

Gales answer ^{DN} their critics 12.09.06

I REGARD the letter from Tim Crawley (DN 2/09), and more in similar vein from Dot Holdom and others, as objectionable, possibly due to people being unaware of some of my past activities.

Our planning already allocates at least 100 acres of our land for the benefit of the community.

Perhaps letter writers are unaware that council planners insisted on the major district centre for the whole coast population being developed on most of our land, immediately adjacent to the Kingscliff beach area. It was, and still is, the only land available.

Planners wanted to include the major bus interchange, and many public, commercial and retail developments serving the whole coast there.

As far back as February 1998, at a meeting with Mayor Boyd and senior council officers, I insisted that I wanted the minimum of commercial traffic near the beach, to allow for residen-

tial and tourist development.

We, but certainly not Kingscliff village, would be much better off if we had gone along with council's plans.

I was fully aware, but council planners apparently were not, of disastrous developments near beaches, now evident almost everywhere, with the almost insuperable traffic and parking problems, and we hope to avoid more happening in the future at Kingscliff.

I also insisted in 1998 that proper allowance for parking was absolutely essential in any modern development.

Council planners ignored my proposals, and the results in the existing Kingscliff centre are very obvious.

HARRY SEGAL
Gales, Kingscliff