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 11:50 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 - 23:50

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

## **Submission Type**

I am making a personal submission



I would like my submission to remain confidential No

## Info



Suburb/Town & Postcode

Winston Hills

## Submission

Design and Place SEPP

There is a lot of vague information with an emphasis on industry. There should be greater recognition that climate change is urgent and must be acted on in the short term. It should not be diverted into vague pathways that will not bring about essential emission reduction and delivery targets. These targets are essential if NSW is going to contribute to an environment that will be liveable for humans and other species.

The SEPP espouses the flexibility approach and invites trade-offs and the undermining of fundamental goals. We need to achieve best practice at all times and inject certainty for the community and industry.

Quality trees should be retained as a high priority. Tree canopy will cool neighbourhoods and vegetation is important for calming. Open space targets must be mandatory and can't be offset by weak alternatives.

BASIX must be maintained and in fact improved to a higher standard. Energy targets (or an alternative higher national standard) for housing and commercial developments must be enforced. If this doesn't happen we will be contributing to run away climate change and condemning young people to more disasters, including floods and bush fires.

The document has to use stronger words that recognise the resilience of our communities in the face of natural challenges. This must not be just a consideration.

Local councils must have a greater consideration. The approach will lead to a multitude of court cases disadvantaging many councils that may wish to reject or significantly amend development plans. Councils are closest to the community and frequently seek community responses. Legal costs will disadvantage councils and their ratepayers.

I agree to the above statement Yes