

To: [Legislation Scrutiny Committee](#)

Subject: Planning Amendment Bill

Date: Wednesday, 11 March 2020 2:41:57 PM

Whoever is reviewing this bill should ask the relevant minister if they have listened to the public response – it is clearly apparent that they have not listened or have for some unknown reason thought that the views of the public were not relevant.

The concept of maintaining “amenity “ has been the most discussed issue and not one public forum has supported the present form of the Bill in that regard. The aim of the existing clause is to **preserve** and **enhance** where possible harmonious or pleasant aspectany existing pleasant locality. For

For some reason the bill still refers to amenity with regard to a building but not the locality – that means as long as the developers are happy the neighbourhood can go jump – really funny thing for any government let alone a labour government to do. It is not responding to public input

In addition the Bill should be dealing with reasonable requirements relating to the internal design elements as other states are now providing for. Why are we at the end of the road in this regard?

Another matter which should be addressed is to require building standards that reduce ongoing maintenance issues – this does not seem to be addressed – it can be done simply by requiring that to be an objective of design to achieve DCA approval

I urge you to stop listening to planning advisors and start reviewing the public submissions in the history of this Bill

With current market conditions it is unlikely that much will be built for accommodation in the near future and we should prepare for the future by supporting higher quality standards as set now by NSW and other states. I am informed those standards have been well accepted by builders and tenants alike.

Hugh Bradley