

Attachment 4:

Planning Proposal PP17/0001 Review of Development Standards – Summary of submissions received during public exhibition

(6 August to 3 October 2019)

This planning proposal seeks to amend Tweed Local Environmental Plan 2014 by incorporating the following planning provisions which are currently located in Tweed Development Control Plan 2008:

- Building heights for Area 'E' Village Centre precinct, and
- Density and minimum lot size requirements for Low Rise Medium Density housing in the R2 Low Density Residential and RU5 Village zones.

The following table provides a summary of submissions received during public exhibition.

A total of 152 submissions were received; the breakdown by numbers was:

- 132 Support the proposed amendment (maintenance of the status quo);
- 18 did not support the proposed amendment (greater housing density), and
- 2 were non-determinate

No submissions were received addressing building heights for Area 'E' Village Centre precinct.

Summary of submissions received – Supporting proposed Amendment

(Supports maintaining the status quo)

Submissions – 132, including submissions from Banora Point & District Residents Assoc.; Cabarita Beach, Bogangar Residents Association; Fingal Head Coastcare Inc.; Fingal Head Community Association; Kingscliff Ratepayers Association; Submission from 52 Kielvale residents; NSW Rural Fire Service, and Team Koala.

Comments received in submissions

- Supports the proposed amendment.
- Is not seeking financial gain that might be had from higher density housing.
- The cost of increased population densities will far outweigh any short term financial gain for individual property owners.
- Supports maintaining the quality of life for current and future residents.
- Retain the low density character.
- Medium density housing will strain existing infrastructure and detract from the small community village life across the Tweed.
- The potential future impacts of climate change and possible rising sea levels make it inappropriate to increase population densities across coastal areas.
- Has invested time, effort and funds into the property because love its character and the benefits that low density housing offers family, guests and neighbours.
- The existing R3 Medium Density zone provides sufficient benefits for developers.
- Anything that allows developers to escape proper scrutiny is a recipe for disaster and should be avoided.
- Council should ensure that development happens with the appropriate checks and balances.
- Tweed valley is unique, and human occupation should fit into the landscape.
- Sydney high density zone should not automatically apply to coastal and rural areas.
- Don't want to be an extension of the Gold Coast.
- Many medium density suburbs suffer congestion and social problems, but the Brisbane Housing Company as provided a good low cost housing option.
- Unsuitable for coastal villages.
- Concerned that 'private certifiers' would lead to manipulation of the Code without council oversight.
- Tourism will suffer if we become like the Gold Coast.
- The Tweed has ample land for development without increasing density of coastal villages.
- It is unreasonable to have pockets of small houses on small blocks scattered anywhere in town.
- Concerned about additional car parking and increase on nature strip parking.
- Need larger lots for pool, vegetable garden and boat, and increased density will push families out.
- Will adversely impact Council services (Garbage collection) and surrounding roads.
- Supports medium density within 300 metres of business zones but elsewhere infrastructure needs assessment against ability to support higher density.
- Application of the Code would remove protections currently present in the DA process.
- There would be a need for more open space for healthy living.
- Economic benefits are outweighed by social impacts, but could be beneficial to rural villages.

- Concerned about impact on adjoining land.
- Residents are more car dependant due to inadequate public transport. Streets were not designed to accommodate large numbers of no-street parking as would result from medium density development.
- The government's proposal lacks planning rigour in regard to infrastructure and financing and is unjustified at this time in the Tweed.
- Close proximity to cane fields, lack of pedestrian infrastructure and public transport makes Kielvale unsuitable for medium density development.
- Murwillumbah hospital downgrade and lack of permanent police presence would be impacted by increased populations.
- Medium density housing should be centred on transport hubs and shopping centres.
- RU5 Village zone should be retained as is.
- There is already traffic congestion on many local roads.
- Loss of heritage homes and village atmosphere.
- No consultation with residents means that the council is not aware of issues in local neighbourhood.
- Need strong restrictions & regulations that protect Koalas in Koala precincts.
- Lifestyle and investment would be compromised by higher density housing.
- Smaller blocks provide less area for native vegetation, trees, open space, habitat, flora and fauna corridors which are significant on the Fingal Peninsula and throughout the Tweed.
- Critical habitat, threatened species populations, ecological communities and their habitat also occur within urban boundaries such as at Fingal Head.
- To address the problem of youth attitude and personality disorder actual block sizes for development should be larger and ensuring that there amply room for the children to play in a safe, secure and supervised environment during their early development years.
- Concerned at the possibility of further building encroachment on to Prime Agricultural such as at Cudgen Plateau.
- 300 metres in an area such as Murwillumbah will adversely impact the amenity of many current residences; proposes 100 metres.
- The State Government planners would have minimal detailed knowledge of local concerns about spatial amenity and loss as well as maintenance of local flora and wildlife habitat, including on private land.
- Thorough and evidence-based planning process is required at the local level to ensure that quality of life is maintained for residents (and associated visitors), and that the habitat for vital local flora and fauna is protected and improved and expanded.
- What may be a suitable development in other areas of NSW may not be suitable locally.
- Does not support by-pass local approval by fast tracking through the State Government policy.
- People choose to live here for the natural beauty of the bush and waterways in quiet villages. If we wanted to live close to others we would live on the Gold Coast or in a city.
- One size doesn't fit all.
- The majority of Fingal Head residents want to maintain the "small coastal hamlet character", and these amendments by the state completely undermines this.
- It is very important that any development in the Tweed Shire is given adequate time for comment especially in consideration of our comprehensive Tweed Coast Koala Plan of Management.
- Fast tracking any type of development in this region is not suitable.
- Houses have been built and established over more than 40 years on a secure set of guidelines, including positioning of buildings, access, and traffic density. Changing to medium density has the potential to change its character in ways never envisaged.
- Fingal Head Community Association is concerned that the State Government amendments would destroy the nature, amenity and fabric of the local community.
- NSW Rural Fire Service has no objections to the proposal.

Summary of submissions

Comments received in support of the proposed LEP amendment provide a broad understanding of the issues and concerns of the community. Submissions demonstrated a clear understanding of the proposed changes to Tweed LEP 2014.

Issues raised are significant and diverse; supporting a retention of the current local planning provisions which if incorporated into the Tweed Local Environmental Plan 2014 will retain the status quo and protect the low density character of the R2 Low Density Residential and RU5 Villages zones.

A more detailed response to submissions can be found in the report to Council.

**Summary of submissions received – Not supporting proposed Amendment
(Supports more medium density housing)**

Submissions - 18

Comments received in submissions

- To accommodate growing population and families 10 storeys should be allowed with two vehicles per apartment.
- Maintaining the status quo does not allow for future growth, and provide business and employment opportunities.
- Lots in close proximity to existing unit or medium density areas would not be out-of-character with development proposed and provide a type of transition zone.
- Major development like the new hospital will change the character of a locality.
- There are many environmental benefits from increasing density while reducing traffic.
- The new blanket State law should be managed to fit in with the existing council planning regulations for villages and low density character areas.
- There is a housing crisis in the Tweed, and reducing red tape for housing that fits with the existing town village environment.
- Need to keep high rise out.
- Fast tracking will encourage developers to build more homes.
- Landowners in Kingscliff have been waiting for this proposal. It's such a great idea given the rest of the street is already zoned that way.
- It depends where it is and infrastructure must be in place.
- The proposed code will bring an increase in supply of living options and better chance to purchase a property and continue to living in the area.
- The new zoning would allow me to put an additional dwelling on our property.
- There are a range of building types nearby and increasing density would adversely affect the standards in the area.
- Additional income or residence for a carer is a distinct advantage and have access to amenities.
- Would like the State Amendments to be accepted in their entirety which could provide more housing, so urgently needed in Tweed.
- Council is effectively limiting the potential of sites available for the development of this new and important type of housing.
- The purpose of the Low Rise Medium Density Housing Code is to provide a new affordable, and arguably more sustainable, type of housing for residents across the State.
- The effect of the Council's proposal will do little if anything to increase the supply, and diversity of housing throughout Tweed Shire, and would lead to increases in the cost of housing for many families.
- The Code, as it is originally intended, will not only provide for a more diverse mix of housing throughout the Tweed Shire, but it is also likely to trigger areas of small-scale urban regeneration, particularly in the older areas where the existing lot sizes are larger. This increases the liveability of areas and will help make Tweed attractive for families seeking an urban, coastal lifestyle.
- Council is stifling prospects for the residents of this area, especially given the lot sizes that have recently been released in Casuarina, it seems un-fair to hold the rest of the Shire to a different standard.
- Support developments going through Council because does not support irresponsible development.
- Does nothing to address The Missing Middle, which is an issue.
- Does not believe Council has the right to go against the state model which is a code trying to provide more cost effective housing and limiting urban spread.

Summary of submissions

Comments received not in support of the proposed LEP amendment emphasise the desirability of change and the benefits of greater housing densities and diversity both to individuals and the community.

The opportunities for more affordable housing and reductions in 'red tape' and application of the Code SEPP were presented as arguments in support of allowing the State Policy to apply to the R2 Low Density Residential and RU5 Village zones.

A more detailed response to submissions can be found in the report to Council.

Summary of submissions received – Non-determinate

Submissions - 2

13, 147.