

Bangalow 26 November Rural weddings workshop feedback

40 attendees

Site suitability

- Not near koala habitat
- Not via access road through Cemetery – lots agree
- Parking should be sufficient
- Parking assessment
- RU6 (7d) scenic escarpment should be considered
- RU6– noise travels far from escarpment so probably not suitable
- Sound proof hall/venue would be good
- Any zone could be okay if application is very thorough
- Not RU1 – needs to be some areas where function centres are banned
- Trial it first in just RU2
- Could average dwelling DA clearly stipulate function centres prohibited
- 500m control will mean no venues get approved
- Some neighbours think 500m is sufficient
- Depends on site and weather so distance is difficult
- Access road needs to be sufficient and safe
- Ability for buses to turn around
- Sealed is good, how far? Private roads?
- What about change of ownership?
- Consent should be limited
- Possum creek is not suitable as used for agriculture
- Land was purchased for agriculture
- Safe parking and access
- Not to be coupled with air bnb
- Venues should be occupied and part of the community
- Signs on road near events regarding parking
- All sites assessed individually on site suitability, structures/ability to sound proof and owners management
- Site by site assessment – no blanket rules – high priority
- Structures/acoustic assessment more important – high priority
- Scaled acoustic assessment – i.e. move in after x pm
- Topography and line of sight buffers are important
- Consider sight buffer to block views
- Protect primary production
- Zoning not as important as site by site assessment

Management

- On site management/third party management is needed for the entire night –high priority
- Management is the most important

- No of events should be left to planner
- Limit the number of events in the clause
- Specific times when no events to give peace to owners
- 20 is a viable amount of events per year
- Why cap number of events if site is suitable?
- Two tier management e.g. all criteria met = 30 per year, some met = 15 per year, similarly with curfew
- How will we know if they comply?
- Bus must be enforced
- Max no. of guests based on engineer referral
- Agreement on 3 strikes and out
- Evidence based complaints
- Need to follow through on complaints
- Education given to neighbours
- Shouldn't need to notify neighbours for every event – annoying to neighbours – high priority
- 8/8:30 is too early, 7 Qld time, flow on effects, no one will adhere or apply
- Can council provide evidence on anywhere that 8pm works?
- Dj work not viable if that early
- 9:30 /10 is better
- 10/10:30 is more realistic – high priority
- Noise scaled curfew
- Registration system that is online and public
- Code of conduct including decibel max
- Yearly compliance
- Manager must live on site – lots agree
- Wedding compliance officer?
- Pre lodgement consultation with neighbours would be useful
- Transparency is important
- How will compliance be enforced?
- Tough mechanism needed to ensure compliance
- 'Neighbours hotline' details given to neighbours and who to contact
- Residents within 5km notified
- Thorough management plan required
- Delivery and pack down of equipment between 9am-5pm
- Controls should be flexible
- Management plan to be available to neighbours
- Trial period for venues
- Acoustic assessment is important
- Too many rules is not sustainable
- Attempt to mend issues with neighbours before shutting down
- Same rules for halls otherwise issues go into residential areas

Other

- Important to support the wedding industry as it provides many jobs and big \$ to economy and they need these venues

- Air bnb will by pass all this as people are starting to use big houses for weddings with no management and this is where the issues are coming from

-

Federal 27 November – Rural weddings workshop feedback

Approximately 20 attendees with a mixture of neighbours and industry. Industry still outnumbered neighbours

Site Suitability

- Need to be able to demonstrate toilets/waste management
- Some agreed on the need for access by sealed roads
- Some agreed sealed roads didn't matter as long as using the appropriate bus
- Buses need to be able to turn around on site
- Parking needs to be sufficient
- Road access was seen as important considering safety, volume and bus turning.
- Consideration of vegetation and fire hazards to be considered
- Topography is important – valleys = noisy
- Some didn't like the idea of anybody being able to host events. Registered event managers only
- Site by site analysis is important.
- Consider a scaled approach i.e. well suited sites have less restrictions or can hold more events
- Ability for temporary licences so farmers can utilise in the off season
- Distance parameters are less important if the site is assessed on merits e.g. topography and passes noise assessment
- Sound proofing is important more than distance
- Distance can become irrelevant with topography and weather
- Ability to party at the house after makes it not suitable
- Distance is good but does depend on site and can be varied
- Some agreed that the current 500m and 250meter is good

Management

- Well managed events aren't the problem
- All agreed (even the neighbours) that 8pm is too early for curfew
- Its too hot to start earlier
- 8pm will destroy the industry which has flow on effects
- Correct management overrides curfew
- Need for on site management/security
- Concern regarding the difficulties to police especially if rural function centres become more common due this planning proposal.
- Mostly agree that there should be a limit on the number of events
- Neighbours said they cannot deal with it occurring every single weekend even if it is well managed and has curfew
- Some agree that it depends on the venue that limiting the number may be irrelevant
- All agree the most import thing is to stop the rogue operators and support the good and well managed venues

- Need for contribution of the impact on roads etc. from the events.
- Look into 'fee per event' similar to 'bed tax' 'voluntary bed tax'
- Concern that voluntary tax may promote the illegal operators – need for accreditation the holds weight
- 10 or even midnight is reasonable especially if limiting the number of events as lots go home to bed if it finishes at 10:30 but not if it finishes at 8:30 reducing flow on effects
- Encourage off season use of venues
- Enforcement infringements needs to be higher to deter rogue operators
- Conduct given to DJ
- There are ways to contain sound
- Decibel maximum set and reader essential
- No bus idling
- Music different depending on structures
- Licenced venue notification – just as when you enter a hotel you can see their license, function centres should have this to raise awareness and undermine/dissuade the illegal venues
- Neighbours to be consulted
- No staying on-site
- Event pays bond that can go to the neighbour
- Agreement on 3 strikes and you're out - but for how long, after 12 months their 2 strikes get wiped out and they start again? Maybe 3 strikes you're out full stop.
-

Rural Weddings Workshop Feedback – Mullumbimby 20 November 2018

Approximately 20 attendants, all but 2 were from the weddings industry

Site Suitability

- R5 should be included also as it is more about the size of the land than the zone
- Site by site is more important than blanket site suitability rules or zoning – majority agreed
- A trial period based on the merits of the site to allow well managed sites to continue
- Management is the most important aspect
- RU1 should also be allowed for farmers to diversify
- Not fair to exclude well managed RU1 properties
- Should not be permitted on RU1
- Some argued that there should be no distance control
- Topography is a key consideration
- Number of people per event should be site specific
- Not the land owners fault if roads aren't sealed – sealed roads should be managed but not restrictive
- Understand the benefits of the sealed road but not entirety of road has to be sealed
- Consideration of availability of car parking to avoid people parking on the side of the road
- Contribution for community infrastructure and access roads should be required (not sure if we can do this)
- Should consider land use conflict with adjoining farmland practices i.e. spraying crops and zoning conflict between adjoining RU1
- Acoustic assessment is very expensive, should be able to be done by the owners/managers. Depends on where the reading is taken
- Look at Earthhouse, buffer or acoustic modelling, why do we need both?
- 500m distance is too restrictive and nobody would be able to get approval
- Concern about the basis for 500m number

Management

- 8:30 is not appropriate and it will destroy the industry; this was generally agreed throughout
- 8pm is 7pm Qld which is where a large portion of the market comes from
- 8pm curfew will discourage people from seeking consent
- Site with DA restrictions with early time is not getting any bookings
- Amplified music to cease at 10
- 10pm noise shutoff and 10:30 off site is reasonable – all agree at one table
- Consistency is key so all event organisers follow same rules
- Leave it to the noise law
- Where do people go at 8:30, may have flow on effects
- 10:30 leave site
- Some argued let people leave when they want
- General agreement with the three strikes and you're out rule
- Clear evidence of breach of rules in complaint to avoid unfair dismissal

- On-site management throughout entire event, all agree at one table
- On-site security is needed and should be in the management plan
- Establish a code of conduct with best practice and the responsibility of the site owner
- Site owner should give contact details to neighbours but not notify them before every event as this can annoy the neighbours – general agreement
- Contact number of security company given to neighbours and if neighbours have to call the security they receive part of the bond, majority agreement at one table
- Minority thought hot air balloons and helicopters could be allowed if managed well
- 3a no caps are required if the site is deemed suitable
- Limit the number of traffic movements to manage impacts on local roads and safety
- Consider distance to emergency services
- Accreditation for management companies
- Consideration of natural hazards i.e. bushfires and flooding during the assessment process
- Scale of number of attendees against site constraints such as remoteness and potential hazards etc.
- Notification to neighbours of applications that are submitted to council
- Approvals should be limited to a number of events per year/month
- Commercial use should have commercial operating hours; later than 8pm
- Sound assessment needs to have specific rules for all, what level etc.?
- Management plan is essential
- “amplified music” not relevant if it is under the noise limit

Other

- Function centres/wedding venues are a good way of utilising small rural holdings that are not economically viable to be used for agriculture
- The need for public liability insurance

Rural Weddings Feedback from Byron Bay 13 November Workshop

3 x Discussion Table approx. 7-8 at each

Curfew

Majority in attendance thought 8:00 and 8:30 finish was too restrictive and thought 10:00 and 10:30 might be a fairer.

Some wanted to keep it at 8:00 and 8:30

Issues/points raised

- Where do the people go after 8:30? This can have flow on effects i.e. they go to private house parties etc.
- 9pm is too late for restaurants to host dinners
- Curfew is too restrictive
- Noise can travel further at night so 8pm is good
- 10pm is legislated time for noise to stop so we should align with this
- 8:30 finish is too early and not realistic
- 8:30 finish will severely impact the wedding industry, nobody will book weddings in Byron and will go elsewhere
- 10:00pm is reasonable. It comes down to the event/ venue management
- Well managed audio makes the time irrelevant
- A better approach could be to contain noise at a certain time e.g. all have to be indoors by 8:30
- It should be dependant on site and topography, blanket curfew is too harsh
- Agreement on use of bus to transport to/from the venues as this manages people to ensure they get off site. Could be a prerequisite before a wedding can be booked.
- Council approved/permit for certain musicians or wedding planners to host/play at events could ensure better management of these events
- Should be grounded in acoustic assessment not in curfew
- Different provisions for sound proofed structures
- Respect for neighbours is important

Site Suitability

- Concerns that the distance constraint is too restrictive, even 250meters
- Acoustic shielding and structures could be more effective than a number.
- Noise level is more important than distance number – acoustic assessment
- Acoustic reports are expensive for venue owners
- Serious venue owners are willing to pay for acoustic assessments
- Clause doesn't currently consider the type of structure the event is held in to block noise etc.
- Sealed road requirement creates unfair advantage for some sites when it is not their fault the roads are unsealed.
- Sealed road requirement is necessary for dust, noise, maintenance
- Buffers against RU1 to limit Land Use conflicts
- 250metres is still too far if sound assessment is fine
- Can make properties better suited to control sound e.g. sound barriers

- 500metres is fine and some argued not enough
- Don't want to be able to be visually impacted/ see the event
- Case by case – topography and vegetation is important
- Is the distance measured from the speakers/ where the noise comes from?
- Too few sites will gain approval through this clause and industry will suffer
- Not just amplified music
- Function centre definition is too broad
- How is 'unacceptable noise' interpreted
- Sound proof dwellings is not mandated – could it be?
- Acoustic assessment is necessary

Noise

- Noise is the biggest issue to neighbours
- Noise needs to be managed and official
- General agreement on sound having to be lower after a set time or more indoors
- Acoustic reporting is expensive for venue owners. Is council aware of prohibiting cost? Some state that owners are willing to pay.
- Clearer requirements needed for acoustic reporting. How long for? Who does it? Whats in it? Clause needs to be specific and clear.
- General agreement on need to notify neighbours but how many do you need to notify? Some will be upset anyway.
- Info should be given to neighbours about events and details on what to do if event doesn't follow rules etc.
- Requirements not detailed or specific
- Event management report is essential
- Consensus that having a contact person on site and a plan of management is a great idea
- Code of conduct for venues
- Unrealistic to expect landowners to seal unsealed roads. Clause is not specific on how far to seal
- Acoustic assessment is necessary per site
- Sealed road not as relevant if using a bus. Bus should be suited for that road e.g big bus or 2 small buses. Bus should be a requirement for booking the venue
- Sealed road limits viable properties which can support halls etc. and not allow too many venues
- Type of audio equipment is important
- Approved event managers and suppliers only could assist in better management
- Location and aspect of audio equipment is important for how the sound impacts neighbours and needs to be done specific to the site and weather
- Noise management is important
- Decibel reading equipment on site and on neighbours site - potential shut off if decibel max is breached
- Maximum number of guests and events should be set

Zoning

- RU2 Only protects valuable farmland
- Community values paddock to plate
- Allowing on both RU1 and RU2 may effect property values increasing values for commercial uses
- Could it be possible to just have part of RU1 site for weddings
- What about people who are already using RU1 for weddings and running it well?
- Merit system or special consideration for well suited properties even in RU1 with stricter rules
- Concerns about site constraints not applying equally to RU5 and RU2. Why don't these constraints apply to the RU5 sites?
- Clause should not include RU1 as this land is valuable for primary food production and should be retained as such.
- Recognition of need to find balance between tourism and farmland
- Some RU1 are not being used for farmland – site specific variation
- Case-by-case may be a better assessment method
- Concerns over land use conflicts
- Why can this apply to one zone and not another?
- Could it apply to RU6 or E3
- Farmers need to be able to diversify so some on RU1 could be good
- Landowners want peace and quite
- RU1 allowing could lead to oversupply and take away from halls
- Will any RU2 sites be appropriate?

Other

- Important to support the wedding industry, especially ones that do the right thing. This industry has great effects to the economy of the shire
- Most comes down to the management companies – Permit list for appropriate venue/management companies needed to be able to host any wedding in Byron. This holds them responsible and can lose privilege if don't abide by the rules.
- No assessment for the scale of events – some venues might be appropriate for smaller functions
- DCP can stipulate numbers –max numbers of guests and max number of events per year and max period a DA can be approved for should all be set either in the DCP or LEP
- -light pollution also needs to be managed
- If venues are on a ridgetop then an acoustic wall does not help. Noise travels right over down to the valley.
- Perhaps venues on ridgetops should have tighter controls or not be allowed at all – this is more important than 250 or 500m control.

- A buffer zone between marquee and neighbouring land needs to be set up – will the DA state exactly where the marquee can go or will the whole site be approved? If the marquee is going to be close to a border than a vegetated buffer needs to be installed. This could be a condition of consent
- -6.10 1a ii needs to be consistent with 1a – not any neighbouring dwelling – should be any dwelling within the 250m or 500m.