

[REDACTED]

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 10:41 AM
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 - 10:41

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Submission Type

I am making a personal submission

Name

First name

[REDACTED]

Last name

[REDACTED]

I would like my submission to remain confidential

No

Info

Email

[REDACTED]

Suburb/Town & Postcode

Avalon 2107

Submission

We all know we need stronger enforcement of environmental regulations, as the recent review into the EPBC act revealed and particularly as climate change kicks in. Yet here we are, dealing with a state planning policy guide that panders to the developer's lobby, by making everything flexible and moving away from prescriptive controls!!! And with plenty of trade -offs. Lots of loopholes and discretionary opportunities. How disappointing.

This 'small govt' ideology means that existing protections are already poorly enforced or ignored - as depts. are downsized, outsourced, with public service funding cuts galore. Developers call the shots now, looking at this alarming document.

Communities do not want to be battling against D.A's perpetually, as is often the case now. Councils and residents will be embroiled in legal actions trying to define what's possible under these loose and apparently endlessly negotiable proposals. The amendment after amendment nightmare, backed by private certifiers, is bad enough.

We treasure our urban environments when they are clean and green and expect new planning legislation to achieve best practice and aim high. Too much flexibility undermines standards.

BASIX must be able to increase energy achievement targets – it must be maintained, improved and enforced if we are to build appropriately for future climate considerations. Meandering pathways and far-fetched dates for net zero goals are inadequate and will not provide incentives or security for the building and construction industry - or for the community. We will regret not setting

high clear standards in a country that faces the most extreme impacts of global warming.

I am a member of a community group called Canopy Keepers, very concerned at the loss of existing urban trees, as a result of all the exemptions available for their removal. We share this planet with other creatures and the loss of habitat is cause for despair as biodiversity rapidly diminishes.

Trees are our best defence at a local level to ameliorate the impacts of climate change. So clear goals must be set for increasing canopy cover and for the retention of established trees. The goal of 40% coverage must be mandated – no trade offs! Planning regulations must be empowered to prioritise tree retention and to ensure that established trees are not commodified into becoming offsets and trade-offs, that won't even be enforced (as is the case presently).

We expect the Dept of Planning to lead by example through the setting of best practice standards to prepare the urban environment for the inevitability of extreme climate events in a warming world. Allowing the developers and private sector to set the parameters condemns us to poor quality infrastructure and profit driven outcomes.

Our communities need to have more faith in govt planning and see that our shared responsibility for caring for this country is effectively realised.

I agree to the above statement

Yes