

ATTACHMENT 1 - SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

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 both proposed changes and public interest review
- Public Notice advertisement in the Sunshine Coast Daily
- Messages on hold during November 2015
- Posters in Libraries
- Display Stands and Banners in Customer Contact Centres during November 2015
- Messaging through Councils social media channels
- Email sent directly to Chamber of Commerce organisations
- Letters to residents within the Sippy Downs proposed parking precinct
- Spotlight radio advertisements
- Spotlight print advertisements
- 2 radio interviews with ABC Radio
- Notification through some Councillor Columns
- Second Media Release a week before close of consultation

Submissions:

State interest checks

1. Consultation Period – 6 November 2015 to 30 November 2015
2. Submissions were invited from 18 State agencies:
 - Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships
 - Department of Agriculture and Fisheries
 - Department of Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services
 - Department of Education and Training
 - Department of Energy and Water Supply
 - Department of Environment and Heritage Protection
 - Department of Health
 - Department of Housing and Public Works
 - Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning
 - Department of Justice and Attorney-General
 - Department of National Parks, Sport and Racing
 - Department of Natural Resources and Mines
 - Department of Police, Fire and Emergency Services
 - Department of Science, Information Technology and Innovation
 - Department of State Development
 - Department of Transport and Main Roads
 - Department of Treasury
 - Department of Tourism, Major Events, Small Business, and the Commonwealth Games
3. Submissions/responses received by State agencies are detailed below:

Ref	Department Comment	Department Recommendation	Recommendation
-----	--------------------	---------------------------	----------------

LOCAL LAW No 1 (ADMINISTRATION) 2011

Response from Public Safety Portfolio agencies (including the Qld Police Service, Qld Fire and Emergency Services, Public Safety Business Agency and Inspector-General, Emergency Management)	Schedule 1 – Dictionary Terminology used in definition of 'life-saving club' is outdated, specifically part (b) 'accredited by the Department of Community Safety'	Replace reference to 'Department of Community Safety' with 'Queensland Fire and Emergency Services'	Amend reference with 'Queensland Fire and Emergency Services'
Department of Transport and Main Roads	Schedule 1 – Dictionary In the term 'model aircraft' it isn't clear that the <i>Civil Aviation Safety Regulations 1998</i> is Commonwealth legislation.	Council should consider clarifying that the <i>Civil Aviation Safety Regulations 1998</i> is a Commonwealth regulation. When referencing Commonwealth legislation in Queensland legislation, the State relies on the <i>Acts Interpretation Act 1954</i> , which states that a Commonwealth Act may be cited together with a reference to the Commonwealth. Queensland uses the abbreviation (Cwlth) following an Act/Regulation reference.	Insert abbreviation "(Cwlth)" after the citation

SUBORDINATE LOCAL LAW No 1 (ADMINISTRATION) 2011			
Response from Public Safety Portfolio agencies (including the Qld Police Service, Qld Fire and Emergency Services, Public Safety Business Agency and Inspector-General, Emergency Management)	Schedule 7 Establishment or occupation of a temporary home The State Coroner recommended the installation of photoelectric type smoke alarms in all Queensland homes following the inquest into the house fire at 60 Wagensveldt Street, Slacks Creek that killed 11 people. It is noted that section 6 'Conditions that will ordinarily be imposed on approvals' includes a requirement under s.6(1)(c)(i) that "the temporary home must be designed, sited, constructed and maintained to ensure it does not adversely impact on public health or safety, and must be... compliant with any structural standards, specified safety requirements and codes under applicable laws." However, it is recommended that the requirement to install a photoelectric smoke alarm be specified under section 5 'Conditions that must be imposed on approvals' as smoke alarms should be mandatory and installed before any occupation of a temporary home.	Include the installation of photoelectric smoke alarms as a condition that must be imposed on approvals for a temporary home under section 5, Schedule 7 of Subordinate Local Law No. 1 (Administration) 2011.	Include in section 5 of schedule 7 5. Conditions that must be imposed on approvals (1) A condition that must be imposed on all approvals is that the approval holder must install photoelectric smoke alarms outside any sleeping areas in the temporary home. (2) However, the condition in subsection (1) does not need to be imposed on the approval if a condition covering smoke alarms is contained in a development approval that applies to the temporary home.
Department of Transport and Main Roads	Part 1 s.4 'roadside stall'. And in Schedule 18 s.3(b)(c) 'roadside stall' 'Road reserve' is not defined for the purposes of the construction of a 'roadside stall'.	A definition for 'road reserve' is required to clarify the defined area for the construction of a "roadside stall".	No amendment is required <i>'Road reserve' is well understood in the local government context as a reserve for road purposes under the Land Act 1994. No amendment is required.</i>
	Schedule 18 Section 3 (b) and (c) 'Domestic work', 'road reserve' and 'commercial and other work' are not defined.	Definitions are required for 'domestic work', 'road reserve' and 'commercial and other work' to clarify what works the section is referring to. This will determine what (if any) impact there may be on, or interference with, the operation of a state-controlled road.	Insert a footnote in SLL1, sch 18, s.3 after the words 'domestic work' and 'commercial and other work': See the local government's website for further information about these categories of applications.
Department of National Parks, Sport and Racing	Schedule 13 Undertaking regulated activities regarding human remains - (b) burial or disposal of human remains outside a cemetery	The proposed local law does not specifically state that landholder consent is required prior to the council authorising disposal of human remains outside of a cemetery. Consent would be required for the disposal of human remains (either burial or scattering of ashes) in a Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service (QPWS) managed area (such as national park, regional park, State forest or marine park), particularly in areas that are environmentally sensitive or contain multiple uses. Schedule 13 should include a section stating that approval from council to dispose of human remains outside of a cemetery is subject to landholder approval.	Consent of the landholder is already required to accompany every application where the applicant is not the owner of the land. Section 8(2)(d) of Local Law No.1 requires this: s.8(2) The application must be accompanied by— (d) if the applicant is not the owner of the premises on which the prescribed activity is to be conducted—the written consent of the owner of the premises. Therefore we don't need to replicate this in the subordinate local law, as an application for approval would not be valid if it did not include the consent of the land owner. No change to the proposed local laws.
Ref	Department Comment	Department Recommendation	Recommendation
LOCAL LAW No 2 (ANIMAL MANAGEMENT) 2011			
Department of Justice and Attorney-General	Section 18 Inserts new section 9A in Local Law No.2 (Animal Management) 2011. Section 9A requires all regulated dogs to wear a collar consisting of red and yellow stripes. Please note: the <i>Animal Management (Cats and Dogs) Act 2008</i> and the <i>Animal Management (Cats and Dogs) Regulation 2009</i> contain identification requirements for regulated dogs.	This would be a matter for consideration by the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries.	No comments were provided by the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries. No change to the proposed local laws.

Ref	Department Comment	Department Recommendation	Recommendation
SUBORDINATE LOCAL LAW No 5 (PARKING) 2011			
Department of Transport and Main Roads	Schedule 2 In Map SLL 5.2.48 the red place locator has not been included in the insert map in the top right hand corner.	Council may want to update the map to insert the red place locator into the inserted map for Map SLL 5.2.48. This will ensure consistency with the rest of the maps in the subordinate local law.	All maps reviewed and red dot locator included in two existing maps: SLL 5.2.48 SLL 5.2.37
Public interest review			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consultation Period – 1 November 2015 to 30 November 2015 2. Submissions were invited from the community 3. Nil submissions were received 			

Community consultation overview
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consultation Period – 1 November 2015 to 30 November 2015 2. Submissions were invited from the public and business community. 3. 53 submissions were received, the topics were : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Law 1 – Horse Riding (1 submission) Local Law 2 – Keeping of Animals (dogs) (3 submissions) Local Law 2 – Dog Off Leash Areas (7 submissions) Subordinate Local Law 4 – Abseiling / Rock Climbing (3 submissions) Subordinate Local Law 5 – Regulated Parking Sippy Downs (39 Submissions)

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)

Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
LOCAL LAW No 1 (ADMINISTRATION) 2011				
PRESCRIBED ACTIVITIES				
Horse Riding				
14	<p>In rural areas this will restrict easy, non-motorised access to local horse riding trails unless signage permits riders to use local road verges to access trails. In rural areas horse riders should be catered for as cyclists are in urban areas. There are many rural and rural residential property owners around Yandina who own horses. Local riders use road verges to access horse riding trails in Mapleton National Park and Parkland Forest Reserve. The amendments will make it very difficult for horse riders on rural properties around Yandina to access horse trails in their immediate vicinity. e.g. riders from properties down Anderson Road use the verge of both Anderson and Cooloolabin Roads to reach the Cooloolabin Trail Head in Mapleton National Park (a distance of 1.5 km along Cooloolabin Road). Likewise the verge of Browns Creek Road is part of the National Horse Trail. There is currently a road sign on Coleman Farm Road (which is gravel) alerting drivers to be aware of horse riders. To the east of Yandina, riders use road reserves to access the horse trails in Parklands State Forest. Riders have also been observed resting their horses in the railway yards in Yandina township while they have lunch or coffee. (Similarly, Pomona attracts riders into town.) Yandina serves a rural area with a horse riding population. In rural areas such as Yandina signage should permit horse riders to use road verges to access horse trails and town.</p> <p>In rural areas such as Yandina signage should permit horse riders to use road verges to access horse trails and town.</p>	<p>The Transport Operations (Road Use Management – Road Rules) Regulation 2009 defines a vehicle as being an animal being ridden, and therefore riding a horse on the road does not require an approval.</p> <p>The proposed changes are removing the need to obtain an approval to ride a horse in an area other than a road.</p> <p>The Environmental Operations Branch will be liaising with local horse riders and local representatives of the Australian Trail Horse Riders Association (ATHRA) in the near future in an effort to gather information and understanding on where the riding demand is taking place across the region. This process will ensure that appropriate signage is located on council-controlled land/areas allowing horse riding to take place without the need for an approval to be obtained.</p>	<p>Proposed change will not affect non-motorised access to local horse riding trails</p>	<p>The proposed changes are removing the need to obtain an approval to ride a horse in an area other than a road where horse riding is signed as a permitted activity.</p> <p>No change to proposed local laws.</p>
LOCAL LAW No 2 (ANIMAL MANAGEMENT) 2011				
Keeping of Animals - DOGS				
91	<p>I wholeheartedly agree with all changes proposed to these local laws. Animal owners and other people who are responsible for animals should be held accountable for the stress or injury caused by their pets to others. Much tighter restrictions are needed on the Sunshine Coast.</p> <p>I recommend that all proposed changes to the local laws in this case are endorsed.</p>		<p>Agree</p>	<p>No change to proposed local laws</p>
2	<p>Issue with fine amount for dog off leash in an area that is not classed as a dog off leash area.</p> <p>Fee needs to be large enough to discourage owners allowing dogs to stray. Fine is consistent with other councils.</p>	<p>This issue does not relate to the proposed changes.</p>	<p>DOES NOT RELATE TO PROPOSED AMENDMENT</p>	<p>Referred to operational area to consider this submission when a future local law review is conducted.</p> <p>No change to proposed local laws</p>
6	<p>Barking Dogs – Need for more regard to the victims of barking, howling and growling dogs who have to tolerate considerable disturbance before perpetrators are penalised.</p>	<p>This comment does not relate to any proposed changes. Amendments to address barking under the Local Law introduced previously.</p>	<p>DOES NOT RELATE TO PROPOSED AMENDMENT</p>	<p>Local Law No. 2 (Animal Management) 2011 already provides the authority to manage nuisance dogs.</p> <p>No change to proposed local laws.</p>
SUBORDINATE LOCAL LAW No 2 (ANIMAL MANAGEMENT) 2011				
Dog off Leash Areas				
8	<p>I believe that this proposal of a Prohibited Animal Area on Mooloolaba beach is a ridiculous idea. We frequent the Mooloolaba beach area once a week to give our dogs a good long walk on lead along this area (mostly early Sunday mornings), and to have this area prohibited to animals all together would drive people away from the area. What you are asking is for local residents with pets to go to another area on the Sunshine Coast to exercise their pets, rather than enjoy their own beach space. I agree that there should be an "On Leash at all Times" rule, but to totally prohibit them is just preposterous.</p> <p>Put time limits on when Animals are allowed to be on the beach -</p>	<p>Mooloolaba Beach is signed as being a dog prohibited area from Beach Access 171 to 191. The proposed amendment is to formalise this arrangement in a map in the Local Law, and extend it to Beach Access 195.</p> <p>Dog owners are still permitted to walk their dogs on a leash on the paths and foreshore areas, dogs are only</p>	<p>Disagree</p>	<p>Mooloolaba Beach is already a prohibited dog beach by way of signage.</p> <p>No change to the proposed local laws.</p>

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)

Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
	Busiest times at the beach are late morning to mid-afternoon - So early morning or late afternoon would affect minimal people. Have more patrols in the areas and stop the select few people ruining it for the other dog owners, with ill-disciplined unruly dog behavior, and allow the people who do the right thing enjoy it.	prohibited from the beach.		
18	<p>Map SLL 2.6.28 - I would like to suggest a practical adjustment to Map SLL 2.6.28 which would complement the recommended change to Map SLL 2.6.35. The suggestion is that the Southern extremity for Dogs off leash as map SLL 2.6.28 be amended so that BA261 becomes the Southern limit. With plenty of parking space available, Dog bag dispensers, dog drinking basin and washing facilities at BA 260 and easy access to the beach, make this a logical and ready made start and finish point for a dog off leash section. The present Southern end to dog off leash area at BA 262 as per Map 2.6.28 has none of these facilities and parking for about 4 cars. Once a dog is off leash South of BA 261, Owners often allow their dog to continue along Dicky Beach not being aware that BA 262 is the Southern limit or having to retrieve the dog that is running south. BA 262 signs are not readily visible south of the rocks and so a stand alone "no dogs sign" is occasionally placed on the beach here to clarify the law at this point. Depending on sand cover, the rocks between BA 261 and 262 provide a natural barrier and would be a logical and acceptable Southern extremity for dogs off leash for Map SLL 2.6.28. Any dog owner arriving at BA 262 has a comfortable walk along the Coastal pathway to reach BA 261 so would not be inconvenienced or disadvantaged.</p> <p>Recommendation In order to make the present dog off leash area Map SLL 2.6.28 more logical and therefore more likely to be abided by, I would like to recommend that the Southern extremity for Dogs off leash as map SLL 2.6.28 be amended so that BA261 becomes the Southern limit.</p>	As this feedback is proposing a reduction in an off leash area, I would propose that if it is supported by the relevant stakeholders it be considered in future local law amendments to allow for appropriate community consultation.	DOES NOT RELATE TO PROPOSED AMENDMENT	<p>Referred to operational area to consider this submission when a future local law review is conducted.</p> <p>No change to the proposed local laws.</p>
26	There needs to be careful consideration of the current laws regarding off leash beaches. Last Thursday 19th November I was walking along the beach at Wurtulla (Beach Exit 250) and a large ridgeback dog bounded towards me. The owners had no control over the dog and it was a frightening experience. On Monday 23rd November I had a similar experience at beach Exit 252. I was exercising on the beach and a large dog bounded towards me on two occasions. The owner did not attempt to control the dog. Some owners believe that because the beaches are designated as off leash that their dogs can run/roam freely. This situation is not acceptable. Our beaches are becoming more and more popular and the time must come that dogs need to be on leashes at all times.	<p>Under <i>Local Law No. 2 (Animal Management)</i>, section 6 dogs in off leash areas are still required to be under effective management by their owner / responsible person. In an off leash area this means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> under direct supervision of a person who is physically able to manage the dog; and not harassing, intimidating, attacking, stalking, mounting or body slamming another animal or person <p>Council officers patrol the Coast to monitor animal management and address these issues when they are identified.</p> <p>There are a number of dog prohibited areas, a full list of these are available on council's website.</p>	DOES NOT RELATE TO PROPOSED AMENDMENT	<p>Local laws currently provide the mechanism to penalise dogs not under effective management.</p> <p>Refer submission to operational area to take into consideration when reviewing dog off leash areas in future local law amendments.</p> <p>No change to proposed local laws.</p>
46	<p>Currently the off leash area is limited to one small section at Town of Seaside between beach access 97-98 within the hours of 5-8am and 5-8pm. I agree with keeping the timings but propose that the section be widened to include up to beach access 91 or 92 towards Point Arkwright. If there are any concerns with the turtle nesting times it could be restricted like Shelly Beach to May to October. By having such a small area at Town of Seaside it means there is a large number of dogs concentrated in one area. By extending the available off leash area provides more area for the dogs to play.</p> <p>To extend the off-leash area at the Town of Seaside from Beach access 97 to 91 within the hours of 5pm to 8am.</p>	<p>There are three(3) off leash areas within 10km of the existing Town of Seaside area -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stumers Creek, Coolum (beach access 67 to 72) Parkland Reserve, Keith Royal Drive, Marcoola North Shore Beach, Twin Waters <p>Council does not permit dogs to be off leash in locations where there are patrolled bathing areas (Boardwalk Beach, Hyatt Beach).</p>	DOES NOT RELATE TO PROPOSED AMENDMENT	<p>Refer submission to operational area to take into consideration when reviewing dog off leash areas in future local law amendments.</p> <p>No change to proposed local laws.</p>
97	I wholeheartedly agree that dogs should NOT be allowed on the beach or in the waterfront areas of Mooloolaba. This is a popular family destination. Time and time again, irresponsible dog owners let their dogs run off leash in these areas. Irresponsible owners consistently flout the regulations here. This causes stress to children and the elderly, and places all individuals at risk of injury from an	<p>Council currently undertake regular patrols across the Coast to monitor animals on the beach.</p> <p>The offence for having an animal in a prohibited area is an on-the-spot fine</p>	Agree	No change to the proposed local laws

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)

Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
	<p>uncontrolled animal. There are so many options for owners to enjoy the beach with their dogs, but very few options for people to enjoy the beach without dogs.</p> <p>I would like to see Council prohibit dogs at Mooloolaba beach, extending to the end of the Spit. I would also like to see Council tighten monitoring of these regulations so that the community knows that disregarding the local laws will not be tolerated. There must be a significant disincentive for dog owners.</p>	of \$235		
102	<p>As a frequent user of the Mooloolaba Beach I believe that council should keep with the current dog on leash area/zones and not prohibit dogs from the beach. They are currently not allowed near the flagged areas and many people walk their dogs along the boardwalk until they reach the dogs allowed on leash beach access and allow for dogs and people to utilise the beach. I understand that the dogs must be on leash however prohibiting them from the area will mean there is no beach in the area that allows beach access for dogs. It is clear by the current approval to allow dogs into outdoor dining establishments that there are a large number of dogs that are walked in the area. This proposal will impact largely on the community and dog owners in particular. Commercial activity (coffee shops) will also reduce if owners take their dogs to a dog friendly beach via car.</p> <p>Council should keep with the current dog on leash area/zones for Mooloolaba, and not prohibit dogs from the beach in this area.</p>	<p>Mooloolaba Beach is signed as being a dog prohibited area from Beach Access 171 to 191. This includes the area outside most of the cafes and retail spaces. The proposed amendment is to formalise this arrangement in a map in the Local Law, and extend it to Beach Access 195.</p> <p>Dog owners are still permitted to walk their dogs on a leash on the paths and foreshore areas, dogs are only prohibited from the beach.</p>	Disagree	<p>Mooloolaba Beach is already a prohibited dog beach by way of signage.</p> <p>No change to the proposed local laws.</p>
101	<p>As a frequent user of the Mooloolaba Beach I believe that council should keep with the current dog on leash area/zones and not prohibit dogs from the beach. They are currently not allowed near the flagged areas and many people walk their dogs along the boardwalk until they reach the dogs allowed on leash beach access and allow for dogs and people to utilise the beach. I understand that the dogs must be on leash, however prohibiting them from the area will mean there is no beach in the area that allows beach access for dogs. It is clear by the current approval to allow dogs into outdoor dining establishments that there are a large number of dogs that are walked in the area. This proposal will impact largely on the community and dog owners in particular. Commercial activity (coffee shops) will also reduce if owners take their dogs to a dog friendly beach via car.</p>		Disagree	<p>Mooloolaba Beach is already a prohibited dog beach by way of signage.</p> <p>No change to the proposed local laws.</p>
LOCAL LAW No 3 (COMMUNITY HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT) 2011				
Shipping Containers				
37 same submitter as 38	<p>Amendment to law satisfactory but no point in having laws if they are not enforced. Need laws in relation to shipping containers, which are unsecured on cement blocks and causes a problem with rainwater from roof, shedding and washing the ground.</p> <p>As above. Law enforcement and laws for shipping containers</p>	Shipping containers may be considered a building in some circumstances and may require approvals before being placed on private property.	DOES NOT RELATE TO PROPOSED AMENDMENT	<p>Referred to operational area to consider this submission when a future local law review is conducted.</p> <p>No changes to the proposed local laws.</p>
38 same submitter as 37	<p>Happy with amendment but what is the point of having laws if they are not enforced. Need for a law in relation to shipping containers, which are unsecured on cement blocks and unsightly. Environmental problem, as water shedding from top of containers washing the ground</p>	<p>Approval is required to place the container on local-government controlled property.</p> <p>If you believe a shipping container has been placed illegally or incorrectly you can raise a request with council to investigate the matter.</p>		
72	<p>Fair enough to change the wording from Allotment to property, it is not reasonable to have these laws if they are not enforced. Need a law for shipping containers standing on unsecured blocks, they are unsightly and washing the ground into the neighbours boundaries.</p> <p>Law enforcement and law preventing shipping containers being placed on unsecured blocks near neighbours boundaries</p>			
SUBORDINATE LOCAL LAW No 4 (LOCAL GOVERNMENT CONTROLLED AREAS, FACILITIES, INFRASTRUCTURE AND ROADS) 2011				
Abseiling / Rock Climbing				
12	<p>Re: Rock climbing: The south face of Mt Ninderry is a popular rock climbing site. The walking track up Mt Ninderry which is currently being upgraded, is deliberately avoiding the cliff face above the rock climbing site. It is recommended that Council authorise rock climbing on the southern face of Mt Ninderry.</p> <p>It is recommended that Council authorise rock climbing on the southern face of Mt Ninderry.</p>	The proposed changes are removing the need to obtain an approval to undertake rock climbing on council-controlled land.	Agree if Council authorise rock climbing on the southern face of Mt Ninderry.	<p>Agree to authorise rock climbing on the southern face of Mt Ninderry.</p> <p>It is proposed for Rock Climbing to be a restricted activity which will be permissible where signed.</p>
16	Sunshine Coast has some excellent places for rock-climbing. Rock-climbing forms an important part of unrestricted local recreation and	The proposed changes are removing the need to obtain an approval to	Disagree – leave unregulated	Rock climbing is currently not a prescribed activity under

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)

Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
	<p>also an attraction to tourists who come to experience our local environment. Restricting climbing to areas only with signage will not improve safety or reduce potential costs to the taxpayer. Rather signed climbs are likely to become more crowded, potentially resulting in higher chance of injury. Furthermore, costs associated with the new restrictions will do nothing to reduce risks of lawsuits. Rather, injuries which occur where signs exist are more likely to result in lawsuits for supposed council negligence. In addition, there are many rock-climbing sites which will go unsigned because they are relatively unpopular. Logically, they will be no more or less safe. Nevertheless, there will also be many crags which will be deemed as not having correct infrastructure, because the climbing that occurs at these sites is traditional, where the climber uses their own protection in combination with rock and landscape features. However, the freedom to explore public parks and reserves in a safety-conscious manner is something that should be maintained to the uttermost. These are the kind of freedoms which make a community enjoyable to live in. They foster healthy interactions with the environment and other members of the community, and the whole encouraging responsible citizens.</p> <p>I would recommend that rock-climbing be left unregulated by local law.</p>	<p>undertake rock climbing on council-controlled land.</p>		<p>council's local law. Council's decision to restrict rock climbing and only permit the activity by way of signage, allows council to manage the risk of this type of activity to the community and the environment. Council is in the process of identifying local government areas where Rock Climbing and Abseiling will be permitted.</p> <p>Factors that council are taking into consideration during this assessment includes but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • protection of long term conservation and heritage values; • establishment of a whole of landscape solution to the provision of sustainable recreational opportunities; • consideration of the previous use of the area. <p>No change to the proposed local law.</p>
SUBORDINATE LOCAL LAW No 5 (PARKING) 2011				
Regulated Parking Sippy Downs				
3	<p>I am a resident that this proposal is affecting.</p> <p>1. This is the worst idea ever! 2. A resident should not have to pay for a paid permit to park in their own street. Other street residents don't. And I've never seen this implemented on the Coast in my 39 years. 3. Perhaps the police should be enforcing speed limits and enforcing safety issues if there are a large number of complaints as stated in Council's letter. 4. This is not a Commercial area - a residential area. A business should be providing adequate parking - which the University is a business and by not providing adequate parking facilities, this is what is causing the biggest problem in the area. Why should the resident have to support their problem? 5. Property prices may very well drop, due to the unattractiveness of having to pay a permit to park in your own street. Who in their right mind would actually want to live in a street like that if they had the choice?! Of course council isn't going to compensate residents if that was to happen. 6. Again, the worst idea ever!</p>	<p>The proposed change is looking at the implementation of timed parking and the ability for residents to apply for a permit allowing them to overstay a time restriction due to ongoing use of the streets surrounding the university for all day parking.</p> <p>Residential Parking Permits are currently in place for the Nambour Hospital 3P area and Lady Musgrave Drive residents, who pay a fee to apply for a permit each year.</p> <p>Without time restrictions, the regulation of the streets surrounding the university will be limited to parking on nature strips, across driveways and on yellow lines. Provided a vehicle is legally parked, a vehicle is able to stop and park on the side of the road.</p> <p>The University of the Sunshine Coast has implemented a parking management strategy, which includes paid parking and free parking options.</p>	Disagree	<p>It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.</p>
5	<p>This is not addressing any parking demands in the Sippy Downs area caused by students. This is just placing an extra cost on families who wish to legally park their car on the street. This seems like a money making scheme for Council. Even in the cities residents are provided with free parking permits. We already pay enough in rates and will be absolutely disgusted if Council proceeds with this.</p> <p>Not proceed with timed parking and parking permits. Council should be addressing this issue with the university and schools, where the problem is coming. Not charging the residents who wish to park in their own street.</p>	<p>The proposed change is looking at the implementation of timed parking and the ability for residents to apply for a permit allowing them to overstay a time restriction due to ongoing use of the streets surrounding the university for all day parking.</p> <p>Without time restrictions, the regulation of the streets surrounding the university will be limited to parking on nature strips, across driveways and on yellow lines.</p>	Disagree	<p>It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.</p>

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)

Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
		<p>Provided a vehicle is legally parked, a vehicle is able to stop and park on the side of the road.</p> <p>The University of the Sunshine Coast has implemented a parking management strategy, which includes paid parking and free parking options.</p>		
7	<p>If the parking problems are caused by university students who don't want to pay for their on-campus parking, I think other alternatives, such as abolishing or reducing the cost of parking on campus, or giving the first 2/3 hours free, should be fully investigated before restricting parking for residents and their families and friends and making them pay to park where they live.</p>	<p>The University of the Sunshine Coast has implemented a parking management strategy, which includes paid parking and free parking options.</p> <p>Discussion to take place with the university regarding this suggestion.</p>	Disagree	<p>It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.</p>
9	<p>It has been highlighted that Students of the University are causing issues with road safety due to on street parking and illegal parking within the area. But it seems that Council are happy to allow unsafe road conditions during school drop off times in the mornings and afternoons affecting other residents such as ourselves who have to incur unsafe streets during school drop off times, when trying to exit/enter our own driveways or local streets. This has been an ongoing problem with parents parking 'illegally' on street corners, in front of driveways and in no standing zones, obscuring road signs and causing safety issues not only for drivers at these times of the day, but also local children walking/riding to school from their respective local homes. We would suggest that Council address this issue directly with Chancellor Park School with discussions around staggered drop off times to accommodate the amount of parents dropping their children off as it is quite evident that the school is not able to cater for the high volume of traffic during these times in their designated set down/drop off zones adjacent to school. We would also propose that all streets within a 2km radius of the Chancellor Park School have in addition to the 'Uni parking proposed changes' parking restrictions put in place to prevent parents from parking on residential footpaths, across driveways and on street corners during the hours of 7.30 – 9.30AM and 2.30-4.30PM. Also, we recommend that yellow 'no parking' lines be applied across the intersections of 1) University Way & Scholars Drive, 2) University Way and Columbia Street, 3) Columbia Street and Franklin (both corners) and any other intersections within a 1-2km radius of the school. Especially those intersections within close proximity of each other highlighted above (1, 2 & 3). We strongly disagree with the parking permits having to be undertaken by owner/residents within the proposed zones for restricted parking when the issue is with commuters/students that are not permanent residents. As permanent owner residents we believe our rates cover the use of our front footpath for visitors parking and we should not incur parking fines for friends/family visiting our property during the restricted proposed times. If this proposal was to go ahead we would strongly suggest that the Council provide a number of permits per rate payer for each property at no cost and then is this number of permits (e.g. 3 per rate payer property) is not substantial then the rate payer can apply for additional permits to park at their property during the restricted parking times.</p>	<p>Consideration to be given to all comments received by the Traffic and Transportation Team.</p> <p>Residential Parking Permits are currently in place for the Nambour Hospital 3P area and Lady Musgrave Drive residents, who pay a fee to apply for a permit each year.</p>	Disagree	<p>It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.</p>
10	<p>Imposing a fee on residents to park in front of their residence (around the University precinct) is discriminatory. All rate paying residents should have the opportunity of parking in front of their residence without cost, not only those in non-regulated parking areas who do not have to pay for the privilege of parking in front of their residence. If permits are needed in these areas, the Council should cover the cost, not the ratepayers.</p> <p>That residents in regulated parking areas receive a permit to permit them to park in front of their residence and that Council cover the cost of such permits.</p>	<p>The application fee for a parking permit is a cost-recovery fee associated with the assessment and issuing of a permit.</p>	Disagree	<p>It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.</p>
17	<p>I live in Abilene Place, Sippy Downs, which is the last year or so along with adjacent streets has been flooded with university student parking from students seeking to evade paying university parking fees on campus. This has been causing significant safety issue for drivers and pedestrians, as well as loss of amenity through streets choked with car parking. The proposed inclusion of this area as a regulated parking area is helpful to some degree, and so better implemented than not. However, it is not sufficiently responsive to addressing the issues in this area. LIMITATIONS OF REGULATED PARKING PROPOSAL FOR THIS AREA (Abilene Place in Sippy Downs and adjacent streets) The 2-hour restriction will increase traffic activity but not</p>	<p>Consideration to be given to the option of placing yellow lines on the length of one side of the street to minimise safety issues associated with all day parking in and around the streets. This to be considered by the Traffic and Transportation Team.</p> <p>The application fee for a parking permit is a cost-recovery fee associated with the assessment and</p>	Disagree	<p>It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.</p>

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)

Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
	<p>reduce the number of parked cars, as more cars come and go to avoid fines from exceeding the 2-hour limit. This will worsen safety and residents' access in the area. Paying for parking permits is unfair to residents: 1). students park for free (albeit a 2-hour limit) to avoid university parking fees a few hundred metres away, while residents pay to park on streets: not fair; 2). having a permit does not guarantee a parking space on street, so not fair to have to pay for something you will not necessarily receive. Narrow streets are not suitable as a parking lot eg. Abilene Place. Whether parked all day or in shifts of 2 hours duration, parking on both sides makes it hard for residents to transit the street and also to get cars out of driveways safely. There is dangerous parking on the curved intersection of Abilene and Columbia: some ambiguity about where the corner begins and ends with subsequent parking causing visibility problems for cars entering/leaving Abilene Place. I live in Abilene Place, Sippy Downs, which is the last year or so along with adjacent streets has been flooded with university student parking from students seeking to evade paying university parking fees on campus. This has been causing significant safety issue for drivers and pedestrians, as well as loss of amenity through streets choked with car parking. The proposed inclusion of this area as a regulated parking area is helpful to some degree, and so better implemented than not. However, it is not sufficiently responsive to addressing the issues in this area.</p> <p>LIMITATIONS OF REGULATED PARKING PROPOSAL FOR THIS AREA (Abilene Place in Sippy Downs and adjacent streets) The 2-hour restriction will increase traffic activity but not reduce the number of parked cars, as more cars come and go to avoid fines from exceeding the 2-hour limit. This will worsen safety and residents' access in the area. Paying for parking permits is unfair to residents: 1). students park for free (albeit a 2-hour limit) to avoid university parking fees a few hundred metres away, while residents pay to park on streets: not fair; 2). having a permit does not guarantee a parking space on street, so not fair to have to pay for something you will not necessarily receive. Narrow streets are not suitable as a parking lot eg. Abilene Place. Whether parked all day or in shifts of 2 hours duration, parking on both sides makes it hard for residents to transit the street and also to get cars out of driveways safely. There is dangerous parking on the curved intersection of Abilene and Columbia: some ambiguity about where the corner begins and ends with subsequent parking causing visibility problems for cars entering/leaving Abilene Place. Columbia Street – parking on both sides make safe transit difficult.</p> <p>PROPOSAL: If the permit system proceeds it should be funded by Council revenue: parking regulation and amenity is a collective responsibility (that is sensitive to specific local circumstances) and should not require private funding by affected residents (or is there a plan to start charging individual residents for road repairs etc outside their homes?) PROPOSAL: Abilene Place - no-parking/yellow line at least along one side to ensure residents' cars have enough room to transit the street safely (if not done, then permit-parking-only along one side, 2 hour regulation the other – however this will not address the problem of getting cars in and out of driveways safely).</p> <p>PROPOSAL: Abilene Place - no-parking/yellow lines on curbs opposite driveways along most of length of the street to ensure residents have room to safely back out their cars onto the street. PROPOSAL: Abilene Place/Columbia Street intersection - no-parking/yellow lines over curved part of street opening on both sides, to improve visibility when entering and departing the intersection. PROPOSAL: Columbia Street – permit parking only on one side, 2-hour regulated on the other: to ensure residents' friends can families can park on street during the day, and to ensure cars can pass through in both directions at the same time (assuming there would be little permit-parking most of the time).</p>	issuing of a permit.		
19	<p>I strongly object to Christian Dickson's proposal to implement a timed parking and a permit system in our locality. We are not affected by students parking in our street and there are certainly no safety concerns for us as local residents. Should this ridiculous proposal go ahead, it would mean that my family and friends, who visit frequently, would only be allowed to stay for a maximum of 2 hours as we have no room for them to park in our driveway and it's against the law to park on the footpath. I am also opposed to the fact that the council would like to make us pay for the privilege of parking in our own street.</p> <p>As I have no concerns around students parking in our street, I suggest you leave things as they are. In fact, if a poor, struggling Uni student</p>	<p>Provided a vehicle is legally parked, a vehicle is able to stop and park on the side of the road.</p> <p>The application fee for a parking permit is a cost-recovery fee associated with the assessment and issuing of a permit.</p>	Disagree	It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)

Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
	wants to park on the road outside my house, as a decent, caring human being, I don't mind!			
22	Charging the fee is not the solution especially for home owners in the designated area. It's the university's responsibility to make car spaces avail on Uni grounds not homeowners.	The University of the Sunshine Coast has implemented a parking management strategy, which includes paid parking and free parking options	Disagree	It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.
23	<p>Opposition to the Council's proposed parking amendments on the grounds of it being an ineffectual policy shift. One which treats the symptom of stressed congestion and parking difficulties, rather than the disease of inadequate local infrastructure and poor planning.</p> <p>A policy which equally treats the congestion and parking conditions through both short-term solutions, and longer term planning and increased infrastructure development. The development of additional (and enforced) pick-up/drop-off only parking bays on the school-side of Scholars Drive as well as the investigation into the potential for diagonal parking on the Village side of Scholars Drive. Additional space could be gained by minimizing the medium divider and replacing it with fencing, thus providing the space necessary for diagonal parking on this road. This would increase parking availability for residents in the high-density Village accommodation. If the Council does seek to introduce paid parking permits, means-tested exemptions for local residents, whilst difficult to implement and administer, would ensure that those residents unable to contribute financially would be insulated.</p>	Comments to be considered by the Traffic and Transportation Team and the Transport Policy Team.	Disagree	It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.
24	<p>The plan is designed to discourage University students in Sippy Downs from using local streets and parking in front of homes all day (in some cases illegally across driveways), creating safety and traffic hazards for pedestrians. On the face of it, the proposal seems like a good idea, however it is a far cry from a proper solution, and will only compound the problem for residents in the future. I want a solution too, but not tackling the initial traffic flow and parking availability on Scholars Drive is missing the mark. The lack of parking in this precinct is a significant and complex issue. Poor traffic flow on Scholars Drive has also been a problem for both residents and school commuters for many years. These core issues need to be addressed before any more restrictions or penalties imposed on the community are considered. Has Council really thought this through properly? Council has had over 8 years to deal with the Scholars Drive issue, and is this the best that they can come up with? Lack of foresight and determination have stopped Council from implementing a real solution to traffic flow on Scholars Drive, such as the "J-link." The main concern for this proposal is that residents should not have to pay for an annual permit to park outside of their own home, irrespective of any time limit. Those who don't mind the idea of paying for an annual permit, I suspect will not be effected by the proposal, particularly if they don't have more than two cars in the family. Just think of the consequences first for your neighbours. Council says that the annual parking permit covers the costs associated with assessing the application and processing a permit. They have also stated, "of course, they can still park in their garage and driveway at no cost. The permit is an added benefit for residents who may require additional car parking spaces." I'm sorry, but I don't see an "added benefit" having to pay \$47 for that right. To charge residents in a designated area (known as the red zone) of Sippy Downs an annual parking permit will create certain problems. Here are my objections to regulated parking and the proposed plan, which include but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared housing in the red zone will be a disaster. With many households having more than 2 cars that will not fit in a driveway or on private property. • Residents will have visitors coming over during the day for more than 2 hours and they won't be able to fit in their driveway. Forcing their guests to only stay for a maximum of 2 hours. • Having householders in the red zone pay for an annual parking permit is totally unfair, when other residents nearby are not charged. • It will effect house prices and buyer behaviour, with prospective buyers considering the disadvantages of living in the red zone. • It will be difficult to roll-back the legislation should the community not want the rules to apply anymore. 	<p>Comments to be considered by the Traffic and Transportation Team and the Transport Policy Team.</p> <p>The proposed change is looking at the implementation of timed parking and the ability for residents to apply for a permit allowing them to overstay a time restriction due to ongoing use of the streets surrounding the university for all day parking.</p> <p>Residential Parking Permits are currently in place for the Nambour Hospital 3P area and Lady Musgrave Drive residents, who pay a fee to apply for a permit each year.</p> <p>Without time restrictions, the regulation of the streets surrounding the university will be limited to parking on nature strips, across driveways and on yellow lines. Provided a vehicle is legally parked, a vehicle is able to stop and park on the side of the road.</p> <p>The University of the Sunshine Coast has implemented a parking management strategy, which includes paid parking and free parking options.</p>	Disagree	It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)

Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This proposal will just push the parking problem to other areas of Sippy Downs, outside of the red zone. The red zone will be an ever expanding area as the University grows each year with more students. The current growth rate is 8-10% each year on the Sippy Downs campus alone: http://www.usc.edu.au/explore/vision/key-statistics. So the parking problem will not get better, but worse. Charging residents for an annual parking permit is perceived as a revenue raising exercise by Council. All proceeds of fines going to Council coffers, with no guarantee of being used exclusively for the benefit of the community. It disadvantages those who are not in a financial position to be able to pay, such as pensioners & students. All revenue generated from fines that are imposed in the existing regulated off-street parking zone, goes straight to Council, not the University. If Council is steadfast on issuing an annual parking permit, they should not charge residents for the permit. This would go a long way in dealing with the objections to the proposal. Council could easily recoup the money from the thousands of dollars that are collected in fines for enforcing the University's paid parking. But that is a short sighted solution which will do nothing for the future of our community in Sippy Downs and Chancellor Park. It must be said that the current problems with parking in surrounding streets have been greatly increased since the University introduced paid parking. Despite immense community opposition those plans went ahead with Council implementing the plan. Since Council had a vested interest in receiving revenue from the fines generated, no wonder that decision was forced through. The good news for now, is if you live outside of the proposed regulated parking zone (in red), you will not be able to, or need to apply for a parking permit. What guarantees are there that the regulated zone will not expand in the future as more students enrol at the University of the Sunshine Coast? What is for certain is that the proposed plan will push the problem to other areas of Sippy Downs. <p>Council's proposed amendment is a band-aid solution which will only compound the problem for future generations. The solution must solve the core of the problem, which is to fix Scholars Drive access, develop more dedicated free parking zones closer to campus, and improve traffic flow around Chancellor State College. In a perfect world, get rid of paid parking altogether. I say no to more on-street regulated parking zones and resident paid parking permits. It really is the thin edge of the wedge.</p>			
25	I do not agree with making the local residents pay to park in their own street. the University should include the parking fees in the tuition of the students at the beginning of each year which would allow them to use the parking on the Uni grounds at any time. Alternatively, make the area a gated community where the residents can go peacefully in and out of there properties and park on the roads if necessary and the people wanting to park there would require the permits. Not the other way around.	<p>Provided a vehicle is legally parked, a vehicle is able to stop and park on the side of the road.</p> <p>The application fee for a parking permit is a cost-recovery fee associated with the assessment and issuing of a permit.</p>	Disagree	It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.
27	<p>In regards to the new system for parking in the Sippy Downs area to regulate two hour parking restrictions. I am against the parking permit and costs associated with this proposal as we pay our rates and I am against paying for parking outside our house bringing another cost to our household. What happens if we have visitors stay with us longer than 2 hours for example a week, two weeks a month or for however long they stay why should they or we have to pay for them to park in our street to visit. I can understand the council wants to regulate the university students parking in the areas of Sippy Downs but I can not understand why the resident has to suffer for this. Residents should be given a permit and a permit for visitors at NO COST AT ALL and these permits should NOT have to be restricted to one registration. I am not in support of paid parking at all for local residents who live in the streets in review.</p> <p>Permits give to residents and NOT being charged for them. Permits NOT restricted to ONE registration.</p>	<p>The proposed change is looking at the implementation of timed parking and the ability for residents to apply for a permit allowing them to overstay a time restriction due to ongoing use of the streets surrounding the university for all day parking.</p> <p>Residential Parking Permits are currently in place for the Nambour Hospital 3P area and Lady Musgrave Drive residents, who pay a fee to apply for a permit each year.</p> <p>Without time restrictions, the regulation of the streets surrounding the university will be limited to parking on nature strips, across driveways and on yellow lines.</p> <p>Provided a vehicle is legally parked, a</p>	Disagree	It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)

Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
		vehicle is able to stop and park on the side of the road.		
30	<p>Following the concerns/complaints by residents relating to people parking in the Sippy Downs Area, as mentioned by Cr Christian Dickson in his letter directed to residents (19.11.15), I agree that prolonged parking and inappropriate use of public space parking is a significant problem. I am the owner of the only property in Varsityview Ct, which has not been specifically designed for student accommodation purposes, and usually have at least 3 cars parked in front of my place. I agree with having the parking spots and marked and patrolled - as far as I'm concerned, having parking meters installed would probably take it too far, but having signs and markings on the road would go a long way towards preventing what is at least a nuisance, if not illegal and dangerous. In particular, I am concerned about the stretch of road between my driveway and the Varsityview Ct/Parkville St roundabout - it has space for 2 cars to safely park in front, but often has more (up to 4 cars) parked there for most of the day. I have 1.5 m wide strip of lawn right next to my driveway in order to allow for turning space when entering/exiting my place, and to provide a spot for the bins to go every Tuesday morning. Unfortunately, it is often 'parked in', and in order to allow the rubbish collectors access to the bins, I have had to resort to putting them into the middle of my driveway, which of course, prevents my access to my home completely. For safety's sake, no one should be parked between the 'Give way' sign and the roundabout, but there often is, and when 4 cars have managed to squeeze themselves into the road space in front of my townhouse, usually at least one of them becomes trapped when they are trying to leave. Having marked lines on the road which outline the two legitimate parking spaces there would eliminate all of these problems.</p> <p>I recommend the council mark the legal, designated car parking spots on the road in front of my property (between my driveway and the Varsityview Ct/Parkville St roundabout) by applying white line paint onto the road surface.</p>	Comment to be considered by the Traffic and Transportation Team.	<p>Supports councils approach to manage parking issues in the area, however doesn't specifically support a residential parking permit scheme in the area.</p> <p>Inconclusive</p>	It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.
31	<p>Streets like scholars Dr are already regulated areas but residents don't have exemptions, which creates major problems for the 150+ students living on that street. Don't enforce regulated parking without providing a residency exemption for every resident of the proposed area. Why not tackle the source of the problem? The regulated area at the university.</p>	<p>The proposed change is looking at the implementation of timed parking and the ability for residents to apply for a permit allowing them to overstay a time restriction due to ongoing use of the streets surrounding the university for all day parking.</p> <p>Residential Parking Permits are currently in place for the Nambour Hospital 3P area and Lady Musgrave Drive residents, who pay a fee to apply for a permit each year.</p> <p>Without time restrictions, the regulation of the streets surrounding the university will be limited to parking on nature strips, across driveways and on yellow lines. Provided a vehicle is legally parked, a vehicle is able to stop and park on the side of the road.</p> <p>The University of the Sunshine Coast has implemented a parking management strategy, which includes paid parking and free parking options.</p>	Disagree	It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.
32	<p>Current resident of area in question and current student of the University of the Sunshine Coast in possession of a motor vehicle within proposed parking boundaries.</p> <p>1. As a resident of the Village apartment complex across the road from the primary school that is next to the University, there are no residential parking areas on our street (Scholars Drive) besides from our own on one side and the school parking on the other. We take no other residential parking spots because there are none. Why should the University residents on Scholars Drive be punished when we cannot effect anybody except ourselves. I recommend that at least regardless of my other points that the Scholars drive be taken off the proposed plan. 2.While i do not live in the other university accommodations (UniCentral and Varsity), i know that UniCentral has parking both inside and on their side of the road with Varsity having another side of a road with what i assume is more parks within the</p>	Consideration for more targeted consultation with university accommodation, although potentially not the cause of the problem. Student parking in the residential streets is possibly due to students attending campus, rather than living in the area.	Disagree	It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)

Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
	complex. If indeed there is sufficient spillover onto neighboring properties the managers of the uni residences could in fact be asked to provide more spaces for parking to ensure a safe environment for all. 3. The fact that in an effort to solve this problem, the only thing that who i assume Cr Christian Dickson (the Councillor for the section) thought of was to put paid parking everywhere in place is both laughable and extremely concerning. From what it seems the only plan that has been put forward is to fine the students. Why not talk to everyone involved first? why couldn't the effort be put in to ring the student accommodations and get their perspectives and see if 1. The student accommodations could do anything to help or 2. See what the council could do to assist the student accommodations to alleviate this problem instead of turning the streets were families and students live and schools and the uni operate into a CBD type "pay for the privilege of parking" style.			
33	As a long term resident of Sippy Downs & an even longer term ratepayer of the Sunshine Coast, I don't believe we should have to pay anything to park in our own streets. We already pay rates & charges to live here. The proposed initial fee amount whilst quite small is per vehicle & will only increase over time. Poor old Mum & Dad with say four children in our case also with vehicles are suddenly up for \$282-00 per annum (the first year & increasing annually if I know Council) on top of our rates just in case we need to park on the street in front of our own residence. Then there are family & friends who come to visit us in our home who cannot park outside of our own home for longer than 2 hours without risk of being fined. The parking problem is primarily the result of SCU students having to find a park & there preferred option is to source free parking. This is a problem for the S/Coast University & Council to solve and the cost to regulate parking in the area should not be passed on to rate payers of the area. If a parking permit ends up being required they should at least be provided free of charge to local residents & all family members. The associated costs should be included in the University fees to students & passed back to council via an annual charge from the Council to the University to cover costs to produce, monitor & regulate the associated permit holder system for the residents of the area ie : User Pays and not the rate paying residents impacted by all the cars of students attending SCU parking in our local streets having to pay. Thanks also for short notice to research & respond. We received the notice in our letter box on the 23rd Nov giving only 1 week to reply.	The proposed change is looking at the implementation of timed parking and the ability for residents to apply for a permit allowing them to overstay a time restriction due to ongoing use of the streets surrounding the university for all day parking. Residential Parking Permits are currently in place for the Nambour Hospital 3P area and Lady Musgrave Drive residents, who pay a fee to apply for a permit each year. Without time restrictions, the regulation of the streets surrounding the university will be limited to parking on nature strips, across driveways and on yellow lines. Provided a vehicle is legally parked, a vehicle is able to stop and park on the side of the road. The University of the Sunshine Coast has implemented a parking management strategy, which includes paid parking and free parking options. Further consultation with the university to be considered in relation to the parking management system and consultation with students.	Disagree	It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.
39	Personal Opinion: I live in Bronte Court, Sippy Downs. It is a SMALL cul-de-sac with just 10 houses in it. We NEVER have any parking issues with anyone, residents, students, visitors or otherwise. There is plenty of room for ALL. WHY do you need to regulate the parking in such a little area? Of what benefit is it to anyone aside from council? You will just be taking money off people who can least afford it! LEAVE BRONTE COURT ALONE. For Sippy Downs itself: If you have to regulate anywhere in Sippy Downs concentrate on the streets close to the schools and university ONLY. Don't inconvenience everyone else in Sippy Downs. I doubt they have a problem with parking either. R Chalk IF YOU MUST REGULATE PARKING: ONLY NEAR THE SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITY. LEAVE ALL OTHER AREAS OF SIPPY DOWNS ALONE.	Possible consideration of a smaller area to the proposed regulated parking area.	Disagree	It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.
40	as a resident of scholars dr sippy downs i have lived here for 8 years in the last 12 months or more parking has become a real issue. I dont see why we should pay for a permit to park when students dont want to pay for parking at the uni. The issue could be solved quite easily by letting the students park for free or including it in there fees.as students most don't have an income, I think it is greed that the students have to pay to park, free parking at the uni problem solved, or if your new regulated system goes a head I think the residence of the street should have a free permit. I recommend free parking for the students free permits for residence, we should not have to pay for uni mismanage and greed of parking	The proposed change is looking at the implementation of timed parking and the ability for residents to apply for a permit allowing them to overstay a time restriction due to ongoing use of the streets surrounding the university for all day parking. Residential Parking Permits are currently in place for the Nambour Hospital 3P area and Lady Musgrave Drive residents, who pay a fee to apply for a permit each year. Without time restrictions, the regulation of the streets surrounding the university will be limited to parking on nature strips, across driveways and on yellow lines.	Disagree	It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)

Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
		<p>Provided a vehicle is legally parked, a vehicle is able to stop and park on the side of the road.</p> <p>The University of the Sunshine Coast has implemented a parking management strategy, which includes paid parking and free parking options.</p> <p>Further consultation with the university to be considered in relation to the parking management system and proposal to look at different fee structure.</p>		
41	<p>Dear Cr Dickson I own a unit at 'UniCentral', Varsity View Court, Sippy Downs which has 4 tenants. This whole complex of 90 units is for the purpose of housing approximately 250 students. Some of which are from overseas, the Sunshine Coast and other areas of Australia. 'Varsity' which is on the other side of the road to UniCentral, is the same. There are no owner occupiers. Each unit has either 2 or 4 tenants with only one car park. All other cars need to park outside the complex. This complex was approved under the Town Planning scheme when built and met with all requirements. It is also known that other houses within close proximity to the University also accommodate students, eg Columbia Street and streets off Columbia Street, etc. Should the Council implement parking restrictions in Varsity View Court, students will only park in other streets where they will not incur a fine or have to pay for the privilege of parking. This will not be effective in providing relief to residents who are not students. It is not an owner's responsibility but rather a tenant responsibility. Students do not attend university all year. They attend for approximately 8 months a year which includes exam block. For 4 months of the year there would not be the need for regulated parking should that be the Council's course of action. I do not believe regulated parking to be a solution on this occasion. The implementation of a regulated parking area will be costly to instigate with little to no effectiveness.</p> <p>At this point in time, I do not have an alternative. However I do believe that regulated parking will only compound the issue. Students are a kind to their own!!</p>	Noted.	Disagree	It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.
42	<p>There are no parking or safety issues with our three lot parking at the bottom of our street either with students or others as vehicles rotate nicely through our lot thank you. We are far enough away from the uni not to need another un-nessasary sign regulating our life and creating another soft council job for one of the boys. Just make it easier for students to park at the uni thats the solver ?.</p> <p>Go to the heart of the problem, and accommodate the misdemeanour.</p>	Further consultation with the university to be considered in relation to the parking management system and proposal to look at different fee structure.	Disagree	It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.
44	<p>I don't believe it is fair that we should have to pay to park in front of our own property. Further that when my visitors come, they generally stay for longer than 2 hours. Restrict parking closer to the University only</p>	<p>The proposed change is looking at the implementation of timed parking and the ability for residents to apply for a permit allowing them to overstay a time restriction due to ongoing use of the streets surrounding the university for all day parking.</p> <p>Residential Parking Permits are currently in place for the Nambour Hospital 3P area and Lady Musgrave Drive residents, who pay a fee to apply for a permit each year.</p> <p>Without time restrictions, the regulation of the streets surrounding the university will be limited to parking on nature strips, across driveways and on yellow lines.</p> <p>Provided a vehicle is legally parked, a vehicle is able to stop and park on the side of the road.</p> <p>The University of the Sunshine Coast has implemented a parking management strategy, which includes paid parking and free parking options.</p> <p>Further consultation with the university to be considered in relation</p>	Disagree	It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)

Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
		to the parking management system and proposal to look at different fee structure.		
45	<p>It is a disgrace that I'm notified less than a week before submissions close. 2. I did not find the links referred to in the correspondence to exist. I had to search for it. You have therefore denied many people the opportunity to have their say. 3. Re Varsity View Court. This is a disgrace. The only people who park here are the students of the University who live at Varsity & Unicentral. This is where you want them to park, not in Columbia St. The effect of your strategy is to charge students parking in the street outside their living quarters or force them to park in front of houses in Columbia. Therefore this is either a filthy money grabbing scheme or gross stupidity or both.</p> <p>Varsity View Court in front of Unicentral & Varsity student accommodation campuses should be exempt from the scheme. The residential area within 200 metres of these sites could be included but the residents who complain might object to paying the fee, after all very few cars are parked in the street, except outside the campuses. The period for comment needs to be extended significantly so that people effected being almost exclusively students can have their say</p>	Noted	Disagree	It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.
48	<p>There is an increasing number of narrow residential streets (sustainable - affordable housing driven). On street parking is becoming more restricted. Many motorists park "one wheel up" on the verge to increase the available width for on road traffic. This is currently illegal. In general it is ignored as an infringement subject to complaints. This should be allowable subject to pedestrian access being maintained to take some of the "grey" away from the response services officer's decision making process. Perhaps this could be achieved by designating areas under the local law where this is acceptable.</p>	<p>Noted, although the comment received is inconsistent with previous discussions where it was determined that nature strip parking was not supported.</p> <p>Unrelated to the proposed amendments.</p>	Inconclusive	It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.
49	<p>1. Make the university provide sufficient free parking for students. 2. Make the university allow one way traffic to use the current bus road to exit Scholars Drive after dropping off children, thus relieving congestion around the school. This would only need to be allowed during school drop off and collection times. 3. Find out why, when there are ample walkways all through Sippy Downs, children are being driven to school rather than walking or riding bikes. (survey?)</p>	Further discussion with the University in relation to comment received. For consideration by the Traffic and Transportation Team.	Disagree	It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.
52	Lack of planning on the councils behalf should not impact on the parking in front of my house. do not implement	Comments to be considered by the Transport Planning Team.	Disagree	It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.
56	<p>As a resident and homeowner of a property in Albany St, Sippy Downs I wish to object to the proposal of regulating parking and forcing home owners and residents to pay for a parking permit of \$47 to park in my own street. I understand there may be issues and complaints from residents in other streets closer to the University however I live at 21 Albany St which has a carpark across the road for the surrounding parkland and playground. This carpark consists of a least one dozen carparks and I have not seen one student park there, only families and visitors to the area due to the fact it is too dangerous to park on the road. Why does the council not put pressure of the Uni to remove the cost of parking within the University? There is plenty of empty carparks within the campus grounds because students do not have parking money in their budget. The University makes a good profit from these students, they should be providing free parking. Instead we impose further costs on home owners and residents of Sippy Downs instead actually addressing the real issue. This is a poor solution and building carparks in the University which are unaffordable and sit empty is poor management. The council needs to advocate for residents and homeowners, not impose extra costs upon us, this is why we pay our rates. Andrea Jensen 21 Albany St Sippy Downs</p> <p>Reduce or remove the cost of the parking at the University so the current car parks are utilised by the students and not our streets.</p>	<p>The proposed change is looking at the implementation of timed parking and the ability for residents to apply for a permit allowing them to overstay a time restriction due to ongoing use of the streets surrounding the university for all day parking.</p> <p>Residential Parking Permits are currently in place for the Nambour Hospital 3P area and Lady Musgrave Drive residents, who pay a fee to apply for a permit each year.</p> <p>Without time restrictions, the regulation of the streets surrounding the university will be limited to parking on nature strips, across driveways and on yellow lines. Provided a vehicle is legally parked, a vehicle is able to stop and park on the side of the road.</p> <p>The University of the Sunshine Coast has implemented a parking management strategy, which includes paid parking and free parking options.</p> <p>Further consultation with the university to be considered in relation to the parking management system and proposal to look at different fee</p>	Disagree	It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)

Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
		structure.		
58	Regulated parking in sippy downs is a good idea as it is not safe the way it is - particularly Columbia street. However believe that perhaps it should be on one side of road only & yellow line on other for major through streets such as Columbia and Parkville as parking both sides restricts traffic whether regulated or not and is very dangerous.	Comments to be considered by Traffic and Transportation Team	Agree with residential parking permit scheme – however suggests only allow parking on one side of the street	It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.
61	The students still need somewhere to park the answer is not restrictions but the Uni should cater for its own parking requirements. Unless the entire suburb is included in the zone Sippy Downs is small enough geographically that no where is really too far away from the Uni that the students won't hesitate to invade streets outside the zone. Furthermore it is my submission that if the zone is intended to free our streets of the inundation of students motor vehicles this proposal will not achieve this all it will do is turn over the vehicles every two hours. Consideration should be given to forcing the Uni to provide sufficient parks for their students, staff and visitors.	Further consultation with the university to be considered in relation to the parking management system and proposal to look at different fee structure	Disagree	It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.
62	concerned re parking restrictions in streets surrounding sc uni. residents should not have to pay to park, and those visiting friends/family in the affected streets will only have a two hour timeframe when visiting or risk being fined.	Noted	Disagree	It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.
63	Not going to make much difference cause most the problem is school pick up parking some days can barely get into my street and blocking view coming out with cars parked everywhere including on the corners of my street there are not that many uni student cars parked there so the big problem is school traffic so charging me to park on front lawn or in visitor car parking will do nothing Regulate school pick up traffic that's 90% of the problem and only a matter of time before a big accident happens in this area and having 2 hr parking only wont fix this problem as there is generally only half dozen Uni student cars parked and are no problem until school pick	Noted. Ongoing regulation of the area surrounding schools during pick up and drop off times.	Disagree	It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.
64	I am a sippy downs resident effected by the traffic congestion due to overparking of uni students in the area. Christian Dickson and council has my full support to implement the new parking regulation on weekdays throughout the day	Noted	Agree	It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.
67	I don't believe that making people pay an annual fee will assist in the parking issues within Sippy Downs. Our house falls in the catchment area and this will now mean that my family members who help look after my kids while I'm at work will now have to pay for parking. This is just crazy! I think the Uni student will pay the fee as I'm sure it's still a cheaper option than the Uni parking - so we still have major congestion on Columbia and it's going to be dangerous for kids crossing from school! They need to do something with A) school parking and B) Uni parking. Having only 1 way in and out of Chancellor school is just crazy and there are no where near enough car parks around the school for parents - this is why they park along the side streets. As for Uni well I have no idea why they don't use the free parking area that they have! It's about the same distance... I don't really know what you can do to fix the issue but something needs to be done that doesn't make the local residents have to pay to park out the front of their property. Again I know it's for certain times but still there are a lot of people that are stay at home parents and they have guests come... So annual parking to me isn't going to help the locals!	Noted. Further consultation with University and local schools to address issues. For consideration by Traffic and Transportation Team.	Disagree	It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.
79	You cannot penalise the residents by forcing them to pay for street parking. You have said that residents 'may still park in their streets' for 2 hours however, this will mean that residents will need to move their cars every 24 hours. The reverse parallel parks outside the village would make far better sense if they were angled parks. This would result in double the parks. I would agree with the suggested idea, if parking permits were free. Students are already paying enough and cannot afford a few. If you are going to make students pay for parking how about making considerations as to the unsafe parking practices occurring by parents. I have on numerous occasions been blocked from entering and exiting my place of residence by rude parents blocking the driveway in order to pick up children. I say no to the	Noted. Without time restrictions, the regulation of the streets surrounding the university will be limited to parking on nature strips, across driveways and on yellow lines. Provided a vehicle is legally parked, a vehicle is able to stop and park on the side of the road. The University of the Sunshine Coast has implemented a parking management strategy, which includes	Disagree	It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)

Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
	<p>proposed plan!!</p> <p>If you want the proposal plan, make it free! Turn the parking into angled parks. There is ample amount of spare space on Sippy downs road. This could be better used.</p>	<p>paid parking and free parking options.</p> <p>Further consultation with the university to be considered in relation to the parking management system and proposal to look at different fee structure.</p> <p>Consideration for alterations to parking, including angle parks to be considered by Traffic and Transportation Team.</p>		
80	<p>I'm a student at the university. I can't afford \$5 per day to park at university. How am I supposed to get to uni if I can't park in the streets near by. I can't walk far with so many books and things.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Further consultation with the university to be considered in relation to the parking management system and proposal to look at different fee structure.</p>	Disagree	<p>It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.</p>
84	<p>I live inside this area and we have a few personal and business vehicles and there is not enough off st (driveway parking) and as I am home most of the time all day my car is parked on the st. As a single income family even though 'only 90c' a day this cost added to the budget when we have 2 vehicles parked adds up. ????. Also I believe it will just push them to park on the other side of the park on sir Raleigh where they already park. I think it will just shift the problem to another area.. Could even be more economical to shift the powerlines along claymore (maybe underground?) to allow a multi storey paid parking lot instead of just a gravel carpark?. That way students can apply for a yearly permit, they come and go as the years pass but permanent residents are there for years. Could there be more paid multi-storey parking built within walking distance of the university? Near the police station possibly?</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Further consultation with the university to be considered in relation to the parking management system and proposal to look at different fee structure.</p> <p>Consideration for alterations to parking, including angle parks to be considered by Traffic and Transportation Team and Transport Planning Team.</p>	Disagree	<p>It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.</p>
86	<p>The proposal for charging uni student to park on scholars drive should be reviewed. Some students who live in student accomodation like myself do not have access to a garage or off steet parking. I believe it is unfair to charge already low income earners such as students to pay a fee to use the parking facilities out side of the housing. I understand that there is a school across the road and that there is a lot of traffic congestion however the issue is that those who life within the student complex should not have to pay parking when they are already paying to live in the accomodation and that the council thinks it's reasonable to charge students to park their cars infront to their house.</p> <p>That the students that live within the student living complexes should be givin a permit with out being charged so it can be seen via council members who are regulating the rest of the parking that those cars belong to residents of the student housing</p>	<p>Noted</p>	Disagree	<p>It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.</p>
87	<p>I think this is unnecessary and is only to make extra money on the students who love in the area, as well as any other family's who need to park on the street for having too many cars.</p> <p>To not do this and leave the situation the same</p>	<p>Noted</p>	Disagree	<p>It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.</p>
88	<p>As a resident of the on campus accommodation, I understand that many of the students cannot afford to pay for parking within the complex and therefore park along varsityview ct. However what is an issue is the cars parking along either side of Columbia St. When cars are parked on either side of the road, there is only room for 1 car to drive past which is very dangerous. I have witnessed near misses when cars are driving either way and 1 car must stop to allow the oncoming car through. The 2 hour parking rule is not a proper solution and will cost the council more when staff have to police it to ensure people aren't staying longer than the 2 hours.</p> <p>I recommend that a yellow line be put on one side of the road to stop cars from parking on one side. Cars will still be able to park on the other side of the road. It will allow traffic to fit along the road while also making room for parking.</p>	<p>Noted. Further consideration by the Traffic and Transportation Team in relation to alternative traffic signs/regulations.</p>	Disagree	<p>It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.</p>
92	<p>As a family resident (sharing accommodation) we have several vehicles - Work Vehicle, Family Cars etc. During this period 8 - 5pm Some vehicles will be on the street due to limited space within the property. (Caravan - Trailer etc) I believe being a FULL time rate paying resident, that nominated vehicles LIVING at residents should have FREE parking permits for on street parking.</p>	<p>The proposed change is looking at the implementation of timed parking and the ability for residents to apply for a permit allowing them to overstay a time restriction due to ongoing use of the streets surrounding the university</p>	Disagree	<p>It is the recommendation of officers that council give specific consideration to the continuation of this particular proposal.</p>

ATTACHMENT 1 – SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (COMMUNITY CONSULTATION)

Council Ref	Submission	Officer Comments	Agree / Disagree	Recommendation
	Residents LIVING at address should have FREE on street parking.	<p>for all day parking.</p> <p>Residential Parking Permits are currently in place for the Nambour Hospital 3P area and Lady Musgrave Drive residents, who pay a fee to apply for a permit each year.</p> <p>Without time restrictions, the regulation of the streets surrounding the university will be limited to parking on nature strips, across driveways and on yellow lines. Provided a vehicle is legally parked, a vehicle is able to stop and park on the side of the road.</p> <p>The University of the Sunshine Coast has implemented a parking management strategy, which includes paid parking and free parking options.</p>		