

Development Assessment Panel Framework Position Paper

Submissions 201 - 250

- 201 Lynne Davies
- 202 John Biggs
- 203 Gary Campbell
- 204 Jack Walsh
- 205 Sean Manners
- 206 Holly Lutzow
- 207 Marcia Breen
- 208 Julian Tertini
- 209 Jacqueline West
- 210 Mandy Rothwell
- 211 BRADLEY HUDSON
- 212 Elise McIntosh
- 213 Louise Sales
- 214 Beverley Richardson
- 215 Jill Wright
- 216 Christine Needham
- 217 Janice Romaszko
- 218 Judy Hebblethwaite
- 219 Kristine Ancher
- 220 Mem Rynne
- 221 Fiona Ringrose
- 222 Joanne Naylor
- 223 Bronwyn Clarke
- 224 Lindsay Brinsdon
- 225 Janice Romaszko
- 226 Haydn Perndt
- 227 Rohan Denman
- 228 Alison Lennox
- 229 John Carter
- 230 Judith Jones
- 231 Rosalie and Allen Rust
- 232 John Levett
- 233 Anna Berger
- 234 Debra Dragonheart
- 235 R J Scott
- 236 Heather Frampton
- 237 Colin and Laurel Trevena
- 238 Sally hildred
- 239 Paul Turvey

240 Michael Fortescue
241 Patricia Knight
242 Nick Attfield
243 Gregory Eade
244 Sandy Hannon
245 Sue Manning
246 Marta Brysha
247 David Loveridge
248 Edward Sykes
249 Penny Morton
250 Joy Phillips

From: Lynne Davies <>
Sent: Friday, 24 November 2023 11:35 AM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: Protect our local democracy - say no to the Liberals new planning panels

I oppose the creation of planning panels and increasing ministerial power over the planning system, for the following reasons:

- **It will create an alternate planning approval pathway allowing property developers to bypass local councils and communities.** Handpicked state appointed planning panels will decide on development applications not your elected local council representatives. Local concerns will be ignored in favour of the developers who may not be from Tasmania. Also, if an assessment isn't going their way the developer can abandon the standard local council process at anytime and have a development assessed by a planning panel. This could intimidate councils into conceding to developers demands.
- **Makes it easier to approve large scale contentious developments** like the kunanyi/Mount Wellington cable car, high-rise in Hobart, Cambria Green and high-density subdivision like Skylands at Droughty Point.
- **Remove merit-based planning appeal rights** via the planning tribunal on issues like height, bulk, scale or appearance of buildings; impacts to streetscapes, and adjoining properties including privacy and overlooking; traffic, noise, smell, light and other potential amenity impacts and so much more. **Developments will only be appealable to the Supreme Court based on a point of law or process.**

- **Removing merits-based planning appeals has the potential to increase corruption and reduce good planning outcomes.** The NSW Independent Commission Against Corruption **recommended** the expansion of merit-based planning appeals as a deterrent to corruption.
- **Increased ministerial power over the planning system increases the politicisation of planning and risk of corrupt decisions.** The Planning Minister will decide if a development application meets the planning panel criteria. The Minister will be able to force the initiation of planning scheme changes, but perversely, only when a local council has rejected such an application, threatening transparency and strategic planning.
- **Flawed planning panel criteria.** Changing an approval process where one of the criteria is on the basis of 'perceived conflict of interest' is fraught. The Planning Minister has political bias and can use this subjective criteria to intervene on any development in favour of developers.
- **Undermines local democracy and removes local decision making.** State appointed hand-picked planning panels are not democratically accountable, they remove local decision making and reduce transparency and robust decision making.
- **Mainland experience demonstrates planning panels favour developers and undermine democratic accountability.** Local planning panels, which are often dominated by members of the development sector, were created in NSW to stamp out corruption, but councillors from across the political spectrum **say** they favour developers and undermine democratic accountability.
- **Poor justification – there is no problem to fix.** Only about 1% of council planning decisions go to appeal and Tasmania's planning system is already among the fastest, if not the fastest, in Australia when it comes to determining development applications.
- **Increases complexity in an already complex planning system.** Why would we further increase an already complex planning system which is already making decisions quicker than any other jurisdiction in Australia?

Say yes to a healthy democracy

- **I call on you to ensure transparency, independence, accountability and public participation in decision-making within the planning system,** as they are critical for a healthy democracy. Keep decision making local with opportunities for appeal. Abandon the planning panels and instead take action to improve governance and the existing Council planning process by providing more resources to councils and enhancing community participation and planning outcomes.
- I also call on you to **prohibit property developers from making donations** to political parties, **enhance transparency and efficiency in the administration of the *Right to Information Act 2009***, and **create a strong anti-corruption watchdog.**

Yours sincerely, Lynne Davies

From:
Sent: Friday, 24 November 2023 10:19 AM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc: Liberals' new Planning Panels
Subject:

I strongly oppose the planning panels proposed by the present Government. Essentially it increases ministerial power and decreased the power of local councils who know better what their local community needs.

This will allow property developers to bypass local councils and communities. Planning panels handpicked by the Government and/or bureaucrats are not in as good a position to make informed decisions about development applications as are elected local council representatives. Local concerns were therefore likely to be ignored in favour of what developers want, and they may not even be from Tasmania. Furthermore, if an assessment isn't going the way the developer wants they can elect out of the standard local council process to have their development proposal assessed by a planning panel. Isn't this likely to intimidate councils into conceding to developers' demands?

This is a gift to contentious developments such high-rise in Hobart, Cambria Green and high-density subdivision like Skylands at Droughty Point.

Remove appeals from the planning process on such issues as the height, bulk, scale or appearance of buildings; their impacts to streetscapes and adjoining properties etc., and allowing appeals only to the Supreme Court based on a point of law or process, as an affront to public rights. Note that the NSW Independent Commission Against Corruption recommended the expansion of merit-based planning appeals as a deterrent to corruption.

Increased ministerial power over the planning system increases the politicisation of planning and risk of corrupt decisions. The Planning Minister will decide if a development application meets the planning panel criteria. The Minister will be able to force the initiation of planning scheme changes, but perversely, only

when a local council has rejected such an application, threatening transparency and strategic planning. The Planning Minister has political bias and can use this subjective criteria to intervene on any development in favour of developers.

Local democracy would be diminished for State appointed hand-picked planning panels are not democratically accountable, they remove local decision making and reduce transparency and robust decision making.

Mainland experience demonstrates planning panels favour developers and undermine democratic accountability. Local planning panels, which are often dominated by members of the development sector, were created in NSW to stamp out corruption, but councillors from across the political spectrum say they favour developers and undermine democratic accountability.

Anyway, what's the problem? Why the new proposals? About 1% of council planning decisions go to appeal, that's all. Tasmania's planning system is already among the fastest, if not the fastest, in Australia when it comes to determining development applications. So why increase an already complex planning system, which is already making decisions quicker than any other jurisdiction in Australia?

Transparency, independence, accountability and public participation in decision-making within the planning system are critical for a healthy democracy, so keep decision making local – and with opportunities for genuine appeals on substantive matters.

The way ahead is not more ministerial driven bureaucracy but to improve the existing Council planning process by providing more resources to councils and enhancing community participation and planning outcomes.

I also call on the Government to *prohibit* property developers from making donations to political parties, but to enhance transparency and efficiency in the administration of the Right to Information Act 2009, and create a strong anti-corruption watchdog.

Yours sincerely,

John Biggs AM

From:
Sent: Friday, 24 November 2023 9:12 AM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: Protect our local democracy, and the influence of "developers" and listen to the people instead - say no to the Liberals new planning panels

You don't often get email from [Learn why this is important](#)

Say no to the Liberals new planning panels

I oppose the creation of planning panels and increasing ministerial power over the planning system, for the following reasons:

- **It will create an alternate planning approval pathway allowing property developers to bypass local councils and communities.** Handpicked state appointed planning panels will decide on development applications not your elected local council representatives. Local concerns will be ignored in favour of the developers who may not be from Tasmania. Also, if an assessment isn't going their way the developer can abandon the standard local council process at anytime and have a development assessed by a planning panel. This could intimidate councils into conceding to developers demands.
- **Makes it easier to approve large scale contentious developments** like the kunanyi/Mount Wellington cable car, high-rise in Hobart, Cambria Green and high-density subdivision like Skylands at Droughty Point.
- **Remove merit-based planning appeal rights** via the planning tribunal on issues like height, bulk, scale or appearance of buildings; impacts to streetscapes, and adjoining properties including privacy and overlooking; traffic, noise, smell, light

and other potential amenity impacts and so much more. **Developments will only be appealable to the Supreme Court based on a point of law or process.**

- **Removing merits-based planning appeals has the potential to increase corruption and reduce good planning outcomes.** The NSW Independent Commission Against Corruption [recommended](#) the expansion of merit-based planning appeals as a deterrent to corruption.
- **Increased ministerial power over the planning system increases the politicisation of planning and risk of corrupt decisions.** The Planning Minister will decide if a development application meets the planning panel criteria. The Minister will be able to force the initiation of planning scheme changes, but perversely, only when a local council has rejected such an application, threatening transparency and strategic planning.
- **Flawed planning panel criteria.** Changing an approval process where one of the criteria is on the basis of 'perceived conflict of interest' is fraught. The Planning Minister has political bias and can use this subjective criteria to intervene on any development in favour of developers.
- **Undermines local democracy and removes local decision making.** State appointed hand-picked planning panels are not democratically accountable, they remove local decision making and reduce transparency and robust decision making.
- **Mainland experience demonstrates planning panels favour developers and undermine democratic accountability.** Local planning panels, which are often dominated by members of the development sector, were created in NSW to stamp out corruption, but councillors from across the political spectrum [say](#) they favour developers and undermine democratic accountability.
- **Poor justification – there is no problem to fix.** Only about 1% of council planning decisions go to appeal and Tasmania's planning system is already among the fastest, if not the fastest, in Australia when it comes to determining development applications.
- **Increases complexity in an already complex planning system.** Why would we further increase an already complex planning system which is already making decisions quicker than any other jurisdiction in Australia?

Say yes to a healthy democracy

- **I call on you to ensure transparency, independence, accountability and public participation in decision-making within the planning system,** as they are critical for a healthy democracy. Keep decision making local with opportunities for appeal. Abandon the planning panels and instead take action to improve governance and the existing Council planning process by providing more resources to councils and enhancing community participation and planning outcomes.
- I also call on you to **prohibit property developers from making donations to political parties, enhance transparency and efficiency in the administration of the *Right to Information Act 2009*, and create a strong anti-corruption watchdog.**

From: Jack Walsh <>
Sent: Friday, 24 November 2023 8:38 AM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc: Protect our local democracy - say no to the Liberals new planning panels

Subject:

This is pretty low effort copy and paste job but I wouldn't know what to write otherwise. Suffice to say that giving this much power to governments in the pocket of developers is not good!

I oppose the creation of planning panels and increasing ministerial power over the planning system, for the following reasons:

- **It will create an alternate planning approval pathway allowing property developers to bypass local councils and communities.** Handpicked state appointed planning panels will decide on development applications not your elected local council representatives. Local concerns will be ignored in favour of the developers who may not be from Tasmania. Also, if an assessment isn't going their way the developer can abandon the standard local council process at anytime and have a development assessed by a planning panel. This could intimidate councils into conceding to developers demands.
- **Makes it easier to approve large scale contentious developments** like the kunanyi/Mount Wellington cable car, high-rise in Hobart, Cambria Green and high-density subdivision like Skylands at Droughty Point.

- **Remove merit-based planning appeal rights** via the planning tribunal on issues like height, bulk, scale or appearance of buildings; impacts to streetscapes, and adjoining properties including privacy and overlooking; traffic, noise, smell, light and other potential amenity impacts and so much more. **Developments will only be appealable to the Supreme Court based on a point of law or process.**
- **Removing merits-based planning appeals has the potential to increase corruption and reduce good planning outcomes.** The NSW Independent Commission Against Corruption **recommended** the expansion of merit-based planning appeals as a deterrent to corruption.
- **Increased ministerial power over the planning system increases the politicisation of planning and risk of corrupt decisions.** The Planning Minister will decide if a development application meets the planning panel criteria. The Minister will be able to force the initiation of planning scheme changes, but perversely, only when a local council has rejected such an application, threatening transparency and strategic planning.
- **Flawed planning panel criteria.** Changing an approval process where one of the criteria is on the basis of 'perceived conflict of interest' is fraught. The Planning Minister has political bias and can use this subjective criteria to intervene on any development in favour of developers.
- **Undermines local democracy and removes local decision making.** State appointed hand-picked planning panels are not democratically accountable, they remove local decision making and reduce transparency and robust decision making.
- **Mainland experience demonstrates planning panels favour developers and undermine democratic accountability.** Local planning panels, which are often dominated by members of the development sector, were created in NSW to stamp out corruption, but councillors from across the political spectrum **say** they favour developers and undermine democratic accountability.
- **Poor justification – there is no problem to fix.** Only about 1% of council planning decisions go to appeal and Tasmania's planning system is already among the fastest, if not the fastest, in Australia when it comes to determining development applications.
- **Increases complexity in an already complex planning system.** Why would we further increase an already complex planning system which is already making decisions quicker than any other jurisdiction in Australia?

Say yes to a healthy democracy

- **I call on you to ensure transparency, independence, accountability and public participation in decision-making within the planning**

system, as they are critical for a healthy democracy. Keep decision making local with opportunities for appeal. Abandon the planning panels and instead take action to improve governance and the existing Council planning process by providing more resources to councils and enhancing community participation and planning outcomes.

- I also call on you to **prohibit property developers from making donations** to political parties, **enhance transparency and efficiency in the administration of the *Right to Information Act 2009***, and **create a strong anti-corruption watchdog**.

The [Position Paper on a proposed Development Assessment Panel \(DAP\) Framework](#) public comment has been invited between the 19 October and 30 November 2023.

The submissions received on the Position Paper will inform a draft Bill which will be released for public comment most likely in January 2024, for a minimum of five weeks, before being tabled in Parliament in early 2024.

The proposed Bill name is *Draft Land Use Planning and Approvals (Development Assessment Panel) Amendment Bill 2024*.

It's honestly insane that this email needs to be sent. Please make the right decision!

Cheers,
Jack

From: Sean Manners <>
Sent: Saturday, 25 November 2023 7:52 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc: Saying no to the Liberals new planning panels to protect our local democracy
Subject:

I oppose the creation of planning panels and increasing ministerial power over the planning system, for the following reasons:

- **Undermines local democracy and removes local decision making.** State appointed hand-picked planning panels are not democratically accountable, they remove local decision making and reduce transparency and robust decision making.
- **Removes merit-based planning appeal rights** via the planning tribunal on issues like height, bulk, scale or appearance of buildings; impacts to streetscapes, and adjoining properties including privacy and overlooking; traffic, noise, smell, light and other potential amenity impacts and so much more.
Developments will only be appealable to the Supreme Court based on a point of law or process.
- **Removing merits-based planning appeals has the potential to increase corruption and reduce good planning outcomes.** The NSW Independent Commission Against Corruption [recommended](#) the expansion of merit-based planning appeals as a deterrent to corruption.
- **It will create an alternate planning approval pathway allowing property developers to bypass local councils and communities.** Handpicked state appointed planning panels will decide on development applications, not your elected local council representatives. Local concerns will be ignored in favour of the developers who may not be from Tasmania. Also, if an assessment isn't going their way the developer can abandon the standard local council process at any time and have a development assessed by a planning panel. This could intimidate councils into conceding to developers' demands.
- **Makes it easier to approve large scale contentious developments** like the kunanyi/Mount Wellington cable car, high-rise in Hobart, Cambria Green and high-density subdivision like Skylands at Droughty Point.
- **Increased ministerial power over the planning system increases the politicisation of planning and risk of corrupt decisions.** The Planning Minister will decide if a development application meets the planning panel

criteria. The Minister will be able to force the initiation of planning scheme changes, but perversely, only when a local council has rejected such an application, threatening transparency and strategic planning.

- **Flawed planning panel criteria.** Changing an approval process where one of the criteria is on the basis of 'perceived conflict of interest' is fraught. The Planning Minister has political bias and can use this subjective criteria to intervene on any development in favour of developers.
- **Mainland experience demonstrates planning panels favour developers and undermine democratic accountability.** Local planning panels, which are often dominated by members of the development sector, were created in NSW to stamp out corruption, but councillors from across the political spectrum [say](#) they favour developers and undermine democratic accountability.
- **Poor justification – there is no problem to fix.** Only about 1% of council planning decisions go to appeal and Tasmania's planning system is already among the fastest, if not the fastest, in Australia when it comes to determining development applications.
- **Increases complexity in an already complex planning system.** Why would we further increase an already complex planning system which is already making decisions quicker than any other jurisdiction in Australia?

Say yes to a healthy democracy

- **I call on you to ensure transparency, independence, accountability and public participation in decision-making within the planning system**, as they are critical for a healthy democracy. Keep decision making local with opportunities for appeal. Abandon the planning panels and instead take action to improve governance and the existing Council planning process by providing more resources to councils and enhancing community participation and planning outcomes.
- I also call on you to **prohibit property developers from making donations** to political parties, **enhance transparency and efficiency in the administration of the *Right to Information Act 2009***, and **create a strong anti-corruption watchdog**.

The [Position Paper on a proposed Development Assessment Panel \(DAP\) Framework](#) public comment has been invited between the 19 October and 30 November 2023.

The submissions received on the Position Paper will inform a draft Bill which will be released for public comment most likely in January 2024, for a minimum of five weeks, before being tabled in Parliament in early 2024.

The proposed Bill name is *Draft Land Use Planning and Approvals (Development Assessment Panel) Amendment Bill 2024*.

Yours sincerely,

Sean Manners

From: Holly Lutzow <>
Sent: Saturday, 25 November 2023 7:26 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: Protect our local democracy - say no to the Liberals new planning panels

Dear Sir/Madam,

I understand the Liberal Government proposes legislation to empower the Planning Minister to remove assessment and approval of developments from the normal local council process and have it done by planning assessment panels.

This fast-track process will remove elected councillors from having a say on the most controversial and destructive developments affecting local communities. There will be no right for the community to appeal the final decision to the planning tribunal.

The criteria being considered would enable virtually any development to be taken out of the normal local council assessment process and instead be assessed by planning panels, including developments already refused such as the kunanyi/Mt Wellington cable car, high-rise buildings in Hobart and new developments such as large-scale high density subdivisions like the Skylands development at Droughty Point.

The Planning Minister can also take a development assessment from councils mid-way through the development assessment process if the developer doesn't like the way it is heading.

The Planning Minister would also have new powers to instruct councils to commence planning scheme changes, but perversely, only when a local council has rejected such an application.

Transparency, independence and public participation in decision-making are critical for a healthy democracy

I oppose the creation of planning panels and increasing ministerial power over the planning system, for the following reasons:

- **It will create an alternate planning approval pathway allowing property developers to bypass local councils and communities.** Handpicked state appointed planning panels will decide on development applications, not your elected local council representatives. Local concerns will be ignored in favour of the developers who may not be from Tasmania. Also, if an assessment isn't going their way the developer can abandon the standard local council process at any time and have a development assessed by a planning panel. This could intimidate councils into conceding to developers' demands.
- **It makes it easier to approve large scale contentious developments** like the kunanyi/Mount Wellington cable car, high-rise in Hobart, Cambria Green and high-density subdivision like Skylands at Droughty Point.
- **It will remove merit-based planning appeal rights** via the planning tribunal on issues like height, bulk, scale or appearance of buildings; impacts to streetscapes, and adjoining properties including privacy and overlooking; traffic, noise, smell, light and other potential amenity impacts and so much more. **Developments will only be appealable to the Supreme Court based on a point of law or process.**
- **Removing merits-based planning appeals has the potential to increase corruption and reduce good planning outcomes.** The NSW Independent Commission Against Corruption recommended the expansion of merit-based planning appeals as a deterrent to corruption.
- **Increased ministerial power over the planning system increases the politicisation of planning and risk of corrupt decisions.** The Planning Minister will decide if a development application meets the planning panel criteria. The Minister will be able to force the initiation of planning scheme changes, but perversely, only when a local council has rejected such an application, threatening transparency and strategic planning.
- **There are flawed planning panel criteria.** Changing an approval process where one of the criteria is on the basis of 'perceived conflict of interest' is fraught. The Planning Minister has political bias and can use this subjective criteria to intervene on any development in favour of developers.
- **It will undermine local democracy and remove local decision making.** State appointed hand-picked planning panels are not democratically accountable, they remove local decision making and reduce transparency and robust decision making.
- **Mainland experience demonstrates planning panels favour developers and undermine democratic accountability.** Local planning panels, which are often dominated by members of the development sector, were created in NSW to stamp out corruption, but councillors from across the political spectrum say they favour developers and undermine democratic accountability.
- **There is poor justification – there is no problem to fix.** Only about 1% of council planning decisions go to appeal and Tasmania's planning system is already among the fastest, if not the fastest, in Australia when it comes to determining development applications.
- **It increases complexity in an already complex planning system.** Why would we further increase an already complex planning system which is already making decisions quicker than any other jurisdiction in Australia?

-
- **I implore you to ensure transparency, independence, accountability and public participation in decision-making within the planning system**, as they are critical for a healthy democracy. Keep decision making local with opportunities for appeal. Abandon the planning panels and instead take action to improve governance and the existing Council planning process by providing more resources to councils and enhancing community participation and planning outcomes.

Yours sincerely,

Holly Lutzow

From:

Sent:

Saturday, 25 November 2023 8:27 PM

To:

State Planning Office Your Say

Subject:

Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

- * The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no

simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Marcia Breen

Your email:

My additional comments::

From:
Sent: Saturday, 25 November 2023 8:12 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Subject: Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

- * The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no

simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Julian Tertini

Your email:

My additional comments::

From:

Sent:

Saturday, 25 November 2023 5:44 PM

To:

State Planning Office Your Say

Subject:

Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

- * The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no

simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Jacqueline West

Your email:

My additional comments::

From:
Sent: Saturday, 25 November 2023 5:08 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Subject: Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

- * The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no

simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Mandy Rothwell

Your email:

My additional comments::

From: BRADLEY HUDSON
Sent: Saturday, 25 November 2023 4:04 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: Protect our local democracy - say no to the Liberals new planning panels

I oppose the creation of planning panels and increasing ministerial power over the planning system, for the following reasons:

- **It will create an alternate planning approval pathway allowing property developers to bypass local councils and communities.** Handpicked state appointed planning panels will decide on development applications not your elected local council representatives. Local concerns will be ignored in favour of the developers who may not be from Tasmania. Also, if an assessment isn't going their way the developer can abandon the standard local council process at anytime and have a development assessed by a planning panel. This could intimidate councils into conceding to developers demands.
- **Makes it easier to approve large scale contentious developments** like the kunanyi/Mount Wellington cable car, high-rise in Hobart, Cambria Green and high-density subdivision like Skylands at Droughty Point.
- **Remove merit-based planning appeal rights** via the planning tribunal on issues like height, bulk, scale or appearance of buildings; impacts to streetscapes, and adjoining properties including privacy and overlooking; traffic, noise, smell, light and other potential amenity impacts and so much more.
Developments will only be appealable to the Supreme Court based on a point of law or process.
- **Removing merits-based planning appeals has the potential to increase corruption and reduce good planning outcomes.** The NSW Independent Commission Against Corruption [recommended](#) the expansion of merit-based planning appeals as a deterrent to corruption.
- **Increased ministerial power over the planning system increases the politicisation of planning and risk of corrupt decisions.** The Planning Minister will decide if a development application meets the planning panel criteria. The Minister will be able to force the initiation of planning scheme changes, but perversely, only when a local council has rejected such an application, threatening transparency and strategic planning.
- **Flawed planning panel criteria.** Changing an approval process where one of the criteria is on the basis of 'perceived conflict of interest' is fraught. The Planning Minister has political bias and can use this subjective criteria to intervene on any development in favour of developers.

- **Undermines local democracy and removes and local decision making.** State appointed hand-picked planning panels are not democratically accountable, they remove local decision making and reduce transparency and robust decision making.
- **Mainland experience demonstrates planning panels favour developers and undermine democratic accountability.** Local planning panels, which are often dominated by members of the development sector, were created in NSW to stamp out corruption, but councillors from across the political spectrum [say](#) they favour developers and undermine democratic accountability.
- **Poor justification – there is no problem to fix.** Only about 1% of council planning decisions go to appeal and Tasmania’s planning system is already among the fastest, if not the fastest, in Australia when it comes to determining development applications.
- **Increases complexity in an already complex planning system.** Why would we further increase an already complex planning system which is already making decisions quicker than any other jurisdiction in Australia?

Say yes to a healthy democracy

- **I call on you to ensure transparency, independence, accountability and public participation in decision-making within the planning system**, as they are critical for a healthy democracy. Keep decision making local with opportunities for appeal. Abandon the planning panels and instead take action to improve governance and the existing Council planning process by providing more resources to councils and enhancing community participation and planning outcomes.
- I also call on you to **prohibit property developers from making donations** to political parties, **enhance transparency and efficiency in the administration of the *Right to Information Act 2009***, and **create a strong anti-corruption watchdog**.

The [Position Paper on a proposed Development Assessment Panel \(DAP\) Framework](#) public comment has been invited between the 19 October and 30 November 2023.

The submissions received on the Position Paper will inform a draft Bill which will be released for public comment most likely in January 2024, for a minimum of five weeks, before being tabled in Parliament in early 2024.

The proposed Bill name is *Draft Land Use Planning and Approvals (Development Assessment Panel) Amendment Bill 2024*.

Regards.
Bradley

Bradley Hudson

From: Peter McIntosh
Sent: Saturday, 25 November 2023 3:54 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: DAP Framework Position Paper and Summary by Michael Ferguson 19 October 2023

Dear State Planning Officer

DAP Framework Position Paper – Comments

I have read the Position Paper and the summary statement by Minister Michael Ferguson sent to ROCC on 19 October 2023. I would be grateful if the points made below can be considered by staff in the State Planning Office.

Regards

Elise McIntosh

Taking the politics out of planning.

The Minister writes:

*The introduction of DAPs [Development Assessment Panels] is intended to help take the **politics out of planning** by providing an alternate approval pathway for more complex or contentious development applications.*

(a) I suggest that all activities associated with the governance of a country, state or area are political, and rightly so. The Minister seems to be mixing the concept of **party politics** with the more general political principle that **ordinary people and their representatives have a right to have a say in governance**.

(b) The Position Paper strongly suggests that in the case of large or contentious projects the above right should be ignored and instead the Minister, or a professional planner, or the DAP should be given decision-making powers. **This change to Land Use Planning**

and Approvals Act (LUPAA) would transfer powers from elected local council officers to a party-political agent (the Minister), or to a professional planner, or to a panel (the DAP) over whose composition the community has no control.

(c) The Minister describes these panels as “*independent DAPs*” but the term “independent” is meaningless in this context. If the Tasmanian Planning Commissioners are appointed by the Minister, and the DAPs are appointed by the Commission then the **DAPs are highly likely to favour policies of the government of the day.**

(d) Unwittingly perhaps, the Minister describes DAPs as providing an “*alternate approval pathway*” instead of writing “*alternate assessment pathway*”, indicating his likely bias for approval (rather than rejection) of complex or contentious projects.

(e) I note that **appeals** against decisions reached under the proposed process **will not be allowed**. The safeguard of an appeal process is essential if the public is to have confidence in the planning process. **It is especially important to retain an appeal process for controversial or contentious projects.**

(f) I also note that the proposed changes to LUPAA would allow the Minister to intervene at any time during the planning process. Regrettably I must conclude that this clause has been inserted **to allow the Minister to ensure that planning decisions favour specific developments (and the financial interests of developers proposing them).**

(g) In summary, I consider the proposal to transfer existing local council powers to the Minister, or a professional planner, or DAPs would be a **retrograde and undemocratic step** if enacted. It is also likely to be deeply unpopular with the Tasmanian electorate.

From: Louise Sales <>
Sent: Saturday, 25 November 2023 3:33 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: I oppose the rubber stamping of new developments by the Liberals

To whom it concerns,

I am deeply opposed to the Liberal Government's current proposal to create planning panels and increase ministerial power over the planning system. This is a blatant attempt by the government to circumvent the current planning process to fast track controversial projects for Liberal Party donors and allies.

The decision by Hobart City Council to reject the recent Mount Wellington Cable Car proposal was validated by the Planning Tribunal which upheld 18 of the grounds of rejection. This demonstrates that our current planning scheme is working well. It is protecting valuable assets such as the Organ Pipes from inappropriate development by well connected developers.

These proposed changes have been poorly justified - there is no problem to fix. Only about 1 percent of council planning decisions go to appeal and Tasmania's planning system is already among the fastest in Australia when it comes to determining development applications.

I oppose the creation of planning panels and increasing ministerial power over the planning system because it will:

- **Create an alternate planning approval pathway allowing property developers to bypass local councils and communities.** Handpicked state appointed planning panels will decide on development applications not our elected local council representatives. Local concerns will be ignored in favour of the developers who may not be from Tasmania. Also, if an assessment isn't going their way the developer can abandon the standard local council process at any point and have a development

assessed by a planning panel. This could be used to intimidate councils into conceding to developers' demands.

- **Make it easier to approve large scale contentious developments** like the kunanyi/Mount Wellington cable car, high-rise in Hobart, Cambria Green and high-density subdivision like Skylands at Droughty Point.
- **Remove merit-based planning appeal rights** via the planning tribunal on issues like height, bulk, scale or appearance of buildings; impacts to streetscapes, and adjoining properties including privacy and overlooking; traffic, noise, smell, light and other potential amenity impacts and so much more. **Developments will only be appealable to the Supreme Court based on a point of law or process.**
- **Increase potential corruption and reduce good planning outcomes.** The NSW Independent Commission Against Corruption [recommended](#) the expansion of merit-based planning appeals as a deterrent to corruption.
- **Increase the politicisation of planning and the risk of corrupt decisions.** The Planning Minister will decide if a development application meets the planning panel criteria. The Minister will be able to force the initiation of planning scheme changes, but perversely, only when a local council has rejected such an application, threatening transparency and strategic planning.
- **Allow the Minister to intervene on any development in favour of developers.** Changing an approval process where one of the criteria is on the basis of 'perceived conflict of interest' is fraught. The Planning Minister can use this subjective criteria to intervene on any development.
- **Undermine local democracy and remove local decision making.** State appointed hand-picked planning panels are not democratically accountable, they remove local decision making and reduce transparency and robust decision making.
- Mainland experience demonstrates planning panels favour developers and undermine democratic accountability. Local planning panels, which are often dominated by members of the development sector, were created in NSW to stamp out corruption, but councillors from across the political spectrum [say](#) they favour developers and undermine democratic accountability.

Increase complexity in an already complex planning system. Why would we further increase an already complex planning system which is already making decisions quicker than any other jurisdiction in Australia?

I call on you to ensure transparency, independence, accountability and public participation in decision-making within the planning system, as they are critical for a healthy democracy. Keep decision making local, with opportunities for appeal. Abandon the planning panels and instead take action to improve governance and the existing Council planning process by providing more resources to councils and enhancing community participation and planning outcomes.

I also call on you to prohibit property developers from making donations to political parties, enhance transparency and efficiency in the administration of the *Right to Information Act 2009*, and create a strong anti-corruption watchdog.

Yours sincerely,

Louise Sales

From:

Sent:

Saturday, 25 November 2023 3:31 PM

To:

State Planning Office Your Say

Subject:

Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Beverley Richardson

Your email:

My additional comments::

From:

Sent:

Saturday, 25 November 2023 3:26 PM

To:

State Planning Office Your Say

Subject:

Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Jill Wright

Your email:

My additional comments:: I do not agree with council planning being over-ruled by any other body.

From:

Sent:

Saturday, 25 November 2023 3:10 PM

To:

State Planning Office Your Say

Subject:

Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Christine Needham

Your email:

My additional comments:: Unfortunately it is extremely doubtful that such a panel would undertake any assessments in a fair manner. Panel members will be carefully chosen, pro development anti community input or local knowledge. Please do not change the existing system which although not perfect at least gives the community a say.

From:

Sent:

Saturday, 25 November 2023 2:39 PM

To:

State Planning Office Your Say

Cc:

Protect our local democracy

Subject:

I oppose the creation of planning panels and increasing ministerial power over the planning system, for the following reasons:

- **It will create an alternate planning approval pathway allowing property developers to bypass local councils and communities.** Handpicked state appointed planning panels will decide on development applications not your elected local council representatives. Local concerns will be ignored in favour of the developers who may not be from Tasmania. Also, if an assessment isn't going their way the developer can abandon the standard local council process at anytime and have a development assessed by a planning panel. This could intimidate councils into conceding to developers demands.
- **Makes it easier to approve large scale contentious developments** like the kunanyi/Mount Wellington cable car, high-rise in Hobart, Cambria Green and high-density subdivision like Skylands at Droughty Point.
- **Remove merit-based planning appeal rights** via the planning tribunal on issues like height, bulk, scale or appearance of buildings; impacts to streetscapes, and adjoining properties including privacy and overlooking; traffic, noise, smell, light and other potential amenity impacts and so much more. **Developments will only be appealable to the Supreme Court based on a point of law or process.**
- **Removing merits-based planning appeals has the potential to increase corruption and reduce good planning outcomes.** The NSW Independent Commission Against Corruption [recommended](#) the expansion of merit-based planning appeals as a deterrent to corruption.
- **Increased ministerial power over the planning system increases the politicisation of planning and risk of corrupt decisions.** The Planning Minister will decide if a development application meets the planning panel criteria. The Minister will be able to force the initiation of planning scheme changes, but perversely, only when a local council has rejected such an application, threatening transparency and strategic planning.
- **Flawed planning panel criteria.** Changing an approval process where one of the criteria is on the basis of 'perceived conflict of interest' is fraught. The Planning Minister has political bias and can use this subjective criteria to intervene on any development in favour of developers.
- **Undermines local democracy and removes local decision making.** State appointed hand-picked planning panels are not democratically accountable, they remove local decision making and reduce transparency and robust decision making.
- **Mainland experience demonstrates planning panels favour developers and undermine democratic accountability.** Local planning panels, which are often dominated by members of the development sector, were created in NSW to stamp out corruption, but councillors from across the political spectrum [say they favour developers and undermine democratic accountability](#).
- **Poor justification – there is no problem to fix.** Only about 1% of council planning decisions go to appeal and Tasmania's planning system is already among the fastest, if not the fastest, in Australia when it comes to determining development applications.
- **Increases complexity in an already complex planning system.** Why would we further increase an already complex planning system which is already making decisions quicker than any other jurisdiction in Australia?

Say yes to a healthy democracy

- **I call on you to ensure transparency, independence, accountability and public participation in decision-making within the planning system**, as they are critical for a healthy democracy. Keep decision making local with opportunities for appeal. Abandon the planning panels and instead take action to improve governance and the existing Council planning process by providing more resources to councils and enhancing community participation and planning outcomes.
- I also call on you to **prohibit property developers from making donations to political parties, enhance transparency and efficiency in the administration of the *Right to Information Act 2009*, and create a strong anti-corruption watchdog.**

Yours sincerely,
Janice Romaszko

From:
Sent: Saturday, 25 November 2023 2:37 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Subject: Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Judy Hebblethwaite

Your email:

My additional comments::

From: Kristine Ancher <
Sent: > Saturday, 25 November 2023 2:22 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Subject: Development Assessment Panels Proposal

Dear Sir/Madam,

I oppose the creation of planning panels and increasing ministerial power over the planning system, for the following reasons:

- **It will create an alternate planning approval pathway allowing property developers to bypass local councils and communities.** Handpicked state appointed planning panels will decide on development applications not your elected local council representatives. Local concerns will be ignored in favour of the developers who may not be from Tasmania. Also, if an assessment isn't going their way the developer can abandon the standard local council process at anytime and have a development assessed by a planning panel. This could intimidate councils into conceding to developers demands.
- **Makes it easier to approve large scale contentious developments** like the kunanyi/Mount Wellington cable car, high-rise in Hobart, Cambria Green and high-density subdivision like Skylands at Droughty Point.
- **Remove merit-based planning appeal rights** via the planning tribunal on issues like height, bulk, scale or appearance of buildings; impacts to streetscapes, and adjoining properties including privacy and overlooking; traffic, noise, smell, light and other potential amenity impacts and so much more. **Developments will only be appealable to the Supreme Court based on a point of law or process.**
- **Removing merits-based planning appeals has the potential to increase corruption and reduce good planning outcomes.** The NSW Independent Commission Against Corruption [recommended](#) the expansion of merit-based planning appeals as a deterrent to corruption.
- **Increased ministerial power over the planning system increases the politicisation of planning and risk of corrupt decisions.** The Planning Minister will decide if a development application meets the planning panel criteria. The Minister will be able to force the initiation of planning scheme changes, but perversely, only when a local council has rejected such an application, threatening transparency and strategic planning.
- **Flawed planning panel criteria.** Changing an approval process where one of the criteria is on the basis of 'perceived conflict of interest' is fraught. The Planning Minister has political bias and can use this subjective criteria to intervene on any development in favour of developers.
- **Undermines local democracy and removes local decision making.** State appointed hand-picked planning panels are not democratically accountable, they remove local decision making and reduce transparency and robust decision making.
- **Mainland experience demonstrates planning panels favour developers and undermine democratic accountability.** Local planning panels, which are often dominated by members of the development sector, were created in NSW to stamp out corruption, but councillors from across the political spectrum [say](#) they favour developers and undermine democratic accountability.
- **Poor justification — there is no problem to fix.** Only about 1% of council planning decisions go to appeal and Tasmania's planning system is already among the fastest, if not the fastest, in Australia when it comes to determining development applications.
- **Increases complexity in an already complex planning system.** Why would we further increase an already complex planning system which is already making decisions quicker than any other jurisdiction in Australia?

I desire a healthy democracy

- **I call on you to ensure transparency, independence, accountability and public participation in decision-making within the planning system**, as they are critical for a healthy democracy. Keep decision making local with opportunities for appeal. Abandon the planning panels and instead take action to improve governance and the existing Council planning process by providing more resources to councils and enhancing community participation and planning outcomes.
- I also call on you to **prohibit property developers from making donations to political parties, enhance transparency and efficiency in the administration of the *Right to Information Act 2009*, and create a strong anti-corruption watchdog.**

I once lived in Hobart on a property that was valuable to neighbours and the local Eco system and environment and once sold it was not protected by Hobart City Council or State Planning Guidelines or rules and was able to be totally annihilated by greedy developers. It has caused grief to my previous neighbours and the greater neighbourhood. Where once four 100 year old original pear trees stood, a walnut tree, newer orchard, gum trees and an old plum tree stood on a parcel of land very little remains. Concrete has taken over. The micro climate and environment destroyed for insects, native birds and other animals that used the rivulet to access a safe foraging trail has all gone.

The property also had a social history being the place where Tim Bowden's father John Bowden grew up and was written about in the book by Tim called "The Way My Father Tells It" — the story of an Australian life. John and Tim visited our property *Hazeldene* and both were delighted to see a family again living and enjoying all that the property offered. Our family thrived there as we planted more trees, shared the fruits of the pear trees with our community and respected this amazing property in North Hobart.

Unfortunately this property was not protected by planning or Council, as an important link in Hobart's social history or as a remnant of the past or as an oasis for local birds and animals moving through the neighbourhood. Council did not respect it, planning provided no protection and developer greed imposed great loss of amenity to neighbours as well as to the environment supporting local birds and animals.



Hazeldene is located between Newdegate St and Lower Jordan Hill Rd North Hobart, the rear property boundaries follow the line of the rivulet. This was a linked green space that evolved naturally and supported a diversity of life.



The house remains subdivided from the land package but the environment has been totally changed with little regard for neighbours, parking, traffic, the natural world and preservation of history for Hobart.

The view from Lochner St says it all, I call it the North Hobart Fish Factory.....The loss of the trees both heritage and recent is a big loss to the community and air quality. None of this is considered in current planning and it is only getting worse as quantity over quality reigns supreme. There is a need to develop more housing in Hobart but not at such a loss to the community and neighbourhood.



This piecemeal erosion in Hobart of the existing neighbourhood form is changing Hobart by stealth, and those who profit take the money and run and do not live here. They just leave the mess for others to adjust to and move forward with enforcing a great sense of loss.

On the outskirts of Hobart and in places not in plain sight this erosion of the natural landscape continues. More needs to be done to evolve a building form that provides quality for all and must include some protections of local habitat.



The image above shows development on the approach to New Norfolk, minimum lot sizes and the concreting of much of the site limits the opportunity for residents to live in a balanced quality environment. The hard reflective surfaces reinforce increased heat, limited water penetration into the soil and the opportunity for landscaping, street trees and biodiversity. It creates a negative monoculture which as temperatures rise provides little relief and increases water and energy usage.

The State Government instead of setting up a new group of decision makers biased towards a small group in the community need to engage with community, educate and evolve quality planning principles that reinforce sustainable living, quality of life and reinforce a balanced Eco system. Our brightest and best planners and consultants need to work much harder to establish the way forward that includes us all, both human and non human, quality design, quality environments and open spaces and improved access for all.

Removal of merit-based planning appeals should not be supported for these reasons.

kunanyi/Mt Wellington cable car: the proposed 35-metre-high pylon on top of the Organ Pipes, kunanyi/Mt Wellington. The community will be unable to appeal developments like the cable car and virtually any development would meet the criteria to be taken out of the normal council assessment process with no opportunity of appeal.

Increased Ministerial intervention

The Planning Minister would have new powers to instruct councils to commence planning scheme changes, but perversely, only when a local council has rejected such an application.

Cambria Green, the Gorge Hotel in Launceston and large-scale subdivisions like the Skylands Droughty Point proposal are all examples of the type of planning scheme changes that could be forced to be assessed by the Planning Minister to help facilitate development.

Cambria Green mega land-rezone: an example of a proposed planning scheme change to facilitate Tasmania's largest ever (+3000 ha) tourism development.

Gorge Hotel, Launceston: was enabled by a planning scheme change.

Large-scale subdivisions: The Planning Minister would have new powers to instruct councils to commence planning scheme changes to facilitate for example large scale high density subdivisions, but perversely, only when a local council has rejected such an application.

Planning affects us all but very few people have an understanding of the way it works and their rights within an existing complex system. The government needs to educate inform simplify and ensure quality over quantity and poor design. Being open and transparent is vital to good planning and support Councils in public consultation and development of community visions for the future that assist in solving many of our current issues.

Yours sincerely,

Kristine Ancher

From: Mem Rynne <>
Sent: Saturday, 25 November 2023 2:15 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: Protect our local democracy - say no to the Liberals new planning panels

I oppose the creation of planning panels and increasing ministerial power over the planning system, for the following reasons:

- **It will create an alternate planning approval pathway allowing property developers to bypass local councils and communities.** Handpicked state appointed planning panels will decide on development applications not your elected local council representatives. Local concerns will be ignored in favour of the developers who may not be from Tasmania. Also, if an assessment isn't going their way the developer can abandon the standard local council process at anytime and have a development assessed by a planning panel. This could intimidate councils into conceding to developers demands.
- **Makes it easier to approve large scale contentious developments** like the kunanyi/Mount Wellington cable car, high-rise in Hobart, Cambria Green and high-density subdivision like Skylands at Droughty Point.
- **Remove merit-based planning appeal rights** via the planning tribunal on issues like height, bulk, scale or appearance of buildings; impacts to streetscapes, and adjoining properties including privacy and overlooking; traffic, noise, smell, light and other potential amenity impacts and so much more. **Developments will only be appealable to the Supreme Court based on a point of law or process.**
- **Removing merits-based planning appeals has the potential to increase corruption and reduce good planning outcomes.** The NSW Independent

Commission Against Corruption **recommended** the expansion of merit-based planning appeals as a deterrent to corruption.

- **Increased ministerial power over the planning system increases the politicisation of planning and risk of corrupt decisions.** The Planning Minister will decide if a development application meets the planning panel criteria. The Minister will be able to force the initiation of planning scheme changes, but perversely, only when a local council has rejected such an application, threatening transparency and strategic planning.
- **Flawed planning panel criteria.** Changing an approval process where one of the criteria is on the basis of ‘perceived conflict of interest’ is fraught. The Planning Minister has political bias and can use this subjective criteria to intervene on any development in favour of developers.
- **Undermines local democracy and removes local decision making.** State appointed hand-picked planning panels are not democratically accountable, they remove local decision making and reduce transparency and robust decision making.
- **Mainland experience demonstrates planning panels favour developers and undermine democratic accountability.** Local planning panels, which are often dominated by members of the development sector, were created in NSW to stamp out corruption, but councillors from across the political spectrum **say** they favour developers and undermine democratic accountability.
- **Poor justification – there is no problem to fix.** Only about 1% of council planning decisions go to appeal and Tasmania’s planning system is already among the fastest, if not the fastest, in Australia when it comes to determining development applications.
- **Increases complexity in an already complex planning system.** Why would we further increase an already complex planning system which is already making decisions quicker than any other jurisdiction in Australia?

Say yes to a healthy democracy

- **I call on you to ensure transparency, independence, accountability and public participation in decision-making within the planning system,** as they are critical for a healthy democracy. Keep decision making local with opportunities for appeal. Abandon the planning panels and instead take action to improve governance and the existing Council planning process by providing more resources to councils and enhancing community participation and planning outcomes.
- I also call on you to **prohibit property developers from making donations to political parties, enhance transparency and efficiency in the administration of the *Right to Information Act 2009*, and create a strong anti-corruption watchdog.**

The [Position Paper on a proposed Development Assessment Panel \(DAP\) Framework](#) public comment has been invited between the 19 October and 30 November 2023.

The submissions received on the Position Paper will inform a draft Bill which will be released for public comment most likely in January 2024, for a minimum of five weeks, before being tabled in Parliament in early 2024.

The proposed Bill name is *Draft Land Use Planning and Approvals (Development Assessment Panel) Amendment Bill 2024*.

Regards,

Mem Rynne

From:

Sent:

Saturday, 25 November 2023 2:11 PM

To:

State Planning Office Your Say

Subject:

Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Fiona Ringrose

Your email:

My additional comments::

From: Jo <>
Sent: Saturday, 25 November 2023 2:01 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc: NO to the Liberals new planning panels - taking the power away from the people
Subject:

I oppose the creation of planning panels and increasing ministerial power over the planning system, for the following reasons:

- **It will create an alternate planning approval pathway allowing property developers to bypass local councils and communities.** Handpicked state appointed planning panels will decide on development applications not your elected local council representatives. Local concerns will be ignored in favour of the developers who may not be from Tasmania. Also, if an assessment isn't going their way the developer can abandon the standard local council process at anytime and have a development assessed by a planning panel. This could intimidate councils into conceding to developers demands.

- **Makes it easier to approve large scale contentious developments** like the kunanyi/Mount Wellington cable car, high-rise in Hobart, Cambria Green and high-density subdivision like Skylands at Droughty Point.
 - **Remove merit-based planning appeal rights** via the planning tribunal on issues like height, bulk, scale or appearance of buildings; impacts to streetscapes, and adjoining properties including privacy and overlooking; traffic, noise, smell, light and other potential amenity impacts and so much more. **Developments will only be appealable to the Supreme Court based on a point of law or process.**
 - **Removing merits-based planning appeals has the potential to increase corruption and reduce good planning outcomes.**The NSW Independent Commission Against Corruption [recommended](#) the expansion of merit-based planning appeals as a deterrent to corruption.
-

-
- **Increased ministerial power over the planning system increases the politicisation of planning and risk of corrupt decisions.** The Planning Minister will decide if a development application meets the planning panel criteria. The Minister will be able to force the initiation of planning scheme changes, but perversely, only when a local council has rejected such an application, threatening transparency and strategic planning.
 - **Flawed planning panel criteria.** Changing an approval process where one of the criteria is on the basis of 'perceived conflict of interest' is fraught. The Planning Minister has political bias and can use this subjective criteria to intervene on any development in favour of developers.
 - **Undermines local democracy and removes local decision making.** State appointed hand-picked planning panels are not democratically accountable, they remove local decision making and reduce transparency and robust decision making.
 - **Mainland experience demonstrates planning panels favour developers and undermine democratic accountability.** Local planning panels, which are often dominated by members of the development sector, were created in NSW to stamp out corruption, but councillors from across the political spectrum [say they favour developers and undermine democratic accountability.](#)
 - **Poor justification – there is no problem to fix.** Only about 1% of council planning decisions go to appeal and Tasmania's planning system is already among the fastest, if not the fastest, in Australia when it comes to determining development applications.
-

-
- **Increases complexity in an already complex planning system.** Why would we further increase an already complex planning system which is already making decisions quicker than any other jurisdiction in Australia?

Say yes to a healthy democracy

- **I call on you to ensure transparency, independence, accountability and public participation in decision-making within the planning system,** as they are critical for a healthy democracy. Keep decision making local with opportunities for appeal. Abandon the planning panels and instead take action to improve governance and the existing Council planning process by providing more resources to councils and enhancing community participation and planning outcomes.
- I also call on you to **prohibit property developers from making donations to political parties, enhance transparency and efficiency in the administration of the *Right to Information Act 2009*, and create a strong anti-corruption watchdog.**

As an island Lutruwita/Tasmania is incredibly fortunate to still have the opportunity to take an enlightened and different path. To create an inclusive society with respect for the individual. One based on genuine empathy for those who do not have a voice, or those whose voice is over-ridden by big business or powerful self-interest.

Please put political self-interest aside and start to lead from the front with compassion and create a vision for a better, kinder, more equitable society of respect for our environment and its sentient beings.

Yours sincerely Joanne Naylor

From:

Sent:

Saturday, 25 November 2023 1:59 PM

To:

State Planning Office Your Say

Subject:

Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Bronwyn Clarke

Your email:

My additional comments::

From:

Sent:

Saturday, 25 November 2023 1:38 PM

To:

State Planning Office Your Say

Subject:

Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Lindsay Brinsdon

Your email:

My additional comments::

From:

Sent:

Saturday, 25 November 2023 2:39 PM

To:

State Planning Office Your Say

Cc:

Protect our local democracy

Subject:

I oppose the creation of planning panels and increasing ministerial power over the planning system, for the following reasons:

- **It will create an alternate planning approval pathway allowing property developers to bypass local councils and communities.** Handpicked state appointed planning panels will decide on development applications not your elected local council representatives. Local concerns will be ignored in favour of the developers who may not be from Tasmania. Also, if an assessment isn't going their way the developer can abandon the standard local council process at anytime and have a development assessed by a planning panel. This could intimidate councils into conceding to developers demands.
- **Makes it easier to approve large scale contentious developments** like the kunanyi/Mount Wellington cable car, high-rise in Hobart, Cambria Green and high-density subdivision like Skylands at Droughty Point.
- **Remove merit-based planning appeal rights** via the planning tribunal on issues like height, bulk, scale or appearance of buildings; impacts to streetscapes, and adjoining properties including privacy and overlooking; traffic, noise, smell, light and other potential amenity impacts and so much more. **Developments will only be appealable to the Supreme Court based on a point of law or process.**
- **Removing merits-based planning appeals has the potential to increase corruption and reduce good planning outcomes.** The NSW Independent Commission Against Corruption [recommended](#) the expansion of merit-based planning appeals as a deterrent to corruption.
- **Increased ministerial power over the planning system increases the politicisation of planning and risk of corrupt decisions.** The Planning Minister will decide if a development application meets the planning panel criteria. The Minister will be able to force the initiation of planning scheme changes, but perversely, only when a local council has rejected such an application, threatening transparency and strategic planning.
- **Flawed planning panel criteria.** Changing an approval process where one of the criteria is on the basis of 'perceived conflict of interest' is fraught. The Planning Minister has political bias and can use this subjective criteria to intervene on any development in favour of developers.
- **Undermines local democracy and removes local decision making.** State appointed hand-picked planning panels are not democratically accountable, they remove local decision making and reduce transparency and robust decision making.
- **Mainland experience demonstrates planning panels favour developers and undermine democratic accountability.** Local planning panels, which are often dominated by members of the development sector, were created in NSW to stamp out corruption, but councillors from across the political spectrum [say they favour developers and undermine democratic accountability](#).
- **Poor justification – there is no problem to fix.** Only about 1% of council planning decisions go to appeal and Tasmania's planning system is already among the fastest, if not the fastest, in Australia when it comes to determining development applications.
- **Increases complexity in an already complex planning system.** Why would we further increase an already complex planning system which is already making decisions quicker than any other jurisdiction in Australia?

Say yes to a healthy democracy

- **I call on you to ensure transparency, independence, accountability and public participation in decision-making within the planning system**, as they are critical for a healthy democracy. Keep decision making local with opportunities for appeal. Abandon the planning panels and instead take action to improve governance and the existing Council planning process by providing more resources to councils and enhancing community participation and planning outcomes.
- I also call on you to **prohibit property developers from making donations to political parties, enhance transparency and efficiency in the administration of the *Right to Information Act 2009*, and create a strong anti-corruption watchdog.**

Yours sincerely,
Janice Romaszko

From: Haydn Perndt <>
Sent: Saturday, 25 November 2023 1:20 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: Liberal planning panels

Dear Esteemed Elected Politicians,

The proposed changes do not reflect the paramount need for urban planning permissions to be:

Independent
Open for public participation
Transparent

Whilst the proposed changes might aim to speed up developments and allow the government of the day to influence decisions based on economic (projects of "State" importance) and other considerations, these changes are open to corruption and rorting in the current absence of any transparent election donation declarations.

By whom and how might the relevant Minister be influenced?

This has been tried in other States. And it failed to improve the process.

Moreover, governments are ephemeral servants of "policy and governance", whilst the public affected by these decisions are rather more permanent.

Make no mistake, politicians supporting this move will see electors respond with their votes in 2025.

The current government has a one vote mandate.

Many in Tasmania and outside the State still remember Lake Peddar decision.....the craven support for Gunns and

the proposed Pulp Mill by Liberal politicians (and corrupt donations to Lennon for his house renovations). The current AFL stadium fiasco has been a display of political hubris and electoral hari kiri.

Please think carefully about your political legacy.

The proposed Liberal Planning Panels is simply poor policy.

Kind regards,

Dr Haydn Perndt AM

From:
Sent: Saturday, 25 November 2023 1:07 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Subject: Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Rohan Denman

Your email:

My additional comments::

From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Alison Lennox

Your email:

My additional comments::

From:

Sent:

Saturday, 25 November 2023 12:26 PM

To:

State Planning Office Your Say

Subject:

Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: John Carter

Your email:

My additional comments::

From:

Sent:

Saturday, 25 November 2023 12:19 PM

To:

State Planning Office Your Say

Subject:

Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Judith Jones

Your email:

My additional comments::

From:

Sent:

Saturday, 25 November 2023 12:16 PM

To:

State Planning Office Your Say

Subject:

Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Rosalie and Allen Rust

Your email:

My additional comments:: There is already TOO much authority given to the government on local affairs. How can an individual minister have more knowledge of local wishes than the local people

From:

Sent:

Saturday, 25 November 2023 12:15 PM

To:

State Planning Office Your Say

Subject:

Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: John Levett

Your email:

My additional comments::

From:
Sent: Saturday, 25 November 2023 11:36 AM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Subject: Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Anna Berger

Your email:

My additional comments::

I am opposed to these new Development assessment panels as they will erode the democratic rights of the public to have a say in their own community about the environment they live in, through undermining the democratically elected Council powers and proper processes. They will be too heavily weighted in favour of developers.

From:
Sent: Saturday, 25 November 2023 11:29 AM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Subject: Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Debra Dragonheart

Your email:

My additional comments::

From:
Sent: Saturday, 25 November 2023 10:40 AM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Subject: Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: R J Scott

Your email:

My additional comments::

From:

Sent:

Saturday, 25 November 2023 10:35 AM

To:

State Planning Office Your Say

Subject:

Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Heather Frampton

Your email:

My additional comments::

From:

Sent:

Saturday, 25 November 2023 9:48 AM

To:

State Planning Office Your Say

Subject:

Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Colin and Laurel Trevena

Your email:

My additional comments::

From:

Sent:

Saturday, 25 November 2023 9:32 AM

To:

State Planning Office Your Say

Subject:

Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Sally hildred

Your email:

My additional comments::

From:
Sent: Saturday, 25 November 2023 9:18 AM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Subject: Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Paul Turvey

Your email:

My additional comments::

From:

Sent:

Saturday, 25 November 2023 8:57 AM

To:

State Planning Office Your Say

Subject:

Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Michael Fortescue

Your email:

My additional comments::

From:

Sent:

Saturday, 25 November 2023 8:22 AM

To:

State Planning Office Your Say

Subject:

Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Patricia Knight

Your email:

My additional comments::

From:

Sent:

Saturday, 25 November 2023 8:17 AM

To:

State Planning Office Your Say

Subject:

Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Nick Attfield

Your email:

My additional comments:: Yet another erosion of democratic government. A blatant attempt at power centralization so the minister can pander to his vested interests , more corruption .

From:
Sent: Saturday, 25 November 2023 8:00 AM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Subject: Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Gregory Eade

Your email:

My additional comments::

From:

Sent:

Saturday, 25 November 2023 7:45 AM

To:

State Planning Office Your Say

Subject:

Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Sandy Hannon

Your email:

My additional comments::

From:

Sent:

Saturday, 25 November 2023 7:34 AM

To:

State Planning Office Your Say

Subject:

Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Sue Manning

Your email:

My additional comments::

I find it depressing that the constant attempts to overrule democracy in Tasmania by taking away the protective services of Councils for the State. So far our council has prevailed against those just interested in money making. I came to Hobart because of it's magnificent difference. Long may those who try to protect it prevail!

From:

Sent:

Saturday, 25 November 2023 7:26 AM

To:

State Planning Office Your Say

Subject:

Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Marta Brysha

Your email:

My additional comments::

From:
Sent: Saturday, 25 November 2023 7:00 AM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Subject: Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: David Loveridge

Your email:

My additional comments::

From:

Sent:

Saturday, 25 November 2023 6:14 AM

To:

State Planning Office Your Say

Subject:

Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Edward Sykes

Your email:

My additional comments::

From:

Sent:

Saturday, 25 November 2023 5:33 AM

To:

State Planning Office Your Say

Subject:

Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Penny Morton

Your email:

My additional comments::

From:

Sent:

Saturday, 25 November 2023 5:30 AM

To:

State Planning Office Your Say

Subject:

Submission against Development Assessment Panels

I oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels because:

- * they will add further complication to the existing system
- * they reduce the democratic rights of the community.

Issue 1 Types of Development applications

- * Critical infrastructure does not need a new panel because Major Projects Legislation or Projects of State Significance already provide an avenue for approval.
- * Perceived bias exists at all levels of the planning system. DAPs will only increase community perceptions of bias favouring developers in the planning scheme.
- * State Governments through the planning scheme limit or encourage certain types of development and the public perception is that a DAP is only to provide another mechanism to remove the local authority.
- * Councils can share skills and resources in the planning area to ensure access to deal with complex issues.

Issue 2 An enhanced role for the Minister

- * The Minister should not be given an enhanced role. Sufficient authority exists in current legislation.

Issue 3 Retaining local input

- * Council should be the primary contact for applicants and its role should not be diminished.
- * Consultation on any proposal should occur at the beginning of the process. The current system of Council being the Planning Authority provides for this.
- * This proposal reduces democratic rights for no perceived public good.

Issue 4 Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information

- * Requests for further information will occur where the developer does not submit the relevant supporting documents with their application. The cable car proposals for Mt Wellington was a perfect example of failure to provide satisfaction of the requirements of the planning scheme in the original proposal. This led to continual requests and responses.
- * Anecdotal evidence is never reliable data. Mention of it in this document is an example of bias being allowed to intrude on the planning scheme. Collect reliable evidence-based data before you implement DAPs and get community approval

Issue 5 Appeal rights and assessment time frames.

- * Special pathways are not faster, cheaper, simpler or FAIRER.
- * Applications that require approval under discretionary provisions rather than acceptable solutions and performance criteria will always take longer to assess
- * Public right of consultation and comment must be guaranteed.
- * All structures are permanent features on the landscape and within the community so should be assessed under existing systems with local input at all stages.

Issue 6 Roles of the planning authority after DAP determination

* The expectation that the DAP will 'engage extensively with the planning authority' provides no simplification to the process or reduction of Council work loads but simply adds more red tape and cost.

It is not the planning system which is stopping development currently it is a lack of qualified workers and shortage of materials. Within Hobart there are a number of developments approved and awaiting construction.

Your name: Joy Phillips

Your email:

My additional comments::