

ATTACHMENT 1 - SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED – Local Law Review (Miscellaneous)

During the consultation phase, Council undertook a range of activities to raise awareness with the public and business community. These activities included:

- Media Release sent out on commencement of consultation
- Website Information Pages “Have Your Say” for proposed changes
- Public Notice advertisements in the Sunshine Coast Daily
- Banners and Information Stands in Caloundra and Nambour Customer Service Centres
- Spotlight radio advertising
- Some Councillor columns print media
- Targeted email notices to the Presidents and also general contacts for Chamber of Commerce organisations
- Targeted email notices to 12 health and community service organisations that provide carers
- Targeted email notices to 15 businesses that provide dog walking and pet care services
- Targeted email notices to QBCC, Engineers Australia, Master Builders Association and the Housing Industry Association
- Targeted email notices to 9 businesses that provide shipping containers

State Interest Check

A State Interest Check was carried out from 23 August to 23 September

- Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy
- Department of Environment and Science
- Department of State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning
- Department of Transport and Main Roads
- Department of Treasury
- Department of Local Government, Racing and Multicultural Affairs

The Department of Transport and Main Roads provided comment which are detailed below:

Local Law Title and section	Issue	Suggested action from Department to rectify issue	Officer Comments
Local Law No.2 (Miscellaneous) 2019 - S7(4)	<p>The definition for “class 2 pest” does not appear to include feral horses.</p> <p>It is understood Council are proposing to rely on this section to assist in the management of horses at Wild Horse Mountain. It would be beneficial to TMR to have horses included in this definition for that purpose.</p>	<p>TMR considers it is important for horses to be included in the definition of "class 2 pest".</p> <p>The Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Regulation 2003 did not prescribe horses as class 2 pests.</p> <p>Council should clarify with the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries whether alternative wording would be more suitable for this purpose.</p>	No change to proposed local law
Amendment Subordinate Local Law (Miscellaneous) no. 3 S5	<p>Under section 66(5)(b) of the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995 (TORUM) a local government may make a local law for declared roads (ie state-controlled roads) in its area only with the chief executive’s written agreement.</p> <p>A footnote in the title of the new section 8 makes reference to a Memorandum of Understanding between TMR and SCRC for the regulation of roadside activities on state- controlled roads. The MoU is not a legally binding document save for some limited exceptions not relevant to this purpose. It does not constitute written agreement under section 66 of TORUM.</p>	<p>TMR does not agree to the proposed amendment to section 8 at this time.</p> <p>If SCRC wishes to regulate the matters on SCRS in section 66 of TORUM, Council should seek written approval from the Chief Executive.</p> <p>Please note that camping and vehicles advertised for sale are not matters for which the chief executive may agree to the application of local laws to SCRs under s66 TORUM.</p>	Remove reference to the MoU and the Roadside Advertising Manual and replace with Guy’s suggestion. This is supported in order to maintain currency with the LL’s.
Amendment Subordinate Local Law no. 3	<p>Section 21 inserts restrictions on using powered vessels to water ski, wave jump or freestyle for Parrearra Lake, Pelican Waters</p> <p>North and Twin Waters Residential Lake. Use is permitted where signs are erected by the local government authorising the activity at the place or where the activity is authorised under a condition of an approval granted under Local Law No.1 (Administration) 2011.</p> <p>Section 19 of the Transport Infrastructure (Waterways Management) Regulation 2012 prohibits the use of a watercraft to freestyle, surf or wave jump in regulated waters of the Sunshine Coast. See schedule 2, part 2, division 4 for regulated waters of the Sunshine Coast.</p> <p>Section 197(3) of the Transport Operations (Marine Safety) Regulation 2016 provides that a person must not conduct an activity in waters if doing so in the waters endangers marine safety. See gazettal details on restricted water ski areas at: www.msq.qld.gov.au/waterways/restricted-areas. Section 86 of the Transport Operations (Marine Safety) Regulation 2016 sets out restrictions for personal</p>	Review proposed amendments in view of current marine legislation	Remove reference to the MoU and the Roadside Advertising Manual and replace with Guy’s suggestion. This is supported in order to maintain currency with the LL’s

	watercraft operating (freestyle, surf or wave jump) in particular places.		
Amendment Subordinate Local Law No.3 (Miscellaneous) 2019 - S20	Clarity required on "exhibit a sign which indicates interference with a road" actually refers to.	Clarity on what "exhibit a sign which indicates interference with a road" intends to achieve.	Use is only permitted where signs are erected by the local government authorising the activity at the place or where the activity is authorised under a condition of an approval granted under Local Law No.1 (Administration) 2011 unless the activity is prohibited under State legislation.

Public Interest Review
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consultation Period – 23 August 2019 to 23 September 2019 2. Submissions were invited from the public and business community 3. No submissions were received

Community consultation overview
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consultation Period – 23 August 2019 to 23 September 2019 2. Submissions were invited from the public and business community 3. 67 submissions were received, 6 of the submissions did not relate to the current proposed amendments

The following table outlines community responses to the proposed Amendment Local Law No.2 (Miscellaneous) 2019

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)				
Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Submitters Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
LOCAL LAW No 1 (Administration) 2011				
Section 9 – Local Government’s discretion in granting approvals				
	Nil Responses			No change to proposed local law.
Section 28 – Power to remove and cost recovery				
	Nil Responses			No change to proposed local law.
Section 44 – Dealing with seized and impounded items				
	Nil Responses			No change to proposed local law.
Schedule 1 (Dictionary)				
1	Pingg low voltage shock to cats and keeping them on owners property - I disagree with this change and see it as a 'lazy fix' to a wider issue that should be addressed with the community and cat owners on how to better prevent cats from leaving the premises. Higher fences, there is also an attachment you can add to your fence line that rolls when a cat tries to jump up which means they can't leave the premises.	Local Law No. 2 Division 2 Section 15 requires cats to be contained to a property at all times by way of a proper enclosure. The pingg fencing provides an additional measure for owners to utilise.	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
Schedule 2 (Prescribed Activities)				
'Causing Building Site Delivery Noise' and 'Causing Building Site Noise'				
2	The ability to allow building noise permits for special circumstances outside business hours. This creates a new permit application process and is only relevant for special circumstances. To minimise impacts the applicant must demonstrate to Council:- (i) there are extraordinary circumstances justifying why the activity should occur outside the prescribed times; or (ii) there are environmental or public safety reasons why the activity should occur outside the prescribed times; and (iii) it will not cause unreasonable noise at which the noise can be heard; and (iv) other control measures such as public notification and the applicant having in place a 24 hour complaints management number to address issues. My issue relates to the "extraordinary" circumstances. Option, where no examples are provided as to what that may mean. Does it mean that a builder has a project underway and is running out of time and might face penalties for late completion, so he/she applies for a permit to work "out of hours"? I would only support the amendment if the "extraordinary circumstances" provision is deleted and the permit process apply only to environmental or public safety issues. However, I would think that under Emergency Services legislation there are	The purpose of the proposed local law change is to protect public health and safety and the environment in extraordinary circumstances. Exclusions for making noise already sit within <i>Environmental Protection Act 1994</i> - Schedule 1 Exclusions relating to environmental nuisance or environmental harm sections 17A, 440 and 440Q. The state legislation specifically gives local governments the power (section 440O) to make local laws about noise which overrides the state legislation and becomes the new noise standard. Extraordinary circumstances have been included as this covers "very unusual circumstances." A builder running out of time to complete the project would not be considered a very unusual circumstance. This	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)

Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Submitters Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
	<p>provisions that cover this eventuality.</p> <p>The concept that the current rules are anti-competitive to business is a nonsense. If an emergency situation arises, then the situation at hand is the issue, not whether it is anti-competitive. The community is entitled to live in an environment during normally "family and/or sleeping times" where building noise is not a major disturber. If this topic is such an issue one would ask why the state is not changing the legislation. It appears to me that this is purely about circumventing the state laws. One might also ask that if there is an emergency that requires a permit it could be counter-productive as the applicant would only be able make application during office hours.</p>	<p>drafting is designed to cater for very unusual situations where different approaches are required or in circumstances where operating out of hours protects public health and safety or the environment.</p>		
3	<p>Building site noise should be restricted to current working hours. Permits should only be authorised in life threatening circumstances in which urgent works need to be carried out. I am certain there is always a resolution to overcome Council's desire to issue developers special dispensation.</p> <p>Totally disagree with Council's proposed amendment to building site noise permits. Council is going against current State Government law, workplace health and safety, compromising workers lives. There is enough noise already created during normal working hours let alone for Council to issue special permits so building sites can operate outside normal working hours. Families would like their loved ones returned home each day after work. Nearly every day a worker loses their life in Australia due to a work related accidents. Council clearly is asking for contractors to break the law by disengaging reverse beepers, sirens and other related machinery noises. Your amendment will cost construction contractors more for their work.</p>	<p>The proposed changes will not be in conflict with state legislation as the local law will become the new noise standard for that activity as covered under section 440O of the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1994</i>.</p> <p>Sunshine Coast Council has contacted Workplace Health and Safety Queensland, who have provided the following information:</p> <p>Powered mobile plant (e.g.s. cranes, excavators, earthmoving machinery) is defined in the <i>Work Health and Safety Regulation 2011</i>. The Powered Mobile Plant Code of Practice provides the details of how to meet the requirements of the legislation. Safe Plans are documents required to spell out how this will be achieved. If a business is thinking to undertake an activity which is outside of their Safe Plan they are required to develop a Work Method Statement relevant to this activity and it must provide alternative controls that are equal or better than those specified. If this cannot be achieved due to certain considerations the controls must be able to minimise the risks. The work method statement must also demonstrate the reasoning behind why these decisions were made and how you came to using the controls. In relation to beepers and squawkers a number of alternative controls may be utilised which could include actual exclusion zones with physical barriers to prevent entry in these work zones and the inclusion of spotters in vantage points. An important component of these alternative controls is the induction and training of all staff to ensure that they comply with work method statement. It is up to the builder to put in place the risk assessments, documentation, site set up and training of staff that needs to comply with the <i>Work Health and Safety Act 2011</i>. If all of this is not in place and the state government workplace health and safety officers audit a site and find non-compliances compliance or enforcement action would be taken.</p>	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
4	<p>Public input. Should only be allowed in emergencies. Council should be looking after local interests not huge development companies.</p>	<p>The purpose of the proposed local law change is to protect public health and safety and the environment in extraordinary circumstances. Exclusions for making noise already sit within <i>Environmental Protection Act 1994 - Schedule 1</i> Exclusions relating to environmental nuisance or environmental harm sections 17A, 440 and 440Q. The state legislation specifically gives local governments the power (section 440O) to make local laws about noise which overrides the state legislation and becomes the new noise standard.</p>	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
5	<p>Under NO CIRCUMSTANCES should noise permits be issued outside of normal business hours because the current 12 hours per day, 6 days per week is sufficient. The interpretation of 'extraordinary' is too subjective and should be defined to include only significant natural disasters or environmental disasters and specifically exclude oversights and errors of judgement. * You might say that a permit cannot be issued for anything other than recovery from a significant natural disaster. * You might say</p>	<p>Exclusions for making noise already sit within <i>Environmental Protection Act 1994 - Schedule 1</i> Exclusions relating to environmental nuisance or environmental harm sections 17A, 440 and 440Q. The state legislation specifically gives local governments the power (section 440O) to make local laws about noise which overrides</p>	Disagree	Refer the comment relating to the construction of the airport and whether this qualifies as building work for drafting consideration as the intent is to only cover building site noise and building site delivery noise; not

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)

Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Submitters Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
	<p>and how long a period should a permit be issued for, 1 week, 1 month, define how long is acceptable? I agree that only a significant natural disaster is sufficiently extraordinary and permits can be issued only for a construction site related to emergency services such as a hospital. A tsunami is extraordinary, however other unpredictable weather events are NOT extraordinary, unseasonal rain is not extraordinary. Extraordinary does NOT include unseasonal rain events, storm events and cyclonic events (all of which occur on the Sunshine Coast) and building project plans should incorporate these events as ordinary. Extraordinary does NOT apply to the Sunshine Coast Airport runway project contamination event as this is a man-made disaster, not a significant natural disaster.</p>	<p>the state legislation and becomes the new noise standard.</p> <p>There are already exclusions for noise for government bodies to respond to disasters and public health risks:-</p> <p><i>Environmental Protection Act 1994 Schedule 1</i></p> <p>2 Government activities and public infrastructure Environmental nuisance caused in the course of any of the following activities— (a) maintaining a public road, State-controlled road, railway or other infrastructure for public transport; (b) maintaining a public infrastructure facility, including— (i) infrastructure for a water or sewerage service; and (ii) a facility for a telecommunication or electricity system; (c) performing a function under the <i>Disaster Management Act 2003</i>; (d) in the case of the State or a local government— preventing or removing, or reducing the risk to public health from, a public health risk under the <i>Public Health Act 2005</i>.</p> <p>building work means any of the following— (a) building, repairing, altering, underpinning (whether by vertical or lateral support), moving or demolishing a building;</p> <p>(b) providing air conditioning, drainage, heating, lighting, sewerage, ventilation or water supply for a building;</p> <p>(c) excavating or filling— (i) for, or that is incidental to, an activity mentioned in paragraph (a) or (b); or (ii) that may adversely affect the stability of a building, whether the excavating or filling is happening on the land on which the building is situated or on adjoining land; [s 440K] <i>Environmental Protection Act 1994</i> Chapter 8 General environmental offences</p> <p>(d) supporting (whether vertically or laterally) land for an activity mentioned in paragraph (a) or (b); (e) installing or removing scaffolding</p> <p>The comment relating to the construction of the airport will need to be considered. It is unlikely that the majority of the construction at the airport is building work as defined in the legislation.</p>		general construction activities.
6	<p>Under NO CIRCUMSTANCES should noise permits be issued outside of normal business hours on the basis that the current 12 hours per day, 6 days per week is sufficient. The interpretation of 'extraordinary' is too subjective and should be defined.</p> <p>I stand by the comments made in part4 sufficiently cover my concerns. However I would like to add this, that there seems to be a prevailing attitude of us and them with regards to the Council and its business. We are not against all change or development - we just want to ensure that it meets the standards and expectations of the residents and that all proposals are transparent and subject to vigorous public scrutiny. The Council's ethics and standards must be fully accountable. Once trust is lost, it's almost impossible to win back.</p>	<p>Extraordinary circumstances have been included as this covers "very unusual circumstances." This drafting is designed to cater for very unusual situations where different approaches are required.</p> <p>Part of the assessment criteria for the application is the "building work will not cause unreasonable noise in a building at which the noise can be heard." Each proposal will be considered on its merits against all of the criteria.</p>	Disagree	Refer to drafting to consider providing a definition for "extraordinary" or stay with using the general definition such as "very unusual circumstances."
7	<p>Under NO CIRCUMSTANCES should noise permits be issued outside of normal business hours on the basis that the current 12 hours per day, 6 days per week is sufficient. There is no need to extend the current.</p>	<p>With continued urbanisation of our region there are more circumstances where the need arises for out of hours building works or building site deliveries. Rather than ignore these occurrences or prohibit them leaving Council no choice but to issue fines to offenders Council is providing a framework to oversee these activities.</p>	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
8	<p>Safety and necessity. We have been building for years in the allowable noise times. Taking beepers off or having the low sounding is being irresponsible even with spotters. Sunshine Coast builders and developers do not need this extra time. If it's too hot to lay a slab wait until it cools down. Leave it as is.</p> <p>Sunshine Coast Councils appears to be for the developers and not for</p>	<p>The purpose of the proposed local law change is to protect public health and safety and the environment or in extraordinary circumstances. Unfortunately not every situation fits into a one size fits all in regards to building site works or building site deliveries. This proposal is to</p>	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)

Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Submitters Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
	residents. Whilst I'm all for development, please do it within the guidelines. Stop moving the post to benefit yourselves.	provide clear rules to ensure public health and safety is protected or address extraordinary circumstances rather than let activities occur outside of hours without any regulation (other than issuing fines). The state government legislation provides that local government can make local laws about noise and this provides a new set of rules for this noise standard.		
9	Disagree with builders working longer hours and turning off the reversing beepers on work vehicles/machines.	The proposed changes will not be in conflict with state legislation.	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
10	I disagree with the proposed amendments. Under NO CIRCUMSTANCES should noise permits be issued outside of normal business hours on the basis that the current 12 hours per day, 6 days per week is sufficient. The interpretation of 'extraordinary' is too subjective and should be defined to include only significant natural disasters or environmental disasters and specifically exclude oversights and errors of judgement. A permit cannot be issued for anything other than recovery from a significant natural disaster. How long a period should a permit be issued for, 1 week, 1 month, define how long is acceptable? I agree that only a significant natural disaster is sufficiently extraordinary and permits can be issued only for a construction site related to emergency services such as a hospital. A tsunami is extraordinary, however other unpredictable weather events are NOT extraordinary, unseasonal rain is not extraordinary. Extraordinary does NOT include unseasonal rain events, storm events and cyclonic events (all of which occur on the Sunshine Coast) and building project plans should incorporate these events as ordinary. Extraordinary does NOT apply to the Sunshine Coast Airport runway project contamination event as this is a man-made disaster, not a significant natural disaster.	Exclusions for making noise already sit within Environmental Protection Act 1994 - Schedule 1 Exclusions relating to environmental nuisance or environmental harm sections 17A, 440 and 440Q. The state legislation specifically gives local governments the power (section 440Q) to make local laws about noise which overrides the state legislation and becomes the new noise standard. There are already exclusions for noise for government bodies to respond to disasters and public health risks:- <i>Environmental Protection Act 1994 Schedule 1</i> 2 Government activities and public infrastructure Environmental nuisance caused in the course of any of the following activities— (a) maintaining a public road, State-controlled road, railway or other infrastructure for public transport; (b) maintaining a public infrastructure facility, including— (i) infrastructure for a water or sewerage service; and (ii) a facility for a telecommunication or electricity system; (c) performing a function under the <i>Disaster Management Act 2003</i> ; (d) in the case of the State or a local government— preventing or removing, or reducing the risk to public health from, a public health risk under the <i>Public Health Act 2005</i> . building work means any of the following— (a) building, repairing, altering, underpinning (whether by vertical or lateral support), moving or demolishing a building; (b) providing air conditioning, drainage, heating, lighting, sewerage, ventilation or water supply for a building; (c) excavating or filling— (i) for, or that is incidental to, an activity mentioned in paragraph (a) or (b); or (ii) that may adversely affect the stability of a building, whether the excavating or filling is happening on the land on which the building is situated or on adjoining land; [s 440K] <i>Environmental Protection Act 1994</i> Chapter 8 General environmental offences (d) supporting (whether vertically or laterally) land for an activity mentioned in paragraph (a) or (b); (e) installing or removing scaffolding The comment relating to the construction of the airport will need to be considered. It is unlikely that the majority of the construction at the airport is building work as defined in the legislation.	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
11	I respectfully submit that I totally DISAGREE with the proposed changes. Under NO CIRCUMSTANCES should noise permits be issued outside of normal business hours which currently provides 12 hours per day, 6 days per week for building sites. If permits are issued for noise after business hours on building sites, then this also means there will be EXCESSIVE BRIGHT LIGHTS required for workplace health and safety. Neither the noise nor the lighting is justifiable. Definitely not for the CBD, not for the airport runway, not for any infrastructure project, not for high rise developments, not for housing developments and not even	Comments noted. The proposed local law provisions provide a framework for Council to consider situations where there can be benefits to protecting public health and safety and the environment by scheduling the works after hours. It is fine to consider the world in black and white in relation to legislation however Council is looking to be proactive and consider each situation by its merits to better serve our	Disagree	Refer the comment relating to the construction of the airport and whether this qualifies as building work for drafting consideration as the intent is to only cover building site noise and building site delivery noise; not general construction activities.

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)

Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Submitters Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
	<p>for a hospital construction project.</p> <p>No amendment is necessary - 12 hours a day, 6 days a week is sufficient. The only reasonable exception might be a State of Emergency.</p> <p>Building site Noise at night entails Bright lights at night and neither is good for the Community</p>	<p>community. Part of the assessment criteria for the application is the “building work will not cause unreasonable noise in a building at which the noise can be heard.” Each proposal will be considered on its merits against all of the criteria.</p>		
12	<p>I DISAGREE with the proposed amendments. Interpretation of ‘extraordinary’ is too subjective. The application should be defined to include only:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. significant natural disasters AND /OR 2. significant environmental disasters <p>The application should also be defined as NOT including oversights, omissions and errors of judgement in building and construction project planning. For example, a tsunami is a significant natural disaster, however, other unpredictable weather events are NOT significant natural disasters; unseasonal rain is not extraordinary. Extraordinary does NOT include unseasonal rain events, storm events and cyclonic events (all of which occur on the Sunshine Coast) and building project plans should incorporate these events as ordinary. A permit cannot be issued for anything other than recovery from a significant natural disaster or a significant environmental disaster, and should not be granted for a period any longer than 2 weeks and only for a construction site related to emergency services such as a hospital. An example is the Sunshine Coast Airport runway project contamination event. This is a man-made disaster, not a significant natural disaster, although certainly it is potentially an environmental disaster. Disposal of the contaminated water should only be undertaken in daylight hours. No permit beyond business hours should apply. It should be noted that business hours are daylight hours and non-business hours would require extensive and excessive artificial light at night which is disruptive to humans and native species.</p> <p>Exclude the word "extraordinary" which is subjective. Include specifics such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. significant natural disasters AND /OR 2. significant environmental disasters <p>The issue of non-business hours - these are generally night-time hours and permits for building site noise would require extensive and excessive artificial light at night which is known to be disruptive to humans and native species.</p>	<p>Extraordinary circumstances have been included as this covers “very unusual circumstances.” This drafting is designed to cater for very unusual situations where different approaches are required.</p> <p>Exclusions for making noise already sit within <i>Environmental Protection Act 1994</i> - Schedule 1 Exclusions relating to environmental nuisance or environmental harm sections 17A, 440 and 440Q. The state legislation specifically gives local governments the power (section 440O) to make local laws about noise which overrides the state legislation and becomes the new noise standard.</p> <p>There are already exclusions for noise for government bodies to respond to disasters and public health risks:-</p> <p><i>Environmental Protection Act 1994 Schedule 1</i></p> <p>2 Government activities and public infrastructure Environmental nuisance caused in the course of any of the following activities—</p> <p>(a) maintaining a public road, State-controlled road, railway or other infrastructure for public transport; (b) maintaining a public infrastructure facility, including— (i) infrastructure for a water or sewerage service; and (ii) a facility for a telecommunication or electricity system; (c) performing a function under the <i>Disaster Management Act 2003</i>; (d) in the case of the State or a local government— preventing or removing, or reducing the risk to public health from, a public health risk under the <i>Public Health Act 2005</i>.</p> <p>building work means any of the following— (a) building, repairing, altering, underpinning (whether by vertical or lateral support), moving or demolishing a building;</p> <p>(b) providing air conditioning, drainage, heating, lighting, sewerage, ventilation or water supply for a building;</p> <p>(c) excavating or filling— (i) for, or that is incidental to, an activity mentioned in paragraph (a) or (b); or (ii) that may adversely affect the stability of a building, whether the excavating or filling is happening on the land on which the building is situated or on adjoining land; [s 440K] <i>Environmental Protection Act 1994</i> Chapter 8 General environmental offences</p> <p>(d) supporting (whether vertically or laterally) land for an activity mentioned in paragraph (a) or (b); (e) installing or removing scaffolding</p> <p>The comment relating to the construction of the airport will need to be considered. It is unlikely that the majority of the construction at the airport is building work as defined in the legislation.</p>	Disagree	Refer to drafting to consider providing a definition for “extraordinary” or stay with using the general definition such as “very unusual circumstances.”
13	<p>Please withdraw this amendment. Allowing it to go through will provide developers and construction companies with a free pass to make noise at any time they can justify. There is no mention of proximity to occupied housing and does not take into account the community's right to reasonable silence from heavy machine noise out of the current hours allotted.</p> <p>Why is this being proposed? Did the community ask for this? Probably not, the development and construction companies want this and for only one reason, profit above all else. Change the rules please so WE</p>	<p>Comment noted. For many years Council has received requests from a range of businesses in relation to out of hours building works or building site deliveries.</p> <p>Part of the assessment criteria for the application is the “building work will not cause unreasonable noise in a building at which the noise can be heard.” Each proposal will be considered on its merits against all of the</p>	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)

Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Submitters Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
	can make more money. This change does not serve the community, but it does benefit business. Passing this is another reduction of our right to a peaceful life.	criteria including proximity to occupied housing.		
14	No need to extend building hours - 12 hours is ample, particularly given the generally mild weather here. Only exception could be in an industrial estate where there is no impact on residents Please provide a list of Councils that allow extended hours. I'll bet there are few.	Comments noted. City of Gold Coast have had a very similar local law in place for several years. http://www.goldcoast.qld.gov.au/planning-and-building/after-hours-building-noise-30656.html	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
15	Construction work outside normal hours is noise pollution. I do not want to see this law amended to extend construction working hours before 7 am and after 7 pm. Just don't do it. Easy !! Use some common sense.	Comments noted however the times provided are not the current times for building works. 440R Building work (1) A person must not carry out building work in a way that makes an audible noise— (a) on a business day or Saturday, before 6.30a.m. or after 6.30p.m; or (b) on any other day, at any time.	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
16	No additional noise. No longer hours. Keep status quo. Too much urban sprawl killing wildlife. Slow development down. Lower noise.	Comments noted. The state government have a regional plan in place which requires development in certain areas and infill in others. Council is obligated to this plan.	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
17	Proposed construction noise on building sites to be allowed longer hours. I strongly disagree	Comments noted.	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
18	Noise on building sites. I am shocked that any Council would put their rate payers through the pain and distress of extended working hours Take it out stop the development mayor needs to go.	Comments noted. City of Gold Coast have had a very similar local law in place <i>City of Gold Coast Local Law No.8 (Public Health, Safety and Amenity) 2008.</i>	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
19	I strongly disagree with the proposal to extend construction hours on building sites in certain situations. Current times of 6.30am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday is a 12-hour window per day, six days a week. The idea in certain circumstances, none of which are outlined in the proposal, builders can work beyond these times is worrying. Surely what we have at the moment is more than sufficient. I would argue the Saturday allowance is already a step too far. Ordinary residents and workers have a chance to rest Saturday morning but lose that thanks to the arrival of heavy machinery and construction on work sites. These constructions workers get paid for the privilege of an early wake-up call whereas residents are simply trying to recharge their batteries with a late start and are denied this. The proposal threatens to worsen this situation and the thought of construction site noise well into the night during the week is alarming. This goes beyond being irritating or unwelcome. This becomes a matter of amenity and health. Construction noise at night has the potential to affect sleep routines of children and then, depending how late into the night the work continues, the sleep of adults. Poor sleep affects physical and mental health. The last thing anyone wants is stressing about sleeping because of a noisy construction site, which can fuel insomnia in addition to the clear impacts of mental and physical health. If building companies want to stay on track, prepare, prepare and prepare. Work a contingency into the timeline. Don't rely on reckless amendments to local laws to keep a project delivery on time, while sacrificing the peaceful enjoyment of the area for residents. The proposal also mentions modifying the way work sites operate, including turning off reversing vehicle warnings and providing a 23-hour hotline for residential complaints. Both of these ideas, with all due respect, are inane. What are the workplace health and safety implications of a silenced work site with respect to reversing machinery? And even if we could guarantee worker safety, the banging of a hammer or arrival of heavy machinery is already unacceptable noise for those in the immediate area. The 24-hour hotline is also ridiculous. This is a token offering that relies on allowing an issue to occur in the first place and having a resident report it in the middle of the night. Totally unacceptable. Councillors considering this proposal may live in an established residential area and have lost memory of what it's like to own and rent in new estates where construction comes in waves for a very long period of time. I argue the current 12 hour window offered six days a week is more than enough. This proposal threatens the peaceful enjoyment of residential areas and carries clear risks to the physical and mental wellbeing of residents. We live in a fast-paced society where everyone is always switched on. Stress is climbing. Mental health issues	Sunshine Coast Council has contacted Workplace Health and Safety Queensland, who have provided the following information: Powered mobile plant (e.g.s. cranes, excavators, earthmoving machinery) is defined in the <i>Work Health and Safety Regulation 2011</i> . The Powered Mobile Plant Code of Practice provides the details of how to meet the requirements of the legislation. Safe Plans are documents required to spell out how this will be achieved. If a business is thinking to undertake an activity which is outside of their Safe Plan they are required to develop a Work Method Statement relevant to this activity and it must provide alternative controls that are equal or better than those specified. If this cannot be achieved due to certain considerations the controls must be able to minimise the risks. The work method statement must also demonstrate the reasoning behind why these decisions were made and how you came to using the controls. In relation to beepers and squawkers a number of alternative controls may be utilised which could include actual exclusion zones with physical barriers to prevent entry in these work zones and the inclusion of spotters in vantage points. An important component of these alternative controls is the induction and training of all staff to ensure that they comply with work method statement. It is up to the builder to put in place the risk assessments, documentation, site set up and training of staff that needs to comply with the <i>Work Health and Safety Act 2011</i> . If all of this is not in place and the state government workplace health and safety officers audit a site and find non-compliance compliance or enforcement action would be taken. Part of the assessment criteria for the application is the "building work will not cause unreasonable noise in a building at which the	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)

Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Submitters Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
	are climbing. Insomnia and anxiety are climbing. Being able to switch off at night and rest is essential more than ever to individual health. Allowing construction on building sites well into the night, no matter the consideration or circumstance, is irresponsible. Health comes before business/profit. I struggle to think of too many residents who would be happy to subsidise big business with their sleep and health.	noise can be heard.” Each proposal will be considered on its merits against all of the criteria.		
20	The ability to allow building site delivery noise permits outside of normal business hours in clearly defined and extraordinary circumstances. I disagree with this as many construction areas are located close to existing housing. How are people meant to sleep? 6:30am is already ridiculously early. Have a think about shift workers. Evenings up to 7:30 would be ok as most kids go to bed then. There is no quiet or enjoyment when they can already work 12hrs out of 24 and when you sleep for 8 you only get a couple of hours escape. Don't shorten that escape. Get local people affected to approve. If they all agree then go with it. I was once woken up a 1am with trucks delivering equipment for a construction site. The workers then got out of their truck and had a loud conversation about women and their bodies and sex. This is what can happen if you extend the hours.	Comments noted. Part of the assessment criteria for the application is the “building work will not cause unreasonable noise in a building at which the noise can be heard.” Each proposal will be considered on its merits against all of the criteria.	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
21	Disagree with altering allowable commercial noise times. Don't change the current local law.	Comments noted.	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
22	Building permits are issued and not enforced when it comes to noise control and working outside of hours. Ghetto blasters and foul language also accompanied the construction noise. Do something about it. Monitor it	Amplified music during normal work hours is covered under the <i>Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000</i> and is a Queensland Police matter. For the proposed local law changes no radios or amplified music will be allowed during the duration of the permit time period. Foul language is not a Council controlled issue and again is a matter for the Queensland Police to consider in each circumstance.	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
23	Work sites 24 hours. Don't do it we don't want it, it's dangerous the roads are full	The intention of the proposed changes to the local law is not for 24 hour work sites.	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
24	DISAGREE - CONSTRUCTION SITE NOISE COULD OCCUR INTO THE NIGHT UNDER COUNCIL PROPOSAL. There is no need to increase building noise times, unless developers have not managed their process well. There are more residents than developers in the Sunshine Coast. Residents are already often besieged by building and urban noises - if you want to maintain a liveable area then there cannot be the possibility that developers can apply for increased hours for noise. There is no need. Time for residents to be considered.	Residents are being considered in the proposed changes to the local law as if the activity occurring outside of normal hours can reduce risks to public health and safety and protect the environment it is beneficial to the residents.	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
25	The ability to allow building site delivery noise permits outside of normal business hours in clearly defined and extraordinary circumstances. The ability to allow building site noise permits outside of normal business hours in clearly defined and extraordinary circumstances. Rubbish. Plan better DISAGREE Don't do it, it is a waste of resources. I don't know where you are going with this but you are "breaking" the Sunny coast. I'm sorry but in my opinion, most of these new amendment is about money and not the community.	The proposed changes to the local law and not financially driven and relate to protecting public health and safety and the environment and being able to deal with extraordinary situations that are not currently addressing in the existing legislation. Unfortunately many people in the community are not aware of how many things are undertaken after hours for a range of reasons. In regards to wasting resources Council will charge a cost recovery fee to cover the application processing and call outs if required.	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
26	Inserts new prescribed activities for 'Causing Building Site Delivery Noise' and 'Causing building site noise'. Absolutely Not! I DISAGREE. When I think of building sites I can't help but think of the wild west. Where I live a number of dwellings have been built over the last few years and it wasn't uncommon for work to start well before 6am. If you give them an inch they'll take a mile. Don't give in to these cowboys. To defer starting work or delivering materials to a building site until 8am and I'm only half joking. At the very least stick to the current start/delivery times. Naturally, a show is made when starting work too early just before 7am its tools down and deathly silence. Then bang on 7am lots of silly noise as if to say that wasn't noise, this is noise. To date I haven't complained to Council but I reiterate - Refuse the proposal	Comments noted.	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)

Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Submitters Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
27	<p>LL1 sch 2 where s8 inserts new prescribed activities for ‘causing building site delivery noise’ and ‘causing building work noise’. Subordinate Local Law No.1 (Administration) 2016, sch 5A and 5B where s7 inserts new schedules related to the new prescribed activities of ‘causing building site delivery noise’ and ‘causing building work noise’. Subordinate Local Law No.1 (Administration) 2016, sch 5A and 5B where s7 inserts new schedules related to the new prescribed activities of ‘causing building site delivery noise’ and ‘causing building work noise’.</p> <p>We believe that</p> <p>1 - under NO CIRCUMSTANCES should noise permits be issued outside of normal business hours on the basis that the current 12 hours per day, 6 days per week is sufficient.</p> <p>2- the interpretation of “extraordinary” is too subjective and should be defined to include only significant natural disasters or environmental disasters and specifically exclude oversights and errors of judgement.</p> <p>3- a permit cannot be issued for anything other than recovery from a significant natural disaster.</p> <p>4- only a significant natural disaster is sufficiently extraordinary and permits can be issued only for a construction site related to emergency services such as a hospital.</p> <p>5- a tsunami is extraordinary, however other unpredictable weather events are NOT extraordinary, unseasonal rain is not extraordinary.</p> <p>6- extraordinary does NOT include unseasonal rain events, storm events and cyclonic events (all of which occur on the Sunshine Coast) and building project plans should incorporate these events as ordinary.</p> <p>7- extraordinary does NOT apply to the Sunshine Coast Airport runway project contamination event as this is a man-made disaster, not a significant natural disaster.</p> <p>Finally, how long a period should a permit be issued for? One day, 1 week or 1 month? Can you define please how long is acceptable?</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Exclusions for making noise already sit within <i>Environmental Protection Act 1994 - Schedule 1</i></p> <p>Exclusions relating to environmental nuisance or environmental harm sections 17A, 440 and 440Q. The state legislation specifically gives local governments the power (section 440O) to make local laws about noise which overrides the state legislation and becomes the new noise standard.</p> <p>There are already exclusions for noise for government bodies to respond to disasters and public health risks:-</p> <p><i>Environmental Protection Act 1994 Schedule 1</i></p> <p>2 Government activities and public infrastructure Environmental nuisance caused in the course of any of the following activities—</p> <p>(a) maintaining a public road, State-controlled road, railway or other infrastructure for public transport; (b) maintaining a public infrastructure facility, including— (i) infrastructure for a water or sewerage service; and (ii) a facility for a telecommunication or electricity system; (c) performing a function under the <i>Disaster Management Act 2003</i>; (d) in the case of the State or a local government— preventing or removing, or reducing the risk to public health from, a public health risk under the <i>Public Health Act 2005</i>.</p> <p>These exclusions however do not apply to private enterprises or private properties.</p> <p>The drafting of the proposed legislation would include this activity in the approval as well as other extraordinary circumstances; not just disasters. This is because there are a range of activities that are better undertaken at night to protect our community and the environment or in consideration of other factors that can arise.</p> <p>There are a number of real situations occurring where Council needs to now permit these activities as they will most likely go ahead regardless and lead to compliance and enforcement actions with the operator happy to pay the fine if they happen to get caught. This approach invites business etc to meet with Council and plan and work through issues before it commences. This is a proactive approach and with the conditions placed on the permit include the community in the process. There are circumstances where this permit process is needed. It is not to be given out just to anyone that wants to operate at night. There will be strict assessment and conditioning of these permits.</p> <p>The period of the permit would be determined on a case by case basis and depend on:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the activities required to be performed 2. consideration of wet weather and wind if that played a part in restricting the activity 3. the benefits to protecting public safety and the environment 4. the levels of noise that will be generated through the activity and received by local residents 5. the number of local residents to be impacted and if other arrangements can be made in those circumstances 6. reasonableness in relation to detrimental impacts on sleep patterns to local residents. 	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)

Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Submitters Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
		The majority of examples witnessed by Council to date are for a one night activity. However there may be scenarios where more nights are required. In these cases there would need to be reduced operating times to ensure that residents sleep patterns are not affected or these impacts are minimised.		
28	<p>Relating to exemptions for building noise (causing building noise and causing delivery building noise), amending Local Law No.1 (Administration) 2011, sch 2 and Subordinate Local Law No.1 (Administration) 2016, sch 5A and 5B. These new prescribed activities enable a person to apply for Council approval to cause noise while undertaking building work or delivering materials to a building site outside of the normal hours permitted for such noise under the noise standards in the Environmental Protection Act 1994.</p> <p>Under the Act the hours of permitted noise for building work are 6.30am to 6.30pm – Monday to Saturday; excluding public holidays and Sundays. If building noise can be heard at premises outside the specified hours the person carrying out the building work is committing an offence. Sunshine Coast Council’s Fact Sheet on noise pollution (building work) dated July 2015 is quite explicit on the issues with noise, particularly the impacts on residential areas, and the law relating to it.</p> <p>The proposed amendments to Local Law No. 1 sch 2 and Subordinate Local Law No. 1 sch 5A and 5B are a blatant attack on residents’ rights and neighbourhood amenity. They appear to be a ploy to enable longer construction/delivery hours, under the guise of “extraordinary circumstances or environmental or public safety reasons”. These “circumstances and reasons” are not enunciated, so neither the business nor residential community has guidance as to what will be permitted or why.</p> <p>Building companies are currently managing their construction within the permitted hours, including deliveries. No doubt there can be challenges in larger building works, but that is part of project management. Construction and delivery noise is already permitted away from residential areas, that is, if the noise is not audible at premises, construction can continue 24/7.</p> <p>The State noise standards and hours of operation have been set, after much consultation, to provide a balance between construction operational efficiency and residential amenity. It is astonishing that Council should seek to vary this, when the construction industry is obviously capable of completing its projects without it.</p> <p>Accordingly, DW objects strongly to these noise amendments.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The permit is not to be given out for normal activities that could occur during the day. The proposed changes to the local law are about circumstances that occasionally arise where it is advantageous to conduct the activity outside the prescribed hours under the state government legislation. The state government have provided local governments with this ability to make a local law noise standard. There are both public health and environmental advantages and other advantages that can be gained from this approach. Whilst there already exist a number of exclusions in the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1994</i> to make audible noise outside of hours these relate to government or utility activities. Businesses and other persons have not been afforded these possibilities that could improve outcomes for the community. It is agreed that extraordinary circumstances could be defined in the local law and guidance provided to potential applicants.</p> <p>Extraordinary circumstances have been included as this covers “very unusual circumstances.” A builder running out of time to complete the project would not be considered a very unusual circumstance. This drafting is designed to cater for very unusual situations where different approaches are required or in circumstances where operating out of hours protects public health and safety or the environment. It is very difficult to define these situations as new technologies and new situations arise. In the last 10 years there have been so many changes to what our community use and the construction processes.</p>	Disagree	Refer to drafting to consider providing a definition for “extraordinary” or stay with using the general definition such as “very unusual circumstances.”
Operation of an amplified music venue within a special entertainment precinct				
29	Noise precinct changes in Nambour - with consideration. Opportunity for people affected by increased noise to provide feedback during a trial period.	<p>The submitter’s request for a trial period is not supported.</p> <p>Following public consultation in late 2018 and consideration of submissions, Council decided to proceed with a proposed planning scheme amendment to identify a Special Entertainment Precinct (SEP) in Nambour. In effect, the proposed SEP Local Law will assist in the implementation of the planning scheme provisions. As a result, it would practically be difficult to implement a trial period at this stage of the process.</p> <p>In addition, the business community requires some certainty that Council is committed to implementing a SEP in order to consider new investments with a reasonable level of confidence.</p> <p>It is likely to take some time for land use changes in the Nambour SEP to occur and potentially for the community to adjust to these changes. Once the SEP is implemented, Council will keep a watching brief on the success or otherwise of the precinct. If, in time, Council considers that the SEP should not continue, a process involving further</p>	Disagree Happy for a trial	No change to proposed local law.

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)

Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Submitters Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
		community consultation would likely be required		
30	Inserts new prescribed activity for operation of an amplified music venue within a special entertainment precinct. Absolutely NOT! I STRONGLY DISAGREE. This proposal is modelled on the 2006 present local law from Brisbane City Council. I consider the proposal to be a threat to our village atmosphere on the Sunshine Coast. Council should refuse this proposed amendment. The proposal represents monoculture. Excessive noise has an adverse effect on human health	<p>The submitter's concerns are noted.</p> <p>Following public consultation in late 2018 and consideration of submissions, Council decided to proceed with a proposed planning scheme amendment to identify a Special Entertainment Precinct (SEP) in Nambour. In effect, the proposed SEP Local Law will assist in the implementation of the planning scheme provisions.</p> <p>The proposed Nambour SEP has been identified in consideration of a range of matters including potential impact on surrounding residential uses, environmental health, local amenity and character and the benefits of a night-time economy. Notably, the proposed Nambour SEP currently has no permanent residential uses within its boundaries.</p>	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
Temporary placement of shipping container				
31	Disagree with proposed regulations regarding shipping containers Temporary, portable, not your authority. But to be, for they are not permanent, not under your authority No authority, potable structure.	<p><u>Strategic Planning</u></p> <p>The proposed Local Law has been made in accordance with the local law making powers under s28 of the Local Government Act 2009 and has been subject to legal review.</p> <p><u>Response Services</u></p> <p>The purpose of the legislation is to ensure the placement of the shipping container is managed safely and is not impacting the amenity within the community.</p>	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
32	Shipping containers. I agree that Council should be able to regulate on these. They are an eyesore and are popping up all over the place. Some people are just including them as an unapproved extension to their home. Approval should be sought from Council before placing one in your yard.	<p><u>Strategic Planning</u></p> <p>The submitter's support is noted.</p> <p><u>Response Services</u></p> <p>The purpose of the legislation is to ensure the placement of the shipping container is managed safely and is not impacting the amenity within the community.</p>	Agree	No change to proposed local law.
33	Insertion of new schedule 11A after schedule 11 – Temporary placement of a shipping container. 3) Documents and materials that must accompany applications for approval. (B) The purpose for placement of container. I agree with what's proposed but my next door neighbour dumped his container with rusted and broken metal at the bottom of our garden, no signs of proposal of use or purpose. When I phoned Council I was told it was only temporary by that section of Council dealing with containers. (C) A dimensioned site plan providing proposed siting location, boundary setbacks, existing building locations, vegetation and other features (for example fencing). I agree with what's proposed but in my case I watched a large crane dumping the container next to a 5ft wire fence. (D) Details demonstrating that the proposed siting has taken account of how to minimise impact on neighbouring residents and surrounding streetscape (F) Photographic images of all sides of the shipping container and details of any proposed changes to its appearance. (G) Details demonstrating no impacts on view lines either public or private. 4) Additional criteria for the granting of an approval. For an application for an approval for the temporary placement of a shipping container, the additional criteria are that placement will not be likely to cause – a detrimental impact on the amenity of the area.	The submitters support for the proposed local law is noted.	Agree	No change to proposed local law
LOCAL LAW No 2 (Animal Management) 2011				
Section 6 – Meaning of effective management of an animal in a public place				
34	Local Law No 2: Animal Management. s6 and s13 I do not believe the proposals are strict enough particularly pertaining to my local environment, Pt Cartwright. With the explosion in the number of dogs being brought here on the beach as well as in the Reserve there is constant issues with harassment of humans and bird life with dog's off-	Feedback has been noted and the area is included as part of the current beach patrol and monitoring program. Patrols are undertaken within current staffing levels. Infringements are issued where dogs are found breaching the	Does not relate to proposed amendments	Comments do not relate to current proposed local law amendments. Comments have been passed onto the relevant

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)

Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Submitters Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
	<p>leash.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The beach: it is a very popular beach for wadding and relaxing. As it is designated off leash beach the constant dog faeces lapping the shore is disgusting. I have heard owners speak proudly of how "good" it is to let their dogs "visit" the area. This is a health hazard. One cannot sit peacefully on the sand without being harassed by roaming dogs. This is terrifying to small children. One afternoon there were 24 dogs in the 200m strip towards the lighthouse end of the surf beach. This area should, at the very least, be a full time leash area. Designated swimming beaches do not allow dogs and this end of Pt Cartwright has as many people on the beach as the flagged beaches. Pt Cartwright Reserve. I have lost count of the number of dog owners ignoring their off-leash dog to foul the area and chase the wildlife. The s13 wording is just that...words! This area again, due to the sheer numbers needs to be an ALWAYS on leash area. Barking of dogs throughout the off leash hours carries upwards to the unit buildings and has been very distressing to some of the local elderly residents, who are rate payers. I am fed up with the fact that Sunshine Coast dogs are given more rights than we are, and owners believing their dogs are more important than we rate paying humans. Dog owners are very aggressive and cannot be challenged for fear of personal abuse. <p>Dogs on leash in the specific areas raised at all times. And that is being generous. Preferably no dogs at all in Pt Cartwright reserve and the corresponding eastern side surf beach.</p> <p>Have some consideration for non dog owners that live in this area.</p>	<p>local law requirements to remove faeces and ensure their dogs are under supervision and not causing a nuisance to other community members at all times.</p>		internal operational areas
35	<p>DISAGREE: Various animal management changes primarily around strengthening enforcement provisions; Local Law No.2 (Animal Management) 2011, s6; "For example, this applies to a dog in an off-leash area...The person must be physical present and within a proximate distance and able to respond immediately to manage the animals behaviour." I disagree with this change as I feel that this will provide too much power to the animal enforcement officers. The majority of dog owners appear to manage their dogs well in these extremely limited off-leash areas and to give 'authorities' more power to distribute more outrageous fines is pathetic. Dog owners generally know how to keep their dogs under effective management, and to provide the opportunity for a subjective opinion by authorities to determine 'proximate distance' is very risky. How are dog owners meant to exercise their dogs in off-leash areas whilst keeping their dogs next to them? The Sunshine Coast Council need to provide more off-leash areas if anything to support healthy, inclusive and wholesome lifestyles. This may actually encourage the public more than ever to ensure effective management of their dogs as these areas are highly valued and currently over-populated. More off-leash beach and park areas may really help to even the distribution of dogs in areas and assist with better management. More efforts need to be focused on managing roaming domestic cats, which have a significant impact on the local environment and wildlife.</p> <p>More focus on roaming domestic cats, less focus on dogs and their owners trying to do the right thing in off-leash areas. Provide more off-leash areas (beach in particular) to ease over-population in current off-leash areas.</p> <p>Provide more warnings instead of absurd fines to dog owners who may unknowingly have their dog off-leash in on-leash areas if their dog appears to be well managed and under verbal command of owners, particularly if no-one else is even around to be 'inconvenienced' by this.</p>	<p>Council takes the responsible management of dogs in public very seriously to ensure that all community members are able to safely enjoy these public spaces.</p> <p>The amount of the infringement reflects the seriousness with which Council takes community safety.</p> <p>Council regularly reviews the off-leash spaces provided for dogs and is committed to balancing the needs of the whole Sunshine Coast community when undertaking these reviews.</p>	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
Section 9 – Minimum standards for keeping animals				
Nil Responses				No change to proposed local law.
Section 9 A, B & C – Collar to be work by regulated dog, Obligation to register dog, Obligation to ensure cat or dog is implanted				
Nil Responses				No change to proposed local law.
Section 13 – Control of animals in a public place				
36	<p>The number of dogs on the Sunshine Coast is increasing dramatically with 'control' of these dogs generally being abysmal. Policing of beaches and walking paths needs to be stepped up. The common use of retractable extended leads needs to be stopped. These leads allow uncontrolled dogs to operate within a very wide arc of the owner. Also</p>	<p>Feedback has been noted and the area is included as part of the current beach patrol and monitoring program. Patrols are undertaken within current staffing levels.</p>	Does not relate to proposed amendments	Does not relate to current proposed local law amendments. Comments have been passed onto the relevant internal

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)

Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Submitters Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
	the common habit of 'walking' dogs by cyclists allowing the dog pull them along our walking paths is a disaster waiting to happen. There is no 'control' of the either the cycle or the dog in these instances. 'Control' of an animal must be thorough.	Responsible pet ownership lies with the owner of the dog whether walked on an extendable lead or whilst cycling and the expectation remains that the dog is under effective management at all times. The proposed amendment provides further tools to enforce this requirement.		operational areas
37	<p>I wish to make contribution to "Subordinate Local Law No 4 (Animal Management)2011 s6/s10. Local Law No2. s13/s14</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obviously some dog owners consider off- leash as 'free range' for the dogs while the owners socialise with other dog owners. That is why some people who are attacked or injured cannot identify the owner of the truant dog. (Case study, Moffat Beach). Consider banning leashes that have an elastic extension. They are a threat to others as the dogs range is threatening when not properly restrained. Dogs (even multiples) can often be seen tethered to the picnic tables and around bar-b-q areas At Moffat Beach. Leashes can often extend way beyond the path. I have even observed a dog on a rope at least 5 m long. Leashed dogs DO interfere with other people, especially on the walkways. I have noted about 9 out of 10 dogs occupy the middle of the path. When I see a person who has trained their dog to walk off the path and beside the walker, I stop and thank them. This situation is especially precarious when riding a bike as there is no assurance the dog will not rush to the opposite side in front of the rider. My experience. Please enforce dog laws with efficiency, and due diligence, not 9-5 daily, but weekends, early and late daily. <p>Mostly benign if there is no improvement in policing recalcitrant dog owners. Please enforce dog laws with efficiency, and due diligence, not 9-5 daily, but weekends, early and late daily.</p>	<p>Feedback has been noted and the area is included as part of the current beach patrol and monitoring program. Patrols are undertaken within current staffing levels seven days a week.</p> <p>Responsible pet ownership lies with the owner of the dog whether walked on an extendable lead or whilst cycling and the expectation remains that the dog is under effective management at all times. The proposed amendment provides further tools to enforce this requirement.</p>	Does not relate to proposed amendments	Comments do not relate to current proposed local law amendments. Comments have been passed onto the relevant internal operational areas
38	<p>Local Law No 2: Animal Management. s6 and s13 I do not believe the proposals are strict enough particularly pertaining to my local environment, Pt Cartwright. With the explosion in the number of dogs being brought here on the beach as well as in the Reserve there is constant issues with harassment of humans and bird life with dog's off-leash.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The beach: it is a very popular beach for wadding and relaxing. As it is designated off leash beach the constant dog faeces lapping the shore is disgusting. I have heard owners speak proudly of how "good" it is to let their dogs "visit" the area. This is a health hazard. One cannot sit peacefully on the sand without being harassed by roaming dogs. This is terrifying to small children. One afternoon there were 24 dogs in the 200m strip towards the lighthouse end of the surf beach. This area should, at the very least, be a full time leash area. Designated swimming beaches do not allow dogs and this end of Pt Cartwright has as many people on the beach as the flagged beaches. Pt Cartwright Reserve. I have lost count of the number of dog owners ignoring their off-leash dog to foul the area and chase the wildlife. The s13 wording is just that...words! This area again, due to the sheer numbers needs to be an ALWAYS on leash area. Barking of dogs throughout the off leash hours carries upwards to the unit buildings and has been very distressing to some of the local elderly residents, who are rate payers. I am fed up with the fact that Sunshine Coast dogs are given more rights than we are, and owners believing their dogs are more important than we rate paying humans. Dog owners are very aggressive and cannot be challenged for fear of personal abuse. <p>Dogs on leash in the specific areas raised at all times. And that is being generous. Preferably no dogs at all in Pt Cartwright reserve and the corresponding eastern side surf beach.</p> <p>Have some consideration for non dog owners that live in this area.</p>	Feedback has been noted and the area is included as part of the current beach patrol and monitoring program. Patrols are undertaken within current staffing levels seven days a week	Agree	Some comment do not relate to current proposed local law amendments. Comments have been passed onto the relevant internal operational areas

Section 15 – Requirements for enclosures, structures and buildings for keeping animals

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)

Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Submitters Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
39	<p>I wish to make contribution to "Subordinate Local Law No 4 (Animal Management)2011 s6/s10. Local Law No2. s13/s14 I have 2 very serious dog bites in the last 18 months. One from a dog in my street where the yard is unfenced. There is now a new tenant and another dog in the same premises. Still no fence!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dogs in Unfenced properties. There are several such places in Moffat Beach. Some are tenanted. Perhaps Agent need educating. Please enforce dog laws with efficiency, and due diligence, not 9-5 daily, but weekends, early and late daily. <p>Mostly benign if there is no improvement in policing recalcitrant dog owners. Please enforce dog laws with efficiency, and due diligence, not 9-5 daily, but weekends, early and late daily.</p>	<p>Council officers will make arrangements to contact the community member and investigate the issue under the local law.</p> <p>Patrols are undertaken within current staffing levels seven days a week.</p>	Does not relate to proposed amendments	Comments do not relate to current proposed local law amendments. Comments have been passed onto the relevant internal operational areas
Section 16 – Conservation requirements				
Nil Responses				No change to proposed local law.
Section 17 – Incidents involving animals				
Nil Responses				No change to proposed local law.
LOCAL LAW No 5 (Parking) 2011				
Part 4 – Heavy Vehicle Parking				
Nil Responses				No change to proposed local law.
Section 12 – Marking tyres for enforcement purposes				
40	<p>Marking of tyre, is this really such a big issue? I was under the impression that you are building a smart city. You don't need tire markings why not use sensors. To me this is just a revenue machine and not about law enforcement. Can't belief that someone on the coast will actually table this to be looked at.</p> <p>Don't do it, it is a waste of resources.</p> <p>I don't know where you are going with this but you are "breaking" the Sunny coast. I'm sorry but in my opinion, most of these new amendment is about money and not the community.</p>	<p>Council intermittently receives complaints and enquiries about officers' allowance to chalk vehicles for the purpose of regulating parking.</p> <p>Chalking is a practice used by officers where Licence Plate Recognition has not been introduced and is currently the most effective and efficient way to identify if a vehicle has overstayed an allowed time for parking.</p>	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
LOCAL LAW No 7 (Sunshine Coast Airport) 2017				
Section 10 – Airport notice may refer to documents held by airport corporation				
Nil Responses				No change to proposed local law.

The following table outlines community responses to the proposed Amendment Subordinate Local Law No.2 (Miscellaneous) 2019

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)				
Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
SUBORDINATE LOCAL LAW No 1 (Administration) 2011				
Section 4 - Definitions				
	Nil Responses			No change to proposed local law.
Section 8 – State-controlled roads to which stated local laws apply (authorising Local Law)				
	Nil Responses			No change to proposed local law.
Schedule 1 – Categories of prescribed activities for the purpose of maximum penalties				
	Nil Responses			No change to proposed local law.
New Schedule 5A – Causing building site delivery noise				
	See responses under proposed Local Law amendments in the above table			
New Schedule 5B – Causing building work noise				
	See responses under proposed Local Law amendments in the above table			
Schedule 9 – Keeping of animals				
	Nil Responses			
New Schedule 10A – Operation of an amplified music venue within a special entertainment precinct				
	See responses under proposed Local Law amendments in the above table			
Schedule 16 – Parking contrary to an indication on an official traffic sign regulating parking by time or payment of a fee (inclusion of new health and community services permit)				
41	<p>I can see where you are going with this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ability to provide parking permits to health and community services workers. Flexibility with eligibility requirements for commercial vehicle parking permits. <p>Payed parking on each and every beachfront parking bay so our coast can become like Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane. DISAGREE</p> <p>If you need to raise revenue which is always good, manage your existing projects better and ensure they meet their deadlines. Have proper business cases and keep contractors responsible for their spend.</p> <p>Don't do it, it is a waste of resources.</p> <p>I don't know where you are going with this but you are "breaking" the Sunny coast. I'm sorry but in my opinion, most of these new amendment is about money and not the community.</p>	<p>Health and Community Services</p> <p>The option for a permit to allow health and community services workers to park for longer than signed was raised by the community in February 2018.</p> <p>The purpose of the permit provides allowances for carers to stay overtime when assisting community members living in timed parking areas.</p> <p>Commercial Vehicle Identification Labels</p> <p>This is simply a correction for the term used in the current Local Laws.</p>	Disagree	
Schedule 17 – Parking in a loading zone by displaying a commercial vehicle identification label				
42	<p>I can see where you are going with this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ability to provide parking permits to health and community services workers. Flexibility with eligibility requirements for commercial vehicle parking permits. <p>Payed parking on each and every beachfront parking bay so our coast can become like Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane. DISAGREE</p> <p>If you need to raise revenue which is always good, manage your existing projects better and ensure they meet their deadlines. Have proper business cases and keep contractors responsible for their spend.</p> <p>Don't do it, it is a waste of resources.</p> <p>I don't know where you are going with this but you are "breaking" the Sunny coast. I'm sorry but in my opinion, most of these new amendment is about money and not the community.</p>	<p>Health and Community Services</p> <p>The option for a permit to allow health and community services workers to park for longer than signed was raised by the community in February 2018.</p> <p>The purpose of the permit provides allowances for carers to stay overtime when assisting community members living in timed parking areas.</p> <p>Commercial Vehicle Identification Labels</p> <p>This is simply a correction for the term used in the current Local Laws.</p>	Disagree	

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)				
Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
SUBORDINATE LOCAL LAW No 2 (Animal Management) 2011				
Schedule 8 – Identification of cats and dogs in certain circumstances				
Nil Responses				No change to proposed local law.
Schedule 5 – Exclusion of animals from specific places				
Nil Responses				No change to proposed local law.
Schedule 6 – Dog off-leash areas				
43	Removal of dog off-leash beach area at Wurtulla - Agree. Would love to see dog off leash area start at beach access 253 and run down to Currumindi lake only. No dogs allowed north on beach from beach access 253. Local law officers & big fines. So many dog attacks go on at Wurtulla beach. So much dog poo	The submitters support for the proposed local law is noted.	Agree	No change to proposed local law.
44	Move the area north or south to suit both off leash area and bathing area. Council at this stage is hell bent on extreme population growth and with this growth comes dog ownership as well, don't be so ignorant and think all your voters don't have dogs, simply taking from one group of people and giving to another is bias and disrespectful. People with dogs use the beach far more than people that swim in patrolled area. People swimming on your beaches cause more issues that people walking there dog/Drownings, patrolled areas don't stop this.	The proposed local law change is to support the introduction of a new lifeguard tower to commence a lifeguard service at Bokarina. Council's intention is to sign the area to allow dog owners to traverse through the bathing reserve with their dog on a lead to access the off-leash area. This removes 700m from the current 13 kms of off leash beaches. This leaves over 12 kms of beach and 30 off leash parks for dog owners to exercise their pets.	Disagree Would prefer area to be moved north or south	No change to proposed local law.
45	Extending the bathing reserve. Moving the dog off leash area. I disagree to new lifeguard tower and extended area for swimming. By preserving the existing area and allow families to spend time on the beach with their dogs. The existing area is not exactly busy as it is. Too few areas where dogs are allowed on the beach at sunshine coast.	The proposed local law change is to support the introduction of a new lifeguard tower to commence a lifeguard service at Bokarina. Council's intention is to sign the area to allow dog owners to traverse through the bathing reserve with their dog on a lead to access the off-leash area. This removes 700m from the current 13 kms of off leash beaches. This leaves over 12 kms of beach and 30 off leash parks for dog owners to exercise their pets.	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
46	Relative to: removal of the dog off leash beach at beach access 247 to 245 to allow for the declaration of a new bathing reserve at Bokarina Beach. I Do Not Agree with this proposed classification. The development of Bokarina Beach has placed and will place more impact on the adjoining established Wurtulla residents. My understanding is that there will be approximately 2500 residents in this small area. Already the beach is over-run with people and my established regime of dog walking and off-leash access will be impacted. I don't understand why you are proposing this. Why is this required? What has prompted this change which impacts existing residents - and that's long term rate payers. Further- how will these results be published and how does Council provide transparency of the local input? Can someone please respond to my queries and also please confirm that my disagreement with this change has been registered. Leave the current set up. Please be mindful of the ever broadening impact on what makes the Sunshine Coast different and better to the Gold Coast. No change on the current dog access arrangements please.	The proposed local law change is to support the introduction of a new lifeguard tower to commence a lifeguard service at Bokarina. Council's intention is to sign the area to allow dog owners to traverse through the bathing reserve with their dog on a lead to access the off-leash area. This removes 700m from the current 13 kms of off leash beaches. This leaves over 12 kms of beach and 30 off leash parks for dog owners to exercise their pets. The feedback and Council's responses are published as part of this report.	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
47	The removal of the dog off leash area to make way for the bathing reserve - I DISAGREE WITH THIS. Don't bother changing it, everything works fine as it is at the moment. People go to that beach to get away from the crowds at every other beach on the sunshine coast. It is one of the only beaches in that area that people can take their dogs and people who sunbake, surf or swim there know dogs will be there and are ok with it. People like seeing the dogs there and like being able to take their dogs there. DONT CHANGE IT. That it is a joke and you shouldn't even be considering changing it. People can go	The proposed local law change is to support the introduction of a new lifeguard tower which already has approval to commence a lifeguard service at Bokarina. Council's intention is to sign the area to allow dog owners to traverse through the bathing reserve with their dog on a lead to	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)				
Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
	to literally any other beach 10 minutes in any direction to swim with a lifeguard, there's no other dog beaches for at least 20 minutes each way.	access the off-leash area. This removes 700m from the current 13 kms of off leash beaches. This leaves over 12 kms of beach and 30 off leash parks for dog owners to exercise their pets.		
48	Fully fenced off leash dog exercise area within multiuse parks	Council regularly reviews the off-leash spaces provided for dogs and is committed to balancing the needs of the whole Sunshine Coast community when undertaking these reviews.	Does not relate to proposed amendments	Comments do not relate to current proposed local law amendments. Comments have been passed onto the relevant internal operational areas
49	Off leash dog area between 245 a 247, Dog off leash in the morning and afternoon between these areas. I understand the issue with dogs passing through during bathing hours, however, I believe early morning and late afternoon would not interfere with the public. Moffat beach is a great example of how this works.	The proposed local law change is to support the introduction of a new lifeguard tower which already has approval to commence a lifeguard service at Bokarina. Council's intention is to sign the area to allow dog owners to traverse through the bathing reserve with their dog on a lead to access the off-leash area. This removes 700m from the current 13 kms of off leash beaches. This leaves over 12 kms of beach and 30 off leash parks for dog owners to exercise their pets	Disagree Would like to see timed multi use	No change to proposed local law.
50	Removal of the off leash area between 247 to 245. Reject the proposal for the bathing reserve between 245 to 247. There are many local residents that enjoy this beach with their dogs. This beach has been kept in pristine condition by the locals and now you are forbidding from allowing them to let their dog off the leash.	The proposed local law change is to support the introduction of a new lifeguard tower which already has approval to commence a lifeguard service at Bokarina. Council's intention is to sign the area to allow dog owners to traverse through the bathing reserve with their dog on a lead to access the off-leash area. This removes 700m from the current 13 kms of off leash beaches. This leaves over 12 kms of beach and 30 off leash parks for dog owners to exercise their pets	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
51	Please provide more dog free and on leash areas on the Kawana beach so that everyone can enjoy a walk on the beach. Also, increase patrols so that the current on leash areas like Oceanic Drive and Pacific Bvd are not considered dog areas. From 5am to 6.30 am each morning dogs run free in this area. Follow Noosa and have one dog area which is specifically for dogs and their owners.	Council regularly reviews the off-leash spaces provided for dogs and is committed to balancing the needs of the whole Sunshine Coast community when undertaking these reviews. Patrols are undertaken within current staffing levels seven days a week.	Does not relate to proposed amendments	Comments do not relate to current proposed local law amendments. Comments have been passed onto the relevant internal operational areas
52	DISAGREE. Allow people with Dogs. They are part of the family too!	The proposed local law change is to support the introduction of a new lifeguard tower which already has approval to commence a lifeguard service at Bokarina. Council's intention is to sign the area to allow dog owners to traverse through the bathing reserve with their dog on a lead to access the off-leash area. This removes 700m from the current 13 kms of off leash beaches. This leaves over 12 kms of beach and 30 off leash parks for dog owners to exercise their pets	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
53	I disagree with removing the off the dog leash area.	The proposed local law change is	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)				
Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
	Let people who are responsible pet owners have off the dog beach areas. This is only a small section of beach and are used by families who live there and also brings tourism to the area as people with dogs choose to stay in pet friendly accommodation and walk their pet on the beach. There is plenty of other beach area designated for swimming, which then adds additional costs as will need to be patrolled. Professional people move to the area with families and pets and choose to live in an area where they can take their dogs on the beach.	to support the introduction of a new lifeguard tower which already has approval to commence a lifeguard service at Bokarina. Council's intention is to sign the area to allow dog owners to traverse through the bathing reserve with their dog on a lead to access the off-leash area. This removes 700m from the current 13 kms of off leash beaches. This leaves over 12 kms of beach and 30 off leash parks for dog owners to exercise their pets		
54	Dog off leash 245 to 247. Disagree. Restrict off-leash to peak hours of swimming say 9am to 4pm. Australia is way behind rest of the world with regards to dog friendly accommodation. This is a proposed tiny new development in an established area of residents who enjoy walking their FAMILY members every day with locals and who have well behaved dogs. Rights that should not be removed by a minority for no reason.	The proposed local law change is to support the introduction of a new lifeguard tower which already has approval to commence a lifeguard service at Bokarina. Council's intention is to sign the area to allow dog owners to traverse through the bathing reserve with their dog on a lead to access the off-leash area. This removes 700m from the current 13 kms of off leash beaches. This leaves over 12 kms of beach and 30 off leash parks for dog owners to exercise their pets	Disagree Would like to see timed multi use	No change to proposed local law.
55	Amendment of off-leash dog area 247 to 245. Disagree. Canine companions are as important as humans to emotional and mental health of all, and have been quietly enjoying and without incident the current off-leash regulations. Suggest instead off-leash hours in early morning and afternoons to satisfy all. Early morning and afternoon off leash times to satisfy possible life guard and patrolled peak swimming times. Make Australia dog friendly. We are far behind the rest of the world in this regard.	The proposed local law change is to support the introduction of a new lifeguard tower which already has approval to commence a lifeguard service at Bokarina. Council's intention is to sign the area to allow dog owners to traverse through the bathing reserve with their dog on a lead to access the off-leash area. This removes 700m from the current 13 kms of off leash beaches. This leaves over 12 kms of beach and 30 off leash parks for dog owners to exercise their pets	Disagree Would like to see timed multi use	No change to proposed local law.
56	Removal dog off leash reserve from 247 to 245. I would like the Council to hear the dog owner who use the beach daily. I don't agree the dog off leash area should be removed. I bought my house at wurley drive 3 years ago because it was a dog off leash area. I walk my dog everyday in the morning. I have the chance to exercise and my dog meets another 5 dogs daily to have a play. In addition we see many other people walking their dogs daily. I understand a lot people will live in the new Bokarina beach area, however there never people bathing early morning. Not in the winter or summer. I would like to request the Council to consider to allow dog off leash area in some times of the day .such as 5pm to 8am. We dog owner can still walk the dogs and family can still swimming during the day without dog running around. This would be similar to how it is in point cartwright. Another point is. I believe people moving to the new Bokarina beach area will also would like to being able to exercise their dog in the beach since the lots a small and possible not a big backyard	The proposed local law change is to support the introduction of a new lifeguard tower which already has approval to commence a lifeguard service at Bokarina. Council's intention is to sign the area to allow dog owners to traverse through the bathing reserve with their dog on a lead to access the off-leash area. This removes 700m from the current 13 kms of off leash beaches. This leaves over 12 kms of beach and 30 off leash parks for dog owners to exercise their pets	Disagree Would like to see timed multi use	No change to proposed local law.
57	Removal of 24/7 dog off leash approval at Boakarina Beach. I disagree. By leaving the off leash areas alone. There are very few dog off leash areas on the Sunshine Coast. We need more off leash areas, not fewer. The area already exist quite harmoniously with dogs and swimmers, there is no need to change it.	The proposed local law change is to support the introduction of a new lifeguard tower which already has approval to commence a lifeguard service at Bokarina. Council's intention is to sign the area to allow dog owners to traverse through the bathing reserve with their dog on a lead to access the off-leash area. This removes 700m from the	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)				
Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
		current 13 kms of off leash beaches. This leaves over 12 kms of beach and 30 off leash parks for dog owners to exercise their pets		
58	<p>Removal of the dog off leash beach at beach access 247 to 245 to allow for the declaration of a new bathing reserve at Bokarina Beach. Allow dogs to remain off leash in the proposed prescribed area 247-245. There are not enough off leash areas for dogs and their owners as it is. I have never seen a problem with dogs on these beaches.</p> <p>I would appreciate it if Council acknowledged how many dog owners use the beach to walk their dogs off leash. Sunshine Coast has become very unfriendly to people with dogs and enough is enough!</p>	<p>The proposed local law change is to support the introduction of a new lifeguard tower which already has approval to commence a lifeguard service at Bokarina.</p> <p>Council's intention is to sign the area to allow dog owners to traverse through the bathing reserve with their dog on a lead to access the off-leash area.</p> <p>This removes 700m from the current 13 kms of off leash beaches. This leaves over 12 kms of beach and 30 off leash parks for dog owners to exercise their pets</p>	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
59	<p>Removal of dog off leash – Agree</p> <p>Dog off leash areas don't work unless they are fenced. They become exclusive use areas for people with dogs (yet they also get to use the rest of the beach as well without taking their dog, so its inequitable). Hardly any actually control their dogs, and there is dog poo everywhere. You can't sit down on the beach or take small children in these areas as dogs will continually harass you because you are low to the ground. The owners don't get that people can't judge their strange dog as to whether it will be nice or not. Most of the time, putting a off leash area somewhere effectively means the whole stretch of beach becomes considered off leash outside of the signs. Looks at Yaroomba to Mudjimba as an example.</p>	The submitters support for the proposed local law is noted.	Agree	No change to proposed local law.
60	Off leash dog beaches - I disagree with proposed changes as the amount of dog beaches are already limited on the Sunshine Coast.	<p>The proposed local law change is to support the introduction of a new lifeguard tower which already has approval to commence a lifeguard service at Bokarina.</p> <p>Council's intention is to sign the area to allow dog owners to traverse through the bathing reserve with their dog on a lead to access the off-leash area.</p> <p>This removes 700m from the current 13 kms of off leash beaches. This leaves over 12 kms of beach and 30 off leash parks for dog owners to exercise their pets</p>	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
61	Dog off leash on the beach. Dogs should be on a lead at all times while on the beach and all public areas	The submitters support for the proposed local law is noted.	Agree	No change to proposed local law.
62	<p>We agree with the proposed amendment but would like it extended to include the access points north of that at 244, 243 & 242. We live in the beach Courts and what we would like to see is off-leash restricted to before 8.00am and after 4.00pm as it used to be before Council amalgamation. We live at exit 244 and have Grandchildren petrified of any dogs coming near them. This change suggested would put all the dogs from the new development onto our beach off leash. We need the amenity to let our grandchildren play unmolested on the beach.</p> <p>We have written to Council about this before. They suggested that a survey found people wanted an off leash area for their dogs on the beach. We suggest that if the question was do you want an off-leash area before 8.00am and after 4.00pm you would get a positive response. This satisfies workers able to exercise their dogs before and after work and lets others enjoy no strange and off leash dogs coming up and sniffing them during the day.</p>	As the proposed area will be a bathing reserve and there are neighbouring off leash areas, Council has determined that restricted off leash access is not appropriate	Agree Would like to see timed off-leash restricted	No change to proposed local law.
63	I do not agree to making an on-leash area from 247-245, as it has the worst rips on the coast on that part of the beach and your life guard would agree so the Council would be stupid to let people swim there at all. As I was a surf coach for over 10 yrs and competed at a high level for over 30 yrs so I do know what I'm talking about and wouldn't let my kids swim there. But if you have to do it can you please make it a on-leash area between 9am and 5 pm when the flags are up as most people walk their dogs along there befor work early or after later. This way the local will all still be happy and you have shown you will compromise with them. Yes I have 2 dogs which I walk early at 5 along there and there are no swimmers early along there even in summer. Thanks for your time hope that you	<p>The proposed local law change is to support the introduction of a new lifeguard tower which already has approval to commence a lifeguard service at Bokarina.</p> <p>Council's intention is to sign the area to allow dog owners to traverse through the bathing reserve with their dog on a lead to</p>	Disagree Would like to see timed off-leash restricted	No change to proposed local law.

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)				
Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
	take this seriously as the locals have all spoken and aren't happy if it becomes on-leash. Thanks heaps please feel free to call if needed. Please be wise with swimming there as if people do and there are no life guards around u will have lives lost.	access the off-leash area. This removes 700m from the current 13 kms of off leash beaches. This leaves over 12 kms of beach and 30 off leash parks for dog owners to exercise their pets		
64	I disagree with the changes to the dogs off leash area from access 245. Retain the current bathing area at Wurtulla which is rarely used by beachgoers, more beach users walk their dogs rather than bath. We purchased in Spindrift Court purely because it has an off leash beach for our dog, Wilson and we feel the changes will negatively affect our lifestyle. As daily walkers we can see the number of people that walk is 100 times more than the number of people swimming. Most people in the water along this strip of beach are surfers, not swimmers. The increase of population due to the new development will easily be able to access the current bathing area at Wurtulla and I feel the changes are unnecessary.	The proposed local law change is to support the introduction of a new lifeguard tower which already has approval to commence a lifeguard service at Bokarina. Council's intention is to sign the area to allow dog owners to traverse through the bathing reserve with their dog on a lead to access the off-leash area. This removes 700m from the current 13 kms of off leash beaches. This leaves over 12 kms of beach and 30 off leash parks for dog owners to exercise their pets	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
65	The dog off leash area at Bokarina Beach should be kept. Leave things as they are	The proposed local law change is to support the introduction of a new lifeguard tower which already has approval to commence a lifeguard service at Bokarina. Council's intention is to sign the area to allow dog owners to traverse through the bathing reserve with their dog on a lead to access the off-leash area. This removes 700m from the current 13 kms of off leash beaches. This leaves over 12 kms of beach and 30 off leash parks for dog owners to exercise their pets	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
66	Removal of off-leash areas really. I will NOT put my dog on a leash on this beach, I visit it often and no one has ever complained about any dogs on this stretch. get the people that needs a "no dog" or "dog on leash" beach to stop being lazy and walk down to beach at the surf club. DISAGREE	The proposed local law change is to support the introduction of a new lifeguard tower which already has approval to commence a lifeguard service at Bokarina. Council's intention is to sign the area to allow dog owners to traverse through the bathing reserve with their dog on a lead to access the off-leash area. This removes 700m from the current 13 kms of off leash beaches. This leaves over 12 kms of beach and 30 off leash parks for dog owners to exercise their pets	Disagree	No change to proposed local law.
67	The map provided with this review has the correct proposed amendments beach access numbers (226-245), but has the wrongs street names – Maloga Street, Kawana to Wurley Drive, Wurtulla (existing limits) where the proposed amendment and beach access numbers say it should be Maloga Street, Kawana to Beach Haven Court, Bokarina. The map as it is depicted is misleading as people will tend to look at street names, not beach access numbers. Secondly, does this amendment result in the bathing reserve at Bokarina being a "no Dogs Allowed" area or dogs must be "on a leash" area? I ask this because even at the existing bathing reserve at Wurtulla there are people who consistently ignore the "dogs off leash" restrictions.	Map has been updated to reflect newly created timed DOLA between beach access 245-249	Agree	No change to proposed local law.
Schedule 8 – Requirements for keeping declared dangerous animals				
Nil Responses				No change to proposed local law.
SUBORDINATE LOCAL LAW No 4 (Local Government Controlled Areas, Facilities, Infrastructure and Roads) 2011				
Section 4 – Definitions				

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)				
Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
Nil Responses				No change to proposed local law.
Schedule 1 – Prohibited activities for local government controlled areas, facilities, infrastructure and roads				
Nil Responses				No change to proposed local law.
Schedule 2 – Restricted activities for local government controlled areas, facilities, infrastructure and roads				
Nil Responses				No change to proposed local law.
SUBORDINATE LOCAL LAW No 5 (Parking) 2011				
Section 8 – Commercial vehicle identification labels				
Nil Responses				No change to proposed local law
Schedule 2 – Declaration of off-street regulated parking areas				
Nil Responses				No change to proposed local law.
Schedule 3 – Persons who may be issued with a parking permit				
Nil Responses				No change to proposed local law