OSCAR Planning Workshop Saturday 15 May 2021, NSCC.

Summary of comments received during meeting. The listings are alphabetical and do not imply any order of importance.

Contents

1 Planning Principles, Drafting Instructions

1.1 Balanced stake-holder input

- Too much influence from the development industry

1.2 Climate change

1.2.1 Building response

- Adapt to changing climate – climate change is a factor in design before not after built.

1.2.2 CHAS

- CHAS principles or outcomes should be included

1.3 Code v impact assessments

- Process has moved too far towards Code Assessable (cf. Impact Assessable) – not enough [opportunity for] community input. Given the "flexibility" of Code interpretation

1.4 Community identity, character & amenity

1.4.1 Population pressure / capacity

- Identify the carrying capacity of the current and future Planning schemes
- Criteria for increasing the population allowance – for what population is SCRC planning?

1.4.2 Identity

- Needs to reflect SC community's philosophy and that the Sunshine Coast is a "community of communities"
- Should reflect Schedule 3A of the Strategic Framework - strengthen community identity and character, and social inclusion

1.5 Transparent direction v motherhood

- Use of weasel words – ''motherhood''/parenthood statements e.g. what does ''protect SC Activity Centres mean? This needs definition – e.g. is it maintain and enhance – be more specific

1.6 Performance of PS - Private certifiers

- Discretionary powers are unequally applied to [Code] assessment
- Perception that private certification "bends the rules" in Code assessable applications

1.7 Performance outcomes

- Acceptable Outcomes should be the measure for compliance to remove uncertainty/"flexibility"[1]
- Code assessable density allowances inappropriate in many areas (e.g. rural small lot development where water/sewerage services not available)[2]
- Perception of too much "wriggle room" in overall Performance Outcomes

1.8 PS structure

- drafting instructions – there to be 'clear line of sight' i.e. transparent link from strategic framework through to performance outcomes

1.9 Technically defensible

1.9.1 Best available science

- Ensure adoption of best available science is included

1.9.2 Population pressure

- Population pressure is driving development – buck passing between State and local government

1.9.3 Strategic framework

- Drafting principles must reflect the Strategic Framework[3]

1.10 Transport dominant

- It would appear that the guiding principles were predicated on the MT proposal

---

1   They are supposed to be aren't they? A matter for the Planning Act ?
2   should be in strategic framework later ?
3   does it ? - may not the review identify missing strategic issues; should this be SPP?

2 Work under-way & principles

2.1 Airport - built surrounds

- airport surrounds – clearer height restrictions and not just for aircraft approach

2.2 Biodiversity overlay

2.2.1 Maintain & enhance

- Improve protection of biodiversity

2.2.2 Mapping

- biodiversity wetlands and waterways mapping – current mapping excludes state land missing migratory birds, turtles & beach
- local plans should include above as well as "local" wetlands of significance

2.3 Climate change

2.3.1 CHAS

- CHAS principles formally recognised in strategic framework and supported as planning policy

2.3.2 Wind impacts

- climate change – wind ratings for new buildings; coast has downgraded cyclone risk at time projections indicate increased cyclone intensity possible

2.4 Code v impact assessments - performance review

- What review was undertaken of Code assessable development?
  - Effectiveness
  - Implications
  - Issues
  - Community awareness

2.5 Community identity, character & amenity

2.5.1 Ageing in community

- housing needs assessment – aged care to have wider support in scheme – zoning for small scale intermediate retirement areas; emphasis on community and in-home care cluster

- universal design principles – avenues for council to support in addition to changes through building code (note: Australian Network for Universal Housing Design campaign)

2.5.2 Community expectations

- sustainable pattern of settlement – add provided community expectations of liveability, amenity and environmental protection are upheld

2.5.3 Defining features

- distinct character of communities supporting 'community of communities' should be better described in measurable criteria[4]
- key features distinguishing the Sunshine Coast – building height should not be the only feature; others could include mass, setbacks, cover density

2.5.4 Parking

- focus on increase of multi unit & mixed development – add increased minimum parking especially in beach area; road width for accessibility especially emergency vehicles

2.5.5 Population pressure

- Elephants in the room:
  ◦ Population growth, economic growth, mantra- what about well-being of community
  ◦ Carrying capacity
  ◦ Review taken re how density is managed

2.6 Extractive resources - define

- review extractive resources – what is this ?[5]

2.7 Flooding – strengthen

- cumulative flood impacts should be addressed by council mapping / hazard areas

- floodplain development statements & policy clear in PS

- committed sea level rise incorporated into planning hazards

- densification on the floodplains – greater green space restrictions

2.8 Green space – dark skies

- strategic green space – to include 'dark sky at night' areas to support nocturnal animals and notably Blackall range areas

2.9 PS review

2.9.1 Identify sections for review

- Negotiability of ALL components of the PS – Performance Outcomes?

2.9.2 Performance review

- Measurability of PS and implementation thereof. Too interpretative at the moment

- Who determines and how ''acceptable variance''?

2.9.3 Transparency

- Where are the reports from the review – are they available to the community?

---

4   Let communities nominate features of their area for inclusion in Local area plans ?
5   as per state ?

- What in ''the review'' determined that a new PS was required now?

2.9.4 Trigger criteria

- What were the criteria for the review?

- Timing of the new PS – why not wait until after next SEQRP?

2.10 Risk – strengthen

- risk assessment – strategic level increase and wider application for impact assessments

2.11 Stakeholder involvement

2.11.1　Community

- SCRC lack of observance of Statutory Guidelines, with respect to formal community consultation – a minimalist approach, rather than an inclusive one

2.11.2　Equal between stakeholders

- The community equal S/H with SG, LG, planner and developers

- Why wasn't the community included?

3 Further investigations

3.1 Code v impact assessments

3.1.1 Criteria

- considered source of widespread friction with community – requires better community threshold and triggers for contentious development to not be code assessable

- Possible triggers:
  - fewer state referable interests
  - MCU
  - non-conformity with AO i.e. more restricted variations[6]
  - multiple overlays

3.1.2 Notification

- lack of notification of neighbours a concerned

3.1.3 Performance review

- ability to progress code assessable developments in stages where, when combined would be impact assessable

- Local plans – use to restrict or better control code assessable within a community

- recognised as largely State matter

- Code assessable v Impact assessable

3.1.4 SEQCA- Action

- OSCAR to support and advance review of code assessable issues through SEQCA

3.2 Community identity, character & amenity

3.2.1 Local area plans – Action

- Local community groups to be supported to document local issues in support of stronger & greater number of local area plans

3.3 Pandemic response

- Implication of COVID-19 on health and well-being, choice of dwelling style particularly in higher density living?

---

6 I would suggest PO here rather than AO

3.4 Performance of PS

3.4.1 Monitoring by community

- Council has put the onus on community to "regulate" (monitor and ensure compliance) on Council's behalf [only act if there's a complaint]

3.4.2 Private certifiers performance

- How to regulate "outsourced" work [e.g. Private Certification]. Too much allowance of "exceptions".

3.4.3 Review

- Critical parts of Development Applications not being adequately assessed prior to Consent being granted [often due to lack of data or reports being supplied to SCRC][7]
- Need a mechanism to ensure Councils uphold their strategic framework and planning schemes
- Review of community review of current performance and expectations of future planning schemes
- Learnings from current PDA's e.g. Aura re:
  ◦ Lot sizes
  ◦ Setback allowances
  ◦ Street width
  ◦ Parking
  ◦ Emergency vehicle access
  ◦ Facilities e.g. police
  ◦ One way in and out of the area
  ◦ Stormwater management ?

3.5 Rentals

- The impact of short-term stays and Air BnB etc. on long-term rental availability?

---

[7] issue for here? Should this be part of PS review rather than need for more professional conduct and/or more resources - Leads to review of tech reviews