

[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 4:20 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 - 16:19

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Submission Type

I am making a personal submission

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

I would like my submission to remain confidential

No

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Submission

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the Design and Place SEPP Explanation of Intended Effect (EIE).

I support the guiding principles that underpin this policy.
However I am not sure that the proposal will support these principles and will probably undermine them. This is because there is too much of a focus on profit in the policy.

I make the following comments

1. Priority to the development industry
According to your brochure "the stated aim of the SEPP is to make the planning system easier for developers, communities, councils, planners to understand and use – and to create built environments that are healthy, sustainable and prosperous".

This aim gives priority to developers - not to communities nor the environment. It does not create any confidence that this is about good development for communities and the environment in which development takes place.

The reality is that developers have no commitment to local communities.
Their interest is in profit. They build as much as they can, and they go.
The matters for consideration approach will allow a lot of developer discretion. There needs to be stipulated requirements that are responsive to the community and the environment.

need.

2. Climate change mitigation and Basix

The impact of development on climate is the most significant issue facing us today.

There is a need to include high standards for cli

If Basix is to be reviewed it should not be done so with a watered- down approach. Including more flexibility in Basix by moving from current flexible requirements, as is proposed, is not supported in any way, nor can it be justified. It's a backward step.

Waverley Council has done quite a lot of work on future proofing development having regard to the climate threat /emergency and this should be reflected in the SEPP. https://www.waverley.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0006/181788/Future_Proofing_Residential_Development_to_Climate_Change_Final_Report.pdf

3. Vegetation and open space

The idea contained in the policy that tree canopy can be offset by green roofs, walls and softscape or two or three small trees is not supported. Aesthetically it does not compare and from a climate perspective it does not stack up.

Allowing the removal of existing mature trees and offsetting them with landscaping and coloured roofs will not only reduce aesthetics and biodiversity but is counterproductive in an era of climate change.

A recent article from ABC Science titled "How to make your home more resilient to heatwaves and severe storms in summer" should be considered.

One of the key points it makes is that large trees contribute very much to the comfort and liveability of development as we manage climate change in the future.

This is about environmental quality and community/public health and must be given a high priority and mandatory consideration for development.

It is important not to rely on public land to provide "green cover". ALL land must contribute to this.

4. Expert reports and assistance

The information provided indicates that developers will need to engage the services of a range of professional experts in areas of architecture, engineering and planning in development of proposals.

It is a good idea to have a range of professionals involved in developments that are extensive and in environmentally sensitive locations etc. However I am concerned that objectivity can be compromised where the proponent engages the "expert assistance". I think it would be better if the local council engaged the experts with the proponent paying for this professional advice.

This is particularly important if the "discretionary" nature of many of the important controls remain.

Conclusion

I am concerned that this SEPP will just make things easier for the development industry to deliver outcomes that do not support the environmental objectives who "host " their developments.

It is essential that all future development is managed in a way that reflects best practice to:

- protect community health and well being
- protect environmental health
- effectively address climate change adaptation and emissions reduction

The SEPP needs to be reviewed so that it places these 3 matters at its centre and does not allow developers so much discretion.

I agree to the above statement

Yes