

Mail OSCAR

From: Simon Cracknell <scrackne@bigpond.net.au>
Sent: Monday, 10 September 2018 10:32
To: 'Mail OSCAR'
Subject: Further action in regards to the latest Planning Scheme amendments

Flag Status: Flagged

Greg,

I would like you to consider placing the following on the next meeting Agenda.

As you are well aware the “Consultation” period for the latest round of proposed changes to the Planning Scheme close on 7th Sept.

I say “proposed changes” some-what tongue in cheek as once our Council reaches this stage they have little intention of considering input or not proceeding.

I am particularly infuriated by the proposed changes in Appendix 2 in regards to increased building heights of retirement homes, aged care facilities and schools.

In the Councils own documents they admit that

“Council has received representations made on behalf of Educational establishments and Residential care facilities/Retirement facilities seeking an increase in the maximum height prescribed for these uses under the Sunshine Coast Planning Scheme 2014, to accommodate buildings such as multi-function halls and vertical retirement villages. In response to these representations, Council has undertaken a review of the maximum heights on the Height of buildings and structures overlay that apply to all Educational establishments, Residential care facilities and Retirement facilities”

You will note that there have been representations and not applications. We have not been advised just how many of the proposed sites have actually made these representations. Was it 10%, 25% or 75% or perhaps even 5%

While they have dutifully listed each location it can be pretty much regarded as a blanket amendment.

Apart from the representation claim there is zero information in regards to justification or substantiation of a need for the change.

RETIREMENT HOMES & AGED CARE

As an example the Glasshouse Views Retirement Village and Eden in Glasshouse Country Retirement Village is described as Lots 1 and 2 on SP202502 at 96 and 104 Peachester Road, Beerwah.

We are meant to be satisfied that Council has conducted a review and decided that Lot 1 on SP202502 will increase from 8.5 metres to 12 metres and Lot 2 on SP202502 will increase from 8.5 metres to 15 metres.

We have no information as to why the different heights have been decided on or even why the increase is required at all.

This logic is repeated across all the locations

SCHOOLS

For Schools the total lack of justification is even more concerning as typically school sites are even larger than the retirement facilities. Using the Immanuel Lutheran College (Lot 1 on RP851949 and Lot 22 on RP139413 126 Wises Road and 10 Magnetic Drive Buderim) as an example Council have decreed that the entire site will increase from 8.5 metres to 15 metres. If you look at the aerial mapping of that school it may be acceptable to have 15 m in some areas and not in others. Equally 15m may not be acceptable anywhere. Without a crystal ball to identify further details as to what the school may desire (or submit for approval) in the future, Council, or anyone else, is not in a position to make an informed decision.

The large school sites may be in one, two or three Lots. Despite this Council have decreed that the every Lot of every school location will be increased. The only exception is the Chancellor Park School at Sippy Downs. Without any investigation at all, common sense would tell you that it is extremely unlikely that all portions of every school site will be as appropriate as the others for an increase in building height ... yet that is what is happening.

COMPLIANCE

Council claim that they comply with the Sustainable Planning Act 2009 and that the proposed amendments do not materially affect this compliance

Council also claim that at the time of the gazettal of the Sunshine Coast Planning Scheme 2014 in May 2014, the Minister identified that the South East Queensland Regional Plan 2009-2031 and the State Planning Policy were appropriately reflected in the planning scheme. The proposed amendments do not adversely affect the planning scheme's compliance with State planning instruments.

Unfortunately I am not au fait with the above to comment but I am sure they are smart enough to technically comply

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Council state:

“No preliminary public consultation has been undertaken in relation to the preparation of the proposed planning scheme amendment. However, it is noted that since commencement of the planning scheme, Council has received representations from internal and external stakeholders seeking an amendment to the zoning and/or overlays relating to a number of specific sites or to address a range of operational matters.

The representations that have been received have informed preparation of the proposed planning scheme amendment.

In accordance with Statutory Guideline 01/16: Making and amending local planning instruments, Council must undertake public consultation during Stage 3 of the process for making a ‘major amendment’ to the planning scheme. Formal public consultation on the proposed amendment will occur for 30 business days from 30 July to 7 September 2018.”

Again, I am sure that Council will technically comply with their consultation obligations. However from a practical sense how such wide spread and high impact changes could be decided by Council without a true public consultation process is beyond me.

ACTION

The residents are being treated as fools. While Council may be (or may not be) technically compliant they are not morally compliant. The intent of the LGA and Planning Scheme must count for something,

If we are all prepared to let the Council continue in this way we might as well suggest that they make one further amendment to allow any building, of any type, to be built anywhere.

I would like to OSCAR to ask if there is anyone in a member group with the necessary detailed understanding of the correct processes to ascertain if there is any avenue what so ever to make a submission to the CCC.

I know OSCAR have asked this previously on a general basis and I think received little response.

The multiple amendments that have been made to our Planning Scheme to date are constantly eroding the structure of the original scheme and providing wider and easier avenues for development to proceed unchecked.

Unless we can stop it soon it will be too late as the Planning Scheme will be an even bigger farce than it is now.

regards

Simon Cracknell