

From: [David Allingham](#)
To: [TPC Enquiry](#)
Cc: [Wolf, Claire](#)
Subject: Brighton Draft LPS - s.35F report on substantially modified draft & s.35G report
Date: Monday, 19 October 2020 2:35:21 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.jpg](#)

Good afternoon

Please see below link for the “Substantially modified part of the Brighton Draft Local Provisions Schedule Section 35 F Report” and Section 35 G Report.

 [Docs for Commission](#)

Docs include:

- PA Agenda report
- PA Minutes
- S.35F report
- Reps
- S.35G report

Please let me know if there is anything else you require.

Kind regards

DAVID ALLINGHAM
MANAGER DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
Working Hours: Mon – Thurs



1 Tivoli Road, Old Beach TAS 7017
Tel: (03) 6268 7021
Mob: 0404 996 614
Fax: (03) 6268 7013

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE AND DISCLAIMER:

Information in this transmission is intended only for the person(s) to whom it is addressed and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying or dissemination of the information is unauthorised and you should delete/destroy all copies and notify the sender. No liability is accepted for any unauthorised use of the information contained in this transmission.



Brighton Council

MINUTES OF THE **PLANNING AUTHORITY MEETING**
OF THE BRIGHTON COUNCIL HELD
IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNCIL OFFICES
OLD BEACH AT 5.32 P.M. ON TUESDAY,
13TH OCTOBER, 2020

PRESENT: Cr Gray (Chairperson); Cr Foster (Mayor); Cr Garlick;
Cr Geard; Cr Jeffries; Cr Murtagh; Cr Owen and Cr
Whelan

IN ATTENDANCE: Mrs J Banks (Governance Manager); Mr D Allingham
(Manager Development Services) and Mr P Carroll
(Senior Planning Officer)

1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY:

2. APOLOGIES:

Cr Owen moved, Cr Geard seconded that the Cr Curran be granted leave of absence.

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

In favour Against

Cr Foster
Cr Garlick
Cr Geard
Cr Gray
Cr Jeffries
Cr Murtagh
Cr Owen
Cr Whelan

3. QUESTION TIME & DEPUTATIONS:

There was no requirement for public question time.

4. DECLARATION OF INTEREST:

In accordance with Part 5, Section 48 of the *Local Government Act 1993*, the Chairman of a meeting is to request Councillors to indicate whether they have, or are likely to have an interest in any item on the agenda; and

Part 2 Regulation 8 (7) of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*, the Chairman of a meeting is to request Councillors to indicate whether they have, or are likely to have, a pecuniary interest in any item on the agenda.

Accordingly, Councillors are requested to advise of any interest they may have in respect to any matter appearing on the agenda, or any supplementary item to the agenda, which the Council has resolved to deal with, in accordance with Part 2 Regulation 8 (6) of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*.

Cr Geard, Cr Gray and Cr Whelan declared an interest in Item 5.4.

5. COUNCIL ACTING AS PLANNING AUTHORITY:

In accordance with the provisions of Part 2 Regulation 25 of the *Local Government (Meeting Procedures) Regulations 2015*, the intention of the Council to act as a planning authority pursuant to the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* is to be noted. In accordance with Regulation 25, the Council will act as a planning authority in respect to those matters appearing under Item 5. on this agenda, inclusive of any supplementary items.

The following item was withdrawn by the applicant prior to the Planning Authority meeting.

5.1 APPLICATION UNDER BRIGHTON INTERIM PLANNING SCHEME 2015 DA 2020/256 – 182 BOYER ROAD, BRIDGEWATER OUTBUILDING:

5.2 APPLICATION UNDER BRIGHTON INTERIM PLANNING SCHEME 2015 DA2020/284 – 6 BORONIA PLACE, GAGEBROOK - DWELLING:

Type of Report	Planning Authority – For Decision
Application No:	DA 2020/284
Address:	6 Boronia Place, Gagebrook
Applicant:	Prime Design
Proposal:	Dwelling
Zone:	General Residential

VOTING RECORD

	In favour Against
--	----------------------

Cr Foster
Cr Garlick
Cr Jeffries
Cr Murtagh
Cr Owen

Cr Geard, Cr Gray and Cr Whelan returned to the meeting at 5.46pm.

Cr Gray resumed as Chairperson.

5.5 SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION TO PART OF THE BRIGHTON DRAFT LOCAL PROVISIONS SCHEDULE AND SECTION 35G REPORT:

Author: Manager Development Services (David Allingham)

Purpose:

The purpose of this report is for the Planning Authority to consider the representations to the substantially modified part of the Brighton Draft Local Provisions Schedule (Draft LPS), and for the Planning Authority to provide recommendations to the Tasmanian Planning Commission (the Commission) pursuant to s.35F (Attachment A) and s.35G (Attachment C) of the *Land Use Planning and Approvals Act 1993* (the Act).

Background:

The Draft LPS was endorsed by the Planning Authority at its meeting on 19 June 2018 and submitted to the Commission. The Commission directed that the Draft LPS be publicly notified in accordance with the Act on 28 March 2019.

The Draft LPS was publicly notified for 60 days and 39 representations were received. At the August 2019 Ordinary Council Meeting (OCM), the Planning Authority endorsed the s35F report, which responded to the representations.

On 18 October 2019, the Commission conducted a Direction Hearing for the Brighton draft LPS and four subsequent Hearing days in November. The Hearings were attended by Council staff, representors and authorities that chose to attend.

The Commission issued a notice to Brighton Council directing the Planning Authority to substantially modify parts of the Draft LPS and place the 'substantial modification' on public exhibition for 60 days.

It is a requirement of the legislation that representations may only be made on the specific matters that are the subject of substantial modification. The public exhibition of the substantial modifications is not an opportunity to revisit issues that were not subject to modification in the TPC notice or to raise new matters. In accordance with the legislation, the Planning Authority must disregard submissions on matters that are not directly related to the substantial modifications.

At the conclusion of the exhibition period, 4 representations were received. Three representations were from State Service Authorities and one from a private landowner. The matters raised in the representations are addressed in accordance with the requirements of the Act in Attachment A.

Having considered the representations received during exhibition of the Draft LPS and the substantially modified part of the Draft LPS, Section 35G of the Act provides for the planning authority to provide advice to the TPC in a notice, that the planning authority is of the opinion that the State Planning Provisions (SPP's) should be altered.

Following receipt of the planning authority report under Section 35F, the Commission will hold hearings into the representations made. The TPC will then seek the agreement of the Minister for Planning for the final form of the Brighton LPS before it is approved and commences operation.

There is no legislative process prescribed for a notice submitted by the planning authority under Section 35G.

Consultation:

The substantial modifications were exhibited from 11 July 2020 to 11 September 2020 in accordance with the requirements of the Act, whereby a notice was placed in two Saturday editions of the Mercury newspaper and the documents displayed on Council's website under "Advertised Development Applications". In addition to the requirements under the Act, Council sent a letter to each property owner affected by the substantial modifications.

Risk Implications:

Once the Draft LPS is finalised, Brighton Council will move to the Tasmanian Planning Scheme (TPS). Through the process of preparing the Draft LPS, it has become clear that the TPS is in many ways inferior to the existing *Brighton Interim Planning Scheme 2015*.

However, moving to the TPS and preparation of modified part of the Draft LPS is a statutory requirement under the Act.

Planning staff will continue to advocate for improvements to the TPS.

Transitioning to the TPS will likely lead to a temporary increase in assessment timeframes as planning staff familiarise themselves with the new planning scheme. Transitioning to the TPS would be particularly problematic if it occurred prior to the traditionally busy Christmas period, where statutory timeframes are already impacted by public holidays and office closures. As such, it would be preferred that the TPS does not come into force until the beginning of 2021.

Financial/Budget Implications:

Council staff has spent a significant amount of time over several years preparing the Draft LPS. This has resulted in a resourcing stress for Council for what could be argued was an unnecessary and cumbersome planning reform.

Additionally, external consultants have been required to be engaged by Council to transition towards to the LPS. For example, the GIS component of the LPS has been outsourced and has cost Council approximately \$7,500 to date.

The Commission has recently advised that Council will need to engage an additional consultant so that the GIS work already undertaken can be converted into the format used required by the Commission.

Social Implications:

The LPS provides for managing some land-use conflict and creating healthier communities. Generally, the LPS improves health and wellbeing standards provided in the SPP's. However, it is considered that the TPS has inferior outcomes than under the current *Brighton Interim Planning Scheme 2015*.

Environmental Implications:

Due to the Guidelines provided by the TPC, there are likely to be a number of bushland areas on agricultural land and Rural Living areas that have a bushland character that receive a lower level of vegetation protection than they do currently. The S.35G report proposes an amendment to rectify this in the Rural Living Zone.

Economic Implications:

There are unlikely to be any significant economic implications.

Options:

1. As per the recommendation.
2. Reject the proposal and provide reasons.
3. Other.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Planning Authority:

1. Endorse the attached document 'A – Substantially modified part of the Brighton Draft Local Provisions Schedule Section 35 F Report' pursuant to s35F of the Act.
2. That the planning authority endorse the attached document 'Planning Authority Notice under Section 35G of LUPAA – Recommended Amendments to the State Planning Provisions' as its notice pursuant to Section 35G of the Act and forward to the Tasmanian Planning Commission.

3. That the planning authority delegate to the General Manager its powers and functions to:
- a) Modify the document submitted under recommendation 1 and 2 if a request is received from the Tasmanian Planning Commission for further information.; and
 - b) Represent the planning authority at hearings pursuant to Section 35H.

DECISION:

Cr Geard moved, Cr Jeffries seconded that the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED

VOTING RECORD

In favour Against

Cr Foster
Cr Garlick
Cr Geard
Cr Gray
Cr Jeffries
Cr Murtagh
Cr Owen
Cr Whelan

The meeting closed at 5.50pm.

Confirmed:

(Mayor)

Date:

20th October 2020

Attachment A

Planning Authority Report under Section 35F of LUPAA –

Consideration of Representations to the Substantially modified part of the Brighton Draft Local Provisions Schedule (LPS)

Introduction

The below table provides a summary of each representation and, pursuant to s.35F(c) of the Act, Council's comments on the merits of each representation and whether the draft LPS ought to be modified (s.35F(c)(i)). Council is of the opinion that no modifications are required as a result of the representations. As such, further statements under s.35F(2)(c)(ii) and s.35F(2)(e) are not necessary.

1. TasRail	
Brighton Industrial Hub Specific Area Plan TasRail is supportive of the inclusion of the Brighton Industrial Hub Specific Area Plan as it will effectively protect the Brighton Industrial Hub from sensitive use establishing within the Specific Area Plan.	Council comment: Noted Modification required: Nil
Zoning of Brighton Transport Hub Query regarding zoning of State Rail Network and some of the lots in the Brighton Transport Hub	Council comment: The zoning of these areas is not included in the Substantially modified part of the Brighton draft LPS, and therefore the issues raised will not be considered. However, Council staff will follow up separately. Modification required: Nil
2. State Emergency Service	
Rezoning of land in Old Beach SES supports Rural Living B Zone over the land to the east of Cassidys Bay. SES notes that part of the rezoned area was covered by the Waterway and Coastal Protection Overlay in the Brighton Interim Planning Scheme (BIPS) 2015. This may indicate a currently unmapped flood risk. Application of the Flood Prone Areas Hazard Code will help manage the risks associated with future land use and development application in the area.	Council comment: The Waterway Coastal Protection Area overlay continues to apply to the same area in the draft LPS. The overlay will continue to help identify a potential flood risk which may be called in under the Flood-Prone Areas Hazard Code under clause C12.2.4. Modification required: Nil

<p>Coastal Inundation Hazard Band Levels</p> <p>The SES notes that the <i>BRI-Table C11.1 Coastal Inundation Hazard Bands AHD Levels</i> has not been exhibited as a substantial modification and recommends that the draft Brighton LPS be modified so that it is included.</p>	<p>Council comment:</p> <p>The Table referred to in the submission was part of the previously exhibited draft Brighton LPS and is not included in the Substantially modified part of the Brighton draft LPS and therefore will not be considered.</p>
<p><i>3. Department of State Growth</i></p>	
<p>Brighton Industrial Hub Specific Area Plan</p> <p>The Department of State Growth supports the proposed Brighton Industrial Hub Specific Area Plan (SAP), which replaces the existing industrial precinct attenuation area applying under the interim planning scheme. The SAP will prevent sensitive uses from establishing close to the Brighton Transport Hub or Boral Quarry, and reduce the potential for future land use conflict and associated fettering of use and development at these important sites.</p>	<p>Council comment:</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Modification required:</p> <p>Nil</p>
<p><i>4. Phil Smith</i></p>	
<p>757 Boyer Road</p> <p>I'm not happy with the zoning of 757 Boyer Rd.</p>	<p>Council comment:</p> <p>No detail was provided about why the representor was not happy with the zoning. It is not possible to provide any meaningful comment in response.</p> <p>Modification required:</p> <p>Nil</p>

Attachment C

Planning Authority Notice Under Section 35G of the *Land Use Planning & Approvals Act 1993* – Recommended Amendments to the State Planning Provisions

Section 35G of the *Land Use Planning & Approvals Act 1993* (LUPAA) provides for a planning authority to advise the Tasmanian Planning Commission (Commission) by notice, that having considered the draft LPS and the representations made in relation to the draft LPS during public exhibition, it is of the opinion that the State Planning Provisions (SPPs) should be altered.

The Commission is required to consider the merits of the advice and provide the notice to the Minister for Planning together with its opinion in relation to the advice. The Minister is then required to consider the notice and the Commission's opinion.

The following outlines the issues and recommended amendments that are the subject of this notice pursuant to Section 35G of the LUPAA:

1. Removal of "Application Requirements" from Codes and Specific Area Plans (SAPs)

Representor: Boral, Department of State Growth

Planning Authority Submission

Under the Interim Planning Schemes, the "Application Requirements" were used to provide clarity about what was required for all, or some, applications that were assessed under the relevant Code or SAP. Under the Planning Scheme Template for Tasmania the "Applications Requirements" heading has been removed.

The Boral and Department of State Growth (DSG) representations have highlighted issues with the removal of the "Application Requirements" for the Tasmanian Planning Scheme (TPS). Under the Attenuation Code in the Brighton Interim Planning Scheme 2015 (BIPS 2015), clause E9.5.2 is:

"The planning authority must refer any application within the Bridgewater Quarry Attenuation Area to the Bridgewater Quarry operator for advice on potential conflict between the proposed use or development and the quarry operations. Council must not determine an application until the quarry operator has provided its advice, or until 14 days from the date of referral, whichever occurs first."

Both Boral and DSG are seeking reinstatement of the mandatory approach. As noted in Council's s.35F on the draft Brighton LPS, including the mandatory approach in the Bridgewater Quarry SAP was discussed with the Commission who were advised that there is not a mechanism in the structure of the LPS to provide for the mandatory referral.

The suggested way to deal with this issue was to use the Performance Criteria which requires the planning authority to have regard to "any advice from the Bridgewater Quarry operator". Whilst this implies that the planning authority should seek advice from the quarry operator it does not clearly require referral. Clarity in the process is always preferred.

Similarly, the removal of the “Application Requirements” has also created issues with the drafting of the Tivoli Green SAP which currently has the following provision at F2.4.1:

The planning authority must refer any application for subdivision to the State Road Authority for advice on traffic impact on the East Derwent Highway. The planning authority must not determine an application until the State Road Authority has provided its advice, or until 14 days from the date of referral, whichever occurs first.

The referral mechanism is now buried in the subdivision standards at clause BRI-S9.8.2 P1(i) “any advice from the road authority”.

A further example is in the Quoin Ridge SAP which currently has a mandatory referral provision at E26.5.1 to become a non-mandatory Performance Criteria standard under the LPS.

The “Application Requirements” were also used extensively in Codes under Interim Planning Schemes for mandatory referrals (e.g. Clause E9.5 of the Electricity Infrastructure Code required referral to the electricity entity) and also what type of reports may/must be required under certain circumstances (e.g. Clause E6.5 (c) of the Parking and Access Code specifies when a Traffic Impact Assessment may be required.).

The use of the “Application Requirements” provides two clear benefits:

1. Provides clear direction when referrals are required, making it clearer for planning and administration staff to undertake a referral in a timely manner and not to overlook the requirement for a referral when it is less manifest in the Performance Criteria – minimising the potential for late referrals and assessment delays.
2. Provides clarity about when certain types of reports are, or may be, required to address certain provision(s) in Codes and SAPs. Having this information clearly shown prevents rude shocks for applicants once the assessment proper commences.

Recommended amendment to SPPs:

Amend the Planning Scheme Template for Tasmania to include the “Application Requirements” heading for Codes and LPS’ and amend SPPs and LPSs accordingly.

2. Protection of existing natural and landscape values in the Rural Living Zone

Representations: Jones, Saulis & Johnston

The representations received regarding the zoning of properties off Melane Rd, Old Beach (to the east of Cassidys Bay) has highlighted the lack of protection for existing natural and landscape values in the Rural Living Zone (RLZ) in the SPPs.

The Melane Road area clearly has an established bushland character and existing natural and landscape values.

The land was proposed to be zoned Landscape Conservation in the draft LPS because of the previous Environmental Living Zone. However, more significantly, this zoning was preferred because of the absence of development controls regulating the clearing of native vegetation in the RLZ *despite* RLZ Zone Purpose statement 11.1.1 (b):

To provide for residential use or development in a rural setting where:

(a) ...

(b) Existing natural and landscape values are to be retained.

In this instance, the zoning for the Melane Rd area is likely to be changed to RLZ in the LPS as it was identified that the priority use for the area is residential and that the landscape can be protected by the priority vegetation protection area and Natural Assets Code.

However, the Brighton municipality has numerous areas that are currently zoned Rural Living that have similar bushland character and existing natural and landscape values that are not protected by the priority vegetation protection area.

The character of these areas is currently retained through the design standards at clause 13.4.3 of the RLZ in BIPS 2015, which has the following objective:

To ensure that the location and appearance of buildings and works minimises adverse impact on the landscape.

The Design standards included provisions for native vegetation removal, building on skylines or ridgelines, reflectivity of colours and materials, and impact of proposed fill and excavation on the landscape.

There are no Design standards for the RLZ in the SPPs. In fact, all Development Standards for Buildings and Works at clause 11.4 relate only to buildings, and there are no standards for Works (native vegetation removal, for example) that could unreasonably impact on natural and landscape values.

For these above reasons, it is strongly considered that the Standards of the Rural Living Zone in the SPPs fail to achieve the Zone Purpose statement at clause 11.1.1 (b).

Recommended amendment to SPPs:

Design provisions similar to those from clause 13.4.3 from the Brighton Interim Planning Scheme 2015 be inserted into the Rural Living Zone as new clauses at 11.4.3 so that the Zone Purpose at 11.1.1 (b) can be achieved:

11.4.3 Design

Objective:	
That the design of buildings and works retains the existing natural and landscape values	
Acceptable Solutions	Performance Criteria
<p>A1</p> <p>The location of buildings and works must comply with any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) be located within a building area, if provided on the title; (b) be an addition or alteration to an existing building. (c) be located on a site that does not require the clearing of native vegetation and is not on a skyline or ridgeline. 	<p>P1</p> <p>The location of buildings and works must satisfy all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) be located on a skyline or ridgeline only if: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) there are no sites clear of native vegetation and clear of other significant site constraints such as access difficulties or excessive slope; (ii) there is no significant impact on the rural landscape; (iii) building height is minimised; (iv) any screening vegetation is maintained. (b) be located in an area requiring the clearing of native vegetation only if: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) there are no sites clear of native vegetation or any such areas are not suitable for development due to access difficulties or excessive slope; (ii) the extent of clearing is the minimum necessary to provide for buildings, associated works and associated bushfire protection measures.
<p>A2</p> <p>Exterior building surfaces must be coloured using colours with a light reflectance value not greater than 40 percent.</p>	<p>P2</p> <p>Exterior building surfaces must avoid adverse impacts on the visual amenity of neighbouring land and not unreasonably detract from the contribution the site makes to the landscape, views and vistas.</p>
<p>A3</p> <p>Fill and excavation must comply with all of the following:</p>	<p>P3</p> <p>Fill and excavation must satisfy all of the following:</p>

<p>(a) height of fill and depth of excavation is no more than 1 m from natural ground level, except where required for building foundations;</p> <p>(b) extent is limited to the area required for the construction of buildings and vehicular access.</p>	<p>a) does not detract from the landscape character of the area;</p> <p>b) does not unreasonably impact upon the privacy for adjoining properties;</p> <p>c) does not affect land stability on the lot or adjoining land.</p>
--	---

3. Requirement for landscaping throughout SPPs.

Representations: Nil, but raised by Planning Authority in s.35F Report.

Under the Interim Schemes, provision of landscaping is required by all the commercial zones and for new car parking areas with more than 5 spaces (which has been applicable to a significant number of multiple-dwelling developments in residential areas). most residential unit dwellings in residential areas.

The SPPs sensationally fail to provide any requirement for landscaping except for in industrial areas, making Tasmania the only jurisdiction in Australia to not require basic landscaping for certain uses, developments and subdivisions in its urban areas. Whilst the SPPs have many other failings in regard to encouraging the creation of vibrant, attractive, healthy and liveable communities (no standards for public open space, urban design, density in appropriate locations, connectivity, for example), the absence of landscaping provisions is considered to have the potential to result in an especially negative impact on urban environments across the State.

Due to the expected growth and existing urban realm issues, Brighton Council consider it critical that landscaping be provided to promote a desirable living environment and improve health and wellbeing within the community. This is particularly important in Brighton as a growth/affordable municipality where entry-level/low-cost development is the norm. Landscaping is well-regarded as a low-cost way of improving the urban realm, particularly where the built form is aesthetically lacking, as it often is in these non-architecturally designed 'first home buyer' dwellings.

There are also many other well documented benefits of having green urban areas:

- From an economic perspective, there is evidence that vegetation and green spaces increase property values. Vegetation used for green walls also help to reduce energy consumption for cooling and related operational expenses.
- Shade can provide relief during hot weather by reducing the urban heat island effect in hot weather, helping workers, residents and customers to cool down across our urban areas.
- From a human health perspective, shade reduces the risk of heat stress in urban populations. Green infrastructure in design could see a decreased probability of people requiring medical services.

- Green infrastructure can promote social interaction and a sense of community and connect people to nature where they may not be able to do so in other urban environments.
- Overall, green infrastructure makes places more liveable and attractive to live, work and play. This need for attractive local areas has become increasingly important during the COVID19 pandemic and people needing to stay in their local neighbourhoods.

The inclusion of a Landscaping requirements is also consistent with the following policies in the STRLUS:

Recreation and Open Space

ROS 1 Plan for an integrated open space and recreation system that responds to existing and emerging needs in the community and contributes to social inclusion, community connectivity, community health and well being, amenity, environmental sustainability and the economy.

ROS 1.5 Provide for residential areas, open spaces and other community destinations that are well connected with a network of high quality walking and cycling routes.

ROS 1.6 Subdivision and development is to have regard to the principles outlined in 'Healthy by Design: A Guide to Planning and Designing Environments for Active Living in Tasmania'.

Land Use and Transport Integration

LUTI 1 Develop and maintain an integrated transport and land use planning system that supports economic growth, accessibility and modal choice in an efficient, safe and sustainable manner.

LUTI 1.11 Encourage walking and cycling as alternative modes of transport through the provision of suitable infrastructure and developing safe, attractive and convenient walking and cycling environments.

Activity Centres

AC 1 Focus employment, retail and commercial uses, community services and opportunities for social interaction in well-planned, vibrant and accessible regional activity centres that are provided with a high level of amenity and with good transport links with residential areas.

AC 1.4 Promote a greater emphasis on the role of activity centres, particularly neighbourhood and local activity centres, in revitalising and strengthening the local community.

AC 1.5 Encourage high quality urban design and pedestrian amenity through the respective development standards.

AC 1.8 Encourage new development and redevelopment in established urban areas to reinforce the strengths and individual character of the urban area in which the development occurs.

AC 3 Evolve Activity Centres focussing on people and their amenity and giving the highest priority to creation of pedestrian orientated environments.

AC 3.1 Actively encourage people to walk, cycle and use public transport to access Activity Centres.

Recommended amendment to SPPs:

Landscaping provisions similar to those existing in the Commercial Zones in the Interim Schemes and Parking and Access Code be inserted into the SPPs and that the below subdivision standard be inserted into the Subdivision Standards for the following zones:

- **General Residential**
- **Inner Residential**
- **Low Density Residential**
- **Village**
- **Urban Mixed Use**
- **Local Business**
- **General Business**
- **Central Business**
- **Commercial**
- **Light Industrial**
- **General Industrial**

Objective:	That new roads are landscaped to provide for: a) increased vegetation cover; b) attractive streetscapes that encourage an active and healthy lifestyle	
Acceptable Solutions		Performance Criteria
A1 Any subdivision with a new road, must provide at least one street tree per frontage, except for internal lots.	P1 Street trees must be provided on subdivisions with new roads, having regard to: a) the width of lot frontages; b) location of infrastructure; c) the topography of the site; d) the safety and efficiency of the road network;	

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">e) the nature of the road; andf) existing vegetation that can be retained. |
|--|---|