



# ***Dingley Village Community Association Inc.***

(c/o 47 Greenwood Mews , Dingley Village, 3172. david@lildam.net)

## **Submission to Planning Guidelines for Golf Course Redevelopment**

### Introduction

The Dingley Village Community Association ( DVCA) is particularly disappointed in the proposal to form a panel to advise the Minister for Planning on developing Golf course land.

This process should be left to individual Councils to decide upon, particularly in the light of the Minister being on record as saying “the best planning results occur when local Councils listen to the views of their residents.”

We submit that the State Government should instead develop policy to protect the open spaces on **all** of our golf courses with policy like the City of Kingston’s, that if a golf club is genuinely unable to manage its affairs so as to continue as a golf course, then it must hand the land over to Council or to another agency that can find an alternative use that retains the land as open space, ideally public open space.

The proposed panel structure greatly weakens Councils decision making process. Any new process should not be used to override a Council decision, especially such as in the case of Kingswood golf club, where Council unanimously rejected an inappropriate proposal to rezone golf course land.

Should this panel proposal proceed, the independent Standing Advisory Committee, should be truly independent, with equal representation from residents appointed from areas that would be most affected by development decisions.

### Key planning considerations.

- a) Any panel decision must consider and reflect any previous actions or views by residents affected by a proposed development.
- b) Must stress *net community* benefit, weighting it appropriately to the residents of the ***immediately affected area*** who obviously will bear the major impact of any development proposal and may experience very little benefit and in fact, have a poorer quality of amenity enjoyment.
- c) Must give increased weight to previous Council decisions and current views on any development.
- d) Must include a category weighting for enjoyment of *local* amenity. It’s the local residents who live near the courses, NOT the panel, who will be most affected by decisions to reduce tree cover or open space, or approve residential housing.
- e) Must take into account the opinions and views of both local State and Federal Members of Parliament as these form an important measure of community feeling. ( see attached examples)

- f) The assessment of oversupply of courses in a particular region must distinguish between private courses and public courses. If most of the courses are private, many people are precluded from playing golf due the high cost of private club membership. This means whilst there may be an apparent excess of courses, there is a limited opportunity non-members to play.

The DVCA loss of open space golf courses to inappropriate high density residential development and other urban uses is a retrograde planning action which will have long term detrimental effects on our urban liveability.

David Madill,  
Chairman DVCA  
30<sup>th</sup> Sept 2019