

Submission No. 024  
11.1.13



15 June 2015

Research Director  
Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee  
Parliament House  
George Street  
Brisbane QLD 4000

ATTN: IPNRC@parliament.qld.gov.au

Dear Sir/Madam

**Subject: Planning and Development Bill (Planning for Prosperity) 2015**

Thank you for the invitation to make a submission on the Planning and Development (Planning for Prosperity) Bill 2015.

Master Builders strongly supports planning reform that provides greater certainty and consistency of outcomes. The lack of certainty adds delay which in turn adds to the cost of development, impacting significantly on affordability.

We commend you for a Bill that is logical and clear – a significant improvement on the existing *Sustainable Planning Act 2009*. A planning framework that is readily understood will go a long way towards providing certainty and consistency of outcomes.

The key issue for the building and construction sector is ensuring that building work is not unduly caught up in local government planning schemes. Building work subject to 'building assessment provisions' should not be subject to further requirements in planning schemes. Section 31(3) of the *Building Act 1975* states that building assessment provisions "cannot be changed under a local law, local planning instrument or local government resolution." There are many examples of planning schemes attempting to do just that.

Second, triggers for a full town planning application to Council must be limited. We welcome the approach where planning schemes clearly map and define appropriate development, opening the way for more development to be regarded as 'Accepted Development'. In particular, we expect that overlays are not used to trigger a development application. Rather they would simply call up an existing Planning Code or building regulation for consideration within the 'Accepted Development' assessment process.



Further to this, we support the introduction of the 'exemption certificate' process. We regard this as a common sense approach, allowing a level of flexibility within the system in certain circumstances. We see it as having benefit where a proposed development meets expected outcomes in a planning scheme by way of a solution not provided for in the scheme. This process could serve as a quick and inexpensive option for assessing minor, low risk alternatives to the defined 'acceptable solutions', building upon the existing Concurrent Agency Referral process.

Over the past 18 months there has been significant discussion surrounding the compensation provisions in relation to managing natural hazards, currently addressed in section 706 (1) (i) of the *Sustainable Planning Act 2009*. We strongly support maintaining the intent of the current legislation and would not support alternative provision.

Thank you for your consideration of these issues.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Paul Bidwell'.

**Paul Bidwell**  
**Deputy Executive Director**