

Committee Secretary  
State Development, Natural Resources and Agricultural Industry Development Committee  
Parliament House  
George Street  
Brisbane Qld 4000  
[sdnraidc@parliament.qld.gov.au](mailto:sdnraidc@parliament.qld.gov.au)

15<sup>th</sup> December 2019

Dear Committee Secretary,

Re: **Implementation of The Spit Master Plan Implementation Bill 2019**

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission on this Bill.

I had the pleasure, as the then co-chair of the Australian Institute of Architects Gold Coast Northern Rivers Region, to be invited to contribute to the master planning workshops which demonstrated, I believe, an exemplary process, resulting in a highly aspirational Spit Master Plan.

That plan is still at a high level and requires several documents, design guidelines, MoU's, perhaps other Acts, place-making and management guidelines, procurement guidelines and governance arrangements to ensure that the plan can be faithfully delivered over time.

My term as co-chair of the AIA GCNR Region has finished and my comments therefore are personal. However, I have canvassed several people in the industry and the community to consider the proposed Act and to frame a suitable submission. Consequently, some messages may be repeated in the submissions you receive.

I support the *Implementation of The Spit Master Plan Implementation Bill 2019* but make the following comments based on my interpretation of the Bill and the clarifications made in the Explanatory Notes.

1. **The aims of the Bill** as set out in the Explanatory Notes are to:

- enhance the public realm of The Spit to create a community space for local residents;
  - improve connections to the surrounding marine environment, including The Broadwater;
  - generate opportunities for job creation through tourism, entertainment and recreation; and
  - find the right balance between protecting environmental and community values and facilitating appropriate development opportunities.
- a. It is suggested that dot point 4 should be repositioned as priority 3 and that these priorities be contained within the Bill as a reminder to all parties involved in delivering the Master Plan.

2. **Leasehold lands:**

Reassurance is sought that no Crown lands on the Spit are to be offered for development as any tenure other than leasehold. In addition, no perpetual leases should be offered.

3. **No further long-term residential development:**

Reassurance is sought that no additional long-term residential accommodation is permitted on the Spit other than caretaker and ranger accommodation.

4. **Income stream:**

Income from rental leasing of crown land and from other Spit related businesses/ventures should, in the main, be quarantined to fund projects and maintain the improvements to The Spit.

**5. Board membership:**

In order to comply with Spit Master Plan Implementation, Act the Board is to be increased by up to three more people.

It is strongly suggested that the Board appoint an architect with experience and appropriate credentials to:

- advise the Board about the varied and appropriate procurement practices that (a) capitalise on great designers and (b) can deliver exemplary design (public and private);
- critique the various design briefs for proposed works/projects
- advocate the involvement of the university schools of architecture
- liaise with a design review entity such as the QUDAPP (Queensland Urban Design and Places Panel) or a specially appointed design review panel.

6. **Ensuring the intent of the Master Plan is delivered faithfully** (i.e. high-quality design; place making and exemplary place management) requires sophisticated governance around the players (State Development DSDMIP, GCWA and City of GCC).

a. This may be done through the creation of:

- another act or
- planning legislation or
- MoU's (with public scrutiny) that ensure watertight governance and compliance.

**7. Who does what?**

It appears that GCWA will be required to work with City of GCCC since most of the land at the Spit comes under the trusteeship of City of GGC.

The Master Plan calls for Place Management as an essential to deliver ongoing success to the Spit yet there is NO suggestion how this will be done. It is unlikely that this can be done with 2 entities doing their "own thing" unless there is an overriding control in the Act or a publicly accessible MoU.

The risk now is that GCCC and GCWA have their own ideas about:

- how to procure projects (public and private)
- how to assess them
- how to get quality

They are both focused on budget and maintenance and fulfilling (perhaps reluctantly) election deadlines.

Therefore, can the Act be broadened to ensure that quality outcomes are pursued just as vigorously by city of GCC?

Alternatively, it is suggested that an MoU between appropriate parties (SD, GCWA and City of GCC) should spell out clearly the governance parameters that determine:

- **place making responsibilities:** joint and singular; authority; accountability; expenditure; compliance and community engagement etc.
- **place management:** structure, authority, operation, accountability and community engagement etc.

**8. Helicopter flights.**

It appears that current legislation around the excessive operation of helicopter joy flights is inadequate. Such noise pollution does not seem to be monitored or controlled by any government entity and results in considerable discomfort to visitors to The Spit as well as residents in nearby residential areas. Apart from the health and nuisance issues of these flights there is concern about the impact on potential investment in Precinct 5 – the Villages. Will potential investors be deterred by the constant noise and erosion of the ambience necessary for their resort and retail developments? Can the issue be tackled through this Act and if not, how can the issue be resolved?

Yours Faithfully,



Philip Follent