



Review of the Environmental Planning Assessment Regulation 2000

We welcome the opportunity to make some comments for the Review in November 2017. This submission is written on behalf of the Committee and membership of the Pennant Hills District Civic Trust which is located in the Shire of Hornsby.

1. In the overview of Page 1 it states that the current legislative framework "Makes local councils and the State Government jointly responsible for the preparation of those plans and the assessment of development."

Comment:

We would like to review to work towards the "jointly" part of the statement which assure that decisions made in Hornsby are made jointly between the Council and the State Government.

2. Housing supply to meet the current and future needs of the state and the goals for faster and more efficient housing approvals are discussed on Page 5.

Comment:

Are these quotas are linked the the GSC Draft Sydney Plan 2056 which for the North District is expecting 95000 dwelling for 2016-2036 our questions are: is a mechanism to spread the housing across they whole North District evenly and can there be a criterion for the level of density for these housing quota?

3. Making a submission on planning matter page 10

Comment:

We appreciate the need to collect data from submissions but submissions on templates some times prevent the public from freely expressing their views because they have to find the category for the comment and in some cases there is no categories for some creative thinkers on issues.

4. Definition of an environmentally sensitive area page 18

Comment:

Can the definition of an environmentally sensitive area be broadened in certain circumstances to protect sensitive "human environments"? Hornsby is a bushland

shire. Can the sensitive human environment (walking trails/mountain bike trails) co exist with the sensitive natural environment within the current definitions?

5. Development contributions are discussed on Page 23.

Comment:

Is it possible the the Development Contributions in Suburb X be required to be spent and if need be later allocated to the Suburb X from which the development and resultant contribution originated?

6. Voluntary Planning Agreements on page 26

Comment:

We support the desire for transparency and the idea of a regulatory provision, provided it is done in a way that does not increase red tape.

7. Related initiative – proposed changes to provisions of the EP&A Act relating to Planning Assessment Commission (PAC) and the Independent Hearing and Assessment Panels (IHAP) from Page 30

Comment:

We support the planned language changes to reflect the independent nature of the PAC. In relation to IHAP what criteria will be used for the panel to “... determine higher risk or more sensitive development applications, while routine development applications will be determined by council staff under delegation.” This will have an impact into the amount of local input, through Council, in developments.

Conclusion

The Trusts philosophy on this and other planning issues in the Shire is that there is an open line of communication about decision making. We understand the State Government Planning authorities sometimes need to make decisions for the community rather than with the community and in these circumstances we wish for transparency and clear communications. Likewise, we hope that the local council can have some real say, informed by community interests, when planning decisions can be made with the community.

Submission:

Martin Pluss Vice President on behalf of the Pennant Hills District Civic Trust

