

Development Assessment Panel Framework Position Paper

Submissions 101 - 150

- 101 Mary Dwyer
- 102 Wendy Ann Jubb Stoney
- 103 Veronica Richter
- 104 Nidhi Verma
- 105 Madeleine Habib
- 106 Jenny Seed
- 107 Ane Kent
- 108 Helen Hussey
- 109 Ian Bayly
- 110 Annie Philips
- 111 Caitlin Fargher
- 112 Anne Parrott
- 113 Andrea Young
- 114 Shelter Tas
- 115 Louisa d'Arville
- 116 TasGas
- 117 Sam Murray
- 118 Fiona Rice
- 119 Janet Leyton-Grant
- 120 Jane Harvey
- 121 Rob Bohmer
- 122 Carol Hurst
- 123 Kat Peric
- 124 Jodi Alexander
- 125 Carmen Whiteley
- 126 Kelsey Bews
- 127 Hollie Adamson
- 128 Helen Ampt
- 129 Caroline Riseley
- 130 Alison Hardinge
- 131 Tim Carroll
- 132 Stephen Bews
- 133 Colin Sutton
- 134 Katherine Barnes
- 135 Sarah Dulak
- 136 Brighton Council
- 137 Mieka Tabart
- 138 Stuart Mcadam
- 139 Emma Battaglione

- 140 Zanna T. Laws BSc
- 141 Andrew Lindner
- 142 Michael Mountain
- 143 Robyn Everist
- 144 Steven Bradford
- 145 Tayla Sernaggia Of West Hobart
- 146 Giovanna Padas
- 147 John Padas
- 148 Trevor Burdon
- 149 Fatme Tala-Montenegro
- 150 Chloé Bibari

From: Mary C Dwyer
Sent: Monday, 20 November 2023 12:33 AM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc: Protect Democracy - this emails is a strong no to the proposed Liberals new planning panels
Subject:

Dear Sir/Madam

I am appalled at this legislation which I see as a direct attack on our democratic process. I oppose the creation of planning panels and increasing ministerial power over the planning system, especially when I look at the calibre of the integrity of our politicians. Other reasons include:

- **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 **stop 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.**

Warm Regards

Mary Dwyer

From: Wendy Ann Jubb Stoney
Sent: Tuesday, 21 November 2023 3:32 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Subject: I agree with a centralised planning department

I agree with the State Government's proposal to centralise planning and take it away from local councils and the local staff in the expectation that a centralised system would permit consistency.

On Flinders Island, currently there have been so few developments despite a housing shortage, that the Housing Institute of Tasmania claimed that up until last May, there were only 4 applications that had succeeded at Flinders Island in the previous nine months.

One reason for the lack of building is Flinders Island's Coastal SAP which is a great injustice because one cannot even collect sufficient water on which to live, nor dig a dam or well. This aspect of the planning scheme was written by people who don't know that rural and remote areas must provide their own water among other things. Having a 300m² cap on roof area and a 500mm prohibition on depth shows how restrictive and unrealistic it is.

I know one landowner who has spent over \$30,000.00 on plans, BAL ratings and septic plans and because of the Coastal SAP, she has walked away from trying to build a home of her own on 65 acres because her step father already has in excess of the 300m² allowed on that block.

I have 2.1 ha of land and the Coastal SAP has taken 82.5% of my land so there is no other place to build except within the area of the coastal SAP.

There is no other council in Tasmania that has inflicted such an overlay on its land owners.

This government should take planning away from the local Councils and should also amalgamate where they can and put an administrator in on Flinders Island and King Island while they have the power to do so.

It is ludicrous that there are 7 Councillors on Flinders Island for such a small population - and most of those Councillors do not have enough understanding regarding decisions they make let alone know how to get the General Manager to do as he is asked.

Sincerely from

Wendy Ann Jubb Stoney

From: Veronica Richter
Sent: Tuesday, 21 November 2023 5:02 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc: Protect our local democracy - say no to the Liberals new planning panels
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,

Veronica Richter

From: Nidhi Verma <
Sent: Tuesday, 21 November 2023 5:54 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Subject: Response to Position Paper

Dear Tasmanian Government,

I would like to make a submission regarding the Development Assessment Panel position paper released on 19th October 2023.

I want the Tasmanian Government to keep planning local and democratic, don't take planning assessments away from local government and don't give the Minister the power to change the local planning scheme.

I reiterate that I want the relevant council/s to be able to continue to assess proposals put forward by developers rather than a development assessment panel.

Thank you,
Nidhi Verma

From: madeleine habib <>
Sent: Tuesday, 21 November 2023 8:48 AM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc: Protect our local democracy - say no to the Liberals new planning panels
Subject:

Dear DPAC,

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,
Madeleine Habib

From: Jenny <>
Sent: Tuesday, 21 November 2023 4:44 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Subject: Mount Wellington absolutely needs protecting from any infrastructural developments

To Whom it Concerns,

If according, to the stance being adopted within the 'DAP Proposal', and reiterated in 'the letter' to ROCC dated 19 October 2023, that "Councils are 'Planning Authorities with defined responsibilities under the Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993", then it should not be up to the Tasmanian State Government body to usurp and misappropriate these responsibilities.

They, Local Councils/Governments and their Planning capabilities, have stood the test of time and offer the Democratic way of dealing with planning issues.

The DAP Framework Proposal is obviously going to bypass any due process from here on in.

So does that mean the only form of Democracy left to Tasmanians is via TASCAT every time the Premier and the Minister for Planning decide to indulge in what ever project suits them.....?????????

Or is the Tasmanian Premier and his Departments, going to remove, blatantly, all and any planning appeal rights.....?????????

The messages to you, are these:

- Tasmanian State Government represents the population, not just a select enclave of developers and decision-makers.
- Do not ignore the citizens, and the communities current rights, and their needs for critical infrastructure.
- Local Councils **must** retain their current Planning Authority, thus ensuring local representations and decision-making that stays connected and accountable to the places they represent.
- Stop designing and pursuing 'want to have projects' in order to get grants in order to spend monies that do not exist [or if the funds actually exist they should be being spent of critical infrastructure].
- Do not** give any Minister, nor Premier, the power to change the Local Planning Scheme.

Yours sincerely
Jenny Seed

From: Jane Kent <>
Sent: Tuesday, 21 November 2023 7:02 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: No to the Liberals new planning panels

Good Afternoon

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 faithfully

Jane Kent

From: Helen Hussey
Sent: Tuesday, 21 November 2023 7:12 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc: Say No to Liberal planning panels.
Subject:

Dear Elected Representatives of the Tasmanian People,

My name is Helen Hussey. I am a retired Secondary School Teacher and also a Human Being.

I am very concerned and worried about 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 monstrous stadium, which would overshadow Constitution Dock, is not in the interest of Tasmanian People.
 - We have the Blundstone arena in the South and York Park in the North, both venues hold AFL matches already. We don't want it, can't afford it, and it is a ridiculous condition for getting a Tasmanian Football Team.
- Yours sincerely,
Helen Hussey.

From: Ian Bayly <>
Sent: Tuesday, 21 November 2023 3:23 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc: Protect our local democracy - say no to the Liberals new planning panels

Subject:

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,

Dr Ian A. E. Bayly,

From: Annie Philips <>
Sent: Tuesday, 21 November 2023 2:32 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: Please reject the Liberals new planning panels

I strongly oppose the creation of planning panels and increasing ministerial power over the planning system and ask that MPs reject this proposal. The proposed changes are deeply flawed for the following reasons:

- **Property developers will be able to bypass local councils and communities.** Any community concerns in relation to a proposed development are much more likely to be ignored.
- **Developers are very likely to have very contentious developments approved by handpicked state appointed panels.** This will result in ongoing conflict between government and communities who feel disempowered and disrespected.
- **Merit-based planning appeal rights will be removed unless an appeal is made to the Supreme Court.** Again this is not fair due process, favouring developers over community. Without a merits based appeal system corruption is much more likely.
- **The Planning Minister will decide if a development application meets the planning panel criteria.** Giving ministers this power is a dreadful outcome and counter to a fair democratic society. The process would be highly politicised and inevitably favour developers.

- **The current system for assessing development proposals is not broken.** There is no problem to fix. There is more opportunity for conflicts of interest with the proposed planning panels than with local councils undertaking assessments.

Please don't allow the current local democratic assessment system to be destroyed and replaced by this undemocratic proposed system of planning panels.

I have great concerns that donations from developers to political parties already occurs in Tasmania, and that these proposed changes have resulted from this kind of insidious influence.

I ask that you reject this proposal in favour of keeping Tasmania truly democratic, a place where big business and developers do not get favoured continuously over the community.

Yours Sincerely
Dr Annie Philips

From: Caitlin Fargher <>
Sent: Tuesday, 21 November 2023 8:22 AM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc: Protect our local democracy - say no to the Liberals new planning panels
Subject:

Dear members of parliament,

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.

Kind regards,
Caitlin Fargher
Kingston

From: Anne Parrott <>
Sent: Tuesday, 21 November 2023 5:01 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Subject: Draft Land Use Planning and Approvals (Development Assessment Panel) Amendment Bill 2024

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am saddened by this proposal as I believe it further empowers developers and reduces the power of the man in street to have a say on the neighbourhood in which he lives.

I may not always agree with the decisions of my local council but at least I know the names and faces of the people making the decisions and I elected them. I do not want to lose that local input into making a decision that is going to directly impact me.

I find it hard to understand the fairness of a scheme which allows a developer to 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.

I am also very concerned about the loss of 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. Once again this appears to favour the developer over the people it affects.

This new system seems very likely to make planning decisions more political and more open to corruption so 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.

Kind regards

Anne Parrott

From: Andrea Young <>
Sent: Tuesday, 21 November 2023 6:00 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: Say No to the proposed new planning panels

To whom it may concern,

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.

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.**

Regards,
Andrea Young
Blackmans Bay



**SUBMISSION TO THE DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT
PANEL FRAMEWORK CONSULTATION
SHELTER TAS, NOVEMBER 2023**



SUPPORTED BY



Tasmanian
Government

Shelter Tas is supported by Homes Tasmania.



Shelter Tasmania acknowledges the Traditional Owners of country throughout Tasmania and their continuing connection to the land, sea and community. We pay our respects to them and their cultures, and to elders past and present.



Shelter Tas welcomes and supports people of diverse genders and sexual orientations.

© Shelter Tasmania Inc. 2023



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 International License, see <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>



21 November 2023

By email to yoursay.planning@dpac.tas.gov.au

Submission to the Development Assessment Panel Framework consultation

About Shelter Tas

Shelter Tas is Tasmania's peak body for housing and homelessness services. We are an independent not-for-profit organisation representing the interests of low to moderate income housing consumers, community housing providers and Specialist Homelessness Services across Tasmania. We provide an independent voice on housing rights and a link between governments and the community through consultation, research and policy advice. We work towards a fairer and more just housing system. Our vision is affordable, appropriate, safe and secure housing for all Tasmanians, and an end to homelessness.

Our submission

Shelter Tas welcomes the opportunity to respond to contribute to the consultation on the [Issues Paper for Development Assessment Panel Framework](#)

Our comments are limited to the sections relating to social and affordable housing. At this time, Shelter Tas does not have a position in favour of or against the rest of the proposals.

Shelter Tas is proposing to support for the proposal social and affordable housing in the Issues Paper for the Development Assessment Panel Framework, subject to the following considerations:

1. The Framework needs a clear definition of social and affordable housing. We recommend consistency with the [Tasmanian Housing Strategy 2023-43](#):
Social housing: is affordable housing provided by the government and community sectors to assist people who are unable to afford or access suitable accommodation in the private rental market. It includes public housing, state owned and managed Indigenous Housing and community housing. Rents are set as a proportion of household income.
Affordable housing: Housing for purchase and rental including social housing, that is appropriate for the needs of very low-, low- and moderate-income households. This is generally understood to mean housing that costs no more than 30 per cent of a household's gross income.



2. We recommend that the provision at 4B (p19) applies specifically to Homes Tas, and to Community Housing Providers who are registered under ACNC and the National Regulatory Scheme for Community Housing. We recommend the following wording suggested by the national Community Housing Industry Association (CHIA):
registered community housing provider means an organisation established as a constitutional corporation that is:
 - a) *Registered as a charity under the Charities Act 2013 (Cth) by the Australian Charities and Not for Profit Commission (ACNC); and*
 - b) *Registered as a community housing Providers National Law set you in the Appendix to the Community Housing Providers (Adoption of National Law) Act 2012 (NSW) (or jurisdictional equivalent in Tasmania)*

3. Resolving the process to deliver clearly streamlined and faster assessments for social and affordable housing projects. In the Issues Paper, the process looks a little cumbersome and potentially duplicates initial assessment at both the Local Government and Tas Planning Commission levels.

4. Given the urgent need to expedite the delivery of much needed social and affordable housing, would it be helpful to separate this part of the proposed DAP Framework for separate consideration and faster implementation?

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to the consultation on the *Development Assessment Panels Issues Paper*. Planning for social and affordable rental housing is essential for good housing and wellbeing outcomes for all Tasmanians.

Please note other relevant submissions by Shelter Tas are available on our website at <https://sheltertass.org.au/resources/papers-and-reports-2/>

For any further information on this submission, please contact:

Pattie Chugg
Chief Executive Officer, Shelter Tas

From: Blackmans Bay Community Association <>
Sent: Tuesday, 21 November 2023 2:09 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc: Protect our local democracy - say no to the Liberals new planning panels
Subject:

Good afternoon,

Say no to the Liberals new planning panels

The Blackmans Bay Community Association opposes 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.**

Keep planning local! Those who know a place are in the best position to assess planning applications.

Yours sincerely,

Louisa

--

Louisa d'Arville

President

Blackmans Bay Community Association Inc.



24 November 2023

Hon Michael Ferguson MP
Deputy Premier
Minister for Planning
Tasmanian Government
Email: Michael.Ferguson@dpac.tas.gov.au

Dear Deputy Premier

Thank you for invitation to make submission to the Position Paper on the proposed Development Assessment Panel (DAP) framework.

Tas Gas Networks has a limited but crucial role in the planning system in Tasmania as a pipeline licensee under the *Gas Industry Act 2019*. As you can appreciate, developments in or around existing gas pipelines can risk impacting the safe operation of network infrastructure.

Accordingly, planning authorities are obligated to involve gas infrastructure licensees in the planning assessment process and provide sufficient time and information for the licensee to advise on the application and any recommended conditions of approval, among other matters.

The existing provisions of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* include Tas Gas Networks as a regulatory authority to which relevant planning applications may be referred for consideration as part of the planning assessment process. These provisions are specified for both development applications and major projects applications.

Our only interest in the drafting of legislation to establish the proposed DAP framework is that these existing referral provisions be retained and similarly applied to the DAP process to ensure the involvement and input of all relevant regulatory authorities.

It is of critical importance that the safety and integrity of the existing gas infrastructure remain a key consideration in assessing development applications.

If you, or the State Planning Office, have any questions in relation to this or any other matters relating to planning assessments and gas networks, our GM of Engineering and Operations, Andrew Bambridge, is available to assist further and can be contacted on 03 6336 9362 or Andrew.Bambridge@tasgas.com.au.

Yours sincerely

Phaedra Deckart
CEO

Cc: State Planning Office (email: yoursay.planning@dpac.tas.gov.au)

From: Sam Murray <>
Sent: Tuesday, 21 November 2023 11:13 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 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 subdivisions 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.

Feel free to also write why this is important to you....

Youse sincerely,

Sam Murray

From: Fiona Rice <>
Sent: Tuesday, 21 November 2023 9:37 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: Concerns over new planning panels

Dear Planning authority

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.**

Fiona Rice
Taroona

From: janet leyton-grant <>
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 11:20 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
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*.

Youse sincerely,

Janet Leyton-Grant

Sent from my iPhone

From: Jane Harvey <>
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 10:35 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: No sneaky deals on planning approvals!

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.**

Your reputation depends on honest and transparent consultation with all stakeholders.

Yours sincerely,

Jane Harvey.

From: Rob Bohmer
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 9:33 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: Planning approval

Hi/Honourable members

I am deeply opposed to the new proposed planning approval process. The proposal will make it easier to approve large scale developments that are contentious. I disagree with ministerial power overriding the usual planning process and increases the risk of corruption. The proposed new approval process removes merit based planning appeals and creates an alternate pathway that may allow bypass of local councils and communities by developers. The panel criteria where one of the criteria is on the basis of perceived conflict of interest is dangerous, the planning minister is biased and may use this in favour of developers. The process will undermine local decision making and local community input. There is no justification for the proposed change except to make it easier for big developers to override local communities with backing from biased politicians.

I call on you to ensure transparency, independence and decision making within the planning system and ask you to prohibit property developers from making political donations.

Yours sincerely
Rob Bohmer

From: Carol Hurst
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 9:04 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc: Protect our local democracy - say no to the Liberals new planning panels

Subject:

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,
Carol Hurst

From: Kat Peric <>
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 8:48 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: Protect our local democracy - say no to the Liberals new planning panels

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 any time and have a development assessed by a planning panel. This could intimidate councils into conceding to developers' demands.
- **This 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 19th 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*.

Youse sincerely,

Kat Peric

From: Jodi Alexander <>
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 8:45 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: No - absolutely no Liberals new planning panel

Dear DPAC,

I find it deeply disturbing that this is the state of politics in Tasmania at the moment. When the planning minister and a select few can single-handedly say yes or no to any development and work for the developers and not the community who elected them.

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,

Jodi Alexander

From: Carmen Whiteley <>
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 8:41 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: Protect our local democracy - say no to the Liberals new planning panels

Good morning

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*.

Kind regards

Carmen

From: Kelsey Bews <>
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 7:42 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc: Protect our local democracy - say no to the Liberals new planning panels

Subject:

Dear Liberal Government members,

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.**

Once the environment is changed, it is changed forever!

Kind regards,
Kelsey Bews

From: Hollie Adamson
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 7:30 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Subject: State Planning Office - Have your say

I am writing to support these new laws to allow the continued progress of exciting and new developments for Tasmania. Coming from Sydney I have seen the benefits of having laws similar to this that allow for the state to respond to local needs to support the improvement of the local community, encourage investment from business that stimulate the economy provide divers employment opportunities and career pathways for Tasmanians here rather than young people having to leave the state

Cheers
Hollie Adamson-Sheehan

From: helen ampt <
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 7:04 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc: SUBMISSION: Protect our local democracy - NO to the Liberals new planning
Subject: panels

Thank you for the possibility of making this submission.

I am against the proposed new planning panels for the following reasons:

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.

Yours sincerely,
Helen Ampt

From: Carrie Riseley <> Wednesday, 22
Sent: November 2023 6:59 PM State Planning
To: Office Your Say
Subject: Protect democracy

Dear legislators,

Local democracy is the most important kind. It's the kind that protects our homes from losing views and sunlight, from being subjected to too much noise, and from losing our local character. We all have the right to have a say on what's happening near where we live.

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.

Kind regards,

Caroline Riseley

From: Alison Hardinge <>
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 6:58 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: No to the Liberals new planning panels

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.

I look forward to your response,

Kind regards
Alison Hardinge

From: Tim Carroll <>
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 6:27 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: Protect our local democracy - say no to the Liberals new planning panels

Dear People,

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*.

Feel free to also write why this is important to you....

Youse sincerely,

(Include your name.)

STEP 5 – PLEASE SEND YOUR EMAIL 😊 ASAP.

IMAGE DESCRIPTION & CREDITS

Removal of merit-based planning appeals

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. Photo credit: Tasmanian Conservation Trust.

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. Photo credit: Freycinet Action Network.

Gorge Hotel, Launceston: was enabled by a planning scheme change. Photo credit: Scheme Amendment Application (page 255), Attachment 1, Council Agenda, 20 May 2021.

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.

Tim Carroll

From: Stephen Bews <>
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 6:12 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: Protect our local democracy - say no to the Liberals new planning panels

Dear Liberal Government members,

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.**

Once the environment is changed, it is changed forever!

Kind regards,

Steve Bews

Adventurer and Educator

From: Colin Sutton <>
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 6:11 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.**

Regards,

Colin Sutton

From: Katherine Barnes
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 5:34 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: Protect our local democracy - say no to the Liberals new planning panels

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*.

Yours sincerely,

Ms Katherine Barnes

From: Sarah Dulak
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 5:00 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say; Sue Denman
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*.

I urge to act in the interests and in true representation of the wishes of the Tasmanian people. Stop corrupt interest from ruining our beautiful state

Regards

Sarah Dulak



22 November 2023

Hon Michael Ferguson MP
Minister for Planning
State Planning Office
Department of Premier and Cabinet
GPO Box 123
HOBART TAS 7001

Dear Minister Ferguson

DEVELOPMENT ASSESMENT PANEL (DAP) FRAMEWORK

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the DAP Framework Position Paper. Brighton Council supports the concept of a DAP in principle but has a number of concerns with the framework proposed in the Position Paper.

Council believes that the proposed Framework does not meet the stated intent of introducing DAPs, which is 'to take the politics out of planning' and deconflict the role of councillors and planning authorities.

Council also does not support the "choose your own adventure" approach which allows applicants and the planning authority to opt into the DAP process at various stages. The proposed Framework will make the planning system unnecessarily more complex than it currently is.

Council's position is that the DAPs process should mirror the current process, but a DAP determines an application rather than Council. That is, Council officers undertake the entire assessment and then put forward a recommendation to the DAP, rather than the PA, when a DAP referral is required based on certain criteria. Any other model will result in a convoluted assessment process with unnecessary delays.

The proposed Framework will also likely require DAPs to rely on significant technical expertise. Whether these be employed directly by the Commission or consultant it will put a significant strain on the existing shortage of planners and development engineers currently facing the industry.

Councils' detailed response to the consultation issues are below to support Councils submission.

Consultation issue 1 – Types of development applications suitable for referral to a DAP for determination

Firstly, the Position Paper refers to models similar to DAPs operating in other jurisdictions. A high-level review of how these models operate and how well they work should be developed to inform the Tasmanian DAP framework. Particularly, an understanding of the 'call-in' criteria in other jurisdictions would be useful.

a) What types of development applications are problematic, or perceived to be problematic, for Councils to determine and would therefore benefit from being determined by a DAP?

Generally, Council perceives applications with a significant amount of community interest being the ones that are most problematic. These are most likely to be applications that receive a large amount of representations and where representors and developers are both lobbying Councillors with opposing views.

Most, if not all, Tasmanian Councils will send applications which receive over a certain number of representations to the PA for determination. Council submits that this is a better criterion than a pre-determined criteria for when DAPs are used. For example, applications that receive five or more representations may be referred to a DAP for final assessment.

This would have the added benefit of the planning assessment being undertaken by Council officers and keep the process simple and timeframes to a minimum.

i. Social Housing

It is disappointing that there is a reliance on anecdotal evidence rather than real data and evidence for the inclusion of social housing in the mandatory referral list. In the last 10 years Brighton Council has approved 192 applications from Housing Tasmania or community housing providers (CHPs) and approved over 532 dwellings. Not one of these have been refused by the PA or been appealed to TASCAT.

For example, in 2022, Council approved 19 developments on HT or CHP land. All but one, was approved well within the statutory timeframe. The only one that could be considered complex and that had to be assessed by the PA was a 40-unit application which was approved.

Council does not support mandatory social housing referrals.

ii. Critical infrastructure

The majority of critical infrastructure applications that Council receive are uncontroversial and managed in a reasonable timeframe. Council does not support mandatory critical infrastructure referrals.

iii. Council applications

Council supports referrals to the DAP for its own applications.

iv. No quorum

Council supports referrals to DAP where there is no quorum.

v. Contentious applications

This criteria is extremely ambiguous and raises all kinds of issues about when an application should be referred and how Council comes to the decision to determine whether an application is contentious. This is why referral to DAPs should be based on representation numbers.

Another option may be for a PA to refer the application to a DAP rather than determine the application if they consider it to be too contentious for them to make a decision. Again, this would be best done at the end of the process. Whilst this option may seem like it would create unnecessary time delays, it would be the same timeframe as proposed in the Position Paper if an application was referred to a DAP at the start of the process.

vi. Applicant perceives bias

Again, this is an ambiguous criterion and provides uncertainty in the system. Council does not support this criteria.

viii. Applications over a certain value

Setting mandatory referrals based on a certain value or certain types of development (e.g. social housing) may cause delays for developments that are not controversial.

For example, in 2022 Council approved two developments with a value of works over \$10M. These included the Brighton High School and the lay down yard for the Bridgewater Bridge. Neither application received a representation, and both were approved within a reasonable timeframe under officer delegation. Putting these applications through a DAP process would have significantly increased the assessment timeframe and added another layer of unnecessary assessment to the process.

b) Who should be allowed to nominate referral of a development application to a DAP for determination?

Council does not support the 'choose your own adventure' approach for use of the DAP process, particularly for applicants. As noted above, referral to a DAP should be based on clear and unambiguous criteria (e.g. number of representations, applications where Council has a direct conflict, such as Council applications & no quorum) to increase certainty of process in the planning system. There may be an option for a PA to move a motion to refer an application to a DAP if it cannot make a determination at a PA meeting.

If the intent of the DAPs is to 'take the politics out of planning' the Minister should not have a role in the planning system.

c) Given the need for a referral of an application to a DAP might not be known until an application has progressed through certain stages of consideration (such as those set out in a) above) have been carried out, is it reasonable to have a range of referral points?

As noted above, Council's position is that DAP referrals should only be at the approval stage.

Trying to determine whether an application is contentious within the first seven days would be difficult and unreasonable. For example, an initial application may be contentious when it is first

submitted but may not be compliant with the scheme at all. Through the assessment process the contentious elements may be amended.

Another example is if an application is perceived as contentious but turns out to have little community interest or Council bias and could be assessed under delegation. An early referral would add an extra layer of assessment, complexity and cost to the process.

Consultation issue 2 – Provision of an enhanced role for the Minister to direct a council to initiate a planning scheme amendment under certain circumstances.

Council notes that this section has nothing to do with DAPs and questions why it is part of the Position Paper.

Council firmly believes that strategic land use planning should remain a matter for Councils.

If the purpose of DAPs is to depoliticise the system, Ministerial involvement should be avoided at all costs.

Perhaps a DAP could replace the Minister in regard to intervention under s.40B.

Consultation issue 3 –

- i. Incorporating local knowledge in DAP decision making.**
- ii. DAP framework to complement existing processes and avoid duplication of administrative processes.**

As noted above, Council's position is that Council officers should continue to carry out the entire assessment process as it currently does, with a DAP referral coming at the end of an application. This ensures that local input and expertise are maintained throughout the process without duplication and unnecessary resource burden.

Duplicating the planning scheme amendment process for DAs puts additional and unnecessary pressure on Council officers to complete its full assessment within 21 days without any community input.

Consultation issue 4 – Resolving issues associated with requests for, and responses to, further information.

It is disappointing that the basis for requiring a review of further information requests is "anecdotal" evidence. Brighton Council suggests a proper independent review of further information requests before a knee-jerk reaction to change legislation. Brighton Council would willingly participate in a review of its own further information requests to see if they are unreasonable.

As noted above, Council only received one large social housing application in 2022. A quick review of this application shows that the initial application was missing critical information such as:

- A planning report that demonstrates how the proposal meets the relevant planning scheme requirements.
- A traffic impact assessment; and
- A landscaping plan.

This is basic information required of any DA of this scale. Council believes that it is the quality of applications being provided for social housing developments that are largely responsible for assessment delays. This same information would undoubtedly be required by a DAP.

Brighton Council would be more than happy to provide additional data about social housing applications if required.

Brighton Council does not support further information review by DAPs.

Consultation issue 5 – Appeal rights and assessment timeframes for DAP determined applications.

Appeal rights

Before Council come to a firm position on appeal rights, it would be good to get an understanding of whether similar models in other jurisdictions have appeal rights and whether they are working.

One of the key issues with the creation of DAPs, particularly if they are not subject to appeals, is that they are likely to end up operating like TasCAT appeals where parties are required to call on technical experts and lawyers. This would potentially add significant cost for developers and Councils and be intimidating for representors, particularly if they just wanted to put forward their view without publicly facing a hearing.

DAP Assessment timeframes

As noted previously, Council does not believe it is necessary to refer applications to a DAP until the end of the assessment process. Under Council's preferred scenario, Council officers would provide a report with its recommendation at the end of the 42 days. The DAP could then hold a hearing and determine the application within 35 days. This would reduce the timeframe put forward in the Position Paper by at least 30 days.

Consultation issue 6 – Roles of the planning authority post DAP determination of a development application.

This becomes an issue of practicality for Councils, as it is unlikely that the Government will entertain any "after permit care".

Issues with DAPs creating permits and Councils issuing them include:

- The DAP need to be available to field questions or clarification required by the applicant, for conditions it imposes.

- Will DAPs have the expertise for their conditions to include compliance considerations or is it preferable that conditions are specified by the authority responsible for their enforcement? Otherwise, issues of practicality and resourcing may come into play.
- How will minor amendments be assessed? Currently permits issued by the Tribunal, or the Commission under a combined amendment and permit, do not provide a pathway for minor amendments to be considered by the planning authority.

Other matters - Resourcing

There does not appear to be any analysis of how many applications are likely to need to be referred to a DAP.

Based on a very conservative scenario of two applications from each Council per year, that would be an additional 58 hearings that would need to be scheduled by the Commission.

In addition to planners, Councils rely heavily on internal advice from their development engineers, environmental health officers, natural resource management officers, etc. to assess an application. How will a DAP resource technical expertise, particularly if it intends to review further information requests? There is already a significant shortage of planners and engineers across the state and the creation of DAP is likely to exacerbate this issue.

If you wish to discuss the matter further please contact David Allingham on 6268 7021 or david.allingham@brighton.tas.gov.au.

Yours sincerely

James Dryburgh
GENERAL MANAGER

From: Mieka Tabart <>
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 4:17 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: Protect our local democracy - say no to the Liberals new planning panels

PLEASE 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*.

It is imperative that long term, democratic processes and principals are employed in relation to planning decisions, and not side-stepped for the potential short term gain of a few.

Youse sincerely,

Mieka Tabart

--

In the spirit of reconciliation, I acknowledge palawa custodians of lutruwita / Tasmania where I live, and pay my respects to elders, past, present and emerging. lutrawita was, is and always will be Aboriginal land.

I recognise a history of truth which acknowledges the impacts of colonisation upon Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, and stand for a future that profoundly respects their stories, culture, language and history.

From: Stuart Mcadam
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 4:01 PM
Cc: State Planning Office Your Say
Protect our local democracy - say no to the Liberals new planning panels

Subject:

To whom it may concern

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: Emma Battaglione <>
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 3:58 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc: Protect our local democracy - say no to the Liberals new planning panels

Subject:

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*.

Youse sincerely,

Emma Battaglione

From: Zanna Laws <>
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 3:54 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: NO to the Liberal's New Planning Panels. Protect our local democracy

To whom it may concern,

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.** Hand-picked State appointed planning panels will decide on development applications and not our elected local council representatives. Local concerns will be ignored in favour of the developers who, very probably, will not be from Tasmania. As we have seen in the past when the 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. The resulting pressure and intimidation could force councils into conceding to developers demands.
- **The Liberal Planning Panel would, unfortunately, 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 state 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.**

This issue is important to me because Governments should not be involved in private development. They should also listen to their constituents and refrain from overturning local Councils decisions that have been made using scientific, financial, environmental and logistical studies

Yours sincerely,

Z.T. Laws

Zanna T. Laws BSc

From: Andrew Lindner <>
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 3:48 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: Local democracy - say no to the 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

Andrew Lindner

From: michael mountain <>
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 3:46 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: Say no to the Liberals new planning panels

I believe the below clearly demonstrates the good intentions of Planning Matters Alliance Tasmania. There are valid concerns raised as stated below, which should be taken into consideration - with further community engagement needed so an equitable decision surrounding planning can be made. I do not think more power should be given to authorities and individuals on matters that concern the residents and communities of Tasmania.

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*.

Feel free to also write why this is important to you....

Youse sincerely,

(Include your name.)

From: Robyn Everist <>
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 3:42 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: Protect our local democracy - say no to the Liberals new planning panels

Good afternoon,

I write to 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.
- 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,

Robyn Everist

From: Steven Bradford
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 3:29 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc: r
Subject: Protect our local democracy - NO to 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 and contentious developments** such as 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 independant 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,

Steven Bradford

From: Tayla S
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 3:15 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: Protect our local democracy - say no to the Liberals new planning panels

To whom it may concern,

I am emailing today as 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.**

Thank you for your time,
Tayla Sernaggia

From: Giovanna Padas <>
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 12:01 PM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: Protect our local democracy - say no to the Liberals new planning panels

Hi there,

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.**

Please, do the right thing, not the easy thing.

Kind regards,
Giovanna

Giovanna Padas

Head of House - Stephens

We humbly and respectfully acknowledge the Muwinina people of the South East Nation as the original custodians of the unceded kreewer lands on which Hutchins stands. As a school, we commit to walking together with Tasmanian Aboriginal people to pursue healing through Voice, Treaty and Truth-Telling.

If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this email. Please notify the sender immediately if you have received this by mistake and delete it from your system.

From: John Padas <>
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 11:36 AM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Subject: Protect our local democracy - say no to the Liberals new planning panels

You don't often get email from john@archadia.net.au. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear DPAC,

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.

Kind Regards,

John Padas

From: Trevor Burdon <>
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 10:59 AM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: Protect our local democracy - say no to the Liberals new planning panels

All concerned,

I 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**
- **Makes it easier to approve large scale contentious developments**
- **Remove merit-based planning appeal rights**
- **Removing merits-based planning appeals has the potential to increase corruption and reduce good planning outcomes**
- **Increased ministerial power over the planning system increases the politicisation of planning and risk of corrupt decisions**
- **Flawed planning panel criteria**
- **Undermines local democracy and removes and local decision making**

- **Mainland experience demonstrates planning panels favour developers and undermine democratic accountability**
- **Poor justification – there is no problem to fix**
- **Increases complexity in an already complex planning system**

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.**

Regards

Trevor Burdon

From: Fatme Tala-Montenegro <>
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 10:03 AM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: Protect our local democracy - say no to the Liberals new planning panels

Hi

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.

Thanks

Youse sincerely,

Fatme Tala-Montenegro

From: Chloé Bibari <
Sent: Wednesday, 22 November 2023 9:10 AM
To: State Planning Office Your Say
Cc:
Subject: 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.**

Kind regards, Chloe Bibari