

**Responses by Independent South Brisbane Candidate Dr Cameron Murray
(supported by the federally registered Sustainable Australia party)**

Friday, 3 November 2017

Urban Planning

Question 1.

“Performance based planning”, with its inherent flexibility of interpretation, has been the basis of Planning legislation in Queensland for nearly a decade, but in recent times, performance assessment has been used to evade carefully constructed planning controls on height, density and siting requirements. If elected what would be your approach to performance based planning?

Scrap it. Performance based planning was always an excuse to give developers free favours. Strict codes are extremely flexible too – you can build any sized building you want up to the coded limit!

As part of my larger and more radical planning reform ideas, applications that exceed coded limits could be put forward but would have to be approved by a citizen jury that judged the merits of exceeding the code. A jury would be the final arbiter of local planning schemes (the State would require councils to run such a system).

Question 2

Consistent with the State Government role in Planning legislation, what are your thoughts on the State Government requiring a review of the South Brisbane Riverside Neighbourhood Plan to achieve greater compliance with the State Government standards for educational, child and youth services and open space?

Sounds fair. State-wide consistency in the provision of open space and necessary services seems fair and equitable.

Question 3

Scope the development outcomes that you would wish to see for the land known as the Kurilpa Master Plan and the timeframes for this development?

I think this area should predominantly be a ‘public realm’ rather than a private one. And extension of the public park and recreation facilities that takes advantage of river access and easy bridge access seems important.

I would also suggest that this large area could host the proposed new inner-city high school, with it’s sporting facilities possibly serving dual purposes on weekends.

Question 4

The approval of the West Village project overdevelops the site as it fails to deliver 20% green space and fails to meet the building height limit of 15 stories. Do you support the changing Stage 2 and Stage 3 of this site to incorporate some affordable housing and increased public green space rather than aggregating laneways and outdoor dining areas as green space? Will you strongly advocate for these modifications if elected?

Yes and yes. The move to call in the development but then allow even greater density to compensate for minor changes was a mistake. Again, this shows the value of prescriptive planning schemes with density limits and minimum requirements for open space, etc.

Community Engagement

Question 5

Kurilpa Futures believe that current Planning Scheme requirements are being evaded by simple amendments such as to overlay provisions, zoning proposal interpretations and “acceptable” variations to conditions. These appear to be made without coherent evidence or statistical

analyses to justify changes. How can residents have access to the evidence based data and ensure it is used for future changes to planning requirements?

I actually don't think access to the evidence is going to be the key here. I think prescriptive planning, and charging for new development rights granted by development approvals at market values would remove the incentive to seek out additional density and to skirt planning limits.

Political Donations

Question 6

Would you vote to prevent donations to candidates or their political party by an owner of registered development company or a company that has a vested interest in land development or their representatives?

No. If our ambition is to have a planning scheme just as corrupt as in NSW, we could go this route.

I would instead prefer to make the land titles register publicly accessible, as well as the hierarchy of corporate ownership structures that is monitored by the Office of State Revenue to administer land taxes.

This would make perfectly clear who owns every single piece of land in the state, the prices they paid to which seller, and the gains in value that they receive from favourable planning decisions.

Developer Contributions

Question 7

Currently developer contributions to the provision of infrastructure are paid into Brisbane City Council's general revenue and not spent directly or in a timely manner in the suburbs that are experiencing the pressure of development. Will you actively lobby to amend State Planning legislation to change this situation and for public release of an annual income and expenditure budget relating to developer infrastructure contributions?

No. This is an ineffective way to get infrastructure built.

Instead, minimum infrastructure upgrades can be written into local plans, with development approvals conditional on the provision of these upgrades. This would align the incentives of developers and the community to pressure councils to invest in those upgrades.

In terms of the developer contributions, these should be replaced by selling new development rights at a 25% discount on market prices upon a material change of use planning application. I estimate this would raise over \$2 billion State-wide each year (or about 17% of total State tax revenue). This system has worked successfully in the ACT for nearly 50 years.

Affordable Housing

Question 8

What are your thoughts on Inclusionary zoning for affordable housing? Would you support establishing a State Government standard of service for a proportion of affordable housing within new development in inner city areas?

Inclusionary zoning is one option for growing a stock of State-administered housing that rents at below-market rates to qualifying households. But there is no reason why the public housing agency can't simply act as a developer and build its own stock of housing, perhaps selling some homes to generate a mix of private and public residents. Acting as a developer themselves will provide far great control over what is built and where (integrating into existing suburbs), the standards and size of dwellings to suits needs, etc.

By also competing for sales in the private market these developments can help to keep prices of homes stable.

Open Space

Question 9

Currently, open space contributions can be land or a monetary contribution with developers generally defaulting to a monetary contribution. This means the ratio of open space to number of residents is decreasing throughout Brisbane's inner city and especially in the Kurilpa peninsula. Would you support a State Planning policy that requires a land contribution for example 20% of site area wherever the proposal is for 0.5 hectares or more?

That's fine. But I think often larger spaces are more useful than many small ones. There is nothing stopping the council or state acquiring land to provide open spaces as areas grow and have it written into the local plan that unless this space is provided (and completed) that more developments cannot be approved. Why not both?

Question 10 (this question is included at JM request but it will be discussed in detail at the meeting and so is repetitive)

Currently there is a significant shortfall in the West End peninsula in the Brisbane City Council's ratio for open space per resident and it is getting worse. Would you support the use of under-utilized crown land, such as overly wide roads , and unused road reserves, to build open space ?

Yes. I have seen proposals for Hampstead Rd and others, and would support this. In general, road space in urban areas needs to be far better utilised.

Transport

Question 11

On at least four occasions, there has been a proposal for a bridge to link West End to northern suburbs. Each time it has been rejected by previous Councils and residents of the Kurilpa peninsula. Once again a new bridge to the University of Queensland is being discussed. Kurilpa Futures is opposed to this proposal. How would you manage the transport and mobility needs of the Kurilpa Peninsula?

One way is simply to say no to more development! Having a citizen jury decide on local planning scheme that require particular investments by councils/state in order to allow development would really help here.

I personally do not have a strong view on the bridge to UQ, though do feel that the existing UQ bridge has been a great success. I am against vehicle access on any bridge – public transport, walking, and cycling only.