

Media Hakim

From: noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au on behalf of Planning Portal - Department of Planning and Environment
<noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au>
Sent: Wednesday, 28 April 2021 4:44 PM
To: PDPS DRDE Design and Places SEPP Mailbox
Cc: DPE PS ePlanning Exhibitions Mailbox
Subject: Webform submission from: Design and Place State Environmental Planning Policy (SEPP)

Submitted on Wed, 28/04/2021 - 16:44

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Submission Type

I am submitting on behalf of my organisation

Name

First name

Luke

Last name

Stein

I would like my submission to remain confidential

No

Info

Email

lstein@alburycity.nsw.gov.au

Suburb/Town & Postcode

Albury, 2640

Submission

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Design and Place SEPP EIE. We support the overall intent to improve design and place outcomes for our cities and regions.

In particular, we note and support the direction on page 26 of the EIE stating that 'Thresholds may vary for projects in urban and regional areas.'

We note many of the directions proposed by Design and Place SEPP appear to focus on issues facing the Greater Sydney area. We welcome the ability for regional Councils to apply different thresholds or clauses depending on their circumstances and urban condition. Two examples (amongst others) where alternate thresholds or clauses should be considered are:

1. The proposed minimum density capacity of 15 dwellings per hectare
 - Land in a regional centres is not constrained to the same degree as in a metropolitan setting as to necessarily warrant absolute minimum density provisions,
 - Demand for residential housing product (density) varies significantly between metropolitan and regional locations, and accordingly, any proposed provision(s) need to reflect varying housing preferences and also consider Minimum Lot Size requirements; and
 - Minimum density provisions (15 dwellings per hectare) will inhibit the provision of lower-density residential housing in the R1 Zone and R2 zones which is counter intuitive to housing diversity.

2. Parking – using the lowest of the different guides or controls listed

- Whilst the setting of absolute minimum parking provision(s) is considered appropriate in a metropolitan setting (where readily available access to public transport and other services are available), an absolute minimum parking provision in a regional setting (where the same level of public transport service may not be readily available) may be problematic insofar as creating land use conflicts associated with overflow parking on-street.

Further consultation and input on these thresholds (and others) would be appreciated. We note there will be the final Design and Place SEPP will go on public exhibition later in 2021 and provide more opportunities for feedback.

I agree to the above statement

Yes