From:	Richard Northover <richard@tropicdesign.com.au></richard@tropicdesign.com.au>
Sent:	Monday, 16 August 2021 5:25 PM
То:	Enquiries
Subject:	Development Application MCUC 2021_4231/1 - Proposed Helipad and Caretakers
	Accommodation

Attention: Daniel Lamond

Douglas Shire Council 64-66 Front Street Mossman

Dear Daniel,

Re: Development Application MCUC 2021_4231/1

Property Address: MCUCI 2021_4231 35-39 and 23-33 Port St, Port Douglas

Applicant Name & Address: Morris Aviation Australia, C-/ Planz Town Planning Pty Ltd, PO Box 181, EDGE HILL QLD 4870

Proposed Development: Material Change of Use (Helipad and Caretaker's Accommodation)

Please be advised , after reading and considering the Applicants documents, I strongly object to this proposed development.

The impact on my property by Helicopter noise will be unacceptable and will seriously affect the amenity of my, and the surrounding properties.

Up to 22 landings and takeoffs per day (44 movements), 7 days a week, in daylight hours will detract from the currently peaceful and quiet environment that exists at present. This is not a busy part of Port Douglas, unlike the edge of a Golf Course which currently has minimal private dwellings abutting same.

As mentioned , the proposed take off flight paths will be to the south east (into the prevailing winds) which is directly over our apartments and as you know , the aircraft will be under maximum power during the take off stage.

Whilst a single helicopter may be a novelty every month or so, 44+ movements per days would become a nightmare.

Looking further ahead, once a registered Helipad is provided in Port Douglas, it would be a simple task to apply for an amendment to the permit to allow other Aviation providers to land , refuel and carry out business from this Heliport.

With the larger aircraft, the majority of users will not walk to their accommodation from the helipad, but require a shuttle service, increasing vehicular traffic on Port Street and

surrounds. This is a busy raod with not good sight distances , and adding up to 50 vehicle movements (crew , passengers etc) would also require a full traffic safety study at the road intersection which may lead to additional roadworks and traffic calming works – at ratepayers cost.

In additional to the loss of amenity there will also be a devaluation of my property and those abutting same due to constant and ongoing noise pollution.

Whilst I fully understand that the provision of an already established fuel outlet will reduce capital costs for the developer, (although the upgrading of facilities to provide JET A1 fuel for aircraft has not been mentioned), this should not be the driver over the real losses which will be incurred by the surrounding owners by the loss of amenity and the potential loss to property values.

May I suggest there are a number of other potential sites , the Port Douglas Yacht Club would be far more practical as there are no surrounding dwellings and the departure path could be over the football grounds which takes air traffic 660m away from dwellings instead of 200m , which is the distance to my property.

We look forward to Councils support in the protection of thew amenity of our property.

Regards,

Richard Northover Owner Unit 11 Full Moon Twerraces Apartments

Craven Close Port Douglas e. <u>richard@tropicdesign.com.au</u> m. 0427 842 925 p. 03 5176 1510