amenity and open space.	Precinct 1 - Mixed use village	Precinct 2 - Residential	Precinct 3 - Vehicle ferries	Precinct 4 - Marina and water based development	Infrastructure plan	Implementation strategy	DA matters
TH14/01	<p>Submitter supports the vision for the POA and believes it is about time.</p> <p>Submitter supports improvements to the movement network and improvements to public transport provision.</p> <p>Submitter supports improvements to public open space and walkways including the public beach.</p>		<p>This relates to the overall intended outcomes in the Toonah Harbour POA for example it acts as a tourism gateway to Moreton Bay and North Stradbroke Island, providing job opportunities and supporting the development of a marina with mixed use development including restaurants and</p>	<p>This relates to the criteria in the document which guide the design of buildings and public spaces including for example height, form, location and reception of cultural heritage.</p>	<p>The marine environment is important and important to tourism as well. Draining needs to be done in a sensitive way in consultation with environmental bodies.</p>	<p>Need to ensure easy access to the POA by public transport</p>	<p>Would like to see a watersport facility provided in the park area for families to meet for a BBQ and children able to play in the water - there are not many facilities like this in close proximity.</p>	<p>Submitter would like to see speciality shops provided in this area.</p>		<p>Submitter requests more convenient ferry services to the other islands (other than Heberton and Stradbroke). Ferry services to some islands have been inconsistent and unavailable in the past. Submitter notes that the service provider is an important consideration and the harbour is only as good as its service.</p>				
TH14/02	<p>Submitter supports the provision of a marina and notes there are insufficient marina and boat storage facilities (wet and dry) in the Redlands and this will provide a much needed service, but should complement the overall broader vision for development.</p>		<p>Submitter suggests that development should relate to themes for the POA and that the POA's theme should be more than just a launching pad to the islands. Submitter suggests: moving the maritime museum from Southbank in Brisbane to the Toonah Harbour POA</p> <p>Incorporate opportunities for Indigenous training and teaching programs and other programs that celebrate on the history and knowledge of the local population of Indigenous and South Pacific Islanders in the area</p> <p>Incorporate opportunities for programs linked to marine park management including animal care and research</p> <p>give the horticulture centre a makeover and incorporate training opportunities</p>	<p>Submitter suggests that a central "square" should be created incorporating shopping and other services which is pedestrian friendly with limited vehicle access. With general vehicle access and parking for all other activities including ferry terminals and marinas etc. should be restricted to the north, south and west boundaries of the pedestrian friendly zone.</p> <p>Submitter suggests high rise buildings should be built along the western boundary of the pedestrian friendly square to provide shade during the heat of summer.</p> <p>Submitter suggests that construction styles should keep with the natural environment and the need for sustainable outcomes.</p> <p>Submitter encourages opportunities for architectural outcomes which think outside the square to create "our own little Sydney Opera House" which will remain unique in 100 years time.</p>	<p>Submitter suggests that all development should incorporate sustainability as a theme.</p> <p>Submitter suggests 100% reuse of storm water in open space features and for irrigation.</p> <p>Submitter suggests solar energy should supplement grid supplied energy.</p> <p>Submitter suggests all high rise buildings should be designed to maximise energy efficiency and where possible use bay breeze as a source for evaporative cooling along with appropriate shrubs and trees to maximise shade and evapotranspiration.</p> <p>Submitter suggests natural tree corridors should surround the development with animal protection bridges and fences ensuring maximum health and safety for the animals.</p>	<p>Submitter suggests that parking for residential and commercial buildings should be provided underground and where possible adjacent to the development.</p> <p>Submitter suggests all active transport including walking should be encouraged and promoted; the provision of kayak parking bays. Submitter notes that visitors should feel the site belongs to them and is not created for vehicles.</p> <p>Submitter suggests a subsidised shuttle from Cleveland Station to and from Toonah Harbour would maximise public transport usage and reduce traffic congestion in local streets and shared car parks.</p>	<p>Submitter encourages the provision of a seamless pedestrian traffic flow between all amenities. Even if in some instances moving footpaths are required for the elderly or infirmed.</p> <p>Submitter suggests wherever possible walkways should be covered and water stations should be provided throughout the area.</p> <p>Submitter suggests it will be important to harness the relationship with Moreton Bay as a unique land / marine interface to provide a sense of place in an otherwise busy world. Submitter notes landscaping will require consideration of this and have a positive benefit to amenity.</p>	<p>Submitter suggests development should promote the opportunity to live, work play and learn beside the Bay, with opportunities to promote the maritime influences on local indigenous and horticultural heritage as well as the beaches and adjacent city views. Submitter also notes it will be important to sign the edge of the city in the "airtime" / land interface event.</p>	<p>Submitter suggests development should promote the opportunity to live, work play and learn beside the Bay, with opportunities to promote the maritime influences on local indigenous and horticultural heritage as well as the beaches and adjacent city views. Submitter also notes it will be important to sign the edge of the city in the "airtime" / land interface event.</p>	<p>Submitter notes vehicle ferries are a part of the POA but are not the main reason for development and, that while they should be catered to they should operate in the background and complement the overall broader vision of the development.</p>			<p>Submitter notes that commercial and residential engineering should demonstrate works best practice standards, with developers demonstrating financial and management skills, capable of meeting all aspects of design, construction, sustainability, practicality and aesthetics for such a project.</p>	
TH14/03	<p>Submitter supports development of the POA and notes it is a wonderful idea, more tourism, jobs, business and people should be brought to the Redlands and this will provide a much needed service, but should complement the overall broader vision for development.</p>		<p>Submitter notes infrastructure should not be an eye sore and should be made to be a natural looking as possible.</p>			<p>Submitter notes there should be sufficient parking for residents and tourists, but not so much that it looks like a concrete jungle.</p>	<p>Submitter notes that parks and amenities are definitely a requirement and plenty of shading should be provided for families and children.</p>							
TH14/04	<p>Submitter believes that the scheme is unnecessarily dense and full of planner jargon. More simple plain English terminology is required for general public to follow.</p> <p>Submitter comments that aspects of the community consultation and online submission form was unclear.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the document is difficult to follow and was unclear whether they were able to have input and critique the plan.</p> <p>Submitter questioned whether detailed designs have been completed for any part of the development.</p>		<p>The submitter believes that the community will need to view a proposed design, not a schematic precinct plan, in order to have an informed opinion. The submitter believes that the harbour should reflect the natural, coastal island character of North Stradbroke Island and not be a low rise Monk Carlo or Gold Coast redone.</p>	<p>The submitter states that building heights have no precedent in Cleveland and are in excess of local heritage and character and to wildlife. The submitter is concerned about the scale and corridor running the length of the development precinct, bounded by 7 storey and 15 storey developments. The submitter is concerned that the mineral high rise planning vision destroys sense of place.</p> <p>The submitter believes that the taken reference to cultural heritage are shabby and thin.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme is not about the natural environment. It is about profitable exploitation of a waterfront property. Submitter believes that missing are the concepts such as orientation, natural ventilation, solar power, place making, sense of place, genus local heritage, Cleveland history, mudflats, mangroves, shore birds, Queensland, low bay, pedestrian, wildlife friendly, social purposes, recreational areas that relate to local and nature environment.</p>	<p>Submitter believes that shaded access zones, pedestrian friendly and cycle paths should be provided in a 21st century development, with walkways accessible.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the public transport network that will get access to the site.</p>	<p>Submitter notes that images of Babay Bay is displayed on the front cover of the POA and should not be used as a model for future development. Submitter notes that the amenity of Cleveland is being degraded and not enhanced by this proposed development.</p>	<p>Submitter notes that the proposed outcomes for precinct 1 is not clear enough and not properly landscaped and replicated at Dunwich.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that development along Middle Street will be replicated within the POA.</p> <p>Submitter believes that this development, especially vehicle ferries and water taxis, needs to take into account the experience of leaving the mainland and embarking for the island (and coming back) as it is a connected experience.</p>	<p>Submitter notes that the park for the Red Cat is brilliant and well planned. Submitter suggests that more car parking is required and properly landscaped and replicated at Dunwich.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned that environmental impact studies have not been completed and notes that they should be acceptable to the public.</p>					
TH14/05	<p>Submitter sees this as an opportunity to do something to benefit the whole community. The Toonah Harbour is an excellent example of a brilliant waterfront development which is used by many people and brings tourists to the area.</p>		<p>Submitter believes this is an opportunity to do a small scale development which will benefit the community and a welcoming point for Stradbroke Island visitors.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned 7-15 storey development will block access, views, sunlight and breeze to other development and the community and does not support buildings of these heights. Submitter notes without detailed plans of buildings it is not possible to comment further.</p>	<p>Submitter believes it is unlikely to be utilised in proximity to 7-15 storey buildings and across busy roads</p> <p>Submitter is concerned access to the site will be affected the marine habitats and any area where fill is deposited</p>	<p>Submitter notes that prevent ferry timetable do no change with the rain and bus timetables which discourages the use of public transport and that this requires attention.</p> <p>Submitter concerned that the development of a mixed use village will worsen traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Concerned areas of GJ Walker Park will be lost to new roads and parking areas and does not support this.</p>							
TH14/06	<p>Submitter has chosen to live in the area as it is quiet and close to the beach and is generally against any major changes to the area or increased development. In particular the submitter is concerned increased people and development in the area will affect their business as well as impact on amenity and habitat / ecology and believes habitats should be protected and not lost to development.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned that increased development will affect pollution, litter, traffic, noise and haze - in particular more boats would have a negative impact on marine habitats and animals and increased people will result in increased rubbish in parks and waterways.</p>		<p>Concerned increased development will result in loss of parkland.</p>									
TH14/07	<p>Submitter comments that there have been many schemes put forward previously and the scheme should take into account comments made on those schemes.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the area needs rehabilitation but it needs to be done in a sensitive nature.</p>		<p>Submitter comments that any development must be scaled appropriately and take full note of the impact on surrounding waterways, neighbours, residential access to light, bridges and views, the road network and general amenity of the area. Submitter believes that building height should be capped at the current height of existing development (7 storey).</p> <p>Submitter believes that marina berths with their necessary infrastructure and pollutants should be restricted to commercial and tourists in survey for recreational walk.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the road network is currently inadequate for the proposed redevelopment.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that any development must be scaled appropriately and take full note of the impact on surrounding waterways, neighbours, residential access to light, bridges and views, the road network and general amenity of the area. Submitter believes that building height should be capped at the current height of existing development (7 storey).</p> <p>Submitter believes that marina berths with their necessary infrastructure and pollutants should be restricted to commercial and tourists in survey for recreational walk.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the road network is currently inadequate for the proposed redevelopment.</p>	<p>Submitter believes that more recreational opportunities and less private moorings (marina berths) are required.</p>	<p>Submitter believes more cycle paths, pedestrian access and local shuttle buses to Cleveland CBD is required.</p> <p>Submitter believes that more recreational opportunities and less private moorings (marina berths) are required.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that low rise, medium density, materials and finishes should be sensitive to the marine environment and take account of potential sea level rise.</p> <p>Submitter believes that development consisting of brick or block on slab and underground parking should be allowed.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that low rise, medium density development should cater for the 4% retirement population as well as singles and couples.</p> <p>Submitter notes that family living would be inappropriate.</p>	<p>Submitter believes that more variety of transport options with different operators will be available to the public.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that the marina is much too large and is causing destruction to the mangroves and has a negative impact on the Marine Park. Submitter suggests that the use of the marina should be restricted to passenger vessels to North Stradbroke Island and recreational hire boats.</p>				
TH14/08	<p>Submitter is concerned that the introduction of large restaurants and pubs in the development will increase the number of patrons using the area which could lead to an increase in alcohol related violence and drink driving as within the area making the area unsafe.</p> <p>The submitter comments that the plan is vague and should be written in simple, plain English.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned that there is no market need for further redevelopment of the Toonah Harbour area, causing it to turn into a ghost town and disoriented community.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that developing the area will kill the CBD, similar to Babay Bay.</p>	<p>Submitter questions whether further residential buildings are required where other developments in the area have not been finished due to the inability to sell.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marine wildlife will not be protected</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that dredging and dumping soil on the land and artificial beach will destroy the waterways and marine wildlife.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the State could convert Passage Street to a truck connector street immediately to relieve traffic congestion.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that Passage Street has no paths except for a section outside the Primary school which does not accommodate foot traffic.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that new open spaces is not required as they are already available and believes that the plan dictates the landscape and takes away the current open space.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the plan does not fully specify the size of the playground and dog park.</p>				<p>Submitter questions whether a marina is required at Toonah Harbour when marinas in Wynnum and Manly have vacant berths.</p>				
TH14/09						<p>Submitter suggests that a facility like the Redcliffe / Settlement Cove lagoon be created in the GJ Walker Park. Redland City currently does not have anything similar. Submitter believes that the attraction of a swimming lagoon would be an enormous draw card for the Toonah Harbour development.</p>								

TH14/10	<p>Submitter comments that it is great to see interest in development the unused potential of the site and hope that the proposed objectives can be achieved in the face of an expected noisy outspoken minority</p>	<p>Submitter believes that the development will open up opportunities for coffee shops/cafes in the development.</p> <p>Submitter is in support of the proposed development scheme and believes that Cleveland is in urgent need of waterfront parkland and recreation facilities which are confined now to picnic areas at Raby Bay.</p>			<p>Submitter believes that in his experience, development such as this with rock walls and deep water of much improved quality result in a major increase in marine life.</p>		<p>Submitter comments that the existing boat ramp is unusable to all but very small lightweight trailer boats (at high tide only) due to a build up of soft mud over the base of the ramp. The mud also prevents use of the access 'channel' at less than high tide.</p> <p>Submitter believes that this is an opportunity to correct the total absence of new boat ramps built at Cleveland and would supplement existing facilities.</p> <p>Submitter proposes a large multi-lane, spacious, sheltered deep water boat ramp be constructed as part of the development, including a much needed wide sandy beach area for boats to queue at while waiting for lanes to become available.</p>							
TH14/11		<p>Submitter believes that the information required to design has not been completed sufficiently and there are critical gaps in the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter believes that the first step to ensure the development Toondah Harbour will be successful is to hold a design summit and draw on the expertise of leading architects, urban planners and landscape architects and involve key stakeholders such as OYAC. Submitter believes that the development for Toondah Harbour should be a memorable, livable and iconic gateway to North Stradbroke Island and a great opportunity will be missed if a design summit is not established.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the Toondah Harbour design will need collaborative input from the Quandamooka people to achieve place-specific landscape and settlement design.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the scheme fails to disclose research to show economic viability, environmental impact studies, transport and infrastructure needs, projected population, development phases and costs.</p> <p>Submitter believes that the magnitude of this task is beyond the scope of local government planners assisted by suburban consultants.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the current presentation of the scheme hampers comprehension.</p>	<p>Submitter believes the Toondah Harbour urban experience should incorporate Durwich.</p> <p>Submitter notes that another Raby Bay at Cleveland Central would not reflect well on this government.</p>		<p>Submitter notes that the POA is on mudflats and on the wrong end of the bay.</p> <p>Submitter states that the scheme assumes unacceptable destruction of irreplaceable wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the scheme assumes the removal of mangroves, and flussy environmental 'compensatory offsets' for destroyed kaka and marine habitat.</p>	<p>Submitter notes that the scheme fails to reconcile the conflict of dense tourist traffic and parking, with high density residential development.</p>								
TH14/12		<p>Submitter does not support the proposed development scheme and believes that the undeveloped foreshore will be ruined.</p> <p>Submitter believes that the development cannot be justified as Raby Bay is under a kilometre away from the proposed site.</p> <p>Submitter believes that the development will destroy the laid back lifestyle and quiet environment.</p>		<p>Submitter notes that buildings that block off views will result in a decline in people coming to Cleveland.</p>	<p>Submitter notes that the scheme does not support the bettering of environment of sustainability as the brown and parks is being redeveloped in buildings.</p>	<p>Submitter notes that Middle Street cannot sustain the traffic as two-way single lanes street. Passage street does not have foot paths to give light traffic. The roads in the POA is too small to house the traffic.</p>								
TH14/13							<p>Submitter notes that the scheme unambiguously notes that the development in Precinct 1 will ensure design and land uses in relation to open space provide an appropriately sized recreation and open space area in GJ Walter Park. However there is no indication in the ILUP or POA as to any proposed plans for GJ Walter Park and Dog park.</p> <p>Submitter believes that there is no practical guidance or guide development as to the existing GJ Walter Park and 'dog park'. The area is currently designated substantially as either 7 or 15 storey building height limits with the exception of a relatively small northern area as discussed in the paragraph below. The ambiguity is that Table 1 page 16 PDA, Column 3A lists 'permissible development' that refers to 'Schedule 2' as developments that apparently are not exempt development and Schedule 2 refers to 'provision for improved facilities in GJ Walter Park including dog off-leash areas within the category of 'Open Space' as part of the Infrastructure Plan.</p>	<p>Submitter notes that a relatively small area located at the far northern boundary of 'Precinct 1' has been designated to insert the open space area in GJ Walter Park and the dog park is provided for.</p> <p>The submitter suggests that the existing cricket oval on GJ Walter Park be designated as an area for open space or such as to maintain the current use.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the 'dog park' aspect may be more problematic given the proposed substantial altering of the existing coastline, including reclamation and construction of a boardwalk.</p> <p>Submitter believes that any 'dog park' should have a section of beach involved. The submitters preference is to retain the GJ Walter cricket oval and construct a fence contiguous with 10, to the southern boundary of the cricket field in an easterly direction to the existing bay shoreline.</p>						
TH14/14		<p>Submitter believes that with the downturn of the Cleveland CBD it does not make sense to develop another retail area. The money would be better spend upgrading/rehabilitating the CBD with a mix of residential and retail rather than an additional area.</p>	<p>Submitter states that car parking for North Stradbroke Island residents and commuters must be preserved.</p>	<p>Submitter opposes development over 5 storeys.</p>	<p>Submitter states that mangroves, the diverse ecosystems and diverse fauna must be maintained and sensitively managed.</p>									

RTI RELEASE

TH14/15	<p>Submitter notes that the scheme does not address the expectations of the Cleveland community collected during the July 2013 Toonah Harbour PDA Engagement Consultation.</p> <p>Submitter questioned why the Statement member has endorsed the plan to be passed on to the developers. Submitter notes that the State member has rejected email and phone calls to clarify his position on the development scheme.</p> <p>Submitter noted that the Benefits Cost analysis and feasibility study were not available for public viewing.</p> <p>Submitter concerned that the document is too jargonistic and that the scheme consists of poor qualitative statements. Submitter is concerned that the reference to Aboriginal stewardship and reconciliation is tokenistic.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that wording through the scheme is complex and makes the document difficult to follow.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the punctuation throughout the document has been used incorrectly.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned of the use of undefined terms throughout the document.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there are too many unjustified assumptions and transparency is needed.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is no mention of community values, definitions and planning concepts as prescribed in the SEQ Regional Plan, Redlands Community Plan and Redlands Planning Scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is a lack of evidence of feasibility for the need of a bigger marina and 15 storey development envelop. Submitter believes that there is a lack of evaluation of other projects to be translated back to the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that 'catalyst project' (ref P20) is not defined in the document.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is a lack of transparency in the design process which is a lost opportunity. Submitter notes that the approach taken does not engage people in the planning process.</p>	<p>Submitter questions when the public beaches and environmentally rich mudflats fronting GI Water Park became part of Toonah Harbour.</p> <p>Submitter notes that there is no mention or measure of loss of views, breezes, park for existing residents and loss of dog beach in the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter notes that perhaps 8 storeys would have more standing from a planning perspective.</p>	<p>Submitter notes that a 15 storey height limit over GI Water Park forebears, when the PDA Engagement Summary states that any apartment and commercial development should be low rise. Submitter believes that 15 storey buildings can be justified closer to the railway station, not at a distance where commuters would require to drive to the transport node. Submitter believes this would be better served in the Cleveland CBD next to the train station.</p> <p>Submitter notes that sustainability has been described in a way that is too off and not an accepted definition.</p> <p>Submitter notes that under point 3.4.4 it is the first section to 'have regard to the environment' and all references are to development that will do something to the environment as though it has no intrinsic value or even claims to achieve the benefits for the environment.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the impact on water birds, RAMSAR requirements, fishing, bait collection, Dugongs etc should be investigated and documented before the scheme is written.</p> <p>Submitter notes section 3.4.4 should be addressed by stating that 'planting strategies which are site responsive and reflect the subtropical nature of the bayside nature of Cleveland' not just South East Queensland.</p> <p>Submitter notes that Council's Storm Tide Mapping shows the GI Water Park to be subject to existing 1 in 100 year storm tide flooding. Development would be 2 to 3 metres high when allowing for sea level rise and floor level requirements. Submitter is concerned that a Highest Astronomical Tide (HAT) and storm surge area hasn't been mapped.</p>	<p>Submitter noted that road upgrades would be completed in accordance with traffic studies as development proceeds, however no report has been made available to the public.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned of the loss of GI Water Park and that there will be limited greenspace in Redlands and potential privatization similar to Roma Street Parklands.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned as to whether Council has resolved to surrender trusteeship of the park and what process will be used with regard to the responsibility under the Land Act regarding the purpose of the reserve and no corporate objectives of the Council.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that existing uses by children is not mentioned or valued given that no quantification of existing or planned need for park under the RSC PS.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the preferred land uses for Precinct 1 do not mention park off leash area, outdoor recreation, environment and Koola Corridor.</p>	<p>Submitter notes that an 800 berth marina in front of GI Water Park is planned, however the PDA Engagement Summary states that the community wanted to maintain its views and sea breezes and has significant recognition and love for the ecological value of the bay.</p> <p>Submitter noted whether the cost of infrastructure to service the PDA and over infrastructure charges to be borne by Council. This would be an adverse impact ratapayers.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the reference to 'infrastructure currently identified for the Toonah Harbour PDA includes Open Space' which is described as works that is required to be completed, off leash area and extending GI Water park, such inclusions are at odds with past State Government inclusions in the definition of infrastructure. The definition needs to be verified.</p>	<p>Submitter notes that the beach and bay are accessible to all, once development of the marina is completed it will be limited to boat owners only.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the reference to 'infrastructure currently identified for the Toonah Harbour PDA includes Open Space' which is described as works that is required to be completed, off leash area and extending GI Water park, such inclusions are at odds with past State Government inclusions in the definition of infrastructure. The definition needs to be verified.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the wording referring to development strategy (S.2) refers to 'an opportunity to locate a mix of retail, office, and residential uses in a unique harbour side location'. This relegates community, open space and environmental outcomes to being incidental but not planned or core outcomes.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is no assessment of out door recreation setting against the broad statements of replacing, new public spaces on waterfront.</p>		
TH14/16	<p>Submitter is concerned that the PDA is not restricted to Toonah Harbour but will also include and 'swallow' up the whole of GI Water public space. Submitter notes that the community will not approve this development and that this has been pushed through Council as quickly as possible without many knowing the full extent.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme is geared towards developers and local and state governments rather than the community.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development will not be economically viable as they do not envisage that people will travel to the Harbour for the views.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the government is not taking into consideration the views of the community.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned that the current infrastructure will not handle the growth expected with the development.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that this will lead to an increase in rates, Redlands rates are currently higher than Brisbane City.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the current infrastructure will not handle the growth expected with the development.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that this will lead to an increase in rates, Redlands rates are currently higher than Brisbane City.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the current infrastructure will not handle the growth expected with the development.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that this will lead to an increase in rates, Redlands rates are currently higher than Brisbane City.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the current infrastructure will not handle the growth expected with the development.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that this will lead to an increase in rates, Redlands rates are currently higher than Brisbane City.</p>			
TH14/17	<p>Submitter is not supportive of the scheme. Submitter is concerned that the development will turn the area into the Gold Coast.</p>								
TH14/18	<p>Submitter is supportive of an improvement and expansion of the ferry terminal and associated parking to increase tourism to North Stradbroke.</p>	<p>Submitter is supportive of small commercial development in the area immediately surrounding the terminal would be beneficial to tourism and job creation.</p>	<p>Submitter opposes raising the building height to 15 storeys. The submitter notes that there are plenty of other areas with the same urban design proposed. Submitter believes that the strength of Redland as a tourist destination lies in what makes it unique, i.e. real earth mangrove mudflats and its proximity to Moreton Bay Islands.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned of the dredging of the mudflats for the marina as it is an important part of Redland's ecology and the proposed marina would destroy the habitat.</p> <p>Submitter is supportive of minor dredging to improve ferry services.</p>	<p>Submitter is opposed to the dredging of the harbour for the creation of a marina. Submitter is concerned that the jobs created for the development of the marina is worth the expense and environmental destruction that dredging it will cost.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina berths will remain unutilised.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned of the dredging of the mudflats for the marina as it is an important part of Redland's ecology and the proposed marina would destroy the habitat.</p> <p>Submitter is supportive of minor dredging to improve ferry services.</p>	<p>Submitter is supportive of section 3.4.4 but is concerned that the statement is ignored throughout the rest of the document.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the current parking and road infrastructure will not accommodate the proposed 15 storey residential apartment, restaurants, retail, marina, park and passenger ferry service. Submitter supports scaling back the residential buildings and removing the marina altogether.</p>	<p>Submitter notes that GI Water Park has the perfect balance between facilities and nature.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the Ferry Terminal is in need of refurbishing and better facilities.</p>	<p>Submitter notes that the area could be improved with some mixed-use development, but the current proposed scheme is more than that required and would not be beneficial in a monetary sense. A similar development already exists in Raby Bay and a number of commercial docks is vacant in the Cleveland CBD.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned of the building height proposed and supports restricting the building height limit to 5 storeys.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the addition of the promenade cuts off access to the water from the dog park or GI Water Park does a disservice with water.</p>		

TH14/24		<p>Submitter is concerned that the development is being called Priority Development and believes that issues requiring attention on North Stradbroke Island need to be addressed first before developing the mainland.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that a number of taxi/cab ferry companies may operate out of Toondah Harbour and believes that priority assistance should be given to the Groom Family who operates the Stradbroke Ferry to continue to service the area. Submitter is concerned that smaller companies will be put out of business allowing for monopoly to occur. Submitter believes that the Gold Cars should not be made to pay additional infrastructure or contribution to upgrade the facilities as this cost will be transferred to the customer or put them out of business.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that high rise accommodation will cause congestion and put a strain on the limited car parks available. Submitter believes development should be limited to low rise buildings only.</p> <p>Submitter believes that it is important to keep both ferry terminals accessible to North Stradbroke Island commuters.</p> <p>Submitter supports the idea of cafes and restaurants.</p>	<p>Submitter supports a broadwalk instead of swampy mangroves.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned with the lack of parking facilities at One Mile and the congestion caused by incoming/outgoing water taxi traffic combined with road traffic and also congestion using the only public boat ramp.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that traffic issues will increase in Middle Street and more entry and exit points should be introduced.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that parking issues will increase and suggest that parking should be free for residents through the use of permits.</p>	<p>Submitter is supportive of improved facilities and services that are detrimental to North Stradbroke Island residents and encourage visitors to the bay. Submitter is concerned that the cost of development will be passed on to local businesses and may cause smaller business to close. Submitter is concerned that a monopoly of services for the harbour will occur.</p>			<p>Submitter is concerned that ferry services will be monopolised.</p> <p>Submitter suggests that more boat ramps will accompany ferries and boats to use the bay and lessen road traffic.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that water speed limits are not enforced in the harbour.</p>										
TH14/25	Submitter is supportive of the proposal.		<p>Submitter is concerned that GI Walter park is zoned for building use in the height plan and believes that this is a mistake.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned with the increase in building heights and believes that the new height levels will be an eyesore and detract from the overall plan.</p>				<p>Submitter is concerned that GI Walter park is being zoned for buildings.</p>												
TH14/26	Submitter supports the overall development and commends the design in part.			<p>Submitter is concerned that a 15 storey building height limit is extreme and would prefer 5 storeys to be acceptable.</p>			<p>Submitter is concerned that impact studies have not been provided.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that parking will be an issue for island residents who will have to rely on two vehicles.</p> <p>Submitter believes a bridge built to link the mainland and island would provide a solution to the parking issue. Submitter believes that the cost to build a multi-storey car park would be better spent on a bridge.</p>	<p>Submitter suggests that a waterpark play area for children be included.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about privacy and noise that possibly should be regulated.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the age of vehicle ferries and believes that they should be replaced with more modern ferries to match the marina.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that there is no longer a strong need for marinas.</p>									
TH14/27		<p>Submitter is concerned that the facilities of Toondah Harbour is outdated and believes that it is in urgent need of upgrade works to bring it up to a safe standard. Submitter believes this will improve the image of Redland City.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that development and construction will be awarded to overseas developers and not to local developers. Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme will not stop this from happening.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development is within a heritage zone and part of the 'scenic drive'.</p> <p>Submitter believes that development on the foreshore should be limited to 5 storeys.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the scale of development with building height limits of up to 15 storeys.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme does not adequately address that the development is within a heritage zone and part of the 'scenic drive'.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that development on the foreshore should be limited to 5 storeys.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme does not adequately address that the development is within a heritage zone and part of the 'scenic drive'.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that development on the foreshore should be limited to 5 storeys.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development is not 'Eco-Development' and a 'carbon neutral development' to put Redlands and Queensland on the map.</p>														
TH14/28		<p>Submitter is concerned that this taxi ferry terminal is in urgent need of repair and not fit for purpose.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that a private developer will undertake the proposed development and believes that the state and council should provide all development.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that an international developer who will limit opportunities for the locals and favour international workers.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not contain enough economic data which will ensure the community that the development will benefit the community.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme does not adequately specify development timeframes noting that 10-20 years of development is a messy and busy timeline.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the current ferry terminal currently presents a poor image of Cleveland.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that 5000m² of retail will severely impact the CBD.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that major site being sold to Asian developers will lead to foreign design and construction professionals instead of local labour. Submitter is concerned that this will result in poor design outcomes as international developments may not understand the requirements.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that a 15 storey height limit will not protect the heritage area around Redlands could drive tourism away.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development is not 'Eco-Development' and a 'carbon neutral development' to put Redlands and Queensland on the map.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that pre-requisites such as 10 Nuthers Stars or 6 GreenStars for development has not been included in the form of formal benchmarking.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the parking issue around the area will increase with the traffic network coming under a pressure strain. Submitter believes that car free zones should be introduced.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the increase in traffic will drive cyclists away from the area which will impact on local cyclists also.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that more details and plans are not available.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that issues such as car parking, queuing may not be addressed and with increased traffic will heighten the issue.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that more details and plans are not available.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that issues such as car parking, queuing may not be addressed and with increased traffic will heighten the issue.</p>	<p>Submitter believes a marina, similar in scale to Manly, would have its benefits.</p>											
TH14/29		<p>Submitter comments that development of a toll road out to sea by a private investor will have a number of advantages such as saving on dredging costs, minimal outgoings and without the need to dredge the natural environment and associated ecosystem.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme will take away the natural environmental features of the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme is against the recognition of environmental values protected mangroves, kaka habitats, indigenous flora and fauna and is essential to marine life.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme is against the recognition of environmental values protected mangroves, kaka habitats, indigenous flora and fauna and is essential to marine life.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the parking issue around the area will increase with the traffic network coming under a pressure strain. Submitter believes that car free zones should be introduced.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the increase in traffic will drive cyclists away from the area which will impact on local cyclists also.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that more details and plans are not available.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that issues such as car parking, queuing may not be addressed and with increased traffic will heighten the issue.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that more details and plans are not available.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that issues such as car parking, queuing may not be addressed and with increased traffic will heighten the issue.</p>	<p>Submitter believes a marina, similar in scale to Manly, would have its benefits.</p>											
TH14/30		<p>Submitter is concerned that mass built environment will be developed over the natural shoreline and comments that a low key broken built environment enhancing the natural shoreline integrated together with restaurants and green spaces will enhance the aesthetic qualities of the harbour and encourage community use.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned of the current proposed building height and notes that recreation and acknowledgement of the original habitats and maintaining green space is important.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme may interfere with the subsurface and affect dredging in the existing channels to protect the marine environment and food supplies for Diapang.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned of the direct impact to the bay best by the development of the marina and its associated infrastructure.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme may interfere with the subsurface and affect dredging in the existing channels to protect the marine environment and food supplies for Diapang.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned of the direct impact to the bay best by the development of the marina and its associated infrastructure.</p>	<p>Submitter is supportive of the bikeways and removing the shipping raffling facilities adjacent to the foreshore in preference of a parking station that will reduce the footprint and potentially open up green space.</p> <p>Submitter suggests extending the railway line to Toondah Harbour and develop the parking station over there.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the parking issue associated with Toondah Harbour could be resolved by building a multi-storey car park on the land set aside for parking in Cleveland and allowing the tourists to catch public transport.</p> <p>Submitter suggested that a paid permit system could be made available at the water taxi for island residents.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic movement in the area and increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that this is a massive over development which could be impacted by global warming and cyclone storms.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development will destroy the pristine area and sandy beaches.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will not decrease travelling time.</p> <p>Submitter comments that a small dredging operation and small retaining wall to protect low water access for 'The Fair' would fix the current problems they have.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that another marina will only duplicate what already exists at Ruby Bay.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina at Toondah Harbour will be subject to both strong northerly and southerly winds.</p>										
TH14/31	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will destroy the village style atmosphere and the peace and quiet of the natural open spaces.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development will turn into waterfront locations such as Cairns and Townsville which is not what the residents want.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme does not provide any direct benefits to island residents in travel time.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that high density buildings developed in the area will not prove profitable with many buildings falling around the Ruby Bay area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the effects of global warming have not been taken into consideration.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the removal of mangroves will negatively impact the marine eco-system. Submitter is concerned that the marine park will not be protected anymore.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that extensive dredging has the potential to disturb and upturn soils. The silt from the dredging could also affect nearby sea grass beds and coral reefs around Peel Island.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	
TH14/32		<p>Submitter notes that development of the Toondah Harbour area should retain and enhance the natural beauty of the estuary and protect the Bay waters and estuary.</p>	<p>Submitter notes that certain aspects of Toondah Harbour such as the dog park, recreation area and mangroves are all important features and should be prioritised in the development.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that development should be done sensibly and instead of retaining the essential nature of the area being a recreational area rather than commercial.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the proposed height limit of 15 storeys.</p>		<p>Submitter is supportive of developing a car park to service the increase in traffic. Submitter supports the need for island residents to have a car park space available for parking of a town car to be used on the mainland.</p> <p>Submitter comments that provisions for secure parking that requires payment should be considered and that all future car parking development should be maintained.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that provisions of walkways, bicycle trails and broadwalks through the mangrove edge would enhance the peaceful and relaxed nature of the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is supportive of introducing casual dining options, better toilet facilities and all-weather departure/arrival areas would enhance visitor's experience.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that construction of a large marina would increase foot traffic and noise level taking away the relaxed atmosphere.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned of the increased pollution in the water from fuel, waste and litter.</p> <p>Submitter notes there is a marina at Manly catering for the people of the Moreton Bay area.</p>											
TH14/33	Submitter is supportive of upgrading the facilities in Toondah Harbour and was looking forward to the development of commuter barge and ferry terminals.		<p>Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limit.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limit.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	
TH14/34		<p>Submitter is concerned that there is an over-development in the upgrading of facilities.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the future safety of the area with the possible increase in criminal activity at night.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development does not take into account that the current schools are at capacity and cannot take future students with the increase in residential population.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the PDA covers too much land.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the increase in pollution to the waterfront during development phase. Submitter is concerned that the water rising will continue to rise.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that currently there is only one set of traffic lights into the Harbour area and it would not be capable of servicing the amount of traffic the development will create.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is not enough parking infrastructure to support increase car traffic.</p> <p>Submitter comments that railway infrastructure from Cleveland would have to be upgraded.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the walking traffic and the threat posed with increase traffic movements in the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that there is not enough parking infrastructure to support increase car traffic.</p> <p>Submitter comments that railway infrastructure from Cleveland would have to be upgraded.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the walking traffic and the threat posed with increase traffic movements in the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase traffic congestion.</p>		

TH14/35	Submitter is supportive of upgrading the facilities in Toondah Harbour.			Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limit along the shoreline and believes that parks, recreational areas, parking facilities and doging precinct with small unit complexes should be proposed instead. Submitter is concerned that the area will be developed into another Gold Coast or Sunshine Coast shadow casting area.	Submitter suggests that a marine Education/Research Facility and whale museum be incorporated and dedicated to the local wildlife and marine life.													
TH14/36	Submitter is supportive of upgrading the ferry terminal and the old CIBO building with car parking facilities.	Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will destroy the character of the area, which was the reason they moved to the area. Submitter notes that the areas early connection with Queensland history and marine resources was the main reason that rejected the car and commercial proposal in 1989 and is concerned that a heritage and environmental impact study has not yet been completed for the proposed development. Submitter is concerned consultation with stakeholders, have not yet taken place where an undertakings was given that they would be consulted. Submitter is concerned that the consideration of future close to the community in terms of health and wellbeing, electricity usage, loss of seabird, continual dredging, road safety and repairs have not been given adequate weight in planning for the area. Submitter believes that the proposed development scheme should be withdrawn and a new scheme favouring healthy natural environment, green living, embracing the bay, wise planning and design should be created.	Submitter is concerned that the proposed development of the harbourside will not retain the unique character of the area.	Submitter is concerned about the high rise development proposed for GI Weber Park and the 15 storey height limit and notes that it is not compatible with surrounding development or consistent with existing and approved development.	Submitter is concerned that the development of an 800 berth marina will increase pollution in the water and endanger critical habitats of the marine life. Submitter is concerned that the removal of mangroves will reduce the quality of the water, fisheries productivity and impact the resilience of the coastline causing erosion and impact the ability of the habitat to sequester carbon. Submitter is concerned that the degradation of seagrasses and mudflats would impact negatively on the fisheries industry and the juvenile brown tiger prawn. Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will destroy the community efforts in educating and promoting the protection and enhancement of the natural environment. Submitter is concerned that the development scheme does not abide by the Moreton Bay Marine Park Guideline.			Submitter is concerned that there is a lack of green space and notes that there is a positive link between health and well being.	Submitter is concerned that the proposal is an over development of Toondah Harbour and could impact and separate growth and the commercial recovery of Cleveland.	Submitter is concerned of the viability of an 800 berth marina where there are extensive marinas already in Moreton Bay which are not at full capacity. Submitter notes that the facilities at Beveridge Street, Thornlands could be upgraded if more marine facilities are required.								
TH14/37	Submitter is supportive of the upgrade of Toondah Harbour.			Submitter is not in favour of building heights of up to 15 storeys.														
TH14/38	Submitter is satisfied that the development cater for the needs of the community. Submitter provides congratulations for a creation of a great development envelope. Submitter comments that the community consultation was well organised, staffed and managed.		Submitter comments that Toondah Harbour require an upgrade and provides opportunity for the construction community to increase work for locals and additional trade from through traffic.	Submitter is supportive of the 15 storey building height limit and believes that higher density living provides a more sustainable solution to minimise impact to koalas and other natural habitats. Submitter notes that the development should be designed to complement local surrounds.	Submitter is concerned about the mangrove area to the south and believes it should be protected from dredging.	Submitter comments that provision of single car parking for commuters should be provided. Submitter comments that the walkway from Erubin Street should be re-routed to provide a great north/south access across the harbour.	Submitter is concerned of the development proposed for GI Weber Park and believes that it should be retained as is. Submitter is concerned that the development will remove the dog park as it is used by many locals. Submitter suggest relocating the dog park to Oyster Point. Submitter is concerned about access to bay and marina access for local residents to ensure that they retain the current bay view.	Submitter is supportive of the mixed use precinct.		Submitter believes that the marina should be redeveloped in one stage to ensure that the marina fits the character of Toondah Harbour rather than a series of incremental upgrades. Submitter notes that the marina should not be limited to 800 berths and believes that it is the marina that will underpin the development.								
TH14/39	Submitter is supportive of increasing the car parking facilities and upgrading the harbour foreshore with walkways and cafes.	Submitter is concerned that submissions against the proposed development will not be considered as per previous submissions and requests for upgrading the road network and extending the railway line from Cleveland.	Submitter is concerned that enlarging the area of the harbour and its facilities will disturb the ambience of the area which is the main reason people move to the area.	Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limit within the harbour area and in Cleveland. Submitter believes that it is a bit of clutter for the area and believes it would cause sewerage problem.	Submitter is concerned about the development of the foreshore as it will increase river pollution and damage the shoreline and its ecology. Submitter believes that it will ruin the peacefulness and ambience of the parklands and mangroves. Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme dismisses the protection of the koala habitat and the peaceful shoreline.	Submitter is concerned that a new road proposed through the park between Middle and Shore street would disturb the koalas and increase noise pollution. Submitter is concerned that the current road network will not support an increase in vehicle traffic as it is currently already congested at peak times and weekends.				Submitter is concerned that a marina will not be viable as current marinas in other areas are not at full capacity.								
TH14/40	Submitter believes the only development required is the upgrade of the car park facilities and enhancing the walkways with shops and cafes. Submitter is concerned that State and Council are treating the proposed development as a 'done deal'. Submitter is concerned that the submission process is secretive and believes that a public forum provides community with a fair response and expression of their opinions.		Submitter is concerned that the 15 storey height limit would destroy the ambience created by the parklands and blue zone. Submitter believes that it will be an eye sore and is unnecessary. Submitter is concerned that the 15 storey height limit would dominate the shoreline and block the views across the bay for existing properties and surrounding suburbs. Submitter is concerned that development of 15 storey buildings will not be financially viable as there is no interest in the property market even for current 6 storey buildings.			Submitter comments that the carpark should be limited to 3 storeys to resolve the issue with street parking. Submitter is concerned that the harbour area will be enlarged or degraded. Submitter comments that the blumen area could be enhanced by beautifying the shoreline with more shops and cafes.			Submitter opposes the development of a marina and is concerned that it would destroy the natural beauty of the shoreline and threaten the ecology of the waterways. Submitter believes the marina is unnecessary and only caters to minority of local residents. Submitter is concerned that the marina will not be viable as current marinas in other areas are not at full capacity.	Submitter is concerned that development opportunities do not fit in with the aesthetics, topography and spirit of the surroundings and the environment.								

TH14/41	<p>Submitter is supportive of the provisions to improve the harbour, access to the harbour and the amenity of the area and should be progressed.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that the proposed development should build on the success stories at Wellington Point and Cleveland Point which attract many visitors and further boost tourism and the amenity of the Toondah Harbour area.</p> <p>Submitter supports most of the views expressed in the vision statement except for those regarding the proposed commercial and residential developments in Precinct 1 and the marina.</p> <p>Submitter suggests that a statement regarding the improved connectivity of the area with adjacent parks should be included in the vision statement.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that a boutique hotel is considered in the vision statement when there is the Grandview adjacent to the area with views to Moreton Bay. The proposed development would impact on that view.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed commercial buildings will compete with the Cleveland CBD. Submitter comments that business in the proposed development be restricted to ones that are not available in the Cleveland CBD.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will over commercialise the location. Submitter is concerned that the scheme fails to deliver a Land Use Plan which is compatible with the location, feelings of residents and the Redland Planning Scheme and does not address the real need to improve facilities as the gateway to Stradbroke Island. Submitter believes that a plan that is consistent with the local location would attract many more visitors to the city and islands.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development of the marina and high rise will impact on the conservation and visual values of the Moreton Bay Marine Park.</p> <p>Submitter suggests that a statement regarding the improved connectivity of the area with adjacent parks should be included in the vision statement.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that a boutique hotel is considered in the vision statement when there is the Grandview adjacent to the area with views to Moreton Bay. The proposed development would impact on that view.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed commercial buildings will compete with the Cleveland CBD. Submitter comments that business in the proposed development be restricted to ones that are not available in the Cleveland CBD.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the 15 storey height limit would block views, be inconsistent with the values and plans for Redland City and reduce the amenity values of the area.</p> <p>Submitter comments that a development that is consistent with Redland City values is more important than one that rivals the aesthetics of the Gold Coast.</p> <p>Submitter comments that except for the building heights, the criteria set out in the PDA. Wide criteria are well thought out and consistent with any development in area.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will ignore Council planning decisions.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is no mention of the number of residential units and submitter believes that some assessments indicate a possible 1500 units which is 50% more than the number of houses in Bally Bay. Submitter is concerned that social, environmental and economic impacts have not been assessed prior to drafting the development scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there no development with building heights 15 storeys in the surrounding area, the closest would be in the Brisbane CBD.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the intention of the proposed development is to develop it into a Gold Coast which will impact on the livability, lifestyle and village atmosphere of Cleveland.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development would impact on the conservation, amenity and visual values of the Moreton Bay Marine Park.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that recognition of minimising the risk of storm surges is not adequately covered in the PDA-Wide Criteria.</p> <p>Submitter suggests that the point covering kooka habitat should be amended to "establishing a vegetated corridor for wildlife habitat and provide for locals and their safe movement"</p> <p>Submitter notes that the habitat values of the marine environment should be enhanced where possible and already currently utilised extensively.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the environmental and ecological concerns that will be impacted by the proposed development scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the site is designed as a RAMSAR site, which is an international agreement to protect wetlands and the flight paths of migratory birds and it is not mentioned in the PDA how it will be managed</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will threaten rare and vulnerable bird species that are found in the Toondah Harbour precinct.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the water current, wind, erosion and sedimentation are real constraints for the development and not understood or planned for in the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the land fill on the whapping is below the 1200 year storm surge height and is likely to contain acid sulphate soils.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the area is also used as a rubbish tip and asbestos and "hot sand" could be buried under the park.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that impact on fishing, bait collection and dugongs have not been investigated and planned for in the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is a plan to use dredged spoil is suitable as a stable and environmentally sound fill. This has been proven incorrect as this has been used in Bally Bay and has proven difficulty in supporting vegetation, house and stiff free channels.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that sustainability is defined as a one-off and is not an accepted definition.</p>		<p>Submitter notes that any land reclamation should be used for parks and visitor facilities.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that no residential development should be in Precinct 1</p> <p>Submitter comments any commercial development should be aimed at the needs of those travelling to the islands and seeking the amenities of the parks, tracks and other facilities nearby.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that residential should be restricted to Precinct 2 and meet current Redland City standards and plans.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that development of the marina would not be appropriate for the area and believes that only a small marina should be considered to cater for day use and short term stays.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that a marina in this location will impact the amenity of the area, run views and increase noise pollution.</p>			
TH14/42		<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as documented in the Redland 2030 Community Plan, Toondah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redlands Planning Scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme does not take into consideration the communities previous objection to a similar overdevelopment in the late 1980s. A community campaign conducted by Secure Toondah's Invaluable Resources succeeded in having the development stopped.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development reflects ongoing consultation that was undertaken after the August 2013 community consultation process however the community were not made aware of the opportunity for ongoing input.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is no disclosure of the who has been consulted and the nature of the consultation and requests that the details be released and disclose the influence that has overruled the community's vision.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme is too complex and poorly written that is difficult to understand.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the nature of the scheme has disenfranchised the community.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the style of writing is too technical and does not follow the Government's mantra to reduce red tape.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the PDA Toondah Harbour "is not a true representation of the scope of land involved. Submitter notes that the majority of land comprises of GI Water Park and the bay which is misleading as the community are supportive of regaining the facilities of Toondah Harbour.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned that the 15 storey height limit ignores Council planning decisions.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is no mention of the number of residential units and submitter believes that some assessments indicate a possible 1500 units which is 50% more than the number of houses in Bally Bay. Submitter is concerned that social, environmental and economic impacts have not been assessed prior to drafting the development scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there no development with building heights 15 storeys in the surrounding area, the closest would be in the Brisbane CBD.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the intention of the proposed development is to develop it into a Gold Coast which will impact on the livability, lifestyle and village atmosphere of Cleveland.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the environmental and ecological concerns that will be impacted by the proposed development scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the site is designed as a RAMSAR site, which is an international agreement to protect wetlands and the flight paths of migratory birds and it is not mentioned in the PDA how it will be managed</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will threaten rare and vulnerable bird species that are found in the Toondah Harbour precinct.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the water current, wind, erosion and sedimentation are real constraints for the development and not understood or planned for in the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the land fill on the whapping is below the 1200 year storm surge height and is likely to contain acid sulphate soils.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the area is also used as a rubbish tip and asbestos and "hot sand" could be buried under the park.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that impact on fishing, bait collection and dugongs have not been investigated and planned for in the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is a plan to use dredged spoil is suitable as a stable and environmentally sound fill. This has been proven incorrect as this has been used in Bally Bay and has proven difficulty in supporting vegetation, house and stiff free channels.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that sustainability is defined as a one-off and is not an accepted definition.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned that GI Water park has heritage value and regional significance but has not been reflected in the scheme. The submitter is concerned that the proposed development will compromise GI Water Park and its use and values has not been investigated to make an informed development plan.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the area will be underutilised with regional scale park land and will become one of SEQ most alienated park land.</p> <p>Submitter comments that alienation of the park is akin to an asset sale which is a breach of the Government's election commitments.</p>						
TH14/43		<p>Submitter is concerned that their submission will not be considered and that their time is being wasted.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase high rises and increase high density living in Redlands.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the Redlands known as the salad bowl of Queensland will now only be known for growing hassles.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the dredging of the water ways will affect the fisheries area and food security of the area to allow for a passage for water vehicles. This will impact the seafood and tourism industry which provides some of the best seafood.</p> <p>Submitter believes that the area should remain as unspoilt as possible.</p>								

TH14/44	<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as documented in the Redlands 2030 Community Plan, Toonah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redlands Planning Scheme. Submitter is concerned that these documents have not been honoured by the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme is a document that will respond to the community engagement process but fails to do so.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that previous community engagement has not been taken into consideration. Submitter notes that the development of Toonah Harbour should be on the already developed area and not on green open spaces or over the bay.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will give public assets (GI Water Park and parts of the McIvoron Bay Marina Park) to developers despite the government's pledge to seek a mandate before sale of assets.</p> <p>Submitter accepts that the Toonah barge/ferry terminal requires an upgrade but does not accept the loss of the park and environmental assets of the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that community consultation was not taken into consideration about the 15 storey and 7 storey height limit and opposes high rise development in Toonah Harbour.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not respect the historical significance of GI Water Park and the "Fernleigh" precinct. That construction of a new access road along the boundary would diminish its value as a historical site. Its aspect looking to high rise buildings and a marina would replace the original views out to the bay.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will destroy the mangroves and seagrass within the PDA.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect the seagrass and fish habitat.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect koala or local wildlife habitat. Submitter is concerned that the proposed new road next to the park beside the existing koala habitat will result in tree loss and increase mortality to koalas.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina would result in total loss of seagrass and fish habitat in the PDA and would cause degradation of old growth mangroves on Casim Island. Submitter believes this is in contravention to the RAMSAR international treaty.</p>						<p>Submitter is concerned that the marina is not viable as the location is in a shallow area and would require extensive and constant dredging at an unacceptable cost to the community.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that development of the marina will remove the well loved and used sandy beach in GI Water park.</p>	
TH14/45	<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as documented in the Redlands 2030 Community Plan, Toonah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redlands Planning Scheme. Submitter is concerned that these documents have not been honoured by the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme is a document that will respond to the community engagement process but fails to do so.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that previous community engagement has not been taken into consideration. Submitter notes that the development of Toonah Harbour should be on the already developed area and not on green open spaces or over the bay.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will give public assets (GI Water Park and parts of the McIvoron Bay Marina Park) to developers despite the government's pledge to seek a mandate before sale of assets.</p> <p>Submitter accepts that the Toonah barge/ferry terminal requires an upgrade but does not accept the loss of the park and environmental assets of the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that community consultation was not taken into consideration about the 15 storey and 7 storey height limit and opposes high rise development in Toonah Harbour.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not respect the historical significance of GI Water Park and that construction of a new access road along the boundary would diminish its value as a historical site. Its aspect looking to high rise buildings and a marina would replace the original views out to the bay.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will destroy the mangroves and seagrass within the PDA.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect the seagrass and fish habitat.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect koala or local wildlife habitat. Submitter is concerned that the proposed new road next to the park beside the existing koala habitat will result in tree loss and increase mortality to koalas.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina would result in total loss of seagrass and fish habitat in the PDA and would cause degradation of old growth mangroves on Casim Island. Submitter believes this is in contravention to the RAMSAR international treaty.</p>						<p>Submitter is concerned that the marina is not viable as the location is in a shallow area and would require extensive and constant dredging at an unacceptable cost to the community.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that development of the marina will remove the well loved and used sandy beach in GI Water park.</p>	
TH14/46		<p>Submitter is concerned that there is a lack of entertainment area to cater to the lack of a central area for people to enjoy a night out proposed fp</p>							<p>Submitter is concerned that government funding will be available to ferry companies to pay for the upgrade. Submitter suggests that a state run option should be investigated.</p>		
TH14/47	<p>Submitter is supportive of development of restaurants and open space areas bound by existing infrastructure, such as entangling car parks and extending harbour walkways.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the process of the PDA and not allowing open forums for community feedback to be heard.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the submission process and believes that does not allow free and open discussion and consideration of the feedback.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the submission process does not fully disclose the final decisions made and can be viewed as subtle corruption. Submitter is concerned that they are not able to trust the process.</p>	<p>Submitter does not support the development as a tourism gateway to Moreton Bay and North Stradbroke Island.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limit and believes that it would look out of place and is unwarranted.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that a 15 storey height limit is not financially viable as several apartment blocks in the area have been abandoned due to lack of tenants or buyers.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the 15 storey height does not recognize the cultural heritage of the site.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that extending the harbour outside of the existing wharf area would impact and destroy the GI Water Parklands, coral and mangrove shorelines, koala habitat and blocking the natural views of the bay and North Stradbroke Island.</p>	<p>Submitter notes that no new street is required between Middle Street and North Shore Street and is concerned that if constructed will destroy sensitive koala habitats in the parklands.</p> <p>Submitter notes that extra parking is required but should be developed but only within existing townland areas, either by spreading into the old CRPD area or by extending trees and corridors and blocking the natural views of the bay and North Stradbroke Island.</p> <p>Submitter supports the improvement of pedestrian and cycle networks around the existing areas to blend in with surrounding parks.</p>	<p>Submitter is supportive of improved facilities as long as they are within the existing harbour area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the mixed use village will disrupt the peaceful ambience of the surrounding areas.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the residential precinct will disrupt the peaceful ambience of the surrounding areas.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the marina will destroy the natural peaceful ambience of GI Water park, surrounding areas and shoreline ecology.</p>		
TH14/48		<p>Submitter supports upgrading the ferry terminal and developing sacred land surrounding the terminal but comments that it should be in keeping with Cleveland.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the large scale development in the Redlands and believes that it is more suited to inner city Brisbane and would not be viable in Redlands as many developments are still empty due to lack of interest and buyers.</p>			<p>Submitter is concerned that GI Water park will be destroyed by the development and is currently used by many locals. Submitter is opposed to any development that will take the park away from the community.</p>				<p>Submitter is concerned that a marina will not be viable as current marinas in other areas are not at full capacity.</p>	

TH14/55		<p>Submitter is concerned that the development is vague and that there is little information made available to the public.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the PDA process allows the Minister to bypass and overlook existing legislation to fast-track development.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there has not been a democratic and diligent process and that the PDA should be withdrawn and resubmitted under the normal due process. Submitter is concerned of the tight turn around period associated with a PDA.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development scheme does not provide the necessary details of how the upgrade of infrastructure will be funded and is concerned that residents will bear the cost through increase rates. Submitter notes that previous developments have already increased the rates in Redland.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the PDA does not have support of all the councillors.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that a failed development in the area will fall on the residents to fund all maintenance and repairs, similar to the current situation in Baby Bay.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned about the proposed height limit of 15 storeys that will block views of existing properties.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned that the development scheme does not adequately manage the increase in traffic volume and additional transport links.</p>														<p>Submitter is concerned that a marina will not be viable as other marinas are currently not at full capacity.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the increase in noise pollution which can travel to close residential areas.</p>	
TH14/56			<p>Submitter is supportive of the upgrade of the ferry terminal, especially the public toilets and waiting area for taxis, and the upgrade of the channel for easier water access for marine craft to the bay.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the high density development and loss of GI Water park and believes that it will reduce access to the area and the bay. Submitter believes that it will destroy the tranquility and bay views.</p>																	<p>Submitter is concerned about the visibility of another marina when other marinas in the area are not operating at full capacity.</p>
TH14/57		<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as enunciated in the Redland's 2010 Community Plan, Toondah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redland Planning Scheme. Submitter is concerned that these documents have not been honoured by the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme is a document that will respond to the community engagement process but fails to do so.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that previous community engagement has not been taken into consideration. Submitter notes that the development of Toondah Harbour should be on the already developed area and not on green open spaces or over the bay.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will give public assets (GI Water Park and parts of the Moreton Bay Marine Park) to developers despite the government's pledge to seek a mandate before sale of assets.</p> <p>Submitter accepts that the Toondah barge/ferry terminal requires an upgrade but does not accept the loss of the park and environmental assets of the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that community consultation was not taken into consideration about the 15 storey and 7 storey height limit and opposes high rise development in Toondah Harbour.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not respect the historical significance of GI Water Park and the "Ternlight" project. That construction of a new access road along the boundary would diminish its value as a historical site. Its aspect looking to high rise buildings and a marina would reduce the original view out to the bay.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will destroy the mangroves and seagrass within the PDA.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect the seagrass and fish habitat.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect koala or local wildlife habitats. Submitter is concerned that the proposed new road next to the park beside the existing koala habitat will result in tree loss and increase mortality to koalas.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina would result in total loss of seagrass and fish habitat in the PDA and would cause degradation of old growth mangroves on Casim Island. Submitter believes this is in contravention to the RAMSAR international treaty.</p>															<p>Submitter is concerned that the marina is not viable as the location is in a shallow area and would require extensive and constant dredging at an unacceptable cost to the community.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that development of the marina will remove the well-loved and used sandy beach in GI Water park.</p>	
TH14/58	<p>Submitter is supportive of development of the ferry terminal and its associated facilities.</p>	<p>Submitter is supportive of limited reclamation around the harbour to support ferry operations, marine services and a small mixed use area.</p> <p>Submitter comments that a new plan should be made and put to a vote to Redland residents.</p> <p>Submitter requests for the development scheme to be withdrawn and a more carefully considered plan developed, including amending the boundaries of the PDA after consideration of public submissions.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that development of excessive commercial development will compete with the Cleveland CBD.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the existing infrastructure will be significantly impacted by the proposed development.</p>	<p>Submitter supports development of Toondah Harbour environment to include modest, mixed use urban village and medium density housing consistent with the surrounding area.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limit and the proposed high population.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development will obstruct the natural view of Moreton Bay and surrounding islands.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the dredging of the Habitat Protection Zone to accommodate for a 500 berth marina.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development will lead to the destruction of wildlife habitat including the current koala corridor, mangroves and seagrass.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that an Environment Impact Study, sedimentation studies or assessment of the impact on the marine has not been conducted.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will reduce access to Moreton Bay and increase traffic congestion on the current road network.</p>	<p>Submitter is supportive of upgrading and widening of Fison Channel to the south of Casim Island to assist marine traffic from the ferry terminal and public boating facilities.</p> <p>Submitter is not supportive of the government and council selling GI Water Water Park and over 48 acres of Moreton Bay.</p>														<p>Submitter is concerned that there will be an increased financial burden on Redland ratepayers due to long term dredging/maintenance of additional waterways in the area if a marina is built.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the increase in noise and ecological pollution.</p>
TH14/59				<p>Submitter is concerned of the negative impact caused by high density development and construction of commercial buildings.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that reclamation and dredging of the site will impact negatively.</p>																<p>Submitter is concerned that GI Water park and surrounds will be sold to private developers.</p>
TH14/60			<p>Submitter is concerned that the harbour is being overdeveloped and believes that it is only the gateway to the bay and transit point, not a destination itself.</p> <p>Submitter is supportive of upgrading facilities but opposes large scale urban development.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development is being rushed without proper consultation with Redland residents.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that a 15 storey height limit does not belong in the development. Submitter agrees that the CSRD also provides sufficient land for apartments.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that protection of the dugongs has not been considered adequately in the scheme.</p>		<p>Submitter is not opposed to the development however is concerned about the impact to GI Water park and its surrounds by the proposal.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the park is the best in the bayside and provides views to the bay and islands. Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will change the character of the park and does not support any development that encroaches onto any land from the Southern Boundaries of the oval up to its north extremity and extending to the waterfront. Submitter is comfortable with a broadwalk development.</p> <p>Submitter suggests that a waterfront park, similar to Redcliffe, should be included in the development. Submitter believes the perfect location is the undeveloped land to the immediate east of the canal entrance to Baby Bay.</p>														

TH14/61	<p>Submitter is supportive of the development of Toonah Harbour but believes that the balance needs to be right.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the site will be an overdevelopment.</p> <p>Submitter suggests that the proposed development scheme be revised and that a more careful considered plan is developed.</p>	<p>Submitter suggests that a Tourist information should be located at the harbour and showcase what Redlands has to offer. Submitter comments that an environmental/marine science museum with interactive displays could also be located there to educate visitors about the Bay and Redlands area.</p> <p>Submitter comments that ferry terminal and facilities require upgrading to be user friendly and is protected from the weather.</p> <p>Submitter suggests that a boarding building the water's edge to give passengers access between the terminal and bus interchange.</p> <p>Submitter is supportive of facilities within the terminal to provide for passengers such as cafes, restaurants and shops.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is an excess of commercial buildings proposed and will compete with the Cleveland CBD.</p>	<p>Submitter is that high density residential will take up public access to the bay and believes that it should be limited to medium density only.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the current parking facilities will not cope with the increase in demand and believes that it is important to address this as a priority. Submitter suggests that the former CSDO building could be redeveloped into a multi-storey car park.</p>															
TH14/62	<p>Submitter is supportive of upgrading the ferry terminal and associated facilities, limited reclamation around the harbour to support ferry operations and upgrading and widening of Fison Channel.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that there will be an increased financial burden to ratepayers due to ongoing dredging in the water ways.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned about the development of high density residential buildings and commercial buildings.</p>						<p>Submitter does not support the loss of G1 Walter Park and over 48 hectares of Moreton Bay, reclamation and dredging of any area adjacent to G1 Walter Park.</p>										
TH14/63	<p>Submitter is supportive of development of the ferry terminal and its associated facilities.</p>	<p>Submitter is supportive of limited reclamation around the harbour to support ferry operations, marine services and a small mixed use area.</p> <p>Submitter comments that a new plan should be made and put to a vote to address requests.</p> <p>Submitter requests for the development scheme to be withdrawn and a more carefully considered plan developed, including amending the boundaries of the PDA after consideration of public submissions.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that development of excessive commercial development will compete with the Cleveland CBD.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the existing infrastructure will be significantly impacted by the proposed development.</p>	<p>Submitter supports development of Toonah Harbour environment to include modest, mixed use urban village and medium density housing consistent with the surrounding area.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limit and the proposed high population.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development will obstruct the natural view of Moreton Bay and surrounding islands.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the dredging of the Habitat Protection Zone to accommodate for an 800 berth marina.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development will lead to the destruction of wildlife habitat including the present koala corridors, mangroves and seagrasses.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that an Environment Impact Study, sedimentation studies or assessment of the impact on the marine has not been conducted.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will reduce access to Moreton Bay and increase traffic congestions on the current road network.</p>	<p>Submitter is supportive of upgrading and widening of Fison Channel (the south of Cassin Island) to allow greater traffic from the ferry terminal and public boating facilities.</p> <p>Submitter is not supportive of the government and council selling G1 Walter Water Park and over 48 acres of Moreton Bay.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that there will be an increased financial burden on Redland ratepayers due to long term dredging maintenance of additional waterways in the area if a marina is built.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the increase in noise and ecological pollution.</p>												
TH14/64		<p>Submitter is concerned that there is no economic market to support retail sales of units which could in turn reduce property values in the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that there is no evidence to support demand for the development of the marina, high density residential.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the overall propose development is not fit for purpose and there is an incompatibility of uses with the commercial hub, transport terminal and heavy mixing machinery and marina.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that a hotel positioned beside a terminal with truck and barge movements will be viable.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme does not recognise or manage the high value environmental areas of protected wetlands, mangroves, and koala habitats.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about how dredge spoils will be managed and habitats protected in compliance with international protection legislation and regulations.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that an Environmental Impact Assessment for the marina has not been conducted to determine the feasibility of construction.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the current infrastructure will not cope with current and proposed demand.</p> <p>Submitter believes that the development of an 800 berth marina and increasing Stradbroke Island will degrade the reef for a 300m through Cleveland, degradation of the northern coastal road, rail line and the long standing Fraserford road. Submitter comments that the private development will impact significantly to the regional infrastructure.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the loss of public open space in the proposed development is not consistent with the community values of an active and healthy lifestyle.</p> <p>Submitter comments that open spaces should be retained to meet increases in population and not redeveloped.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that a marina will not be viable with many marina facilities not operating at full capacity.</p>												
TH14/65	<p>Submitter is supportive of developing the site and surrounds.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned of the current degradation and awkward entry to the area and believes that upgrading the facilities and development of suitable off-site should be made a priority.</p>																		
TH14/66	<p>Submitter is supportive of the upgrade to the ferry terminal and believes that a waiting room with a kiosk bar and amenities should be included. Submitter is supportive of dredging the channel.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that there are 2 projects being merged into one development in the PDA.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that Toonah Harbour is being developed into a satellite city and is unrelated to the upgrade of the ferry terminal. Submitter is concerned that the current infrastructure will not support the demand and increase in population and tourists.</p> <p>Submitter suggests that the satellite city should be relocated next to the Railway station at Thornside which has the infrastructure to support the increase in demand and has boating access to Moreton Bay.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned that the current road network will not cope with increase traffic as it is already operating at capacity at peak times.</p> <p>Submitter comments that development of an underground car park would be expensive and is concerned with how it will be funded.</p>															
TH14/67		<p>Submitter is concerned that there will be an increased financial burden to ratepayers due to ongoing dredging in the water ways.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the excess commercial buildings proposed will have a negative impact on the commercial sector in Cleveland.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned that a 15 storey height limit is an overdevelopment and will overload on existing infrastructure and impact on the quality of life.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will impact on the village atmosphere which is the original plan for Cleveland.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that wildlife habitats on land and water will be destroyed in the development.</p>				<p>Submitter opposes the loss of a substantial part of G1 Walter Park. Submitter is concerned that an increase in population and decrease in public land will impact negatively on the amenity and quality of life.</p> <p>Submitter opposes the reclamation of 48 hectares of Moreton Bay and is concerned that loss of the access and view will impact the quality of life for residents.</p>											
TH14/68		<p>Submitter opposes the proposed development and comments that if the project goes ahead that the submitter will protect at the ballot box.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned that the individuality of the area will be destroyed by the proposed development.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme does not consider the environmental and ecological impacts.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the long term detrimental and adverse effect to the biosphere have not been taken into consideration and managed for in the development scheme.</p>															
TH14/69		<p>Submitter is concerned that feedback from community consultation has not been taken into consideration in the planning of the scheme.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned is an overdevelopment of an area that is currently used by the public.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that development will encroach on parklands and foreshore and should be limited to current residential areas with no land reclamation.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned that there will be a loss of habitat including wildlife corridors and the marine environment.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that parking should be the priority in the development.</p> <p>Submitter comments that focus should also be on connection of the pathways to local communities and public transport upgrades.</p>	<p>Submitter opposes the loss of G1 Walter park or foreshore.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that there is no demand for recreational boating facilities when this is already met at Raby Bay.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that only limited ferry terminals upgrades are required to support ferry operations.</p>											

TH1470		<p>Submitter is concerned that the online submission facility for the PDA is excessive and is designed to make the process difficult for the public. Submitter believes that there should be adequate consultation with the community.</p> <p>Submitter believes that this is a wonderful opportunity for innovative design in line with the natural environmental and community wishes.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development fails to take into consideration of the community's feedback.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that it will be an overdevelopment that will impact negatively on the gateway to Stradbroke Island. Submitter is concerned that Dunwich has not been taken into consideration.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development is not consistent with the village appearance.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that 15 storey height limit is not consistent with current regulations.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will impact the natural and unique wetlands and cause irreversible damage to offshore species of birds and land and water animals.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will increase pollution and rubbish which will have a negative impact on wildlife.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the high density residential development will increase traffic, congestion and pollution. The current road network will not support the increase in use.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the multi-storey car park is not consistent with community feedback.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that there will not be sufficient open space for the increase in residential and tourists.</p>					<p>Submitter is concerned that a marina will not be viable when there are currently marinas in other locations not operating at full capacity.</p>
TH1471		<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will spoil the area for the sake of making a profit.</p>		<p>Submitter opposes the 15 storey height limit and believes it should be limited to 5 storeys.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that the natural environment should not be destroyed.</p>		<p>Submitter opposes the loss of GI Water Park</p>					
TH1472		<p>Submitter believes that the vision for the area should be to enhance the natural beauty of the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will become another Raby Bay which will offer little diversity in commercial use and competing with the Cleveland CBD.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the gate way concept can be realised through integration with the Cleveland CBD.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that a 15 storey height limit and commercial hub is not consistent with the goal of beautifying the area but places the emphasis on commercial development.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the substantial infrastructure in the proposal will not be able to adjust to changes in the natural environment.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the wetlands and birdlife habitats will be destroyed by the proposed development.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the current road network and infrastructure will not be able to support the increase in traffic use.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the public will be opposed to paying for parking while using the amenities around area.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that underground car parks will be prone to flooding in flood prone areas.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that open space in the area will be deemed appropriate for development.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the mixed use village presents conflicting interests between the commercial and residential.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned of the increased social pollution (from computers and internet usage).</p>	<p>Submitter believes that high rise development does not fit the area. Submitter believes that the mixed use village presents conflicting interests between the commercial and residential.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the current terminal and large infrastructure will not support the increase in demand and requires priority jurisdiction to upgrade facilities.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that a marina will not be viable when there are currently marinas in other locations not operating at full capacity.</p>	
TH1473		<p>Submitter is supportive of the concept of enhancing the gateway to Moreton Bay however believes that there is a discrepancy between the goal of beautifying the area and the proposed commercial/high rise profile in the plan.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that development of a commercial hub will compete with the Cleveland CBD.</p>	<p>Submitter believes that the main thrust of the proposal is to provide harbour access and is concerned that the proposal for commercial and residential high rise building does not achieve this goal.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the height limits and does not respect the natural beauty of the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not take into account level rises and development on the foreshore could be risk prone.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that urban infrastructure will not be able to adjust to changes in the natural environment.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the current road network and infrastructure will not be able to support the increase in traffic use.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that increase use of the ferry terminal will further exacerbate the issue with parking.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that underground car parks will be prone to flooding in flood prone areas.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned of the urban development, opening natural wetlands to enhance the gateway concept and believes that this should not extend to urban development over open space.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the approach is to create a coastal treatment precinct not consistent with the re-aligning the CBD.</p>		<p>Submitter supports that ferry operators should be given an opportunity to improve services, which should include catering and tourist information.</p>			
TH1474	<p>Submitter fully supports the intended outcomes in the Toondah Harbour PDA.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that this will give Cleveland the most that is long overdue. Submitter believes that Cleveland is the gateway to Stradbroke Island and the current harbour facilities require improvement.</p>	<p>Submitter supports the urban design principles however is concerned with the 15 storey height limits being excessive.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that being a relatively small development it would expect minimal effect on the natural environment.</p>	<p>Submitter is supportive of upgrading the road network to improve access and traffic flow.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the cycle network will also improve accessibility to the bay.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that this will allow all hotel and residents and visitors to enjoy Moreton Bay.</p>						
TH1475	<p>Submitter supports the propose development to an extent. Submitter accepts the creation of new areas of public open space to enhance opportunities to enjoy the waterfront.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that public consultation will not be taken into consideration as it is merely a mechanism to follow due process.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that overdevelopment may inhibit the public from enjoying the foreshore.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that 15 and 7 storeys is unacceptable and not consistent with the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that it is not evident in the proposal how the development will respect and value marine and land based ecology and seek to protect matters of ecological and cultural significance.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will also impact negatively on the infrastructure of Moreton Bay. Submitter believes that the wastewater will also be congested. There is a concentration of marine craft in a Marina.</p> <p>Submitter suggests that a north-south cycle path be included to provide better access. Submitter notes that if the path continued down to the shore at GI Water park and past the aquifer frontage of Fish Grandview area that it would provide a safe route out to the point.</p>	<p>Submitter is opposed to the marina and reclamation of the land (filling) on the area and believes that a public jetty will be sufficient.</p> <p>Submitter comments that all water frontages should be made available to the public and wide enough so as not to limit a path with buildings immediately over a pedestrian's should casting an unnatural shade.</p>	<p>Submitter is supportive of the mixed use precinct.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that parking for trailers should not conflict with other parking where there is a recreational boat ramp.</p>	<p>Submitter opposes the reclamation of land for a marina and is concerned of the payment. Provides an opportunity to create land that will be utilised for development in the future.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that Project 2 is not a priority and should be staged for development towards the end.</p>	
TH1476		<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as documented in the Hedlands 2030 Community Plan, Toondah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Hedlands Planning Scheme. Submitter is concerned that these documents have not been honoured by the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme is a document that will respond to the community engagement process but fails to do so.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is a lack of feasibility reports and evaluation of fish projects around Queensland.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is no transparency in the process.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the past state definition of infrastructure is inconsistent with the definition in</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that previous community engagement has not been taken into consideration. Submitter notes that the development of Toondah Harbour should be on the already developed area and not on green open spaces or over the bay.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not respect the historical significance of GI Water Park and that construction of a new access road along the boundary would diminish its value as a historical site. Its aspect looking to high rise buildings and a marina would reduce the original views out to the bay.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme is not mindful of the recognition and loss of the ecological value of the bay.</p> <p>Submitter comments that visual amenity or scenic amenity should be used.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect koalas or local wildlife habitat. Submitter is concerned that the proposed new road next to the park beside the existing koala habitat will result in tree loss and increase mortality to koalas.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the road network upgrade will not assist in linking it up to the train station.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned with the proposed road next to the koala corridor.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned with the proposed road next to the park beside the existing koala habitat will result in tree loss and increase mortality to koalas.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned with traffic congestion with the increase in residential population.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that dredged spoil will not be environmentally stable or sound as fill or support vegetation.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that sustainability is defined in a way that is one off and not an accepted definition.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the statement made at 3.4.4 has no intrinsic value or claims to achieve benefits for the environments.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will destroy the mangroves and seagrass within the PDA.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect the seagrass and fish habitat.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect koalas or local wildlife habitat. Submitter is concerned that the proposed new road next to the park beside the existing koala habitat will result in tree loss and increase mortality to koalas.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina would result in total loss of seagrass and fish habitat in the PDA and would cause degradation of old growth mangroves on Casim Island. Submitter believes this is in contravention to the RAMSAR international treaty.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that the off leash dog park should be maintained as there is a high community use.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is only a small amount of open green space in the proposed development.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the SEQ Regional plan defines open space as delivering parks and open spaces and not built environment.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the surrender of the trusteeship of the park and whether due process was followed.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that the marina will not be viable as the location is in a shallow area and would require extensive and constant dredging at an unacceptable cost to the community.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that development of the marina will remove the well loved and used sandy beach in GI Water Park.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina will not be viable as there are marinas in other locations that are not operating at full capacity.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the marina is not viable as the location is in a shallow area and would require extensive and constant dredging at an unacceptable cost to the community.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that development of the marina will remove the well loved and used sandy beach in GI Water Park.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development strategy relegates the community, open space and environment outcomes as being incidental and not planned or core outcomes.</p>			
TH1477		<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as documented in the Hedlands 2030 Community Plan, Toondah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Hedlands Planning Scheme. Submitter is concerned that these documents have not been honoured by the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme is a document that will respond to the community engagement process but fails to do so.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that previous community engagement has not been taken into consideration. Submitter notes that the development of Toondah Harbour should be on the already developed area and not on green open spaces or over the bay.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will give public access (GI Water Park) and parts of the Moreton Bay Marine Park to developers despite the government's pledge to seek a mandate before sale of assets.</p> <p>Submitter accepts that the Toondah barge/ferry terminal requires an upgrade but does not accept the loss of the park and environmental assets of the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not respect the historical significance of GI Water Park and that construction of a new access road along the boundary would diminish its value as a historical site. Its aspect looking to high rise buildings and a marina would reduce the original views out to the bay.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme is not mindful of the recognition and loss of the ecological value of the bay.</p> <p>Submitter comments that visual amenity or scenic amenity should be used.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will destroy the mangroves and seagrass within the PDA.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect the seagrass and fish habitat.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect koalas or local wildlife habitat. Submitter is concerned that the proposed new road next to the park beside the existing koala habitat will result in tree loss and increase mortality to koalas.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina would result in total loss of seagrass and fish habitat in the PDA and would cause degradation of old growth mangroves on Casim Island. Submitter believes this is in contravention to the RAMSAR international treaty.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that the off leash dog park should be maintained as there is a high community use.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is only a small amount of open green space in the proposed development.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the SEQ Regional plan defines open space as delivering parks and open spaces and not built environment.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the surrender of the trusteeship of the park and whether due process was followed.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that the marina will not be viable as the location is in a shallow area and would require extensive and constant dredging at an unacceptable cost to the community.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that development of the marina will remove the well loved and used sandy beach in GI Water Park.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development strategy relegates the community, open space and environment outcomes as being incidental and not planned or core outcomes.</p>				

TH14/78			<p>Submitter is concerned that the 15 storey height limit is not consistent with the existing low density housing and will have a negative impact flow on effect on traffic and noise, destroying the peaceful lifestyle in Clevedon. Submitter believes 7 storeys could be relied on.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned that G1 Walter park will be lost in the development and is the last remaining natural stretch of beach that is used by the community for various uses. Submitter comments that G1 Walter park is an area of great historical significance and can be lost if changed or destroyed.</p> <p>Submitter comments that development of the residential area will impact on the park's current uses and a highly valued community asset will be lost.</p> <p>Submitter does not believe that there are any vital facilities in the proposed development that will warrant destruction of the park.</p>					
TH14/79	<p>Submitter is supportive of the development, upgrade of infrastructure and income producing business to support the local economy.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that there is an increased financial burden on rate payers due to long term shoddy maintenance or additional waterways in the area.</p>								
TH14/80			<p>Submitter is concerned that the 15 storey height limit is not consistent with the existing low density housing and will have a negative impact flow on effect on traffic and noise, destroying the peaceful lifestyle in Clevedon. Submitter believes 7 storeys could be relied on.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned that G1 Walter park will be lost in the development and is the last remaining natural stretch of beach that is used by the community for various uses. Submitter comments that G1 Walter park is an area of great historical significance and can be lost if changed or destroyed.</p> <p>Submitter comments that development of the residential area will impact on the park's current uses and a highly valued community asset will be lost.</p> <p>Submitter does not believe that there are any vital facilities in the proposed development that will warrant destruction of the park.</p>					
TH14/81	<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as document in the Redlands 2030 Community Plan, Toonidah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redlands Planning Scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme does not take into consideration the communities previous objection to a similar overdevelopment in the late 1980s. A community campaign conducted by Secure Toonidah's invaluable resources succeeded in having the development stopped.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development reflects ongoing consultation that was undertaken after the August 2013 community consultation process however the community were not made aware of the opportunity for ongoing input.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is no disclosure of the who has been consulted and the nature of the consultation and requests that the details be released and disclose the influence that has overruled the community's vision.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned the the scheme is too</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the 15 storey height limit ignores Council planning decisions.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is no mention of the number of residential units and submitter believes that some assessments indicate a possible 1500 units which is 50% more than the number of houses in Raby Bay. Submitter is concerned that social, environmental and economic impacts have not been assessed prior to drafting the development scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there no development with building height 15 storeys in the surrounding area, the closest would be in the Bisanane CBD.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the intention of the proposed development is to develop it into a Gold Coast which will impact on the liveability, lifestyle and village atmosphere of Clevedon.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the environmental and ecological concerns that will be impacted by the proposed development scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the site is designed as a RAMSAR site, which is an international agreement to protect wetlands and the flight paths of migratory birds and it is not mentioned in the PDA how it will be managed</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will threaten rare and vulnerable bird species that are found in the Toonidah Harbour precinct.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the water current, winds, erosion and sedimentation are real constraints for the development are not understood or planned for in the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the land shown on the map being is below the 1:100 year storm surge level and is likely to contain acid sulphate soils.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the land was also used as a rubbish tip and asbestos and that land could be buried under the park.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that impact on fishing, bait collection and dugongs have not been investigated and planned for in the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is a plan to use dredged spoils suitable as a stable and environmentally sound fill. This has been proven incorrect as this has been used in Raby Bay and Toonidah difficulty supporting vegetation, house and off free channels.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that G1 Walter park has heritage value and regional significance but has not been reflected in the scheme. The submitter is concerned that the proposed development will compromise G1 Walter Park and its use and values has not been investigated to make an informed decision on plan.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the area will be underdredged with regional scale park land and will become one of SEQ's most alienated park land.</p> <p>Submitter comments that alienation of the park is akin to an asset sale which is a breach of the Government's election commitments.</p>						
TH14/82		<p>Submitter is concerned that the commercial proposed will negatively impact the Clevedon CBD and should be protection and supported.</p> <p>Submitter is supportive of upgrading the ferry terminal and widening of Foon Channel and believes that medium density housing and commercial development consistent with the village atmosphere is more sensitive and appropriate approach.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that a 15 storey height limit will block out a substantial amount of the view across the bay.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the building will be an eyesore and a blight on the landscape denying residents and visitors of free and unobstructed access to the bay.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the impact of development of the natural habitat, coastal corridors, mangroves and sea grasses.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the impact of dredging, heavy traffic and the impact on existing roots, infrastructure and noise and visual pollution.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned environmental and sedimentation studies have not been conducted prior to proposing reclamation of the land for residential development.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned that G1 Walter park will be lost in the proposed development</p>				
TH14/83	<p>Submitter is concerned that PDA process cuts out the rights of Redland residents.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the process is being rushed.</p>		<p>Submitter suggests that a world class design competition be incorporated into the process to ensure a high class facility.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development of Toonidah Harbour will compromise the RAMSAR area of reserve and plans of management have not been set out in the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that migratory birds will be affected by the development.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned that the open space used by the community currently will be lost and no suitable alternative has been provided.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the constant dredging will cause turbidity of the water and impact the sea grass and dugongs of the area.</p>				

TH14/84		<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as documented in the Redlands 2030 Community Plan, Toonidah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redlands Planning Scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme does not take into consideration the community previous objection to a similar overdevelopment in the late 1980s. A community campaign conducted by Secure Toonidah's invaluable resources succeeded in having the development stopped.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development reflects ongoing consultation that was undertaken after the August 2013 community consultation process however the community were not made aware of the opportunity for ongoing input.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is no disclosure of the who has been consulted and the nature of the consultation and requests that the details be released and disclose the influence that has overruled the community's vision.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme is too complex and poorly written that is difficult to understand.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the nature of the scheme has disadvantaged the community.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the style of writing is too technical and does not follow the Government's mantra to reduce red tape.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the PDA Toonidah Harbour "is not a true representation of the scope of land involved. Submitter notes that the majority of land comprises of GI Water Park and the bay which is misleading as the community are supportive of upgrading the facilities of Toonidah Harbour.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned that the 15 storey height limit ignores Council planning decisions.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is no mention of the number of residential units and submitter believes that some assessments indicate a possible 1500 units which is 50% more than the number of houses in Ruby Bay. Submitter is concerned that social, environmental and economic impacts have not been assessed prior to drafting the development scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is no development with building heights 15 storeys in the surrounding area, the closest would be in the Brisbane CBD.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the intention of the proposed development is to develop it into a Gold Coast which will impact on the liveability, lifestyle and village atmosphere of Cleveland.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the environmental and ecological concerns that will be impacted by the proposed development scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the site is designed as a RAMSAR site, which is an international agreement to protect wetlands and the flight paths of migratory birds and it is not mentioned in the PDA how it will be managed.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will threaten rare and vulnerable bird species that are found in the Toonidah Harbour precinct.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the water current, winds, erosion and sedimentation are real constraints for the development are not understood or planned for in the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the land shown on the mapping is below the 1:100 year storm surge level and is likely to contain acid sulphate soils.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the area was also used as a rubbish tip and asbestos and 'hot sand' could be buried under the park.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that impact on fishing, bait collection and dugongs have not been investigated and planned for in the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is a plan to use dredged spoil is suitable as a stable and environmentally sound fill. This has been proven incorrect as this has been used in Ruby Bay and has proven difficulty supporting vegetation, house and silt free channels.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that sustainability is defined as a one-off and is not an accepted definition.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned that GI Water park has heritage value and regional significance but has not been reflected in the scheme. The submitter is concerned that the proposed development will compromise GI Water Park and its use and values has not been investigated to make an informed development plan.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the area will be undersupplied with regional scale park land and will become one of SEQ most alienated park land.</p> <p>Submitter comments that alienation of the park is akin to an asset sale which is a breach of the Government's election commitments.</p>					
TH14/85	<p>Submitter does not oppose the elements of the proposal that will improve facilities for more appropriate and modernised access to the Morston Bay Island.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that there is a disregard of the community and environment with the high density development proposal.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposal is an overdevelopment and will change the face of the unique locality and open the gates to ongoing overdevelopment in the area.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the commercial development will impact negatively on the Cleveland CBD. Submitter believes that large commercial and retail centres within a few kilometres of the area sufficiently serve the needs of the local population.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limit as it will reduce and restrict views of the bay and change the profile of the waterfront.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the over development will lead to loss of the unique area.</p> <p>Submitter supports development that with limited modern facilities, ferry terminals, medium density housing and an urban village precinct consistent with existing style developments.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will impact and destroy the habitats for wildlife.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that dredging for the marina development will destroy the mangroves and sea grasses which is the nursery for marine life.</p> <p>Submitter is supportive of limited reclamation around the harbour which will not adversely affect the natural habitat or endanger marine life.</p>							
TH14/86		<p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme is too complex and poorly written that is difficult to understand.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the style of writing is too technical and does not follow the Government's mantra to reduce red tape.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned that the 15 storey height limit ignores Council planning decisions.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is no mention of the number of residential units and submitter believes that some assessments indicate a possible 1500 units which is 50% more than the number of houses in Ruby Bay. Submitter is concerned that social, environmental and economic impacts have not been assessed prior to drafting the development scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is no development with building heights 15 storeys in the surrounding area, the closest would be in the Brisbane CBD.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the intention of the proposed development is to develop it into a Gold Coast which will impact on the liveability, lifestyle and village atmosphere of Cleveland.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the environmental and ecological concerns that will be impacted by the proposed development scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the site is designed as a RAMSAR site, which is an international agreement to protect wetlands and the flight paths of migratory birds and it is not mentioned in the PDA how it will be managed.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will threaten rare and vulnerable bird species that are found in the Toonidah Harbour precinct.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the water current, winds, erosion and sedimentation are real constraints for the development are not understood or planned for in the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the land shown on the mapping is below the 1:100 year storm surge level and is likely to contain acid sulphate soils.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the area was also used as a rubbish tip and asbestos and 'hot sand' could be buried under the park.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that impact on fishing, bait collection and dugongs have not been investigated and planned for in the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is a plan to use dredged spoil is suitable as a stable and environmentally sound fill. This has been proven incorrect as this has been used in Ruby Bay and has proven difficulty supporting vegetation, house and silt free channels.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that sustainability is defined as a one-off and is not an accepted definition.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned that GI Water park has heritage value and regional significance but has not been reflected in the scheme. The submitter is concerned that the proposed development will compromise GI Water Park and its use and values has not been investigated to make an informed development plan.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the area will be undersupplied with regional scale park land and will become one of SEQ most alienated park land.</p> <p>Submitter comments that alienation of the park is akin to an asset sale which is a breach of the Government's election commitments.</p>					

TH14/87		Submitter opposes the development of a marina.	Submitter is concerned about the high density development	Submitter is concerned about the pollution and waste caused from the development of the marina and the loss of mangroves to the area.	Submitter is supportive of the bikeway but is concerned that the Council is not able to complete the existing shoreline bikeway.	Submitter is concerned about the loss of parklands for the development.	Submitter is supportive of the mixed use village with low density development of cafes and shops.	Submitter is supportive of the precinct.		Submitter opposes the development of the marina.									
TH14/88	Submitter is supportive of the upgrade to Toondah Harbour.	Submitter comments that the development of the precinct should be complemented on the island to keep the concept consistent.	Submitter is supportive of the concept of enhancing the 'gateway' to Moreton Bay.	Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limit and believes that it should be limited to 7 storeys to ensure that the character of the area is not lost. Submitter comments that the modernisation of the area should be consistent with the current development.	Submitter is concerned about the requirements for dredging and disposal of spoils surrounding mangroves. Submitter comments that the area is fragile and it is necessary to retain the ecology.				Submitter comments that this is the perfect opportunity to address the parking issue at Dunwich.										
TH14/89	Submitter is supportive of development of the ferry terminal and its associated facilities.	Submitter comments that a new plan should be made and put to a vote to Redland residents. Submitter requests for the development scheme to be withdrawn and a more carefully considered plan developed, including amending the boundaries of the PDA after consideration of public submissions.	Submitter is concerned that development of excessive commercial development will compete with the Cleveland CBD. Submitter is concerned that the existing infrastructure will be significantly impacted by the proposed development.	Submitter supports development of Toondah Harbour environment to include roads, mixed use urban village and medium density housing consistent with the surrounding area. Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limit and the proposed high population. Submitter is concerned that the development will obstruct the natural view of Moreton Bay and surrounding islands.	Submitter is concerned about the dredging of the Habitat Protection Zone to accommodate for an 800 berth marina. Submitter is concerned that the development will lead to the destruction of wildlife habitat including the present koala corridors, mangroves and seagrasses. Submitter is concerned that an Environment Impact Study, sedimentation studies or assessment of the impact on the marine has not been conducted.	Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will reduce access to Moreton Bay and increase traffic congestion on the current road network.	Submitter is supportive of upgrading and widening of Frison Channel to the south of Caslin Island to assist marine traffic from the ferry terminal and public boating facilities. Submitter is not supportive of the government and council sitting GI Water Walker Park and over 48 acres of Moreton Bay.			Submitter is concerned that there will be an increased financial burden on Redland ratepayers due to long term dredging maintenance of additional waterways in the area if a marina is built. Submitter is concerned about the increase in noise and ecological pollution									
TH14/90	Submitter is supportive of the enhancement of the foreshore to increase efficiency for access to Stradbroke Island. Submitter is supportive of some commercial development.	Submitter is concerned that the proposal is to ambitious and flawed. Submitter is concerned about the expenditure by Council on the proposal where there is little prospect of success.		Submitter is concerned that high rise development will detract from the value of the location.	Submitter is concerned about the impact the development will have on the environment. Submitter comments that there is acid soil contamination present and should be tested prior to disturbance of the soil. Submitter is concerned that the management of dredge spoil is not clearly outlined in the development scheme.	Submitter is concerned about whether the parking areas will be maintained for North Stradbroke Island residents and visitors.				Submitter is concerned that development of the marina will not be viable as there are marinas in other locations not operating at full capacity.									
TH14/91	Submitter is supportive of only redevelopment of the ferry terminal, including improved parking facilities, mixed use area and a low density housing.	Submitter is concerned that the target residential population is over 3500 and believes it is too much for the area. Submitter is concerned that public consultation for the plans have been very minimal.	Submitter is concerned that the name of the PDA is misleading. Submitter believes that the development should be related to Toondah Harbour and the adjacent land over and not extend to the Parkland and Moreton Bay. Submitter is concerned that an over supply of commercial development will impact the existing Cleveland CBD and Raby Bay harbourside business.	Submitter is concerned that the proposal is an overdevelopment which is inconsistent with the surrounding areas of Cleveland. Submitter comments that the building heights should be governed by the current Redland City Council plans or less. Submitter is concerned that the development is not consistent and must be kept attractive and livable for new and existing residents.	Submitter is concerned about the increase in demand for parking which the current infrastructure cannot support. Submitter is concerned that the plans for road upgrades have not been put forward and is concerned that the current road network cannot support the increase in traffic.	Submitter is concerned that the sale of 48 hectares of Moreton Bay is undermottic.			Submitter is concerned that development of the marina will not be viable as there are marinas in other locations not operating at full capacity. Submitter is concerned that development of the marina will increase the financial burden on ratepayers due to dredging and maintenance of additional waterways.										
TH14/92	Submitter is supportive of improving facilities for travellers to South Stradbroke Island.		Submitter is supportive of small mixed use services and a limited mixed use urban village including medium density housing. Submitter is concerned that extensive construction of commercial development will be detrimental to the Cleveland CBD.	Submitter is concerned that a 15 storey height limit is an over development and unsustainable.	Submitter is concerned that the development would be detrimental to the marine and land environment.	Submitter is concerned that parks will be lost to development.				Submitter is not supportive of an extensive marina.									
TH14/93	Submitter comments that the long term economic future of the bay is not tourism and will be impacted negatively by the proposal. Submitter is concerned that the local fishermen will not be compensated for their loss of business.		Submitter believes the PDA site is better located in Cleveland.	Submitter is not concerned that the proposed development does not take into account the heritage values for the area.	Submitter is concerned that fish habitat and mangroves will be destroyed in the development. Submitter is concerned that BAAASA has not been considered in development of the marina. Submitter is concerned that the additional boat traffic will pollute the water and be detrimental to the sea grass and turtle population, water farms and fisheries. Submitter is concerned that dredging and land reclamation would also be detrimental to marine and plant life in the Bay.	Submitter is concerned that GI Water park will be lost in the proposed development.			Submitter is not supportive of an extensive marina.										
TH14/94	Submitter is supportive of the proposal and believes that it is overdue.	Submitter believes that the proposal should not be withdrawn or watered down due to the minority's opposition. Submitter believes that the current opposition would also have opposed other development around the area.	Submitter is supportive of marina and believes it will be a fantastic asset to firm up the area.		Submitter believes that this area cannot be described as a koala and/or wildlife corridor or in need of reservation.		Submitter is supportive of the proposal and believes that the park is being overtaken by mangroves and the view of bay will be obstructed. The beach is concerned that the beach is unusable in its current state for any water activities.												
TH14/95	Submitter is supportive of early redevelopment of the ferry terminal, including improved parking facilities, mixed use area and a low density housing.	Submitter is concerned that the target residential population is over 3500 and believes it is too much for the area. Submitter is concerned that public consultation for the plans have been very minimal.	Submitter is concerned that the name of the PDA is misleading. Submitter believes that the development should be related to Toondah Harbour and the adjacent land over and not extend to the Parkland and Moreton Bay. Submitter is concerned that an over supply of commercial development will impact the existing Cleveland CBD and Raby Bay harbourside business.	Submitter is concerned that the proposal is an overdevelopment which is inconsistent with the surrounding areas of Cleveland. Submitter comments that the building heights should be governed by the current Redland City Council plans or less. Submitter is concerned that the development is not consistent and must be kept attractive and livable for new and existing residents.	Submitter is concerned about the increase in demand for parking which the current infrastructure cannot support. Submitter is concerned that the plans for road upgrades have not been put forward and is concerned that the current road network cannot support the increase in traffic.	Submitter is concerned that the sale of 48 hectares of Moreton Bay is undermottic.		Submitter is concerned that development of the marina will not be viable as there are marinas in other locations not operating at full capacity. Submitter is concerned that development of the marina will increase the financial burden on ratepayers due to dredging and maintenance of additional waterways.											
TH14/96			Submitter would like to see an attractive, clean, open entry to Toondah Harbour to welcome water craft and allow for safe boarding and disembarkment.																
TH14/97			Submitter is supportive of a more modest Toondah Harbour development that may include a small marina, small commercial development, a children's playground, toilet block and central green area which could be used for local events. Submitter believes that the development should be the 'Aboriginal themed Gateway to Stradbroke' to promote and brand the area. Submitter believes that construction of commercial buildings will be detrimental to the Cleveland CBD.	Submitter believes a smaller development will retain the 'country town' atmosphere. Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limit and believes that 5 storeys would be more consistent with the area.		Submitter is concerned that GI Water Park and 48 hectares of the Marine Park will be sold or given to private developers.													
TH14/98			Submitter is concerned of the extensive development and believes that such facilities are already available with sufficient capacity in the local area.	Submitter is concerned that the proposed building height is not consistent with the existing area.	Submitter is concerned that the existing habitat and wildlife will be impacted negatively and undermined by the development.	Submitter comments that the natural environment should be the focus and not concrete walkways and cycle paths. Submitter is concerned that the park shall be downsized by the development.	Submitter is concerned that the off leash dog park is current well used and the proposed development will impact on the community's access to the park. Submitter is concerned that the park shall be downsized by the development.	Submitter is concerned that additional residential development will not be viable and that there is no evidence to support the additional development.		Submitter is concerned that the proposed 800 berth marina is excessive.									
TH14/99			Submitter comments that the southern end of the proposed development would be welcomed by most residents.			Submitter is concerned that the planned walkway will make the extensive marina seem like a concrete jungle.	Submitter opposes inclusion of GI Water Park being included in the PDA boundary as development will reduce public access to the bay.												

TH14/100		Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will not be aesthetically pleasing.	Submitter is concerned that the vision of the proposal is more related to commercial activity than the open space and natural environment.	Submitter is concerned that there will be an overdevelopment of high density buildings. Submitter is supportive of commercial buildings near the ferry terminal. Submitter is concerned that buildings are proposed over GI Walter Park and believes that it will be spoilt. Submitter is concerned that the development will affect the beauty of the bay and raised atmosphere. Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limit.	Submitter is concerned that the proposed infrastructure will disrupt the natural environment. Submitter is concerned that the dredging for the marina will disrupt the natural environment.	Submitter is supportive of a bicycle path/pedestrian path. Submitter comments that a car park should be developed near the ferry terminal but not at GI Walter Park.	The submitter is concerned that GI Walter park will be lost and overdeveloped. Submitter comments that access to the bay can be achieved without development of the marina.	Submitter is concerned that the revised use village will spoil the beauty of the bay.	Submitter comments that there should be no residential development.		Submitter is concerned that development of the marina will spoil the view out to the bay.							
TH14/101	Submitter is supportive of development of modern ferry terminals and associated facilities.		Submitter is supportive of development of the immediate environment to include modest, mixed use urban village and medium density housing consistent with the surrounding area.	Submitter is concerned about the construction of high density buildings and the increase in population and traffic.	Submitter is concerned that reclamation of Moreton will destroy marine life and their habitats.		Submitter is concerned about the development in the area of GI Walter Park and the consequential loss as a public open space and dog exercises area. Submitter comments that the old CSIRO building should be incorporated into GI Walter Park.											
TH14/102			Submitter is supportive of upgrading the Marine Rescue area and some low density urban village environment.	Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limit and believes that it is not consistent with the current area.		Submitter is concerned that the increase in road traffic from the development cannot be supported by the current road network.	Submitter is concerned about the development in the area of GI Walter Park and the consequential loss as a public open space and dog exercises area.											
TH14/103			Submitter is concerned that the proposal will over develop and commercialise the area against the community's wishes.	Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limit and believes that it is too high for a site that is so close to Moreton Bay. Submitter is concerned that the proposal will create a 'Sanctuary Cove' style development that is inconsistent with the atmosphere of the area.	Submitter is concerned about the affect that long term dredging will have on the marine park. Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme has been created without a full environmental impact study.	Submitter is concerned about increase traffic congestion on the current road network which cannot sustain its current capacity.	Submitter is concerned about the development in the area of GI Walter Park.				Submitter is concerned that development of a Marina will not be viable as Brisbane has an over-supply of marina berths and the current one at Baby Bay is sufficient to meet demand.							
TH14/104			Submitter is concerned about the 'local village' theme for the area. Submitter opposes commercial development in the area as a means to attract visitors to the islands. Submitter is supportive of improving refreshment facilities for travellers.	Submitter is concerned about the development of high density residential buildings and commercial buildings. Submitter believes that this development should be at a distance where transport and parking do not cause congestion.	Submitter is supportive of dredging to improve ferry water access at all tide states. Submitter comments that land and seaway reclamation should be kept at a minimal, enough for the safe use of the harbour.	Submitter comments that the provision of footpaths and bus stops should be enforced naturally to preserve the beauty of the area.												
TH14/105			Submitter is concerned that the commercial development will affect the Cleveland CBD. Submitter comments that the upgrade of facilities for the harbour should be current and low key.	Submitter is concerned that the development is out of scale and inconsistent with the area.	Submitter is concerned about the dredging requirements for the proposal.													
TH14/106	Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as documented in the Redlands 2030 Community Plan, Toondah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redlands Planning Scheme. Submitter is concerned that these documents have not been honoured by the scheme. Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme is a document that will respond to the community engagement process but fails to do so.	Submitter is concerned that previous community engagement has not been taken into consideration. Submitter notes that the development of Toondah Harbour should be on the already developed area and not on green open spaces or over the bay. Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will give public assets (GI Walter Park and parts of the Moreton Bay Marine Park) to developers despite the government's pledge to seek a mandate before sale of assets. Submitter accepts that the Toondah barge/ferry terminal requires an upgrade but does not accept the loss of the park and environmental assets of the area.	Submitter is concerned that community consultation was not taken into consideration about the 15 storey and 7 storey height limit and proposed high rise development in Toondah harbour. Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not respect the historical significance of GI Walter Park and the "pragmatic" practice that construction of a new access road along the barge terminal denies the area as a historical site. Its aspect looking to high rise buildings and a marina would replace the original views out to the bay.	Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will destroy the mangroves and seagrass within the PDA. Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect koala or local water habitat. Submitter is concerned that the proposed new road next to the park beside the existing koala habitat will result in tree loss and eventual mortality to koalas. Submitter is concerned that the marina would result in total loss of seagrass and fish habitat in the PDA and would cause degradation of old growth mangroves on Casim Island. Submitter believes this is in contravention to the RAMSAR international treaty.	Submitter is concerned that the marina is not viable as the location is a shallow area and would require intensive and constant dredging at an unworkable cost to the community. Submitter is concerned that development of the marina will remove the well loved and used sandy beach in GI Walter Park.													
TH14/107	Submitter is supportive of reasonable development of modern ferry terminals and facilities at Toondah Harbour			Submitter is supportive of modest housing and accompanying facilities.	Submitter is concerned about the interference with mangroves that the proposal suggests. Submitter is concerned that the local environment, marine life and wildlife will be affected by the proposed development.		Submitter is concerned that the development over GI Walter Park will affect the being of people who use the park regularly.											
TH14/108	Submitter is supportive of development that will improve the ferry terminal.	Submitter is supportive only of a small amount of reclamation. Submitter is concerned that there will be an increased financial burden to ratepayers due to long term dredging.	Submitter is supportive of a modest mixed business and urban village, but opposes development of an excess commercial buildings.	Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limit and believes that it should be limited to the current 7 storey height limit for development on the southern side of Middle Street with 3 storey of car park included. Submitter believes that the height limit should be limited to 2 storeys.		Submitter is concerned about the road that is proposed through GI Walter Park. Submitter comments that parking should be limited to outside GI Walter Park.	Submitter is concerned that GI Walter Park will be lost to development. Submitter comments that the Broadwalk should stop at the Marina. Submitter is concerned about the amount of marine park that is being reclaimed and believes it is unnecessary.				Submitter is supportive of a small marina with a maximum GI berths, with a small dog use park.							

TH14/109	<p>Submitter is concerned that there is no evidence of demand or need for the proposed scale of development.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will impact the commuters from South Stradbroke Island through increasing parking costs.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme is silent on complement development opportunities and proposals for North Stradbroke area and Dunwich.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme fails to consider the outcomes from community consultation in July 2013 and the community vision identified in 2010.</p> <p>Submitter requests for the document to be withdrawn and reviewed to meet the needs and expectations of the community.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme focuses on development around GI Water Park rather than the area locally recognised as Toondah Harbour. Submitter believes that the POA boundary be redefined to focus solely on Toondah Harbour.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposal will affect the commercial viability of the Cleveland CBD. Submitter believes that there is no demand or interest in unit living.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme identifies the harbour as a destination will inhibit travel to North Stradbroke Island.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the commercial development will affect and impact on the Cleveland CBD, Raby Bay and North Stradbroke Island.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not have any connectivity with Cleveland CBD or the rail station.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposal focuses on the primary purpose of encouraging development rather than meeting needs or expectations of the people of the Neelds.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that 15 storey building height is incompatible with the primary purpose of the POA as a transport hub. Submitter is concerned that the increase in noise pollution from ferry ferries would not attract potential buyers.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the low mudflow at low tide would require constant dredging. Submitter is concerned that maintenance of the marina will increase rates in the area.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposal will result in the loss of seagrass and existing habitats for marine life and cause degradation of old growth for a marina.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that dredge spoils are not managed appropriately and that is an negative impact.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that "sustainability" and "natural environment" have not been recognised or considered in the proposed development scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposal will increase koala mortality through the increase in road traffic and additional roads.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme is not underpinned by expert research into the environmental issues and constraints.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that there will be an increase in traffic and congestion on a road network that cannot support any increase in traffic.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that GI Water Park will be redeveloped despite no documentation or studies indicating the current or likely future needs for the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposal to replace GI Water park with a man made beach is unacceptable.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned that there is no evidence for a marina.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina would deny visual and physical connectivity to the bay.</p>			
TH14/110	<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as document in the Redlands 2030 Community Plan, Toondah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redlands Planning Scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme does not take into consideration the communities previous objection to a similar development in the late 1980s. A community campaign conducted by Secure Toondah's Invaluable Resources succeeded in having the development dropped.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development reflects ongoing consultation that was undertaken after the August 2013 community consultation process however the community were not made aware of the opportunity for ongoing input.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is no disclosure of the who has been consulted and the nature of the consultation and requests that the details be released and disclose the influence that has influenced the community's vision.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme is too complex and poorly written that is difficult to understand.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the nature of the scheme has disenfranchised the community.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the style of writing is too technical and does not follow the Government's manuals to reduce red tape.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the POA "Toondah Harbour" is not a true representation of the scope of land involved. Submitter notes that the majority of land comprises GI Water Park and the bay which is misleading as the community are supportive of upgrading the facilities of Toondah Harbour.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposal development scheme is not a true representation of the scope of land involved. Submitter notes that the majority of land comprises GI Water Park and the bay which is misleading as the community are supportive of upgrading the facilities of Toondah Harbour.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the 15 storey height limit ignores Council planning decisions.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is no mention of the number of residential units and submitter believes that some assessments indicate a possible 1500 units which is 50% more than the number of houses in Raby Bay. Submitter is concerned that social, environmental and economic impacts have not been assessed prior to drafting the development scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there no development with building heights 15 storeys in the surrounding area, the closest would be in the Brisbane CBD.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the intention of the proposed development is to develop it into a Gold Coast which will impact on the liveability, lifestyle and village atmosphere of Cleveland.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the environmental and ecological concerns that will be impacted by the proposed development scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the site is designed as a RAMSAR site, which is an international agreement to protect wetlands and the flight paths of migratory birds and is not mentioned in the POA how it will be managed.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will threaten rare and vulnerable bird species that are found in the Toondah Harbour precinct.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the water current, wind, erosion and sedimentation are real constraints for the development are not understood or planned for in the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the land shown on the mapping is below the 1:100 year storm surge level and is likely to contain acid sulphate soils.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the area was also used as a rubbish tip and asbestos and "hot sand" could be buried under the park.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that impact on fishing, bait collection and dugongs have not been investigated and planned for in the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is a plan to use dredge spoil suitable as a stable and environmentally sound fill. This has been proven incorrect as this has been used in Raby Bay and has proven difficulty supporting vegetation, house and off road vehicles.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that "sustainability" is defined as a one-off activity, not an accepted definition.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the land shown on the mapping is below the 1:100 year storm surge level and is likely to contain acid sulphate soils.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that GI Water park has heritage value and regional significance but has not been reflected in the scheme. The submitter is concerned that the proposed development will compromise GI Water Park and its use and values has yet been investigated to make an informed development plan.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the park will be underutilised with regional public park land and will become one of SEQ most polluted park land.</p> <p>Submitter comments that alienation of the park is akin to an illegal sale which is a breach of the Government's election promises.</p>					
TH14/111	<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as document in the Redlands 2030 Community Plan, Toondah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redlands Planning Scheme. Submitter is concerned that these documents have not been honoured by the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme is a document that will respond to the community engagement process but fails to do so.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that previous community engagement has not been taken into consideration. Submitter notes that the development of Toondah Harbour should be on the already developed area and not on green open spaces or over the bay.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will give public access (GI Water Park and parts of the Moreton Bay Marine Park) to developers despite the government's pledge to seek a mandate before sale of assets.</p> <p>Submitter accepts that the Toondah barge ferry terminal requires an upgrade but does not accept the loss of the park and environmental assets of the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that community consultation was not taken into consideration about the 15 storey and 1500 units height limit and opposes high rise development in Toondah Harbour.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not respect the historical significance of GI Water Park and the "Merleigh" precinct, that construction of a new access road along the boundary would diminish its value as a historical site. Its specific link to high rise buildings and a marina would replace the original view of the bay.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will destroy the mangroves and seagrass within the POA.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect the seagrass and fish habitat.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect koala or local wildlife habitats. Submitter is concerned that the proposed new road next to the park beside the existing koala habitat will result in tree loss and increase mortality to koalas.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina would result in total loss of seagrass and fish habitat in the POA and would cause degradation of old growth mangroves on Cassin Island. Submitter believes this is in contravention to the RAMSAR international treaty.</p>				<p>Submitter is concerned that the marina is not viable as the location is in a shallow area and would require extensive and constant dredging at an unacceptable cost to the community.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that development of the marina will remove the well loved and used sandy beach in GI Water park.</p>			

TH14/120		<p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not reflect or consider the feedback and community consultation in 2013.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the cost of the development and the process of funding the ferry terminal upgrade. Submitter is concerned that the cost of developments will increase rates.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme is superficial which does not represent community feedback.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the process has not been transparent and forthcoming with information for residents to make an informed decision. Submitter is concerned that submissions are only acknowledged by a generic letter rather than a response detailing consideration of the issue and its merits.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the development set out in the community feedback should be adopted instead.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the fast tracking of planning and development under the PDA process and does not allow the public to debate and talk about their concerns.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the title of the PDA leads to confusion as Toonah Harbour refers only to the area surrounding the ferry terminal. Residents may be unaware that the PDA also includes GI Water Park and a larger boundary.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that Council initially requested the Toonah Harbour/Ferry terminal as a PDA but has resulted in a larger area being decided.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development outcomes are unrealistic for the area.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that residential development close to the ferry terminal will not be viable due to the noise pollution from ferries and barges. Submitter is concerned that affected residents will not have a process of complaints.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the 7 and 15 storey height limit, associated access and parking facilities and the 800 berth marina.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the community engagement documentation states that the development should be low rise.</p>			<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will lead to the loss of GI Water Park.</p>				
TH14/121		<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as documented in the Redlands 2030 Community Plan, Toonah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redlands Planning Scheme. Submitter is concerned that these documents have not been honoured by the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme is a document that will respond to the community engagement process but fails to do so.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that previous community engagement has not been taken into consideration. Submitter notes that the development of Toonah Harbour should be on the already developed area and not on green open spaces or over the bay.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will give public assets (GI Water Park and parts of the McDermott Bay Marine Park) to developers despite the government's pledge to seek a mandate before sale of assets.</p> <p>Submitter accepts that the Toonah barge/ferry terminal requires an upgrade but does not accept the loss of the park and environmental assets of the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that community consultation was not taken into consideration about the 15 storey and 7 storey height limit and opposes high rise development in Toonah Harbour.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not respect the historical significance of GI Water Park and the "Turnright" precinct, that construction of a new access road along the boundary would diminish its value as a historical site, its aspect looking to high rise buildings and a marina would reduce the original views out to the bay.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina would result in total loss of seagrass and fish habitat in the PDA and would cause degradation of old growth mangroves on Casim Island. Submitter believes this is in contravention to the RAMSAR International Treaty.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will destroy the mangroves and seagrass within the PDA.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect the seagrass and fish habitat.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect koala or local wildlife habitat. Submitter is concerned that the proposed new road near to the park beside the existing toilet habitat will result in tree loss and increase mortality to koalas.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina would result in total loss of seagrass and fish habitat in the PDA and would cause degradation of old growth mangroves on Casim Island. Submitter believes this is in contravention to the RAMSAR International Treaty.</p>				<p>Submitter is concerned that the marina is not viable as the location is in a shallow area and would require extensive and constant dredging at an unacceptable cost to the community.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that development of the marina will remove the well-loved and used sandy beach in GI Water Park.</p>		
TH14/122		<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as documented in the Redlands 2030 Community Plan, Toonah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redlands Planning Scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme does not take into consideration the community's previous objection to a similar development in the late 1980s. A community campaign conducted by Secure Toonah's Invaluable Resources succeeded in having the development stopped.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development reflects ongoing consultation that was undertaken after the August 2013 community consultation process however the community were not made aware of the opportunity for ongoing input.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is no disclosure of the who has been consulted and the nature of the consultation and requests that the details be released and disclose the influence that has pertained the community's input.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme is too complex and poorly written that is difficult to understand.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the nature of the scheme has disenfranchised the community.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the style of writing is too technical and does not follow the Government's mantra to reduce red tape.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the PDA "Toonah Harbour" is not a true representation of the scope of land involved. Submitter notes that the majority of land comprises of GI Water Park and the bay which is misleading as the community are supportive of upgrading the facilities of Toonah Harbour.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the 15 storey height limit ignores Council planning decisions.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is no mention of the number of residential units and submitter believes that some assessments indicate a potential 1500 units which is 50% more than the number of houses in Kglu Bay. Submitter is concerned that social, environmental and economic impacts have not been assessed prior to drafting the development scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is no development with building heights 15 storeys in the surrounding area, the closest would be in the Brisbane CBD.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the intention of the proposed development to develop it into a golf course which will impact on the livability, amenity and value of the area of Cleveland.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the environmental and biological concerns that will be impacted by the proposed development scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the site is designated as RAMSAR (a wetland of international importance to protect wetlands and the flight paths of migratory birds and is protected in the PDA how it will be managed.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will threaten rare and vulnerable bird species that are found in the Toonah Harbour precinct.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the water current, which provides light penetration are real constraints for the development are not understood or planned for in the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the land shown on the mapping is below the 1:100 year storm surge level and is likely to contain acid sulphate soils.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the area was also used as a rubbish tip and asbestos and "hot slag" could be buried under the park.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that impact on fishing, bait collection and dugongs have not been investigated and planned for in the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is a plan to use dredged spoil is suitable as a stable and environmentally sound fill. This has been proven incorrect as this has been used in Raby Bay and has proven difficulty supporting vegetation, house and off free channels.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that sustainability is defined as a one-off and is not an accepted definition.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the 15 storey height limit ignores Council planning decisions.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is no mention of the number of residential units and submitter believes that some assessments indicate a potential 1500 units which is 50% more than the number of houses in Kglu Bay. Submitter is concerned that social, environmental and economic impacts have not been assessed prior to drafting the development scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is no development with building heights 15 storeys in the surrounding area, the closest would be in the Brisbane CBD.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the intention of the proposed development to develop it into a golf course which will impact on the livability, amenity and value of the area of Cleveland.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the environmental and biological concerns that will be impacted by the proposed development scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the site is designated as RAMSAR (a wetland of international importance to protect wetlands and the flight paths of migratory birds and is protected in the PDA how it will be managed.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will threaten rare and vulnerable bird species that are found in the Toonah Harbour precinct.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the water current, which provides light penetration are real constraints for the development are not understood or planned for in the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the land shown on the mapping is below the 1:100 year storm surge level and is likely to contain acid sulphate soils.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the area was also used as a rubbish tip and asbestos and "hot slag" could be buried under the park.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that impact on fishing, bait collection and dugongs have not been investigated and planned for in the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is a plan to use dredged spoil is suitable as a stable and environmentally sound fill. This has been proven incorrect as this has been used in Raby Bay and has proven difficulty supporting vegetation, house and off free channels.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that sustainability is defined as a one-off and is not an accepted definition.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that GI Water park has heritage value and regional significance but has not been reflected in the scheme. The submitter is concerned that the proposed development will compromise GI Water Park and its use and values has not been investigated to make an informed development plan.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the area will be undersupplied with regional scale park land and will become one of SEQ most alienated park lands.</p> <p>Submitter comments that alienation of the park is akin to an asset sale which is a breach of the Government's election commitments.</p>				

TH14/140	Submitter is supportive of the development and believes the bigger the better.		Submitter believes that the development will increase job opportunities in the area. Submitter believes that the area can support a higher population density as the area is open and there is room for expansion. Submitter believes that upgrading the facilities and making it all in walking distance will increase patronage use and increase financial viability.	Submitter supports the high density development being built along the foreshore and believes will increase the financial viability of the project.																
TH14/141	Submitter is supportive of the upgrade of the ferry terminal.	Submitter is concerned about the hands off approach that Council have taken in the planning of development. Submitter is concerned that the development will be funded by the residents through increases in rates.	Submitter is concerned about the financial viability of the high density development and commercial development and the impact on the Cleveland CBD.						Submitter is concerned about the loss of GI Water Park in the development.											
TH14/142			Submitter believes that North Stradbroke Island facilities must be prioritised before there needs to be a tourism gateway as it will not attract visitors to the island. Submitter is concerned that the same funding is not being spent on the island for upgrades.	Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limit and believes that it is sufficient to cater for the population. Submitter is concerned that high density development will not be economically viable.	Submitter is concerned that the development will impact negatively on the land and marine wildlife.													Submitter is concerned about the viability of a marina development when there are other marinas not operating at full capacity.		
TH14/143	Submitter comments that commercial activity should be transparent. Submitter is concerned that the timeslot does not allow for impact studies to be done.		Submitter believes that North Stradbroke Island facilities must be prioritised before there needs to be a tourism gateway as it will not attract visitors to the island. Submitter is concerned that the same funding is not being spent on the island for upgrades. Submitter believes that the harbour should be a state of the art terminal that will accommodate all users.	Design for the multi-storey residential development should complement the existing residential.	Submitter is concerned that the impact studies have not yet been completed to underpin the development scheme. Submitter comments that any Expressions of Interest should incorporate detailed studies on traffic, water quality, noise, lighting, heritage.	Submitter is concerned that public transport will not be able to service the area once there is an increase in population.		Submitter believes that Toonindah Harbour should be a harbour and not a park or a pedestrian thoroughfare.	Submitter is concerned that commercial development will impact on the Cleveland CBD.										Submitter comments that a marina development is an obvious commercial activity to complement harbour facilities.	
TH14/144				Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limit. Submitter is concerned that consultation with the Quandamooka people have not yet occurred. Submitter comments that only the existing development should be upgraded. Submitter believes that the proposal is better being closer to Cleveland CBD where there is a greater connection to the shops and public transport.	Submitter is concerned about the impact to mangroves and sea grass due to the development.			Submitter is concerned about the loss of GI Water Park to developers.											Submitter is against the development of the Marina.	
TH14/145	Submitter is supportive of the project.	Submitter comments that local contractors should be placed on the tender list for development of the area and increase job opportunities.	Submitter believes that the development outcomes of the scheme will benefit the future of the community and increase job opportunities and present a gateway to Moreton Bay.	Submitter is supportive of the development bring a more modern 21st century feel to the architecture around the area.	Submitter believes that the marina will provide more structure for the marine ecosystem and improve marine wildlife habitats. Submitter believes that the development done correctly will allow for a sustainable future.			Submitter comments that the open spaces have been well preserved. Submitter suggests that consideration for public amenities is important.										Submitter comments that improving the facilities would increase safety for marine crafts.	Submitter comments that the marina should be affordable for public use.	
TH14/146				Submitter is concerned that the development will not preserve the local heritage history with many of iconic places, such as Stranvow Hotel, Queensland's oldest banyan tree and St Paul's Church of England will be redeveloped. Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limit and believes it should remain as low density development.				Submitter is concerned about the loss of GI Water Park in the development.												
TH14/147		Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as documented in the Redlands 2030 Community Plan, Toonindah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redlands Planning Scheme. Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme does not take into consideration the community's previous objection to a similar overdevelopment in the late 1980s. A community campaign conducted by Secure Toonindah's Invaluable Resources succeeded in having the development stopped. Submitter is concerned that the proposed development reflects ongoing consultation that was undertaken after the August 2013 community consultation process however the community were not made aware of the opportunity for ongoing input.	Submitter believes that the area already has the requirements to be the Gateway to Moreton Bay and a tourist destination with experiences and local history to showcase the beauty of the bay.	Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limit and fish rise development being allowed in GI Water Park. Submitter is concerned that the development of the area as "coastal village" will fail.				Submitter is concerned that GI Water Park, the bay views, Coastal landscapes and open space will be lost to developers.												
TH14/148		Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as documented in the Redlands 2030 Community Plan, Toonindah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redlands Planning Scheme. Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme does not take into consideration the community's previous objection to a similar overdevelopment in the late 1980s. A community campaign conducted by Secure Toonindah's Invaluable Resources succeeded in having the development stopped. Submitter is concerned that the proposed development reflects ongoing consultation that was undertaken after the August 2013 community consultation process however the community were not made aware of the opportunity for ongoing input. Submitter is concerned that there is no disclosure of the who has been consulted and the nature of the consultation and requests that the details be released and disclose the influence that has		Submitter is concerned that the 15 storey height limit ignores Council planning decisions. Submitter is concerned that there is no mention of the number of residential units and submitter believes that some assessments indicate a possible 1500 units which is 50% more than the number of houses in Red Bay. Submitter is concerned that social, environmental and economic impacts have not been assessed prior to drafting the development scheme. Submitter is concerned that there is no development with building heights 15 storeys in the surrounding area, the closest would be in the Brisbane CBD.	Submitter is concerned about the environmental and ecological concerns that will be impacted by the proposed development scheme. Submitter is concerned that the site is designated as a RAMSAR site, which is an international agreement to protect wetlands and the flight paths of migratory birds and it is not mentioned in the PSDA how it will be managed. Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will threaten rare and vulnerable bird species that are found in the Toonindah Harbour precinct. Submitter is concerned that the water current, wind, erosion and sedimentation are real constraints for the development are not understood or planned for in the scheme. Submitter is concerned that the land shown on the mapping is below the 1:100 year storm surge level and is likely to contain acid sulphate soils. Submitter notes that the area was also used as a rubbish tip and			Submitter is concerned that GI Water park has heritage value and regional significance but has not been reflected in the scheme. The submitter is concerned that the proposed development will compromise GI Water Park and its use and value has not been investigated to make an informed development plan. Submitter is concerned that the area will be undersupplied with regional scale park land and will become one of SEQ's most alienated park lands. Submitter comments that allocation of the park is also in an												

TH14/154	<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as documented in the Redlands 2030 Community Plan, Toondah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redlands Planning Scheme. Submitter is concerned that these documents have not been honoured by the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme is a document that will respond to the community engagement process but fails to do so.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that previous community engagement has not been taken into consideration. Submitter notes that the development of Toondah Harbour should be on the already developed area and not on green open spaces or over the bay.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will give public assets (GI Water Park and parts of the Morston Bay Marine Park) to developers despite the government's pledge to seek a mandate before sale of assets.</p> <p>Submitter accepts that the Toondah barge/ferry terminal requires an upgrade but does not accept the loss of the park and environmental assets of the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not respect the historical significance of GI Water Park and the "Trimbleigh" precinct. That construction of a new access road along the boundary would diminish its value as a historical site. Its aspect looking to high rise buildings and a marina would replace the original views out to the bay.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will destroy the mangroves and seagrass within the PDA.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect koala or local wildlife habitats. Submitter is concerned that the proposed new road next to the park beside the existing koala habitat will result in tree loss and increase mortality to koalas.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina would result in total loss of seagrass and fish habitat in the PDA and would cause degradation of old growth mangroves on Cassim Island. Submitter believes this is in contravention to the RAMSAR international treaty.</p>							<p>Submitter is concerned that the marina is not viable as the location is in a shallow area and would require extensive and constant dredging at an unacceptable cost to the community.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that development of the marina will remove the well-loved and used sandy beach in GI Water park.</p>
TH14/155	<p>Submitter supports the development of modern ferry terminals and associated facilities, modest mixed use urban village and medium density housing consistent with the building height in the area.</p> <p>Submitter is supportive of widening Fison Channel to assist marine traffic.</p> <p>Submitter is supportive of improved mechanisms to facilitate marine appraisals of Toondah Harbour especially for dredging of silt.</p> <p>Submitter is supportive of the developer meeting all infrastructure costs of connections, upgrades and augmentations for the road, water and sewerage network.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the PDA process denies the public a normal right of appeal.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the size of the PDA and believes that it should be reduced in the scale and arrangement.</p> <p>Submitter believes that the public consultation period should be extended for a formal public forum to take place.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the fast tracking of the planning and development.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development scheme will give developers unrealistic expectations of ultimate developers.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development scheme is not consistent or considers the community feedback taken in 2013.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development is inconsistent and inappropriate to the amenity of the area.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limit.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the PDA has not been underpinned by robust technical and environmental studies.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the dredging of the Marine Bay to protect park and amenity is inconsistent, lacks detail and allow for extreme overdevelopment.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the extension Koala corridor north of Middle Street.</p>	<p>Submitter opposes the extension of cross street and believes that all access should be from Middle Street.</p>	<p>Submitter opposes any dredging or reclamation of any area adjacent to GI Water Park.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the high density development to occur over the GI Water Park site.</p>				<p>Submitter opposes the development of an 800 berth marina and believes that it will greatly increase water and noise pollution. Submitter suggests a smaller marina.</p> <p>Submitter does not support the marine industry in this precinct due to noise and water pollution.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the Marina will be based on a RAMSAR site which will have many requirements and conditions attached.</p>	
TH14/156	<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as documented in the Redlands 2030 Community Plan, Toondah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redlands Planning Scheme. Submitter is concerned that these documents have not been honoured by the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme is a document that will respond to the community engagement process but fails to do so.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that previous community engagement has not been taken into consideration. Submitter notes that the development of Toondah Harbour should be on the already developed area and not on green open spaces or over the bay.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will give public assets (GI Water Park and parts of the Morston Bay Marine Park) to developers despite the government's pledge to seek a mandate before sale of assets.</p> <p>Submitter accepts that the Toondah barge/ferry terminal requires an upgrade but does not accept the loss of the park and environmental assets of the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not respect the historical significance of GI Water Park and the "Trimbleigh" precinct. That construction of a new access road along the boundary would diminish its value as a historical site. Its aspect looking to high rise buildings and a marina would replace the original views out to the bay.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will destroy the mangroves and seagrass within the PDA.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect koala or local wildlife habitats. Submitter is concerned that the proposed new road next to the park beside the existing koala habitat will result in tree loss and increase mortality to koalas.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina would result in total loss of seagrass and fish habitat in the PDA and would cause degradation of old growth mangroves on Cassim Island. Submitter believes this is in contravention to the RAMSAR international treaty.</p>							<p>Submitter is concerned that the marina is not viable as the location is in a shallow area and would require extensive and constant dredging at an unacceptable cost to the community.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that development of the marina will remove the well-loved and used sandy beach in GI Water park.</p>
TH14/157	<p>Submitter opposes the proposal as there is a lack of construction and future zoning of the project.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the proposed bridge from Morston Bay Road, Capalaba and Wellington Road with an extension to the PDA should be given a go ahead.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned about the 16 storey height limit and should be restricted to 6 storeys to keep consistent with work.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned that the current road network will not be able to handle the expected traffic during the construction phase.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the current parking facilities will not be able to support an increase in tourism.</p>						
TH14/158	<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as documented in the Redlands 2030 Community Plan, Toondah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redlands Planning Scheme. Submitter is concerned that these documents have not been honoured by the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme is a document that will respond to the community engagement process but fails to do so.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that previous community engagement has not been taken into consideration. Submitter notes that the development of Toondah Harbour should be on the already developed area and not on green open spaces or over the bay.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will give public assets (GI Water Park and parts of the Morston Bay Marine Park) to developers despite the government's pledge to seek a mandate before sale of assets.</p> <p>Submitter accepts that the Toondah barge/ferry terminal requires an upgrade but does not accept the loss of the park and environmental assets of the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not respect the historical significance of GI Water Park and the "Trimbleigh" precinct. That construction of a new access road along the boundary would diminish its value as a historical site. Its aspect looking to high rise buildings and a marina would replace the original views out to the bay.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will destroy the mangroves and seagrass within the PDA.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect koala or local wildlife habitats. Submitter is concerned that the proposed new road next to the park beside the existing koala habitat will result in tree loss and increase mortality to koalas.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina would result in total loss of seagrass and fish habitat in the PDA and would cause degradation of old growth mangroves on Cassim Island. Submitter believes this is in contravention to the RAMSAR international treaty.</p>							<p>Submitter is concerned that the marina is not viable as the location is in a shallow area and would require extensive and constant dredging at an unacceptable cost to the community.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that development of the marina will remove the well-loved and used sandy beach in GI Water park.</p>
TH14/159	<p>Submitter supports the development of modern ferry terminals and associated facilities, modest mixed use urban village and medium density housing consistent with the building height in the area.</p> <p>Submitter is supportive of widening Fison channel to assist marine traffic.</p> <p>Submitter is supportive of improved</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the PDA process denies the public a normal right of appeal.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the size of the PDA and believes that it should be reduced in the scale and arrangement.</p> <p>Submitter believes that the public consultation period should be extended for a formal public forum to take place.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the fast tracking of the planning and development.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development scheme will give developers unrealistic expectations of ultimate developers.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development scheme is not consistent or considers the community feedback taken in 2013.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development is inconsistent and inappropriate to the amenity of the area.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limit.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the PDA has not been underpinned by robust technical and environmental studies.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the dredging of the Marine Bay to protect park and amenity is inconsistent, lacks detail and allow for extreme overdevelopment.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the extension Koala corridor north of Middle Street.</p>	<p>Submitter opposes the extension of cross street and believes that all access should be from Middle Street.</p>	<p>Submitter opposes any dredging or reclamation of any area adjacent to GI Water Park.</p>				<p>Submitter opposes the development of an 800 berth marina and believes that it will greatly increase water and noise pollution. Submitter suggests a smaller marina.</p> <p>Submitter does not support the marine industry in this precinct due to noise and water pollution.</p>	

TH14/188	<p>Submitter is supportive of the redevelopment of the ferry terminal and associated facilities and development of the immediate environs of Toondah Harbour for urban village and medium density housing. Submitter is supportive of upgrading and widening Fison Channel.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposal is an overdevelopment and should be reconsidered.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that commercial development in the area will compete with the Cleveland CBD.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limits.</p>					<p>Submitter is concerned about the loss of GJ Walter Park and over 48 hectares of Moreton Bay due to the development. Submitter does not support dredging of the land adjacent to GJ Walter Park.</p>						<p>Submitter is concerned about the development of a marina.</p>	
TH14/189	<p>Submitter is supportive of the proposal.</p>															
TH14/190		<p>Submitter is concerned about the proposal and believes that it should not be approved until more information is available to the community.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned how the proposal will affect the current shopping centre.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned about the impact the proposal will have on the ecology.</p>											
TH14/193	<p>Submitter believes that redevelopment is well overdue.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that there has been a lack of community consultation. Submitter is concerned that the credentials of architectural and planning companies engaged have not been released to the public. Submitter is concerned that the development will be a repeat of what occurred at Ruby Bay and that this should be avoided.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the only reference to North Stradbroke Island other than it is a gate way and believes that further consideration should be given to how Dunwich and One Mile will be integrated into the proposal.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the high density development is out of character for the area.</p>												
TH14/192	<p>Submitter is supportive of the redevelopment of Toondah Harbour.</p>		<p>Submitter is supportive of the development of commercial and hospitality spaces to encourage the community to use the area as a place to socialise and support local business.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the high density development will destroy the village atmosphere of the area.</p>												
TH14/193	<p>Submitter is supportive of the redevelopment of the ferry terminal and associated facilities and development of the immediate environs of Toondah Harbour for urban village and medium density housing. Submitter is supportive of upgrading and widening Fison Channel and limited reclamation around the harbour to support ferry operations.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that there will be a financial burden due to increase rates for resident due to ongoing maintenance and dredging of additional waterways.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposal is an overdevelopment of commercial buildings.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limit and believes that it is an overdevelopment.</p>					<p>Submitter is concerned that GJ Walter park and over 48 hectares of Moreton Bay will be lost to development. Submitter opposes the reclamation and dredging of any area adjacent to GJ Walter Park.</p>							
TH14/194	<p>Submitter has no concerns over the redevelopment of Toondah Harbour and associated facilities to benefit commuters and tourists.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the boundary of the PDA extends over to GJ Walter Park and further north and the name of the PDA is misleading to the community. Submitter is concerned that the fact tracking of the PDA does not allow due process to be served and does not consider the rights and feedback of the community. Submitter is concerned that the cost of maintaining and dredging the additional waterways will fall on ratepayers. Submitter requests for the proposal to be withdrawn. Submitter is concerned that the proposal will decrease the value of their property as the site does not have infrastructure required to facilitate the development.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the balance of the proposal is an overdevelopment of the site and ignores the Town Plan and Redlands 2030.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the history of GJ Walter Park will be lost in the development of the site. Submitter comments that building heights should be limited to 6 storeys.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that Environmental Impact Studies have not been completed to underpin the proposal.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that parking infrastructure needs to be improved and increased. Submitter is concerned that the current road network will not be able to support the increase in population and tourist numbers.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that GJ Walter Park will be lost to development. Submitter does not support reclamation of land adjacent to GJ Walter Park. Submitter comments that it is not necessary to build over Casim Hill to achieve the commercial interests set out in the proposal.</p>								<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed marina is not sustainable and financially unviable. Submitter is concerned about the proposal to locate the Marine industry close to existing residential sites.</p>	
TH14/195	<p>Submitter is supportive of the upgrading of the ferry terminals.</p>	<p>Submitter objects to the proposal and believes that the Development Scheme has not gone through a full and proper community consultation process and does not consider the feedback from the community.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the balance of the proposal is an overdevelopment of the site and ignores the Town Plan and Redlands 2030. Submitter believes that the development should occur only over the existing development, not over green space.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the history of GJ Walter Park will be lost in the development of the site. Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limit set for the development which will block access to views.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that construction of GJ Walter park will unearth toxic waste from which the site was used as land fill. Submitter is concerned about the destruction of seagrass, mangroves and marine habitats and existing local habitat. Submitter is concerned that shallow water areas will require constant dredging and believes that the north east aspect will cause channels to fill up with sand. Submitter is concerned that the proposal will contravene the RAMSAR Convention.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposal road network will disrupt existing access to the area and that the site is currently impaired due to large heritage trees on each corner.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the loss of open space that is currently used by the community for many events. Submitter is concerned about the loss of the existing sandy beach in GJ Walter park.</p>									
TH14/196			<p>Submitter suggests that a similar "Rock Pool" area to Southport should be included in the proposal.</p>													
TH14/197				<p>Submitter is concerned that the 15 storey height limit is not consistent with the height of the area. Submitter is concerned that there will be an increase in silt deposition to the submitter's property due to the alteration of the flow of water which will increase the extensive intertidal zone mudflats.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that there is an increase risk to flooding potentially by impeding the natural flow of waters in the redevelopment. Submitter is concerned that there will be an increase in silt deposition to the submitter's property due to the alteration of the flow of water which will increase the extensive intertidal zone mudflats.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that access to their property on Shore Street North will be limited with the proposed new road. Submitter is concerned that the high density development will increase traffic and parking issues.</p>									<p>Submitter is concerned that the development of the marina is not sustainable and viable. Submitter is concerned that the waterways will need to be constantly dredged. Submitter is concerned about the increase in noise and waste pollution from boats.</p>	
		<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as documented in the Redlands 2030 Community Plan, Toondah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redlands Planning Scheme. Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme does not take into consideration the environmental and ecological concerns that will be impacted by the proposed development scheme. Submitter is concerned that the site is designed as a RAMSAR site, which is an international agreement to protect wetlands and the flora</p>														

		<p>overturned the community's vision.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme is too complex and poorly written that is difficult to understand.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the nature of the scheme has disadvantaged the community.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the style of writing is too technical and does not follow the Government's mantra to reduce red tape.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the PDA Toondah Harbour "is not a true representation of the scope of land involved. Submitter notes that the majority of land comprises of GI Walter Park and the Bay which is misleading as the community are supportive of upgrading the facilities of Toondah Harbour.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the intention of the proposed development is to divert it into a Gold Coast which will impact on the livability, lifestyle and village atmosphere of Cleveland.</p>	<p>asbestos and 'hot sand' could be buried under the park.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that impact on fishing, bait collection and dugongs have not been investigated and planned for in the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is a plan to use dredged spoil is suitable as a stable and environmentally sound fill. This has been proven incorrect as this has been used in Raby Bay and has proven difficulty supporting vegetation, house and silt free channels.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that sustainability is defined as a one-off and is not an accepted definition.</p>	<p>asset sale which is a breach of the Government's election commitments.</p>															
TH14/216	Submitter supports the general planned development for the area	<p>submitter is concerned that there is a lack of information and transparency for the proposal.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development will increase the financial burden on ratepayers</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about how additional dredging will be funded.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that a more viable development for the Cleveland CBD would be multi-story residences, with shopping, environment down Bloomfield the main street.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the plan does not consider improvements necessary for water, power, schools, parks, police, fire, hospital and other facilities in the area.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that residential areas will be subject to excess noise and that no controls are in place to minimise this.</p>	<p>submitter is concerned that there is a lack of parking infrastructure to support the current development and more parking is required to improve the situation.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the road network will not be able to support the increase in traffic.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the water front development will impact the environment.</p>															
TH14/217	Submitter is supportive of some development.			<p>Submitter is concerned that the 15 storey height limit is an overdevelopment and will create significant impact on existing infrastructure.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development of additional waterways that will require constant dredging.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that GI Walter Park will be lost to private developers.</p>														
TH14/218	Submitter is supportive of only redevelopment of the ferry terminal, including improved parking facilities, mixed use area and a low density housing.	<p>Submitter is concerned that the target residential population is over 3500 and believes it is too much for the area.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that public consultation for the plans have been very minimal.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the name of the PDA is misleading. Submitter believes that the development should be related to Toondah Harbour and the adjacent land over and not extend to the Parkland and Moreton Bay.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that an over supply of commercial development will impact the existing Cleveland CBD and Raby Bay harbourside business.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposal is an overdevelopment which is inconsistent with the surrounding areas of Cleveland.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the building heights should be governed by the current Redland City Council plans or less.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development is not consistent and must be kept attractive and livable for new and existing residents.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the increase in demand for parking which the current infrastructure cannot support.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the plans for road upgrades have not been put forward and is concerned that the current road network cannot support the increase in traffic.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the sale of 48 hectares of Moreton Bay is unhelpful.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that development of the marina will not be viable as there are marinas in other locations not operating at full capacity.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that development of the marina will increase the financial burden on ratepayers due to dredging and maintenance of additional waterways.</p>													
TH14/219	Submitter is concerned that the council does not have a coherent and connected vision for development in Cleveland that it has resulted in separate developments in Raby Bay and Cleveland. Submitter believes that the proposal will not be a viable development.	<p>Submitter comments that the ferry terminal should be updated by that ancillary development should only be redeveloped on a small scale to ensure that civic amenities and sightlines were not destroyed.</p> <p>Submitter believes that the focus should be on the shoreline development to promote North Stradbroke Island.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that the ferry terminal should be updated by that ancillary development should only be redeveloped on a small scale to ensure that civic amenities and sightlines were not destroyed.</p> <p>Submitter believes that the focus should be on the shoreline development to promote North Stradbroke Island.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the high density development throughout the proposal.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the current proposal will destroy the Moreton Bay marine environment.</p> <p>Submitter believes that the proposal should include a joint effort between GI Walter Park and the ferry terminal to improve public transport, which is in keeping with the Redland environment rather than the current proposal.</p>															
TH14/220	Submitter is concerned that there will be an increase in financial burden on ratepayers due to ongoing dredging and maintenance of additional waterways.		<p>Submitter is concerned that excessive commercial development will impact on Cleveland CBD and ratepayers.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the 15 storey height limit is an overdevelopment and will create significant impact on existing infrastructure.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned that GI Walter Park and 48 hectares of the Moreton Bay will be sold or given to private developers.</p> <p>Submitter opposes the reclamation and dredging of any area adjacent to GI Walter park.</p>														
TH14/221	Submitter comments that the proposal should be scaled back to what the community is comfortable with. Submitter requests for the proposal to be withdrawn.	<p>Submitter comments that the proposal should be scaled back to what the community is comfortable with.</p> <p>Submitter requests for the proposal to be withdrawn.</p>	<p>Submitter believes that the northern PDA boundary should be amended to remove the unnecessary extension of Shore Street East.</p> <p>Submitter believes that property values would be impacted negatively.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the 15 storey height limit will destroy the ambience of the area and will obscure views. Submitter believes that the development is inconsistent with the existing development and natural setting.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the community do not want to look like a high rise development when walking along the broad walk.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that the site is RAMSAR listed and is a habitat to many marine wild and bird life.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the loss of Koala habitat due to the construction of the road.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the loss of GI Walter Park and open space that is used by the community for recreational purposes.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that more of GI Walter Park will be lost to develop roads to lead up to the proposed park on the northern marina wall.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed beach on the northern side of the north wall of the marina is unstable and expensive to maintain.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the conditions inside the marina will be unstable due to the north east aspect and severe winds. This will require much dredging.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina is not sustainable and financially viable.</p>													
TH14/222	Submitter requests for the proposal to be withdrawn and a new development scheme be prepared with full and proper consultation with the community.	<p>Submitter comments that they are in favour of the development of the ferry terminal and comments that it should be in harmony with the natural environment, respecting the marine park, Quandamook people, marine life, mangroves and RAMSAR protected sites.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that Cleveland and Stradbroke Island residents will benefit from the project and will boost tourism.</p> <p>Submitter is supportive of the concept of being the gateway to Stradbroke Island.</p>	<p>Submitter supports development of low to medium rise buildings on designated building sites. Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey building height limit which should not be developed over green space.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development of the Marina will impact the smaller area and natural habitat for marine life.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that Casim Island which has coral, white sands and mangroves will be threatened by silt.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the loss of GI Walter Park and open space over the water.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned that the loss of water space will mean that there is loss of an area for recreational water sports, fishing and intertidal study.</p>	<p>submitter is against the development of a marina in front of GI Walter Park with 800 berths.</p>													
TH14/223	Submitter is supportive of redevelopment of the Toondah Harbour.	<p>Submitter is concerned about the scale residential facilities compared to the current infrastructure facilities and public transport.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that Cleveland and Stradbroke Island residents will benefit from the project and will boost tourism.</p> <p>Submitter is supportive of the concept of being the gateway to Stradbroke Island.</p>																	
TH14/224		<p>Submitter comments that provisions should be made to allow for a second ferry operator. Submitter is concerned that construction of facilities for a second operator will not occur. Submitter comments that the ACCC allowed the merger of Stradbroke Ferries to Big Red Cat based on the assumption that provisions for a second ferry operation be progressed.</p>			<p>Submitter comments that adequate free long term parking should be provided for water taxi patrons.</p>															
TH14/225		<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposal lacks community consultation and planning.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the commercial development will affect the Cleveland CBD.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limit on the shoreline and is concerned that the developer is focused more on the developer. Submitter believes that height limits should be set at 3 storeys.</p> <p>Submitter believes that the community do not want to live in high density buildings, but rather houses and low density.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the unique character of the area will be lost to the development.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that no environmental impact study has not been completed.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that an increase in population will lead to an increase in noise, rubbish and car pollution.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the current road network and infrastructure will not be able to support the additional growth in population.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the public transport system will not be able to cope with the increase in demand.</p>														

TH14/249		Submitter is concerned that the PDA is being fast tracked and requests for the scheme to be withdrawn and consider a more carefully considered path to be developed.	Submitter is concerned about the obstruction of natural views from the development of the area. Submitter is concerned that extensive commercial development will impact on the Cleveland CBD.		Submitter is concerned that dredging of the Moreton Bay Marina Park to accommodate for a Marina will be detrimental to the food chain and adversely affect the marine life within the whole of Moreton Bay. Submitter is concerned that an increase in the Marina industry will increase noise and ecological pollution that adversely affects the marine life, wildlife, mangroves and seagrasses. Submitter is concerned that an Environmental Impact study, sedimentation studies or assessment of the impact on the marine environment has not been conducted to underpin the planning for reclamation and residential development connecting the main land to Cassin Island.	Submitter is concerned that the high density residential development will increase traffic congestion and pollution. The current road network will not support the increase in use. Submitter is concerned that this will reduce access to the area. Submitter is concerned that the car parking issue will increase with an increase in demand by population growth.	Submitter is concerned that the development will make it more difficult to access the boat ramps and enjoy the facilities by the water. Submitter is concerned that the GI Water Park will be lost to private developers and that there will be a lack of open space.													
TH14/250		Submitter is concerned that the PDA is being fast tracked and requests for the scheme to be withdrawn and consider a more carefully considered path to be developed.	Submitter is concerned about the obstruction of natural views from the development of the area. Submitter is concerned that extensive commercial development will impact on the Cleveland CBD.		Submitter is concerned that dredging of the Moreton Bay Marina Park to accommodate for a Marina will be detrimental to the food chain and adversely affect the marine life within the whole of Moreton Bay. Submitter is concerned that an increase in the Marina industry will increase noise and ecological pollution that adversely affects the marine life, wildlife, mangroves and seagrasses. Submitter is concerned that an Environmental Impact study, sedimentation studies or assessment of the impact on the marine environment has not been conducted to underpin the planning for reclamation and residential development connecting the main land to Cassin Island.	Submitter is concerned that the high density residential development will increase traffic congestion and pollution. The current road network will not support the increase in use. Submitter is concerned that this will reduce access to the area. Submitter is concerned that the car parking issue will increase with an increase in demand by population growth.	Submitter is concerned that the development will make it more difficult to access the boat ramps and enjoy the facilities by the water. Submitter is concerned that the GI Water Park will be lost to private developers and that there will be a lack of open space.													
TH14/251	Submitter is supportive of the proposal to develop Toondah Harbour.	Submitter comments that once Toondah Harbour has been developed, the State should also look to developing the infrastructure at Durwich.																		
TH14/252		Submitter is concerned that the process is not transparent to the community.	Submitter is concerned that the proposal does not take into consideration the community feedback sought in 2013.	Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limit is not within the historical precinct.	Submitter is concerned that the proposal does not take into account the environment impacts.		Submitter is concerned that GI Water Park and existing open space will be lost to private developers.	Submitter is concerned that the Marina will impose an increase financial burden to rate payers.												
TH14/253	Submitter supports the development of modern ferry terminals and associated facilities as well as extra car parking.	Submitter comments that the development scheme should be prepared and amend the boundaries of the PDA.	Submitter is concerned that extensive commercial development will impact negatively on Cleveland CBD.	Submitter is concerned that the 15 storey height limit is not required in the area.	Submitter is concerned about the dredging of the habitat Protection Zone of Moreton Bay. Submitter is concerned about the destruction of wildlife habitat including the boats corridor, mangroves and seagrasses.	Submitter is concerned that the current road network and parking infrastructure will not support the increase in demand.	Submitter is concerned that GI Water Park and existing open space will be lost to private developers without future provisions.													
TH14/254			Submitter comments that retail development should be limited to restaurants and cafes only. Submitter comments that retail expansion should be confined to the CBD.	Submitter is concerned about building height limits and comments that it should be limited to 6 storey and not encroaching on the foreshore/walkway area.	Submitter is concerned about the impact on the environment from the development. Submitter is concerned that there is no information on how Council will manage and investigate the effect of the development on Moreton Bay will have on mangroves, seabird and marine life.	Submitter is concerned that the current road network will not support the increase in population and usage.	Submitter is concerned that there will be a lack of open space. Submitter comments that the GI Water Park and existing open space should be left as it is with any buildings kept off the site.	Submitter is concerned that the Marina will require ongoing dredging and maintenance. Submitter comments that a small area for visiting boats would be adequate.												
TH14/255	Submitter supports upgrading the ferry terminal and progressing development that is in keeping with the area that the community wants and needs.	Submitter comments that there is no information about the development for the public. Submitter is concerned that the public consultation process is merely a tick the box event rather than engaging with the community.	Submitter is concerned that extensive commercial development will impact negatively on the Cleveland CBD. Submitter believes that Council should refocus on supporting established areas and improve facilities.	Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limit and believes that it is not necessary for the community and would not preserve the ambience of the area. Submitter believes that it will be an overdevelopment of the area.	Submitter is concerned about the impact on the environment from the development. Submitter is concerned that there is no information on how Council will manage and investigate the effect of the development on Moreton Bay will have on mangroves, seabird and marine life.	Submitter is concerned that the current road network will not support the increase in population and usage.		Submitter is concerned that council have not taken into consideration the consequences of the weather that will have on boats moored at the harbour. Submitter believes that people will not moor their boats at the marina if they feel that it is unsafe.												
TH14/256				Submitter is concerned that the height limit will be an overdevelopment and is inconsistent with the current height restrictions in the area. Submitter is concerned that the development does not take into consideration the area historical precinct.				Submitter is concerned about the loss of GI Water Park and associated open space due to private development.												
TH14/257	Submitter is supportive of an upgrade to the ferry terminal, passenger waiting area and car park, dredging to improve access for ferries and making the ferry terminal pleasant with green space and small cafes.	Submitter comments that the area only requires minimal upgrades. Submitter is concerned that a private developer will develop the whole site of a transformer. Submitter comments that the scheme should be withdrawn and re-submitted under the correct pay system.	Submitter comments that Toondah Harbour is the gateway to the islands and the development will destroy the natural landscape of the area. Submitter is concerned that extensive commercial development will impact the Cleveland CBD.	Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limit and believes it is an overdevelopment that is inconsistent with the local area. Submitter comments that height limits should be set at 7 storeys.	Submitter is concerned about the removal of mangroves along the front of GI Water Park and believes it is an important part of the natural environment.			Submitter opposes the development of an 800 berth marina that will have a significant environmental impact on the area.												
TH14/258	Submitter is supportive of the ferry terminal and immediate surrounds to be developed.				Submitter is concerned that the natural habitat for marine life will be destroyed.		Submitter is concerned that GI Water Park will be lost to private development. Submitter is concerned that the proposed new open space will not be adequate to service an increase in population and tourism growth. Submitter comments that a small boardwalk and retail outlets can be developed but the park should not be open for private development.													
TH14/259		Submitter does not support the proposed development scheme and believes that the undeveloped foreshore will be ruined.			Submitter is concerned that the bay and coastline will not be protected and development will impact the wildlife and marine life.															

<p>TH14/260</p>	<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as documented in the Redlands 2030 Community Plan, Toondah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redlands Planning Scheme. Submitter is concerned that these documents have not been honoured by the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme is a document that will respond to the community engagement process but fails to do so.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that previous community engagement has not been taken into consideration. Submitter notes that the development of Toondah Harbour should be on the already developed area and not on green open spaces or over the bay.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will give public assets (GI Water Park and parts of the Moreton Bay Marine Park) to developers despite the government's pledge to seek a mandate before sale of assets.</p> <p>Submitter accepts that the Toondah barge/ferry terminal requires an upgrade but does not accept the loss of the park and environmental assets of the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that community consultation was not taken into consideration about the 15 storey and 7 storey height limit and opposes high rise development in Toondah Harbour.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not respect the historical significance of GI Water Park and the "Fernleigh" precinct. That construction of a new access road along the boundary would diminish its value as a historical site. Its impact looking to high rise buildings and a marina would replace the original views out to the bay.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will destroy the mangroves and seagrass within the PDA.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect the seagrass and fish habitat.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect koala or local wildlife habitats. Submitter is concerned that the proposed new road next to the park beside the existing koala habitat will result in tree loss and increase mortality to koalas.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina would result in total loss of seagrass and fish habitat in the PDA and would cause degradation of old growth mangroves on Casim Island. Submitter believes this is in contravention to the RAMSAR International Treaty.</p>							<p>Submitter is concerned that the marina is not viable as the location is in a shallow area and would require extensive and constant dredging at an unacceptable cost to the community.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that development of the marina will remove the well-loved and used sandy beach in GI Water Park.</p>	
<p>TH14/261</p>	<p>Submitter is supportive of refurbishing the ferry terminal area.</p> <p>Submitter requests for the proposed development scheme to be withdrawn and a new scheme prepared that is more environmentally and socio-economically sound drawing on community consultation.</p> <p>Submitter believes that the development of GI Water Park and Marine Park poses an unacceptable social, economic and environmental impact.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposal is an overdevelopment as currently there are undeveloped building sites in the area that are affected by lack of interest by developers.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the 15 storey height limit is not viable as it does fit with the character of the area. Submitter believes that 5 storeys should be set as the limit.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that an Environmental Impact Statement has not been completed to underpin the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that wild, marine and plant life and their habitats will be impacted by the development.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that GI Water Park was previously a landfill and the land could be contaminated and not suitable for development.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that a number of old pine and Moreton Bay figs exist in the park area and construction of the Marina will require removal of these trees.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the current road network and infrastructure will not be able to support the increase in population.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development of the Marina will mean the loss of GI Water Park.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that loss of green and open space will not be adequate to meet the demand of an increase in population and users.</p>				<p>Submitter is concerned that development of the Marina is not viable as the proposal location is an area that is prone to low shallow tides and would require significant dredging and continue maintenance which would be costly and the financial burden will fall on the ratepayer.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the location for the proposed development is also subject to strong winds and damage to boats could be significant.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina will not be financially viable as there are other marinas currently not operating at full capacity.</p>		
<p>TH14/262</p>	<p>Submitter supports upgrading transport facilities and providing cafes/restaurants and other associated facilities to benefit tourists and commuters.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposal ignores community feedback, town plan and disregards Redlands 2030 document.</p> <p>Submitter requests that the document be withdrawn and the scale and size of the PDA be reduced.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development is an overdevelopment and development should be limited to existing land, not on reclaimed marine areas.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the height limit and believes it should be limited to 5 Storeys as per the Town plan.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that administration studies have not yet been completed which are critical to the feasibility of the development.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that car parking facilities require improvement and increased in numbers.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the existing road network will not be able to support the proposed population increase at the end of Middle Street and coming out at Stone Street.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned and objects to the loss of GI Water Park to grey developers.</p> <p>Submitter comments that it is not necessary to build out into Moreton Bay to achieve commercial development.</p> <p>Submitter does not support relocation or changing of any area adjacent to GI Water Park.</p>				<p>Submitter is concerned about the development of the marina and believes it is unsustainable and financially unviable.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is an increased financial burden on ratepayers due to long term dredging maintenance of additional waterways in the area.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the Marine Industry will be located in the area so close to residential areas.</p>		
<p>TH14/263</p>	<p>Submitter is supportive of an upgrade to the Toondah Harbour precinct only.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the MEDO acting as "Corporation Sole" in respect to the development is undemocratic and basically infers that the development will proceed regardless of community concerns.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the PDA process to fast track development is too fast for a development of this magnitude.</p> <p>Submitter questions why the PDA was declared and comments that this process replaces the Toondah Harbour PDA Interim Land Use Plan which came about through community consultation and was more sympathetic and palatable option to upgrade Toondah Harbour.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that key stakeholders consulted during the process have not been disclosed. Submitter questions whether Aboriginal communities and Stradbroke Island have been consulted.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposal is not sustainable with an increase in commercial, residential and mixed use development.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposal does not support Aboriginal stewardship and reconciliation.</p> <p>Submitter does not support high density population.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that no environmental impact study has not been completed to underpin the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned there will be a negative impact on local flora and fauna and their natural habitats.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not identify who will determine matters of ecological significance and believes this is unacceptable.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about what fill will be used to reclaim parts of the Bay. Submitter believes that this is an environmental concern which will threaten the ecology of Moreton Bay.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the proposal "granting further opportunities for development and efficient dredge spoils through land reclamation and the creation of dredge spoils". Submitter is concerned that environmental checks are not sufficient to ensure the waters of Moreton Bay will not be adversely affected. Submitter is concerned about the damage from dredging and that studies have not been conducted to show impact.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not adequately deal with impacts to the environment from the development.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the loss of GI Water Park and the reduction in open space.</p>					<p>Submitter does not support marina development.</p> <p>Submitter does not support dredging for the marina, only in the channel.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there will be a financial impact on ratepayers due to continuous dredging.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that there is a provision for exempt development, and submitter believes this indicates that the proposal is a "brown dwarf".</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the Development Assessment process has been taken out of council's hands and comments that it lacks transparency.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that this allows for development to occur even if it is inconsistent with the PDA if there are sufficient grounds to justify the approval.</p>	
<p>TH14/264</p>	<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as documented in the Redlands 2030 Community Plan, Toondah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redlands Planning Scheme. Submitter is concerned that these documents have not been honoured by the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme is a document that will respond to the community engagement process but fails to do so.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that previous community engagement has not been taken into consideration. Submitter notes that the development of Toondah Harbour should be on the already developed area and not on green open spaces or over the bay.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will give public assets (GI Water Park and parts of the Moreton Bay Marine Park) to developers despite the government's pledge to seek a mandate before sale of assets.</p> <p>Submitter accepts that the Toondah barge/ferry terminal requires an upgrade but does not accept the loss of the park and environmental assets of the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that community consultation was not taken into consideration about the 15 storey and 7 storey height limit and opposes high rise development in Toondah Harbour.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not respect the historical significance of GI Water Park and the "Fernleigh" precinct. That construction of a new access road along the boundary would diminish its value as a historical site. Its impact looking to high rise buildings and a marina would replace the original views out to the bay.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will destroy the mangroves and seagrass within the PDA.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect the seagrass and fish habitat.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect koala or local wildlife habitats. Submitter is concerned that the proposed new road next to the park beside the existing koala habitat will result in tree loss and increase mortality to koalas.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina would result in total loss of seagrass and fish habitat in the PDA and would cause degradation of old growth mangroves on Casim Island. Submitter believes this is in contravention to the RAMSAR International Treaty.</p>						<p>Submitter is concerned that the marina is not viable as the location is in a shallow area and would require extensive and constant dredging at an unacceptable cost to the community.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that development of the marina will remove the well-loved and used sandy beach in GI Water Park.</p>		
<p>TH14/265</p>	<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as documented in the Redlands 2030 Community Plan, Toondah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redlands Planning Scheme. Submitter is concerned that these documents have not been honoured by the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme is a document that will respond to the community engagement process but fails to do so.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that previous community engagement has not been taken into consideration. Submitter notes that the development of Toondah Harbour should be on the already developed area and not on green open spaces or over the bay.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will give public assets (GI Water Park and parts of the Moreton Bay Marine Park) to developers despite the government's pledge to seek a mandate before sale of assets.</p> <p>Submitter accepts that the Toondah barge/ferry terminal requires an upgrade but does not accept the loss of the park and environmental assets of the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that community consultation was not taken into consideration about the 15 storey and 7 storey height limit and opposes high rise development in Toondah Harbour.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not respect the historical significance of GI Water Park and the "Fernleigh" precinct. That construction of a new access road along the boundary would diminish its value as a historical site. Its impact looking to high rise buildings and a marina would replace the original views out to the bay.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will destroy the mangroves and seagrass within the PDA.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect the seagrass and fish habitat.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect koala or local wildlife habitats. Submitter is concerned that the proposed new road next to the park beside the existing koala habitat will result in tree loss and increase mortality to koalas.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina would result in total loss of seagrass and fish habitat in the PDA and would cause degradation of old growth mangroves on Casim Island. Submitter believes this is in contravention to the RAMSAR International Treaty.</p>						<p>Submitter is concerned that the marina is not viable as the location is in a shallow area and would require extensive and constant dredging at an unacceptable cost to the community.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that development of the marina will remove the well-loved and used sandy beach in GI Water Park.</p>		

TH14/266	<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as documented in the Redlands 2030 Community Plan, Toondah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redlands Planning Scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme does not take into consideration the communities previous objection to a similar overdevelopment in the late 1980s. A community campaign conducted by Secure Toondah's Invaluable Resources succeeded in having the development stopped.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development reflects ongoing consultation that was undertaken after the August 2013 community consultation process however the community were not made aware of the opportunity for ongoing input.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is no disclosure of who has been consulted and the nature of the consultation and requests that the details be released and disclose the influence that has overruled the community's vision.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme is too complex and poorly written that is difficult to understand.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the nature of the scheme has disenfranchised the community.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the style of writing is too technical and does not follow the Government's mantra to reduce red tape.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the PDA Toondah Harbour is not a true representation of the scope of land involved. Submitter notes that the majority of land comprises of GI Water Park and the bay which is misleading as the community are supportive of upgrading the facilities of Toondah Harbour.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the 15 storey height limit ignores Council planning decisions.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is no mention of the number of residential units and submitter believes that some assessments indicate a possible 1500 units which is 50% more than the number of houses in Baby Bay. Submitter is concerned that social, environmental and economic impacts have not been assessed prior to drafting the development scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is no development with building heights 15 storeys in the surrounding area, the closest would be in the Brisbane CBD.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the invention of the proposed development is to develop it into a Golf Course which will impact on the livability, lifestyle and village atmosphere of Cleveland.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the environmental and ecological concerns that will be impacted by the proposed development scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the site is designed as a RAMSAR site, which is an international agreement to protect wetlands and the flight paths of migratory birds and it is not mentioned in the PDA how it will be managed.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will threaten rare and vulnerable bird species that are found in the Toondah Harbour precinct.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the water current, winds, erosion and sedimentation are real constraints for the development are not understood or planned for in the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the land shown on the mapping is below his 1100 year storm surge level and is likely to contain acid sulphate soils.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the area was also used as a rubbish tip and asbestos and 'hot sand' could be buried under the park.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that impact on fishing, bait collection and dragings have not been investigated and planned for in the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is a plan to use dredged spoil is suitable as a stable and environmentally sound fill. This has been proven incorrect as this has been used in Baby Bay and has proven difficulty supporting vegetation, house and off free channels.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that sustainability is defined as a one-off and is not an accepted definition.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will destroy the mangroves and seagrass within the PDA.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect the seagrass and fish habitat.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect local wildlife habitat. Submitter is concerned that the proposed new road next to the park beside the existing koola habitat will result in tree loss and increase mortality to koalas.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina will result in total loss of seagrass and fish habitat in the PDA and would cause degradation of old growth mangroves on Casim Island. Submitter believes this is in contravention to the RAMSAR international treaty.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will destroy the mangroves and seagrass within the PDA.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect the seagrass and fish habitat.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect local wildlife habitat. Submitter is concerned that the proposed new road next to the park beside the existing koola habitat will result in tree loss and increase mortality to koalas.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina will result in total loss of seagrass and fish habitat in the PDA and would cause degradation of old growth mangroves on Casim Island. Submitter believes this is in contravention to the RAMSAR international treaty.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will destroy the mangroves and seagrass within the PDA.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect the seagrass and fish habitat.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect local wildlife habitat. Submitter is concerned that the proposed new road next to the park beside the existing koola habitat will result in tree loss and increase mortality to koalas.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina will result in total loss of seagrass and fish habitat in the PDA and would cause degradation of old growth mangroves on Casim Island. Submitter believes this is in contravention to the RAMSAR international treaty.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will destroy the mangroves and seagrass within the PDA.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect the seagrass and fish habitat.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect local wildlife habitat. Submitter is concerned that the proposed new road next to the park beside the existing koola habitat will result in tree loss and increase mortality to koalas.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina will result in total loss of seagrass and fish habitat in the PDA and would cause degradation of old growth mangroves on Casim Island. Submitter believes this is in contravention to the RAMSAR international treaty.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will destroy the mangroves and seagrass within the PDA.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect the seagrass and fish habitat.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect local wildlife habitat. Submitter is concerned that the proposed new road next to the park beside the existing koola habitat will result in tree loss and increase mortality to koalas.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina will result in total loss of seagrass and fish habitat in the PDA and would cause degradation of old growth mangroves on Casim Island. Submitter believes this is in contravention to the RAMSAR international treaty.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the marina is not viable as the location is in a shallow area and would require extensive and constant dredging at an unacceptable cost to the community.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that development of the marina will remove the well-loved and used sandy beach in GI Water Park.</p>
TH14/267	<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as documented in the Redlands 2030 Community Plan, Toondah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redlands Planning Scheme. Submitter is concerned that these documents have not been honoured by the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme is a document that will respond to the community engagement process but fails to do so.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that previous community engagement has not been taken into consideration. Submitter notes that the development of Toondah Harbour should be on the already developed area and not on green open spaces or over the bay.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will give public assets (GI Water Park and parts of the Moreton Bay Marine Park) to developers despite the government's pledge to seek a mandate before sale of assets.</p> <p>Submitter accepts that the Toondah barge/ferry terminal requires an upgrade but does not accept the loss of the park and environmental aspects of the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the 15 storey and 7 storey height limit and opposes high rise development in Toondah Harbour.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not respect the historical significance of GI Water Park and the 'Morninghigh' precinct, that construction of a new access road along the boundary would diminish its value as a historical site. Its aspect looking to high rise buildings and a marina would replace the original view out to the bay.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will destroy the mangroves and seagrass within the PDA.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect the seagrass and fish habitat.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect local wildlife habitat. Submitter is concerned that the proposed new road next to the park beside the existing koola habitat will result in tree loss and increase mortality to koalas.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina will result in total loss of seagrass and fish habitat in the PDA and would cause degradation of old growth mangroves on Casim Island. Submitter believes this is in contravention to the RAMSAR international treaty.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will destroy the mangroves and seagrass within the PDA.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect the seagrass and fish habitat.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect local wildlife habitat. Submitter is concerned that the proposed new road next to the park beside the existing koola habitat will result in tree loss and increase mortality to koalas.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina will result in total loss of seagrass and fish habitat in the PDA and would cause degradation of old growth mangroves on Casim Island. Submitter believes this is in contravention to the RAMSAR international treaty.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will destroy the mangroves and seagrass within the PDA.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect the seagrass and fish habitat.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect local wildlife habitat. Submitter is concerned that the proposed new road next to the park beside the existing koola habitat will result in tree loss and increase mortality to koalas.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina will result in total loss of seagrass and fish habitat in the PDA and would cause degradation of old growth mangroves on Casim Island. Submitter believes this is in contravention to the RAMSAR international treaty.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will destroy the mangroves and seagrass within the PDA.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect the seagrass and fish habitat.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect local wildlife habitat. Submitter is concerned that the proposed new road next to the park beside the existing koola habitat will result in tree loss and increase mortality to koalas.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina will result in total loss of seagrass and fish habitat in the PDA and would cause degradation of old growth mangroves on Casim Island. Submitter believes this is in contravention to the RAMSAR international treaty.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will destroy the mangroves and seagrass within the PDA.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect the seagrass and fish habitat.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect local wildlife habitat. Submitter is concerned that the proposed new road next to the park beside the existing koola habitat will result in tree loss and increase mortality to koalas.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina will result in total loss of seagrass and fish habitat in the PDA and would cause degradation of old growth mangroves on Casim Island. Submitter believes this is in contravention to the RAMSAR international treaty.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the marina is not viable as the location is in a shallow area and would require extensive and constant dredging at an unacceptable cost to the community.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that development of the marina will remove the well-loved and used sandy beach in GI Water Park.</p>
TH14/268	<p>Submitter is supportive of the upgrade to the ferry terminal that is reasonable.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the Moreton Bay Marine Park area was not included in the gazetted notice.</p> <p>Submitter requests for the scheme to be withdrawn and prepare a scheme that allows proper community consultation and takes into account the biodiversity of the area.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the process dictated by State government and that it does provide a transparent and democratic process.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that economic development is being used as the primary reason to fast track the development.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development scheme does not reflect the views of the community as per the consultation in 2013.</p> <p>Submitter comments that Toondah Harbour is a transit centre and not a destination. Submitter believes that the area requires to be cleaned with more parking and few cafes and broadwalks in the Toondah Harbour area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development is not consistent with the area and will destroy the natural beauty of the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will impact on the natural habitat and feeding grounds of marine life.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development will require the removal of mangroves.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will impact on the natural habitat and feeding grounds of marine life.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development will require the removal of mangroves.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will impact on the natural habitat and feeding grounds of marine life.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development will require the removal of mangroves.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will impact on the natural habitat and feeding grounds of marine life.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development will require the removal of mangroves.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will impact on the natural habitat and feeding grounds of marine life.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development will require the removal of mangroves.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the marina will destroy the ambience of the park and turn it into a semi-industrial service area with increase noise and pollution.</p>
TH14/269	<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as documented in the Redlands 2030 Community Plan, Toondah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redlands Planning Scheme. Submitter is concerned that these documents have not been honoured by the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme is a document that will respond to the community engagement process but fails to do so.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development scheme does not reflect the views of the community as per the consultation in 2013.</p> <p>Submitter comments that Toondah Harbour is a transit centre and not a destination. Submitter believes that the area requires to be cleaned with more parking and few cafes and broadwalks in the Toondah Harbour area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the total removal of all mangroves and seagrass in the PDA.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the loss of koola habitat to the development.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the loss of protected marine park will impact on the natural habitat and feeding grounds of marine life.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not consider the RAMSAR treaty sufficiently.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the high density development will increase pressure on the current road network and parking infrastructure.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina development will destroy the natural sandy beaches in the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the high density development will increase pressure on the current road network and parking infrastructure.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina development will destroy the natural sandy beaches in the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the high density development will increase pressure on the current road network and parking infrastructure.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina development will destroy the natural sandy beaches in the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the high density development will increase pressure on the current road network and parking infrastructure.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina development will destroy the natural sandy beaches in the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the high density development will increase pressure on the current road network and parking infrastructure.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina development will destroy the natural sandy beaches in the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the marina will destroy the ambience of the park and turn it into a semi-industrial service area with increase noise and pollution.</p>
TH14/270	<p>Submitter suggests that the boundary of the PDA be moved away from the shoreline of Moreton Bay.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that community consultation with the public, Quandamook people, Bay Aborigines and fishermen has not taken place.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the main purpose of the EQ Act is for economic development of industry in Queensland which would include the fishing industry.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development is excessive and extreme and will impact on the Toondah Harbour environment.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the high density development is an overdevelopment.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will impact on the natural habitat and feeding grounds of marine life.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development will require the removal of mangroves.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will impact on the natural habitat and feeding grounds of marine life.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development will require the removal of mangroves.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will impact on the natural habitat and feeding grounds of marine life.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development will require the removal of mangroves.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will impact on the natural habitat and feeding grounds of marine life.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development will require the removal of mangroves.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will impact on the natural habitat and feeding grounds of marine life.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development will require the removal of mangroves.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that the man made walking tracks and roads for dogs and people on the edge of Moreton Bay is an overdevelopment.</p>

TH14/271	<p>Submitter supports the upgrading of the ferry terminal and supporting marine services.</p> <p>Submitter supports upgrading and widening the channel to assist marine traffic, from the terminal and public boating facilities.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposal is focused only on reclaiming large areas of land for profit making enterprises which has nothing to do with Ferry Services or public boating services.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that extensive commercial development will compete with the Cleveland CBD and Bay by precinct.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there are too many fragmented developments in the area and that it is imperative to maintain all available coastline for the enjoyment of residents.</p> <p>Submitter comments that Redland should be promoted as a tourist destination for people to explore the beauty of the area and not exploited for the profit of developers.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey building height limit.</p> <p>Submitter comments that we should enhance and improve what is already available.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not take into consideration the preservation of natural flora and wildlife.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the wild life will be threatened by the development.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that GI Walter Park will be lost to private development.</p> <p>Submitter does not support dredging or reclamation of any area adjacent to GI Walter Park.</p>																
TH14/272			<p>Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey building height limit.</p> <p>Submitter comments that we should enhance and improve what is already available.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the dredging of the bay will lead to the destruction of mangroves, sea grasses and impact the fishing industry.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that koala habitats will be disturbed.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the loss of GI Walter Park.</p>																
TH14/273		<p>Submitter comments that more community consultation is required.</p> <p>Submitter comments that a competition to get design ideas for the ferry terminal, marine services, parking, coffee shops and small business: can be incorporated into the process.</p>		<p>Submitter opposes high density development on or near the foreshore.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that there should be a high regard for the environment.</p>	<p>Submitter is considered that the current road network will not be able to support the increase in road traffic and notes that it should be considered early in the planning stage.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the loss of GI Walter Park and associated open space due to private development and comments that it should not be included in the boundary of the PDA.</p> <p>Submitter comments no road through the park.</p>													<p>Submitter opposes the development of the marina as it will be danger to wildlife habitat and marine environment from pollution and reclamation.</p>	
TH14/274		<p>Submitter would consider supporting a smaller scale project.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the extensive commercial development will impact on the Cleveland CBD and Bay Bay.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the 15 storey height limit is an overdevelopment.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the impact on wildlife and the beauty of the Bay coast will be affected permanently.</p>		<p>Submitter opposes the selling or giving away of GI Walter Park which was given to Council for the purpose of its current use.</p> <p>Submitter opposes the selling of Moreton Bay.</p> <p>Submitter opposes the reclamation or dredging of the area adjacent to GI Walter Park.</p>	<p>Submitter opposes the selling or giving away of GI Walter Park which was given to Council for the purpose of its current use.</p> <p>Submitter opposes the selling of Moreton Bay.</p> <p>Submitter opposes the reclamation or dredging of the area adjacent to GI Walter Park.</p>												<p>Submitter is concerned that there will be an increased financial burden on Redland ratepayers due to long term dredging/maintenance of additional waterways in the area.</p>	
TH14/275	<p>Submitter is supportive of the proposal and believes that it is well overdue.</p> <p>Submitter supports the council working together with the State to achieve the vision of the development.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that the project should not be scaled down or withdrawn due to an active protest by minority groups.</p> <p>Submitter comments that objectors have given a false impression of a large scale opposition.</p>	<p>Submitter supports the upgrade and notes that the current state of the terminal is an eyesore.</p>		<p>Submitter comments that there is false representation regarding the wildlife.</p>		<p>Submitter comments that consideration should be given to further boat ramps if there is a sufficient water.</p> <p>Submitter comments that an off the beach dog park should not be on the development.</p> <p>Submitter comments that there are currently false representations about beach land access.</p>														<p>Submitter comments that there are measurable benefits for the development of a marina.</p>
TH14/276		<p>Submitter comments that the scheme should be withdrawn and a new one prepared with full community consultation for a smaller scale development.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not take into consideration advice from the GHQ report completed in 2014 noting that a number of technical studies are required to underpin the scheme.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the 15 storey height limit will impact on the environment.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will destroy beaches, mangroves, sandbanks and mudflat in the unspoilt coastal area.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development will destroy the natural habitat for wild, marine and plant life.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that increased boat traffic from the marina will lead to pollution and impact the immediate environment of the development.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not consider the RAMSAR areas as part of the planning process.</p>																
TH14/277	<p>Submitter is supportive of upgrading the ferry terminal.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the PDA process is undemocratic and does not allow the public a means of appeal.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the public is not aware of the PDA process and the implications that come with it and should not be used as a means to fast track development.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that the PDA boundary should be amended to keep the park and tidal flats out of the PDA.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that extensive commercial development will impact on the Cleveland CBD.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the area is being compared to South Bank or Redcliffe.</p>	<p>Submitter does not support the 15 storey height limit and should be limited to 7 storeys.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that by reducing the northern boundary it will achieve the retention of tidal flats under RAMSAR, access to the bay water from Cleveland Park for swimming and fishing rather than a marina and the Fish Channel (used by the only fishing for dredging and maintenance).</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned about the loss of GI Walter Park and 48 hectares of the Marine park to private development.</p>														<p>Submitter does not support the development of the Marina and believes that 100 berths is adequate.</p>
TH14/278		<p>Submitter comments that the scheme should take on board community consultation and advice from local experts.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the PDA has long term fiscal and financial implications to the residents of Redland.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the extension of the consultation period should occur.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that there is an overdevelopment and the impact that it will have on service delivery and emergency management in the future.</p>																		
TH14/279		<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as document in the Redland 2030 Community Plan, Toonah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redland Planning Scheme. Submitter is concerned that these documents have not been honoured by the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme is a document that will respond to the community engagement process but fails to do so.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that extensive commercial development will impact the viability of Cleveland CBD.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development is an overdevelopment of the area and ignores the community's vision and values which will have negative impacts on the quality of life for residents and the atmosphere of the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will impact the marine, wild and plant life of the Marine park and local population.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned that GI Walter Park and associated park lands will be lost to private development.</p>														
TH14/280	<p>Submitter is supportive of the Ferry terminal upgrade.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the extreme government powers declaring and fast tracking development with very little community consultation.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that appropriate development for cafes and waiting areas should be constructed.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that high density development has been included in the scheme which will destroy the relaxed, peaceful and beautiful shoreline.</p>			<p>Submitter is concerned that GI Walter Park and associated park lands will be lost to private development.</p>														<p>Submitter is opposed to the marina development.</p>
TH14/281	<p>Submitter is supportive of development of the ferry terminal and its associated facilities.</p>	<p>Submitter is supportive of limited reclamation around the harbour to support ferry operations, marine services and a small mixed use area.</p> <p>Submitter comments that a new plan should be made and put to a vote to Redland residents.</p> <p>Submitter requests for the development scheme to be withdrawn and a more carefully considered plan developed, including amending the boundaries of the PDA after consultation of public submissions.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that development of excessive commercial development will compete with the Cleveland CBD.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the existing infrastructure will be significantly impacted by the proposed development.</p>	<p>Submitter supports development of Toonah Harbour environment to include mixed, mixed use urban village and medium density housing consistent with the surrounding area.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limit and the proposed high population.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development will obstruct the natural view of Moreton Bay and surrounding islands.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the dredging of the Habitat Protection Zone to accommodate for an 800 berth marina.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development will lead to the destruction of wildlife habitat including the present koala corridors, mangroves and seagrasses.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that an Environment Impact Study, sedimentation studies or assessment of the impact on the marine has not been conducted.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will reduce access to Moreton Bay and increase traffic congestions on the current road network.</p>	<p>Submitter is supportive of upgrading and widening of Fison Channel to the south of Casim Island to assist marine traffic from the ferry terminal and public boating facilities.</p> <p>Submitter is not supportive of the government and council selling GI Walter Water Park and over 48 acres of Moreton Bay.</p>														<p>Submitter is concerned that there will be an increased financial burden on Redland ratepayers due to long term dredging/maintenance of additional waterways in the area if a marina is built.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the increase in noise and ecological pollution.</p>

TH14/444	<p>Submitter is concerned that the process appears rushed and tokenistic.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the scheme does not reflect the community's views expressed during the consultation in 2013.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme is presented in town planning jargon and not plain english that makes it hard for a layperson to understand.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that Council have stated that not all ideas on display will be built. Submitter is concerned that the process is being fast tracked with a lack of community consultation and tight time frames prior to starting the EOI process. Submitter questions at what point does the development scheme get amended and by whom and how.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the community will not have any further input once EOs are received.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about how the development of Toondah harbour will fit within the wider centre network in Redlands is not outlined in the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is lack of information on the economic cost benefits, visual and amenity impacts and effects on surrounding road network, traffic and parking management and that the scheme does not explain how these issues will be</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the vision for the POA is out of place and over the top and lacks information and explanations.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the 15 storey height limit is an overdevelopment and not supported by the current Redlands Planning Scheme. Submitter believes that it is inconsistent with the area and its village atmosphere.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that no environmental impact statements have been completed to underpin the planning process.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that GI Water Park and parklands will be lost to private developers and not replaced.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the 800 berth marina development.</p>
TH14/445	<p>Submitter supports a small mixed use design with upgrades to existing channels and medium density housing and believes that that would be consistent with the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that extensive commercial development will attract the least interesting of retail options and believes that Cleveland should be more innovative in terms of retail and local businesses.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that a 15 storey height limit is not consistent with the atmosphere of the area.</p> <p>Submitter believes that development should incorporate good design and feature the natural environment.</p>		
TH14/446			<p>Submitter is concerned that environmental impacts on the development have not been fully considered and managed in the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter notes that construction of the marina will impact on the diagen and turtle population due to increase boat traffic.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the development is located in a RAMSAR protected wetland and this has not been considered or managed in the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the impact on walt, marine and plant life.</p>		
TH14/447	<p>Submitter is concerned about the hands off approach by Redland City Council and the cavalier manner in which the information sessions have been handled.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the community consultation process was merely tokenistic.</p> <p>Submitter comments that benchmarking and comparing against other development does not guarantee success of any given project.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that extensive commercial development will be detrimental to the Cleveland CBD and its prospect being financial viable.</p> <p>Submitter comments that Stradbroke Island is special and will be in danger of being ruined if too many tourists are allowed access to it.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the 15 storey height limit commercial development will destroy the village atmosphere.</p> <p>Submitter comments that building heights should be limited to 2 storeys.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that multi storey buildings built close to the foreshore will ruin their own environmental issues and would be better to back away from the shoreline.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed koala corridor is insufficient as the numbers in the area decreased when the dog park opened and construction in the area will decrease numbers again.</p> <p>Submitter comments that there street east should be dedicated to through traffic.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the marina development will not be viable as constant dredging will be required to maintain the access required.</p>
TH14/448		<p>Submitter is concerned that the area will be developed into a mini Gold Coast.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that extensive commercial development will be detrimental to the Cleveland CBD.</p>	<p>Submitter opposes the 15 storey height limit or any high rise development along the foreshore.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that marine, wild life and plants will be destroyed in the development.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the koala population will suffer due to the development and road corridor through their natural habitat.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the area will be an increase in road and boat traffic in the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that GI Water Park will be given away or sold off to private developers.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the area adjacent to GI Water Park will be reclaimed and dredged.</p>
TH14/449			<p>Submitter opposes the 15 storey height limit as it is inconsistent with the existing height limit in the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the current road network and infrastructure will not be able to support the increase in population.</p>	<p>Submitter opposes the number of berths planned for the marina.</p>
TH14/450	<p>Submitter supports the redevelopment of the area to provide modern ferry terminals, attractive on land associated infrastructure, modest residential and social facilities and widening and maintaining fronn channel to assist existing ferry operations.</p> <p>Submitter supports the integration of teh GI Water Park and Toondah park areas as a single precinct with mixed use recreation, urban village, ferry terminal and recreational boat launching and service facilities.</p>	<p>Submitter does not support any financial burden on Redland City Council caused by the development.</p> <p>Submitter comments that commercial development should be designed to attract customers to currently establish business in Cleveland/Ruby Bay rather than dividing the customer base.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that there is no market pr demand for high density development and believes that the height limit should be capped at 4 storeys.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development will interfere with the Bay, including the dredging of any other Bay fronn Channel and land reclamation using spoil dredged from the Bay will the effect of such interference on marine, wild and plant life and wave patterns and erosion have been analysed.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the current road network will not be able to support the increase in population.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the car parks outlined on Map 2 structure plan is conflicting because the car parks are too close to the waterfront so that cars will cross the mixed-use roads. This conflicts with the objective of establishing an accessible and connected place, with efficient traffic circulation, water front promenades. Submitter suggests that a better way to meet this objective would be site the car parks away from teh waterfront and to access can be made via Wharf Street and Emmett Drive.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the current road network will not be able to support the increase in population.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that there must also be confidence that following construction of residential buildings that these buildings will not become a stranded financial asset with the consequence of deterioration and reduction of visual attractiveness.</p>
TH14/451	<p>Submitter supports the redevelopment of the area to provide modern ferry terminals, attractive on land associated infrastructure, modest residential and social facilities and widening and maintaining fronn channel to assist existing ferry operations.</p>				
	<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as document in the Redlands 2010 Community Plan, Toondah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redlands Planning Scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme does not take into consideration the communities previous objection to a similar overdevelopment in the late 1980s. A community campaign conducted by Secure Toondah's Invaluable Resources succeeded in having the development stopped.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned about the environmental and ecological concerns that will be impacted by the proposed development scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the site is designed as a RAMSAR site, which is an international agreement to protect wetlands and the flight paths of migratory birds and it is not mentioned in the POA how it will be managed.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will threaten</p>		

TH14/465	Submitter is supportive of the concept.		Submitter comments that the development will enhance the Redlands, in becoming a gateway tourist destination and provide jobs in the area. Submitter comments that they waterway, are being congested with moored boats so additional mooring space will provide facilities for those boats.	Submitter comments that as long as the buildings are pleasing to look at it they do not mind the building heights set.		Submitter comments that sufficient parking is available close to the parklands. Submitter comments that sufficient parking should be available to tourists and commuters and notes that parking should be free for dry trippers and a fee be payable for long term users. Submitter comments that respondents should not bear the costs of long term parking for users. Submitter comments that more than one road in/out of the precinct would assist traffic movement. Submitter comments that increased efficient and free public transport to the area would increase movement around the area and to the Cleveland CBD.	Submitter comments that the Wharf area and some green areas will provide open space. Submitter comments that there are other dog parks that can be utilised.	Submitter comments that this appropriate mix will eventually be determined by those who visit the area.	Submitter comments not let more people enjoy the bay and all it offers.	Submitter comments that upgrades are necessary.						Submitter comments that this is a great concept and will help overcome the issue that arise at Wellington Point with inadequate facilities for boat trailers vs picnickers.
TH14/466	Submitter is supportive of the vision.	Submitter comments that a free fully serviced camping ground should be provided for caravans, tents and motorhomes.	Submitter comments that residential development is not necessary in the PDA and should be left as a tourist/local use area. Submitter comments that a complimentary plan developed for the ferry terminals and surrounds at Stradbroke.	Submitter comments that there should be no medium or high rise buildings within the area with lower buildings at the waterfront and higher at the back. Submitter is concerned that the development will end up as Surfers Paradise.		Submitter is concerned that the current parking situation is insufficient to support an increase in population and tourists and should be increased and improved.	Submitter believes that G1 Water Park should be retained and have as much open space as possible.		Submitter opposes any residential development.	Submitter comments that this is a good idea.						Submitter comments that they do not have a problem with the marina but believes that it should be thought out very carefully in relation to the outdoor development. Submitter comments that there is a significant need for new marinas in the Redlands. Submitter has no objection to development as long as there is no impact on the environment from dredging.
TH14/467			Submitter is concerned that the area is not suitable for the enormous amount of development and large number of people trawling through the area smothering a popular recreational area. Submitter comments that as a gateway to North Stradbroke Island it may work.	Submitter is concerned that the 15 storey height limits is inconsistent with the Redland Planning Scheme and is unnecessarily high.	Submitter is concerned about the impact on the environment from the development.	Submitter comments that the area has been used for recreational purposes and is not suitable for the amount of traffic and pollution that would be generated.	Submitter comments that the open space should be left as it is and not developed.	Submitter comments that this is unacceptable as the Cleveland CBD is only minutes away.	Submitter is concerned that development of the residential precinct will impact the environment.							
TH14/468				Submitter believes that the building heights should be limited to 6 storeys to keep the bayside atmosphere. Submitter comments that this is the limit for fish brigades if required. Submitter is concerned that the development will turn into a mini Gold Coast. Submitter comments that the heritage site with the area need to be encouraged through statues and seats amid trees.	Submitter is concerned that the development will impact the marine park and its fisheries. Submitter is concerned that the development will destroy and clean environment and increase pollution.	Submitter comments that wide footpaths and separate cycle paths should be incorporated into the development. Submitter suggests that bins be placed on the foot paths and arranged with bins to incorporate the theme and atmosphere of the area. Submitter comments that car parking should be close to ferry parking.	Submitter comments that public open spaces need to be family friendly including sports, recreation equipment, toilet facilities, baby changing rooms and lighting at night. Submitter suggests including seating around the waterfront park to enjoy the view, toilet facilities and picnic shelters.	Submitter comments that the village should have a variety of shops, cafes, hair salon and a post office. Submitter comments that a garage for petrol and supplies for cars and boats would be good as well.	Submitter comments that ferries and private vessels should be limited access to one area only. Submitter comments that protection from weather elements is important and allow for safe access for people and vehicles.							Submitter suggests that the marina be limited to 20-40 berths.
TH14/469	Submitter comments that they did not know how to complete the online submission form properly.		Submitter is concerned that extensive commercial development will be detrimental to the Cleveland CBD.	Submitter is concerned about high density development		Submitter is concerned that the current parking infrastructure does not meet the call for a future of land and will not support any increase in population. Submitter is concerned that paid parking will not provide a solution to the issue and comments that it could lead to a decrease in visitor numbers to the island. Submitter is concerned that the current road network is congested and will not support any increase in population or use.	Submitter is concerned that G1 Water Park will be lost to private developers as it is highly utilised by residents. Submitter is concerned that the development will spoil the walkways and public spaces.									
TH14/470	Submitter is concerned that Council will give the development to the highest bidder and will sacrifice the community values for profit. Submitter is concerned that an overseas developer will have the construction rights overlooking local developers. Submitter is concerned that community feedback is not being considered.	Submitter comments that a multi-storey resort will not attract visitors to the area. Submitter believes that Toosah harbour is only a transit hub and not a destination for tourism. Submitter comments that a development similar to Baby Bay would be more viable and consistent with the area. Submitter is concerned that employment opportunities will only be available during the construction period and that once it finishes the developer will leave taking with them their workers and the small economy that was created. Submitter comments that the community will not be better off as only a few extra hospitality jobs will be created.	Submitter is concerned that Toosah heritage aboriginal culture will not be recognised as high density development. Submitter comments that the development should preserve the natural environment, protect local species, trees and best interests.	Submitter is concerned that the removal of mangroves for the development will impact on the wild, marine and plant life in the environment.	Submitter is concerned about the parking facilities around Cleveland and surrounding areas. Submitter is concerned that parking issues is not a priority for Council.	Submitter is concerned that the development will impact on the wild, marine and plant life in the environment. Submitter is concerned that the development will impact on the wild, marine and plant life in the environment.	Submitter comments that the site should not encroach on public open space that already exist. Submitter comments that improvements should be made to the existing parkland.	Submitter does not agree.	Submitter does not agree.	Submitter comments that this is the only precinct that requires redevelopment and include a cafe, shop and interactive complex. Submitter comments that no high rise at terminal end of harbour should be allowed only Grand View Hotel end. Submitter asks whether hotel in the preferred land use is meant to be hotel.						Submitter is concerned that the dredging required for the marina will kill seagrasses.
TH14/471	Submitter supports a revamp of the existing Toosah Harbour. Submitter comments that these developments are outdated. Submitter comments that this is an opportunity to do something on a lesser scale and analyse what is already on offer.	Submitter comments that the plans are poorly done. Submitter comments that these developments are outdated. Submitter comments that this is an opportunity to do something on a lesser scale and analyse what is already on offer.	Submitter comments that the scale of development is too large.	Submitter comments that buildings should not be above tree height that close to the bay.	Submitter comments that investigations as to what is sustainable in the scale of the development for the fisheries.	Submitter is concerned that there are no principles underpinning the plans.	Submitter comments that the site should not encroach on public open space that already exist. Submitter comments that improvements should be made to the existing parkland.	Submitter does not agree.	Submitter does not agree.	Submitter comments that this is the only precinct that requires redevelopment and include a cafe, shop and interactive complex. Submitter comments that no high rise at terminal end of harbour should be allowed only Grand View Hotel end. Submitter asks whether hotel in the preferred land use is meant to be hotel.						Submitter does not support construction of the moorae. Submitter comments that a boardwalk to Cassin Island should be developed.
TH14/472	Submitter comments that it is hard to understand the maps.		Submitter agrees with the importance of Toosah Harbour being an attractive and effective gateway to Stradbroke Island and Moreton Bay. Submitter agrees that creation of cafe precinct with more effective marina will create job opportunities.	Submitter is concerned about the height limit and believes that anything over 6 storeys will not look good, create noise and traffic problem. Submitter comments that buildings should only occur on reclaimed area in front of G1 Water Park. Submitter comments that development should embrace the Quandamook cultural heritage.	Submitter comments that the mangroves and marine park need to be preserved. Submitter comments that gum trees should not be removed and submitter is happy to see plans for a leafy corridor. Submitter comments that issues relating to increase noise pollution should be addressed.	Submitter is concerned that the current road network and parking infrastructure will not support the development and should be addressed. Submitter comments that there should be a separate bikeway to footpaths.	Submitter suggests that the dog park should be moved to Island Street. Submitter comments that more walkways along the waterfront will be good. Submitter suggests a water park/pool in front of Grand View Hotel would be great facility.	Submitter comments that no high rise at terminal end of harbour should be allowed only Grand View Hotel end. Submitter comments that no high rise at terminal end of harbour should be allowed only Grand View Hotel end. Submitter comments that no high rise at terminal end of harbour should be allowed only Grand View Hotel end. Submitter comments that no high rise at terminal end of harbour should be allowed only Grand View Hotel end.	Submitter comments that no high rise at terminal end of harbour should be allowed only Grand View Hotel end. Submitter comments that no high rise at terminal end of harbour should be allowed only Grand View Hotel end. Submitter comments that no high rise at terminal end of harbour should be allowed only Grand View Hotel end. Submitter comments that no high rise at terminal end of harbour should be allowed only Grand View Hotel end.							Submitter comments that no high rise at terminal end of harbour, including boat storage should be allowed only Grand View Hotel end. Submitter comments that flood lights to the water.

TH14/481		<p>Submitter is concerned that there has been limited consultation with local and state government. Submitter comments that the development scheme bases little consultation to the community engagement document released in 2013.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the community consultation process was merely tokenistic. Submitter is concerned that there is no transparency in the planning process.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that Council do not have detailed plans of the entire scheme available for the community to review.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme is ambiguous and self-contradictory and is confusing to read.</p> <p>Submitter comments that section 3.2.A subsection (i) (b) does not offer any evidence of support for overwhelming community need as a reason for permissible development.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the document is full of erratic, non-heraldic statements. Submitter notes that the scheme requires a writing and include at stakeholder's input. Submitter comments that the POA does not reveal any genuine public input and well adjusted planning and design.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned that there is no detailed and transparent environmental impact content and needs analysis and assessment of the project to underpin the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development will threaten and impact matters of national environmental significance including the bay, mangroves and seagrass areas and areas of natural flora and fauna.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned that GJ Walter Park and surrounding foreshore will be lost to private development.</p> <p>Submitter comments that destroying or reducing existing parkland and open space for additional vehicle movement is not in the public's interest. Additional noise, parking and vehicle traffic does not improve the current amenity.</p> <p>Submitter comments that there are numerous safe walkways and bikeways in the area now that are sufficient for many years to come.</p>		<p>Submitter supports the upgrading of the ferry terminal with minimal impact on the environment and surrounds.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the marina development will not benefit the whole community but only the small minority who have boats.</p> <p>Submitter does not support the construction of the marina.</p>			
TH14/482	Submitter is supportive of the development.		<p>Submitter comments that it will be a great benefit to Cleveland and the sustainability of Stradbroke Island as a tourist destination.</p> <p>Submitter suggests that the boundary should be extended South to the northern side of Dyster Point.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the foreshore is an exposure.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that it is a good mix of uses to cater for a wide range of participants.</p> <p>Submitter does not have an issue with 7-15 storey buildings provided they do not impact on the view of nearby properties.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that the negligible effect on the environment will be minimal.</p>		<p>Submitter comments that the proposal will enhance the facilities of GJ Walter Park.</p>	<p>Submitter supports the proposal and comments that it will improve the ordinary facilities.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that there is a need for more water based and marina facilities.</p>			
TH14/483			<p>Submitter comments that the proposal is an overdevelopment and will end up looking like the Gold Coast.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development will be inconsistent with the village atmosphere.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the height limits and notes that it should be only four or five storeys high in keeping with the surrounding area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that there is too much dredging in a very fragile area.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the mangroves should not be removed.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that parking infrastructure will not support the increase in demand due to population and tourism growth.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that the park should not be redeveloped, it is a piece of history and ideal located with views across the bay.</p> <p>Submitter suggests a boardwalk connecting the ferry and golf, sign the public which would be environmentally developed.</p> <p>Submitter comments a restaurant and cafe at the terminal would be good and that parking should only be short stay.</p> <p>Submitter also suggest a jetty would be good in this right spot.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that there will be an increase of traffic, public with more need and residential development.</p> <p>Submitter comments a restaurant and cafe at the terminal would be good and that parking should only be short stay.</p>	<p>Submitter supports the modernisation of the ferry/water taxi terminal.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that the marina should be located away from Parklands.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the area does not need a marina and only water based development should be opening the channel for the barges and boardwalks connecting Cleveland but not encroaching on the mangroves and existing parking.</p>		
TH14/484			<p>Submitter comments that there are other areas around Redlands that already act as the gateway to Moreton Bay.</p>				<p>Submitter is concerned that GJ Walter Park will be lost to private development and the parklands should be left intact and undisturbed.</p>	<p>Submitter is supportive of upgrading transport facilities to North Stradbroke Island.</p>	<p>Submitter opposes the marina development but is supportive of boardwalks, cafes and shops that has minimal impact on the environment.</p>			
TH14/485			<p>Submitter is concerned about the building height and believes that it will disturb the natural beauty of the area.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that minimal disturbance to the environment should be the focus of the development.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that dredging for the marina will be constant and ongoing in the cilling mud.</p> <p>Submitter comments that mangroves and natural spring lines are irreplaceable and the damage that would be done is irreversible.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the disturbance to koala habitats.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that single free parking should be made available for public visitors.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the road infrastructure entering Stradbroke is at capacity and there are no plans to upgrade the road network to meet demand.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that minimal impact should be had on existing parks.</p>			<p>Submitter is concerned that a marina will take away from the view and would require regular dredging which would be very expensive.</p>			
TH14/486			<p>Submitter is concerned that extensive commercial development will compete with the Cleveland CBD and its viability.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the primary function of the area must be a hub for bus and ferry transport with some marine industries supported.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that residential development near GJ Walter Park will not be aesthetically pleasing.</p>		<p>Submitter comments that a multi level vehicle parking facility is important so that parked vehicles are a short distance from the ferry terminal and would minimise the area of land used for vehicle parking.</p> <p>Submitter comments that pedestrian and cycle networks are desirable.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that public access to the bay and water connectivity in the GJ Walter Park area is important.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the GJ Walter Park beach area should be enhanced and trees retained in the area.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that residential construction should be deferred until demand is assessed.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that the transit hub is vital.</p>	<p>Submitter suggests that Point Halloran should be the location for the marina.</p>		
TH14/487			<p>Submitter suggests that land should be allocated for the Australia Navy Cadets Training Ship Diamantina within the development.</p>									
TH14/488	Submitter is supportive of the development.		<p>Submitter comments that the area has much potential and needs to be brought forward into the 21st century with new business and outdoor lifestyle attractions.</p>									
TH14/489			<p>Submitter comments that more tourism isn't always good and that community will not benefit from the proposal.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development will turn the area into a Gold Coast.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the development should be kept simple and keep in line with the natural beauty.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will disturb the koala habitats.</p>							
TH14/490			<p>Submitter is concerned that extensive commercial development will compete with the Cleveland CBD and its viability.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that the building height should remain the same and keep it consistent with the rest of Redlands.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposal does not follow due process and rules set for environmental protection with regard to removal of mangroves and destruction of the marine park.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development will destroy the natural habitat of marine, plant and wild life in the area.</p>		<p>Submitter comments that there is already sufficient access to the bay and should not be spoiled.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that the additional development is not required and support should be given to local businesses.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the residential project is too close to the noise and diesel fumes of the ferries.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that there is no demand for more marina berths and the development of another marina would not be viable.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the amount of dredging spoil that would need to be dumped.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that dredge soils will be dumped on Mudstone.</p> <p>Submitter comments that improved access for barges, ferries and boating public should be a priority.</p> <p>Submitter comments that a large marina is not desirable.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the precinct will be a Dutch style reclamation of land were marine animals, locals and visitors will only see artificial land and sea scape.</p>			
TH14/491			<p>Submitter is concerned that extensive commercial development will compete with the Cleveland CBD and its viability.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limit and is inconsistent with the area.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that pine trees and mangroves should be retained.</p> <p>Submitter comments that marine life should be protected.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the current road network will not be able to support an increase in population growth.</p> <p>The parking infrastructure should be improved for commuters and visitors.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that GJ Walter Park needs to be retained and improved with amenities.</p> <p>Submitter is supportive of improved water vessel access without extensive dredging and depositing of dredged material into the sea.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the precinct will be high density but have limited recreation facilities.</p>				

TH14/511	Submitter is supportive of the upgrade to Toondah Harbour.		Submitter comments that the community requires a gateway to Moreton Bay that is world class. Submitter comments that this will create much needed jobs in the area as well as a wonderful recreation facility for locals and tourists.	Submitter comments that no more than 15 storeys built well back from the shoreline with plenty of green space included.	Submitter comments that Redlands prides itself on being a sustainable city and that it needs to be a priority in the project.	Submitter comments that more parking for commuters is required.	Submitter comments that a water park should be included.												
TH14/512																			Submitter comments that the Marina should offer short term berthing for new built vessels up to 35m length and 10m beam.
TH14/513	Submitter is concerned that opposing minority groups will delay or stop development of the proposal.		Submitter comments that the redevelopment will upgrade the area to show off Redlands in the 21st century. Submitter comments that the development should include a decent marina, boat ramps, ferry terminal and fully developed recreational park and forebore with cafes, restaurants and mixed business. Submitter comments that the development will bring more affordable housing into the area and create long term employment prospects.																
TH14/514		Submitter comments that the development will not attract the tourists numbers predicted and makes comparisons to the Melbourne Docklands development.		Submitter comments that the buildings are too high and general design is not attractive, modern and sea-less.				Submitter is concerned that GI Walter Park will be lost to private development and the proposed park replacement will not be adequate to meet the needs and demands of the community. Submitter comments that as much parkland should be retained and preserved as much as possible.											
TH14/515		Submitter comments that the development should only be a small scale ground level development.		Submitter comments that the maximum height should be at 3 storeys to keep consistent with the village feel of the area. Consideration should be taken to the design to minimise light and noise pollution for local residents. Submitter comments that as Toondah Harbour will be the gateway to the bay the building designs should mirror those of the architectural designs specified for dwellings on the islands - natural materials, angles lines, or idiosyncratic centre etc.	Submitter comments that the focus should be on the natural environment with lots of native trees and grass.	Submitter comments that the footpaths and bike ways should be connected to promote healthy living. Submitter comments that lots of trees should be in the vehicle parking areas for visual amenity.	Submitter comments that as much parklands and open space should be retained to allow for the bay breezes to flow through the area. Submitter comments that GI Walter Park and the dog park should not be developed.												
TH14/516	Submitter is supportive of the development and believes that it is a brilliant opportunity for the area.	Submitter comments that the current development is attractive and under utilised.		Submitter comments that the location of the building and design will work well in the area specified and will not impact on surrounding areas.	Submitter comments that the safety and ongoing protection of the fauna and flora of the local area should be an ongoing concern for developers.	Submitter comments that new parking areas and cycle networks will further enhance the ability for tourists and community members to utilise the space.	Submitter comments that the development of the area will greatly improve the ability for the local community to access the bay and water front area. Submitter comments that the area is not being used to its potential and the community are not able to fully appreciate the beauty of the Cleveland waterfront.	Submitter comments that this will bring business to the local community which will bring welcome change to the area. Submitter comments that increasing residential development will increase the local economy and have positive impacts on the community.										Submitter comments that the marina is a brilliant idea for the area	
TH14/517		Submitter comments that a basketball stadium should be included in the development.	Submitter is concerned that the development will turn the area into a Gold Coast. Submitter is concerned that extensive retail and residential development will detrimentally impact Cleveland CBD and Raby Bay.	Submitter is concerned that there is no market or demand for high density development and will not be consistent with the existing development in the area. Submitter is concerned that the high rise development will block bay breezes/	Submitter is concerned that the development will impact on the grading of the water way and believes that it will reverse the work done to improve it. Submitter is concerned that the development will impact on the ecosystem of the water and the natural habitats of marine and plant life. Submitter is concerned that the development will disturb and destroy the natural habitat of koalas.	Submitter is concerned that the increase in population will increase the traffic congestion.	Submitter is concerned that GI Walter Park and Moreton Bay will be lost to private development. Submitter is concerned that the proposed park replacement will not be adequate to meet the needs and demands of the community.												
TH14/518		Submitter comments that Council should focus on updating and improving the Cleveland CBD. Submitter is not against the downsized development of Toondah Harbour.			Submitter is concerned that the development does not have regard to the natural environment and objects to the dredge waste disposal general.	Submitter (or suggest) that underground car parking may mitigate the parking issue.	Submitter is concerned that GI Walter Park and Moreton Bay will be lost to private development. Submitter objects to the reclamation or dredging of the area adjacent to GI Walter Park.												
TH14/519		Submitter is concerned that the cost of dredging and maintaining additional waterways will be borne by ratepayers.			Submitter is confirmed that the dredge spoil will contain large tracks of ammonia and nitrate but would not be a big concern and the cost for this exercise is expensive. Submitter is concerned that excess dredge will be unsustainable and not sensible.														
TH14/520		Submitter comments that the scheme should be withdrawn and a new one prepared without GI Walter Park within the boundary and full community consultation.	Submitter is concerned that the development is not in keeping with the sub tropical, coastal and natural environment surroundings. Submitter is concerned that the view from Grandview Hotel will be obstructed by high density development.	Submitter comments that development should have impact to be consistent with the existing development.			Submitter comments that high density development should not be allowed in GI Walter Park.												
TH14/521	Submitter is concerned that there is no evidence of demand or need for the proposed scale of development. Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will impact the commuters from North Stradbroke Island through increased parking costs. Submitter is concerned that the scheme is silent on complementary development opportunities and proposals for North Stradbroke and Dunwich. Submitter is concerned that the scheme fails to consider the outcomes from community consultation in July 2013 and the community vision identified in 2010. Submitter requests for the document to be withdrawn and reviewed to meet the needs and expectations of the community.		Submitter is concerned that the scheme focuses on development around GI Walter Park rather than the area locally recognised as Toondah Harbour. Submitter believes that the POA boundary be redrafted to focus solely on Toondah Harbour. Submitter is concerned that the proposal will affect the commercial viability of the Cleveland CBD. Submitter believes that there is no demand or interest in unit living. Submitter is concerned that the scheme identifies the harbour as a destination will inhibit travel to North Stradbroke Island. Submitter is concerned that the commercial development will affect and impact on the Cleveland CBD, Raby Bay and North Stradbroke Island. Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not have any connectivity with Cleveland CBD or the rail station.	Submitter is concerned that the proposal's primary purpose of encouraging development rather than meeting needs or expectations of the people of the Redlands. Submitter is concerned that 15 storey building height is incompatible with the primary purpose of the Redlands transport hub. Submitter is concerned that the increase in noise pollution from ferry barges will not attract potential buyers. Submitter is concerned that the proposal will increase koala mortality through the increase in road traffic and additional roads. Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme is not underpinned by expert research into the environmental issues and constraints.	Submitter is concerned that the low mudflow at low tide would require constant dredging. Submitter is concerned that maintenance of the marina will increase rates in the area. Submitter is concerned that the proposal will result in the loss of seagrass and existing habitats for marine life and cause degradation of old green for a marina. Submitter is concerned that the proposed scheme is in contravention of the RAMSAR treaty. Submitter is concerned that dredge spoils are not managed appropriately and that it is an negative impact. Submitter is concerned that 'sustainability' and 'natural environment' have not been recognised or considered in the proposed development scheme.	Submitter is concerned that there will be an increase in traffic and congestion on a road network that cannot support any increase in traffic.	Submitter is concerned that the GI Walter Park will be redeveloped despite no documentation or studies indicating the current or likely future needs for the scheme. Submitter is concerned that the proposal to replace GI Walter Park with a man made beach is unacceptable.											Submitter is concerned that there is no demand for a marina. Submitter is concerned that the marina would deny visual and physical connectivity to the bay.	
TH14/522		Submitter is concerned that crime will increase.	Submitter is concerned that extensive commercial development will impact on the Cleveland CBD.	Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey high rise buildings and shops that will block the views from existing residents. Submitter comments that high rise development will look dirty from being stained from salt water air.	Submitter is concerned that there will be an increase in pollution and rubbish from increased population and tourism numbers.	Submitter is concerned that there will be an increase in pollution and rubbish from increased population and tourism numbers.	Submitter is concerned that the local road network will not be able to support the increase in traffic. Submitter is concerned that there will be an increase in flood drives.	Submitter comments that a revamp to the parklands is required with safe walking paths and lighting, but should not be redeveloped into residential precinct.											

<p>TH14/543</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the cost of maintaining additional waterways will be borne by rate payers.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the area is being sacrificed for profit making developers.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey building height limit and believes that this is inconsistent with the area.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that property values for existing residents will be affected by high density development.</p>		<p>Submitter comments that the vision of the development could be achieved without construction of a road through GI Water Park.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that GI Water Park will be lost to development.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed new parks will not be sufficient to meet the needs and demands of the community.</p>			<p>Submitter is supportive of redevelopment of the ferry terminals and facilities to welcome tourists and supports the boardwalk concept with a small selection of retail shops.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that a marina will not be viable as there are many marinas in the area to meet demand.</p>
<p>TH14/544</p>	<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as documented in the Redlands 2030 Community Plan, Toondah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redlands Planning Scheme. Submitter is concerned that these documents have not been honoured by the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme is not supported by the community and is being lobbied by property developers.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the process is not transparent and open. Submitter comments that access to information should be made accessible and freely available.</p> <p>Submitter comments that Council voted for the community consultation to be extended for a further 4 weeks. Submitter is concerned that the request has been made for an extension and the State has not advised its decision in a timely manner and sees this as not listening.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that the POA vision should describe a plan for transforming the area to achieve a better overall outcome, recognising both community and environmental values as well as the economic basis for redevelopment of Toondah Harbour facilities.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the POA vision is misleading as the statement that the development respects and values marine and land based ecology and seeks to protect matters of ecological significance contradicts the proposal for development of a marina.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the POA vision is deceptive as it omits to specify that GI Water Park will be used for the proposed new road and residential development, whilst the POA states new areas of public open space enhance opportunities to enjoy the waterfront.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development of the marina will destroy the habitat and ecology of the Marine Park.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the site is protected by the RAMSAR treaty.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed road through GI Water Park will destroy the koala population and their natural habitat.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that an ES has not been completed to underpin the development.</p> <p>Submitter comments that all development respects and values marine and land based ecology and ensures protection of matters of ecological significance including preservation of koala corridors, coastal wetlands and migratory shorebird habitats.</p>	<p>Submitter suggests that existing open space should be retained and forest tracked for inclusion on the State Heritage List.</p>			<p>Submitter comments that the redevelopment of the ferry terminal should be funded by ferry users over the long term with appropriate support from the State and Council by contributing the former CSIRO property.</p> <p>Submitter comments that development and redevelopment should be restricted to the current developed footprint in Toondah Harbour plus the CSIRO property.</p> <p>Submitter comments that a site business analysis should be undertaken to determine the nature and extent of facilities required for expected future use, including the appropriate mechanisms and sources for cost recovery.</p>	
<p>TH14/545</p>	<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as documented in the Redlands 2030 Community Plan, Toondah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redlands Planning Scheme. Submitter is concerned that these documents have not been honoured by the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme is a document that will respond to the community engagement process but fails to do so.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that previous community engagement has not been taken into consideration. Submitter notes that the development of Toondah Harbour should be on the already developed area and not on green open spaces or over the bay.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will give public assets (GI Water Park and parts of the Midtown Bay Marine Park) to developers despite the government's pledge to seek a mandate before sale of assets.</p> <p>Submitter accepts that the Toondah barge/ferry terminal requires an upgrade but does not accept the loss of the park and environmental assets of the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will destroy the mangroves and seagrass within the POA.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect the seagrass and fish habitat.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not protect koala or local wildlife habitat. Submitter is concerned that the proposed new road next to the bay beside the existing koala habitat will result in tree loss and increase mortality to koalas.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina would result in total loss of seagrass and fish habitat in the POA and would cause degradation of old growth mangroves on Casim Island. Submitter believes this is in contravention to the RAMSAR international treaty.</p>				<p>Submitter is concerned that the marina is not viable as the location is in a shallow area and would require extensive and constant dredging at an unacceptable cost to the community.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that development of the marina will remove the well-loved and used sandy beach in GI Water Park.</p>	
<p>TH14/546</p>	<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as documented in the Redlands 2030 Community Plan, Toondah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redlands Planning Scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme does not take into consideration the Communities previous objection to a similar development in the late 1980s. A community campaign conducted by Secure Toondah's Invaluable Resources succeeded in having the development stopped.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development reflects ongoing consultation that was undertaken after the August 2013 community consultation process however the communities were not made aware of the opportunity for ongoing input.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is no disclosure of the who has been consulted and the nature of the consultation and requests that the details be released and disclose the influence that has overruled the community's vision.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme is too complex and poorly written that is difficult to understand.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the nature of the scheme has disenfranchised the community.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the style of writing is too technical and does not follow the Government's mantra to reduce red tape.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the POA 'Toondah Harbour' is not a true representation of the scope of</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will give public assets (GI Water Park and parts of the Midtown Bay Marine Park) to developers despite the government's pledge to seek a mandate before sale of assets.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the POA vision is deceptive as it omits to specify that GI Water Park will be used for the proposed new road and residential development, whilst the POA states new areas of public open space enhance opportunities to enjoy the waterfront.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the POA vision is misleading as the statement that the development respects and values marine and land based ecology and seeks to protect matters of ecological significance contradicts the proposal for development of a marina.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the POA vision is deceptive as it omits to specify that GI Water Park will be used for the proposed new road and residential development, whilst the POA states new areas of public open space enhance opportunities to enjoy the waterfront.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the POA vision is misleading as the statement that the development respects and values marine and land based ecology and seeks to protect matters of ecological significance contradicts the proposal for development of a marina.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the POA vision is deceptive as it omits to specify that GI Water Park will be used for the proposed new road and residential development, whilst the POA states new areas of public open space enhance opportunities to enjoy the waterfront.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the environmental and ecological concerns that will be impacted by the proposed development scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the site is designated as a RAMSAR site, which is an international agreement to protect wetlands and the flight paths of migratory birds and is not mentioned in the POA how it will be managed.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will threaten rare and vulnerable bird species that are found in the Toondah Harbour precinct.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the water currents, winds, erosion and sedimentation are real constraints for the development are not understood or planned for in the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the land shown on the mapping is below the 300 year 100 year surge level and is likely to contain acid sulphate soils.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the area was also used as a rubbish tip and asbestos and that sand could be buried under the park.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that impact on fishing, bait collection and diatoms have not been investigated and planned for in the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is a plan to use dredged spoil is suitable as a stable and environmentally sound fill. This has been proven incorrect as this has been used in Baby Bay and has proven difficulty supporting vegetation, house and silt free channels.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that sustainability is defined as a one-off and is not an accepted definition.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will threaten rare and vulnerable bird species that are found in the Toondah Harbour precinct.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the water currents, winds, erosion and sedimentation are real constraints for the development are not understood or planned for in the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the land shown on the mapping is below the 300 year 100 year surge level and is likely to contain acid sulphate soils.</p> <p>Submitter notes that the area was also used as a rubbish tip and asbestos and that sand could be buried under the park.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that impact on fishing, bait collection and diatoms have not been investigated and planned for in the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is a plan to use dredged spoil is suitable as a stable and environmentally sound fill. This has been proven incorrect as this has been used in Baby Bay and has proven difficulty supporting vegetation, house and silt free channels.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that sustainability is defined as a one-off and is not an accepted definition.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that GI Water Park has heritage value and regional significance but has not been reflected in the scheme. The submitter is concerned that the proposed development will compromise GI Water Park and its use and values has not been investigated to make an informed development plan.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the area will be undersupplied with regional scale park land and will become one of SEQ most alienated park land.</p> <p>Submitter comments that alienation of the park is akin to an asset sale which is a breach of the Government's election commitments.</p>			
	<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as documented in the Redlands 2030 Community Plan, Toondah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redlands Planning Scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme does not take into consideration the communities previous objection to</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development will give public assets (GI Water Park and parts of the Midtown Bay Marine Park) to developers despite the government's pledge to seek a mandate before sale of assets.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the POA vision is deceptive as it omits to specify that GI Water Park will be used for the proposed new road and residential development, whilst the POA states new areas of public open space enhance opportunities to enjoy the waterfront.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the POA vision is misleading as the statement that the development respects and values marine and land based ecology and seeks to protect matters of ecological significance contradicts the proposal for development of a marina.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the POA vision is deceptive as it omits to specify that GI Water Park will be used for the proposed new road and residential development, whilst the POA states new areas of public open space enhance opportunities to enjoy the waterfront.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the environmental and ecological concerns that will be impacted by the proposed development scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the site is designated as a RAMSAR site, which is an international agreement to protect wetlands and the flight</p>					

TH14/563	<p>Submitter suggests that a university be built instead to build and strengthen both the local community and economy on a far greater scale than the proposal.</p> <p>Submitter comments that there should be a sincere regard to well being and enjoyment of locals with generous compensation.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposal is an overdevelopment and will impact the community and businesses.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that further research into the local indigenous traditions farming/strawberry/market garden history, local wildlife populations, importance of mud flats to the local ecology should be completed to underpin the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter comments that provisions for emergency services should be planned.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the environmental lessons learnt with the Ruby Bay project have been ignored.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the protection of plant, wild and marine life.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme ensures best practice in energy conservation, environmental conservation, recycling, noise pollution, air quality, crowd flows, security and crime-reducing design.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that there is a loss of shared pedestrian/bike paths</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the parking amenities will look like an eyesore.</p> <p>Submitter comments that planned traffic flows should avoid as many residential areas as possible.</p> <p>Submitter comments that upgrades to Short Street and widen Ross Creek bridge close to the RL.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the elements of design with Life Cycle Assessments and Strategies should be implemented into the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter comments that residents should be compensated with extensive, well made, well maintained footpaths, curbing, lighting, traffic flow, landscaping, median strips etc.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the loss of public open space in the proposed development is not replaced with parklands that is sufficient to meet the needs and demand of the people.</p> <p>Submitter noted that an enclosed beach and playground equipment should be provided.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that the mixed use precinct will make the facility more inviting.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that public housing should be included</p>	<p>Submitter comments that the facility have good access and state of the art provision for emergency responses.</p>										
TH14/571	<p>Submitter comments that the time, detail and background information provided for review is insufficient for sincere and generous community consultation.</p> <p>Submitter comments that access to the pre-planning studies, such as the rationale, the brief, the design principles and the research are required to make an informed review.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the implications are problematic without the required environmental, technical, social and architectural reports to underpin the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter suggests that Ruby Bay could be redeveloped as the Tourist hub and only upgrade the Ferry Terminal at Toondah Harbour.</p>	<p>Submitter believes that the development is grossly oversized and inappropriate on such a sensitive site.</p>			<p>Submitter comments that the development will result in congestion from the growth in population and tourism</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that GI Water Park will be lost in the development</p>													
TH14/576	<p>Submitter comments that the scheme should be withdrawn.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the scheme should consult with a wider range of stakeholders.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned about the fast tracking of the development and the preparation of the scheme.</p>	<p>Submitter believes it is not a vision for growth that has as its foundation, a necessary understanding of the social, environmental, economic and fiscal impact of its implementation.</p>																	
TH14/577	<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as documented in the Redlands 2030 Community Plan, Toondah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redlands Planning Scheme. Submitter is concerned that these documents have not been honoured by the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme is a document that does not respect to the community engagement process.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the consultation process is not transparent and misleading when it states that the Proposed Development scheme reflects the ongoing consultation that was undertaken after August 2013.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the social, environmental and economic impacts need to be properly assessed.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the POD covers the ferry terminal and the green space and the bay. Submitter believes that this is too big and goes against the Newman government mandate of not selling public assets.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that extensive commercial development will impact on the economic viability of Cleveland CBD</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the building height set at 15 storeys will impact on the livability, lifestyle and cherished village atmosphere of Cleveland.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not respect the past history of the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that marine, plant and wild life on the land and in the bay will be impacted on by the development which will ruin the ecology of the area.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not consider the RAMSAR treaty as part of its management of the bay.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that sea bird species if the area will be impacted.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the land is mapped as below T100, 100 year storm surge level which is likely to contribute to coastal erosion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposal does not respect the historical significance of GI Water Park.</p> <p>Submitter comments that GI Water park is a significant coastal park in Cleveland.</p>			<p>Submitter supports the upgrade to the ferry terminals and the development of the immediate environs of Toondah Harbour to include a modest, mixed use urban village with medium density housing.</p> <p>Submitter supports limited reclamation around the harbour to support ferry operations and widening of Fison Channel.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that a marina would not be viable due to the extensive initial and ongoing dredging required.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is no demand for marina berths with many marinas not operating at full capacity and would be a poor investment.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the marina would remove the sandy beach in GI WATER park.</p>										
TH14/579	<p>Submitter comments that a location be secured for the JMC TS Diamantina</p>																		
TH14/580	<p>Submitter comments that the development will facilitate the first steps to delivering new investments and world class developments.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the Harbour should be transformed to be exciting destinations with restaurants and activities to attract residents and tourists.</p>																		
TH14/581	<p>Submitter comments that the scheme was hastily prepared with little regard to community feedback.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the community consultation period was merely tokenistic rather than engaging with the community.</p>	<p>Submitter does not believe that the proposal will create a large increase in jobs except in the short term during development.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme destroys the vision of Redlands by overdeveloping into the open spaces and destroying trees, bushland and wildlife.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that extensive commercial development will impact on the economic viability of Cleveland CBD</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposal is an overdevelopment including GI Water Park and destroys the area's unique character.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that high density development will increase noise, environmental and pollution problems.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that an ES has not been completed to understand the impact that the development will have on the wild, marine and plant life.</p>	<p>Submitter does not support a new road proposed through GI Water Park.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the parking infrastructure and local road networking will not be able to support the increase in road use and will lead to congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that the Pine Trees are of historic value and should be retained.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the area should not be replaced with boardwalks and believes that it is the only place where you can get direct access to the water with a beach front.</p> <p>Submitter comments that development should be retained on already developed land and not on open spaces.</p> <p>Submitter supports the improved walking & cycling paths along the foreshore.</p>		<p>Submitter comments that residential development should be kept as low rise developments, 3 storey maximum.</p> <p>Submitter comments that this precinct should be retained within the Toondah Harbour area and not encroach further north.</p>	<p>Submitter agrees with the ferry terminal redevelopment with some commercial development of cafes, restaurants and entertainment facilities.</p> <p>Submitter comments that there should be more competition for ferry services.</p>	<p>Submitter believes that a smaller marina would be more appropriate.</p>									

TH14/582		<p>Submitter comments that there are serious social and environmental considerations which require investigation before the proposal is implemented.</p> <p>Submitter comments that Durwin will require upgrades to its facilities to keep with the gateway concept.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is a lack of consultation with the Quandamooka people.</p>		<p>Submitter is concerned about the impact on the ecology of the marine park from the development.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme lacks consideration of the fundamental environmental issues.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the parking infrastructure and local road networking will not be able to support the increase in road use and will lead to congestion.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the provisions for open space in the proposal is not sufficient to meet the demands and needs of the community and increase in population.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the precinct is close to a school and a designated bird sanctuary.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that building heights are too tall and inconsistent with the history of the area.</p>	<p>Submitter is support of upgrades to the ferry terminal.</p> <p>Submitter comments that raising the quay area south will create its own social and environmental issues as well as the straightening of the main channel.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the area is heavily ammonia saturated spoil which will impact on the ecology of the bay.</p>		
TH14/584	Submitter is supportive of the Toondah Harbour development.			<p>Submitter comments that the building heights set are inconsistent with the area and natural amphitheatre.</p>	<p>Submitter suggests that carparking facilities should be kept away from the waterfront as far as practicable.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that retention of as much public space is practical.</p> <p>Submitter suggests that the waterfront be a primary area of public access.</p>		<p>Submitter comments that a study be conducted into the feasibility of two ferry operators being able to remain sustainable.</p> <p>Submitter supports the provision of wheelchair and fast services.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that there is a necessity for ongoing dredging works within the Toondah Harbour area to ensure access to the harbour at all tide levels. Submitter believes that without sufficient marina infrastructure it is considered that the marine business proposed will be financially unviable.</p> <p>Submitter comments that unless Eison is</p>			
TH14/585		<p>Submitter comments that the scheme should be rewritten and confined to the existing area occupied by the harbour facility and CSRH sites.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the building heights and believes that it is not an appropriate area for high density development.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that there is lack of proximity to public transport.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that there is a lack of parking infrastructure and local road network to support the growth in population and tourism.</p>					<p>Submitter is concerned that the development of the marina will increase traffic issues and destroy the undeveloped coastal areas.</p>			
TH14/586		<p>Submitter requests that the proposed development scheme be withdrawn and commence a new development scheme through a full and proper community consultation process which will have as its foundation the community vision and values as documented in the Redlands 2020 Community Plan, Toondah Harbour Community Engagement Report and Redlands Planning Scheme. Submitter is concerned that these documents have not been honoured by the scheme.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the proposed development scheme is a document that does not respond to the community engagement process.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the consultation process is not transparent and misleading when it states that the Proposed Development scheme reflects the ongoing consultation that was undertaken after August 2013.</p> <p>Submitter comments that the social, environmental and economic impacts need to be properly assessed.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the commercial development interests has influenced the preparation of the document.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the building height set at 15 storeys and believes that it should be low rise development only.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that marine, plant and wild life on the land and in the bay will be impacted on by the development which will ruin the ecology of the area.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not consider the Ramsar treaty as part of its management of the bay.</p> <p>Submitter is concerned that the development will impact on the recovery of the water raring.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that the roads, parking, pedestrian and cycle networks need to be restructured to reflect the community values and wishes.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the proposal does not respect the historical significance of GI Walker Park.</p> <p>Submitter comments that GI Walker park is a significant coastal park in Cleveland.</p> <p>Submitter's arguments that the amenity and open space arguments align to be respected to reflect the community's vision and aspirations as set out in the engagement document.</p>	<p>Submitter comments precinct 2 parameters need to be restructured to reflect the community's vision and aspirations as set out in the engagement document.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that the amenity and open space parameters need to be restructured to reflect the community's vision and aspirations as set out in the engagement document.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that the marina is unacceptable and believes that 800 berths is too excessive. Submitter believes that there should be other means to cater for passenger ferry traffic which could be better integrated with the vehicle ferry terminal at the southern end.</p>			
TH14/587		<p>Submitter comments that part of the proposed development and drainage issues in the south west corner of the POA could impact on parish land which has riparian rights and discussions would need to take place to determine what impact the development would have on the parish land.</p>		<p>Submitter comments that Queen Street should not be extended to the proposed development as a means of reducing traffic flow in other areas.</p>								
TH14/588	Submitter is concerned that commercial development is underpinning the proposal.	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will create more population density which will mean less lifestyle, space, room to move, freedom, privacy and less peace and quiet.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will turn the area into Redcliffe and Gold Coast.</p> <p>Submitter comments that hotel accommodation is not required in the area.</p> <p>Submitter does not believe that the development will increase tourism as they would already go to Brisbane via the terminal.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the increase in population will destroy the environment.</p>	<p>Submitter supports the upgrade of roads and car park facilities only.</p>	<p>Submitter supports an upgrade to facilities only.</p>		<p>Submitter supports the upgrading of the ferry terminal.</p>				
TH14/589		<p>Submitter is concerned that the development will turn the area into Redcliffe and Gold Coast.</p> <p>Submitter comments that hotel accommodation is not required in the area.</p> <p>Submitter does not believe that the development will increase tourism as they would already go to Brisbane via the terminal.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that the high density development will affect the resident amenity and aesthetics.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the impact the development will have on the environment and wildlife.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that there is a lack of parking infrastructure and local road network to support the growth in population and tourism.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that parklands will be lost to development.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that there is no use or demand for a mixed use village.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about a residential area within the ferry and barge terminal.</p>				
TH14/590	Submitter is supportive of the development	<p>Submitter is supportive of the development and believes that it will enhance interactions with Moreton Bay.</p>	<p>Submitter would prefer height restrictions of 7 storeys.</p>			<p>Submitter comments that walking tracks and cycle paths are required.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that cafes that interact with the foreshore will be a great improvement.</p> <p>Submitter suggests an arts precinct and sculpture park.</p>					
TH14/591	Submitter supports the proposal to revitalise the area by providing waterfront activities including outdoor dining, residential and commercial development.	<p>Submitter comments that the development scheme should not be substantially changed after adoption unless there is another consultation period available.</p>	<p>Submitter is happy with the height proposals.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that environmental values of the bay are protected and enhanced.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that there must be an area of movement for pedestrians and sufficient car parking.</p>	<p>Submitter is supportive of a public beach or water park.</p> <p>Submitter supports the idea of a jetty or promenade for use by the public.</p>	<p>Submitter is supportive for the proposed mixed of retail, dining, commercial and residential.</p>	<p>Submitter is generally supportive of high density development as long as the park footprint is retained.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that a marina can be combined with a beach.</p> <p>Submitter is supportive of the marina as long as there is no detrimental effect on the environment.</p>			
TH14/592		<p>Submitter is concerned that extensive commercial development will impact on the economic viability of Cleveland CBD.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the building height set at 15 storeys and believes that the development and its growth in population is an overdevelopment.</p>			<p>Submitter is concerned that Toondah Harbour will be lost to private development.</p> <p>Submitter does not support the reclamation or dredging of any area adjacent to GI Walker Park.</p>			<p>Submitter is concerned that the maintenance and dredging of additional waterways for the marina will result in an increased financial burden on ratepayers.</p>			
TH14/593		<p>Submitter comments that the vision should include commentary of the relationship of Toondah Harbour to Cleveland CBD to ensure that Toondah Harbour does not compete for use with the CBD.</p> <p>Submitter questions whether the relocation of the ferry terminal was to connect directly to the rail station at Cleveland.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned about the 15 storey height limiting views of existing development.</p> <p>Submitter believes that development on the foreshore should be limited to 4-6 storeys.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that ongoing dredging and maintenance of additional waterways is not sustainable.</p>		<p>Submitter comments that the Map 2 should more clearly indicate and emphasise a public open space foreshore.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that the high density development will decrease property values and amenities.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned how the proposal will deliver the capital works associated with the precinct as it is isolated from the 'value add' precincts.</p>	<p>Submitter is concerned that 800 berths is excessive.</p>	<p>Submitter comments that Toondah Harbour is difficult to stage efficiently so early private capital can only be followed by an infrastructure Agreement/Levy process. Submitter believes that details funds from precincts of methods of</p>		

TH14/594				Submitter is concerned that the high density development will destroy the natural beauty and village atmosphere of the area.	Submitter is concerned that the marina will destroy the plant, marine and wild life and impact on the ecology of the bay. Submitter is concerned that this will decrease the natural fisheries found in the bay. Submitter is concerned that the marina will bring increased petrol, oil and diesel pollution into the water.															
TH14/595		Submitter suggests that a university be built in Redland City instead of the development of Toondah Harbour. Submitter comments that the community should be involved throughout the implementation of the development.	Submitter is concerned about the proposed benefits of the development to the community. Submitter comments that the development should be moved to the Rabby Bay Foreshore Reserves. Submitter comments that the development should respect the local heritage precinct, local traditions and indigenous culture.	Submitter comments that the proposal should respect local indigenous traditions, the farming and market garden history.	Submitter is concerned that the environmental issues that arise in the Rabby Bay development will be repeated in this development. Submitter comments that the proposal should respect the local wild, bird and marine life population and the importance of mud flats to the ecology of the bay. Submitter comments that development should ensure best practice and award winning strategies for energy conservation, environmental conservation, recycling, noise pollution, air quality, crowd flows, security, crime-reducing design.	Submitter comments that suitable road upgrades to Shore Street and widen its Moss Creek Bridge are required. Submitter comments that traffic plans are required to ensure that they avoid residential areas. Submitter comments that parking facilities should be increased to meet demand and should be an architecturally pleasing design. Submitter comments that the road upgrades should ensure that there is room for heavy vehicles and buses. Submitter comments that the scheme should implement the designs in the Life Cycle Assessments and Strategies. Submitter comments that Cleveland roodsters should be compensated with extensive footpaths, curbing, lighting, traffic flow, landscaping, median strips, traffic calming, free circle buses.	Submitter comments that there should be as much open space as there is now for community to use. Submitter comments that there should be accessibility for all abilities. Submitter comments that the scheme should encourage green spaces, share pedestrian and bicycle paths, preservation of historically significant trees and land forms, enclosed beach for safe swimming and safe playground equipment for all abilities. Submitter comments that the shared walkways to extend the entire perimeter and that priority to be on people and environment rather than vehicles.	Submitter comments that the mixed use development is desirable to make a village feel.	Submitter comments that public housing should be included.	Submitter comments that the development should encourage good access, provisions for emergency responses.	Submitter comments that previous developments at the Gold Coast or Docklands in Melbourne should be prevented.									
TH14/597			Submitter comments that Toondah Harbour is the primary port for access to and from North Stradbroke Island and the proposal should serve to promote and preserve this role. Submitter suggests that development should be complementary with plans for the CBD. Submitter comments that development in the area around the harbour should be that supports the port function of makes best use of the waterside location for community enjoyment.	Submitter is concerned that the scheme does not sufficiently address quality design and construction of buildings.	Submitter comments that the scheme does not adequately provide provisions for the protection of koala habitats and population.	Submitter comments that connectivity with the external road and rail networks and the CBD should be provided for in the scheme. Submitter also suggests that the enhancement of vehicle and passenger ferry facilities at Durwich should be provided for in the scheme.	Submitter comments that if a proposal should include provisions for a jetty built out towards Ocean Island together with a series of interlinked broadwalks and paths.			Submitter suggests that provisions should be made to include space for vessel berthing, swinging and access but also sufficient landside facilities for the entire operation to function efficiently.										
TH14/599			Submitter is concerned that extensive commercial development will impact on the economic viability of Cleveland CBD. Submitter is concerned that the development will turn into a South Bank development.	Submitter is concerned that the 15 storey height limit is an overdevelopment.	Submitter is concerned that the development will destroy on the ecology of the bay and will have detrimental impacts on the marine, bird and plant life.	Submitter is concerned that the increase in population on Stratum will not be able to support by the local road network and will lead to congestion.	Submitter is concerned that Toondah Harbour will be lost to residential development. Submitter does not support the reclamation or dredging of any area adjacent to GI Water Park.			Submitter supports the upgrade to the ferry terminals and the development of the immediate environs of Toondah Harbour to include a modest, mixed use urban village with medium density housing. Submitter supports limited reclamation around the harbour to support ferry operations and widening of Fossil Channel.	Submitter is concerned that the maintenance and dredging of additional waterways for the marina will result in an increased financial burden on ratepayers. Submitter is concerned that there is no demand for a marina.									
TH14/600		Submitter is not supportive of the scheme and proposal.																		
TH14/601		Submitter is not supportive of the scheme and proposal.				Submitter comments that the employment must be profitable.														
TH14/602		Submitter is not supportive of the scheme and proposal.						Submitter is not supportive of developing GI Water park. Submitter is concerned that the proposal will take away too much public open space and the proposed new areas will not meet the needs and demand of the community.	Submitter believes that there is currently too much retail in the area.											
TH14/603		Submitter is not supportive of the scheme and proposal.						Submitter is not supportive of developing GI Water Park.												
TH14/605		Submitter is supportive of the proposal.						Submitter suggests that provisions are included to extend the rail, road and sea link to Stradbroke Island.												
TH14/606		Submitter is supportive of the proposal.		Submitter believes that the development would turn the area into a better Gold Coast holiday destination.				Submitter suggests that provisions are included to extend the rail, road and sea link to Stradbroke Island.												
TH14/607		Submitter is concerned that the two main pictures are not in accord with the text of the scheme, noting that the pictures are of 7 story buildings while the scheme allows for 15 stories. Submitter is concerned that the estimated costs of dredging are not current and underestimated. Submitter is concerned that financial liability of dredging and maintain the additional waterway will fall on Council and ratepayers.		Submitter is concerned about the extent of the height limits and residential development.	Submitter is concerned that the provisions for a koala sanctuary is unrealistic and misleading to the public.			Submitter is concerned about the loss of GI Water Park to development and the proposed new road. Submitter is concerned that the new provisions for parkland will not be sufficient to meet the demand and needs of the community.			Submitter comments that dredging and maintaining the waterways for the Marina will be expensive.									
TH14/608				Submitter comments that the development would impact on tourism numbers.	Submitter is concerned that the development will destroy the natural environment of the area.	Submitter opposes the proposal for Toondah Harbour, GI Water Park and foreshores as these areas are paramount to the ongoing welfare of marine wildlife and residents.														
TH14/609		Submitter comments that the area was a food producing area, however this will be impacted on by the development. Submitter comments that sensitive thinking and planning should be implemented into the proposal.	Submitter comments that Toondah Harbour is not the Redcliffe and should not be copied in terms of the development.		Submitter comments that the wetlands and mangroves areas are essential for fish habitat and wading birds and that the development will impact on their feeding grounds and habitat.			Submitter comments that GI Water Park is essential open space. Submitter is concerned that the loss of the park and the new provisions for parkland will not be sufficient to meet the demand and needs of the community.	Submitter comments that the residential precinct should be located to the railway station with retail to enhance the existing Cleveland CBD.	Submitter comments that a marina will not be viable as there are currently other marinas not operating at full capacity.										
TH14/612	Submitter is supportive of the proposal in principal.	Submitter is concerned that the community are signing petitions against the proposal without knowing what they are signing.	Submitter comments that Cleveland is far behind Redcliffe and its development. Submitter believes this is required to increase tourism.	Submitter is concerned about the loss of their views due excessive overdevelopment.																
TH14/613					Submitter is concerned that the development will eliminate green space and turn it into a concrete jungle.			Submitter is concerned that the GI Water park and open spaces will be lost to commercial and residential development.												

