



# Consultation Report

October 2019

**Tailored Amendment No. 1 and  
Planning Scheme Policy New and Major Amendment No. 1**

Contents

INTRODUCTION ..... 4

**Background** ..... 4

**Amendment Process**..... 5

        Tailored Amendment to the MBRC Planning Scheme..... 5

        New and Major Amendment to Planning Scheme Policies..... 5

CONSULTATION ..... 6

**Consultation Activities** ..... 6

**Submissions Received** ..... 6

SUBMISSION REVIEW PROCESS..... 7

SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED AND COUNCIL RESPONSE ..... 10

**Theme 1 - General Residential Zone** ..... 10

**Theme 2 - Recreation and Open Space Zone** ..... 18

**Theme 3 - Rural Zone** ..... 19

**Theme 4 - Rural Residential Zone**..... 20

**Theme 5 - Township Zone** ..... 22

**Theme 6 - Dwelling House Code** ..... 24

**Theme 7 - Residential Uses Code** ..... 33

**Theme 8 - Reconfiguring a Lot Code**..... 35

**Theme 9 - Works Code**..... 38

**Theme 10 - Works Criteria** ..... 40

**Theme 11 - Mapping**..... 49

**Theme 12 - Flood and Coastal Hazard Overlay Codes** ..... 72

**Theme 13 - Service Stations**..... 76

**Theme 14 - Car Parking Rates**..... 77

**Theme 15 - Other Guidance Changes** ..... 78

**Theme 16 - Planning Scheme Policies** ..... 93

**Theme 17 - Not Amendment Related**..... 104  
**Theme 18 - State Interest Review Matters**..... 109

## INTRODUCTION

This report has been prepared by Moreton Bay Regional Council (MBRC) in accordance with the Chief Executive Notice for proposed Tailored Amendment No.1 (Tailored Amendment) and the Minister's Guidelines and Rules for making and amending Planning Scheme Policies (PSPs). Its purpose is to summarise the issues raised in the submissions and outline how Council has responded to the issues raised.

### Background

Council's planning scheme commenced on 1 February 2016. Since this time, Council has been working on the proposed amendment to ensure it remains a living document that supports growth and maintains the region's unique characteristics.

Council previously consulted the community on proposed improvements to the planning scheme and supporting planning scheme policies in 2017.

Council reviewed and considered much of this feedback, using it to inform the development of a new planning scheme amendment. The proposed changes generally aim to improve functionality and address implementation issues which have been identified since the planning scheme first came into effect. They address key matters including, but not limited to:

- Improvements to cater for carports and secondary dwellings in residential areas, and sheds in rural residential areas
- Changes to encourage the efficient use of land within walking distances of commercial centres and train stations, and further clarify the design and location of service stations
- Enhancements to 14 planning scheme policies to improve their usability and ensure they are up-to-date and fit for purpose
- Introduction of a new planning scheme policy for Township Character which aims to encourage unique design solutions that reinforce a sense of rural identity and character.

It is important to note this amendment does not include some of the proposed changes previously advertised in 2017 including emerging community and investigation areas.

## Amendment Process

### Tailored Amendment to the MBRC Planning Scheme

To amend the MBRC Planning Scheme, Council must follow the steps outlined in the Notice from the Chief Executive under Section 18 of the Planning Act 2016. This involves 5 key steps as illustrated in Figure 1 below.



Figure 1: S18 Tailored Amendment Process

### New and Major Amendment to Planning Scheme Policies

To make a new planning scheme policy and amend existing planning scheme policies, Council must follow the steps outlined in The Minister's Guidelines and Rules. This involves 4 key steps as illustrated in Figure 2 below.



Figure 2: Making and Amending a Planning Scheme Policy

## CONSULTATION

In accordance with the *Planning Act 2016* Council was required to:

1. Publish at least one public notice about the proposal to amend the planning scheme.
2. Keep the instrument available for inspection and purchase for a period (the consultation period) stated in the public notice of at least 20 business days after the day the public notice is published in a newspaper circulating in the local government area.
3. Ensure that the public notice states that any person may make a submission about the instrument to the Local Government within the consultation period.

Council undertook an initial public consultation period for the proposed amendment from 24 June 2019 to 19 July 2019. An additional consultation period was then undertaken from 22 July 2019 to 19 August 2019.

### Consultation Activities

In accordance with the Communications Strategy prepared by Council, a number of engagement methods were utilised through the consultation period. The methods utilised are listed below:

Awareness	Information Dissemination
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Letter or flyer provided via post to residents/owners</li><li>• Advert in local papers</li><li>• Facebook announcement(s)</li><li>• Banner on Council's web page</li><li>• Notice in libraries</li><li>• Notice on information boards in Council Customer Service centres</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Information sheet(s) on the website explaining the amendment content and how to navigate and use the planning scheme</li><li>• Information on how to make a properly made submission</li><li>• Online submission form</li><li>• Information on how submissions will be considered</li><li>• Access to the proposed amendments</li><li>• The ability to ask questions via email or in person</li></ul>

### Submissions Received

During consultation 163 submissions were received. This resulted in 260 submission matters being raised.

## SUBMISSION REVIEW PROCESS

The below outlines the submission review process undertaken by Council.

### Step 1 - Submission received and recorded

1. Council received the submission via, post, email or using the online form.
2. Each submission was allocated a unique reference number.
3. Each submission was checked to:
  - i. Determine if it was properly made.

*Note: For submissions to be 'properly made' the submission must:*

    - *be in writing (including by electronic means);*
    - *include the full name and residential or business address of each person making the submission;*
    - *state a postal or electronic address for service of a response to the submission;*
    - *be signed by each person making the submission (unless made electronically);*
    - *state the grounds of the submission and the facts and circumstances relied on in support of the grounds;*
    - *be made to Moreton Bay Regional Council; and*
    - *be received by Council on or before 19 August 2019.*

Despite this, all submissions received have been considered with responses recorded in this report.
  - ii. Ensure it was not a duplicate.

*Note: Where a duplicate was identified it was identified as a secondary submission.*
4. Each submission was recorded in Council's database.

### Step 2 - Submission summarised and themed

1. Each submission was reviewed in detail and a high-level summary of the matters raised prepared.
2. Each submission was then allocated a 'theme' or number of 'themes' depending on the matters raised.

*Note: The allocation of theme's is a way of categorising submission matters so that like issues or concerns can be considered together.*

The themes used relate to the proposed amendment and are as follows:

  - Theme 1 - General Residential Zone

- Theme 2 - Recreation and Open Space Zone
- Theme 3 - Rural Zone
- Theme 4 - Rural Residential Zone
- Theme 5 - Township Zone
- Theme 6 - Dwelling House Code
- Theme 7 - Residential Uses Code
- Theme 8 - Reconfiguring a Lot Code
- Theme 9 - Works Code
- Theme 10 - Works Criteria
- Theme 11 - Mapping
- Theme 12 - Flood and Coastal Hazard Overlay Codes
- Theme 13 - Service Stations
- Theme 14 - Car Parking Rates
- Theme 15 - Other Guidance Changes
- Theme 16 - Planning Scheme Policies
- Theme 17 - Not Amendment Related

### **Step 3 - Submission issue identification**

Each submission identified for each theme was then reviewed again to determine the specific submission issue or matter related to that theme. This process ensured all matters raised were captured, as a submitter may raise multiple items relating to one theme. Similarly, multiple submitters may raise the same issue or concern.

Each submission was then summarised for consideration.

### **Step 4 - Submission issue consideration**

Each submission issue was then considered in relation to the proposed amendment to determine if a change or improvement could be made. Not all submission issues resulted in a change or improvement.

Responses to each issue raised were categorised as follows:

- Change - Amendment Related;

- No change - Amendment Related; or
- No change - Not Amendment Related

To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Government's Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. Some submissions were not supported due to technical, policy or legislative reasons, or because they were outside the scope of the advertised amendment to the planning scheme and planning scheme policies.

Further changes were considered to ensure they continue to integrate all relevant State interests and do not result in the proposed amendments being 'significantly different' to the proposed amendments as advertised.

### **Step 5 - Responses**

A response to each submission matter was then prepared.

## SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED AND COUNCIL RESPONSE

### Theme 1 - General Residential Zone

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
1.1	A18952279	<p><b>Support for removal of maximum density requirement in General residential zone - Next generation neighbourhood precinct</b></p> <p>Support for the removal of maximum density requirement in General residential zone - Next generation neighbourhood precinct to allow setbacks, site cover and building height to determine the density.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Support is noted. However, Council has further considered the matter raised and, after the review of all submissions received, Council is no longer progressing with this proposed amendment. Accordingly, provisions in relation to density will remain unchanged in the zone code. This further change will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p> <p>Council has determined to undertake a broader review of the Next generation neighbourhood precinct and will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.</p>	Yes
1.2	<p>A18835121*</p> <p>A18837035*</p> <p>A18843894*</p> <p>A18844053*</p> <p>A18848733*</p> <p>A18851086*</p> <p>A18913522*</p> <p>A18942807*</p> <p>A18964646*</p> <p>A18964750*</p> <p>A18965038*</p> <p>A18971530*</p> <p>A18971566*</p> <p>A18965216</p>	<p><b>Objection to removal of maximum density requirement in General residential zone - Next generation neighbourhood precinct</b></p> <p>Objection to the removal of maximum site density requirement in General residential zone - Next generation neighbourhood precinct due to the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• resulting in increased density;</li> <li>• leading to less variety in development;</li> <li>• impacts on amenity and character;</li> <li>• increased traffic congestion and on-street parking;</li> <li>• loss of privacy, access to light and breezes;</li> <li>• infrastructure not suitable to cater for densities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council acknowledge the matters of concern raised in the submissions received and has further considered the proposed amendments. In light of the submissions received Council will not proceed with the proposed amendments as advertised in relation to the removal of maximum site density. Accordingly, provisions in relation to density for Next generation neighbourhoods will remain unchanged in the zone code. This further change will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p> <p>Council has determined to undertake a broader review of the Next generation neighbourhood precinct and will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.</p>	Yes

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
	A18965278 A18965144 A18964993 A18965270 A18963519 * Pro-forma letter			
1.3	MBRC	<b>Morayfield South urban area setbacks</b>  Suggest the proposed amendments to the setbacks tables in the code also be applied to the Morayfield South urban area table to ensure consistency.	<b>Change - Amendment related</b>  Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to provide consistency across all areas. The amendments as advertised within this code, relating to the setbacks tables, will also be made to Table 6.2.3.2.2.4 Morayfield South urban area for consistency. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.	Yes
1.4	A18835121* A18837035* A18843894* A18844053* A18848733* A18851086* A18913522* A18942807* A18964646* A18964750* A18965038* A18971530*	<b>Off-street parking requirements</b>  Concern that the current car parking requirement in General residential zone - Next Generation neighbourhood precinct is not sufficient to cater for demand.	<b>No change - Not amendment related</b>  The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.  The intent for Next generation neighbourhoods is to provide a mix of residential uses, tenure and densities on a variety of lot sizes to provide housing choice and affordability for different lifestyle choices and life stages to meet diverse community needs. It is intended that these communities will include retail, commercial and community uses and therefore promoting active transport is an important consideration in this precinct.  Council will continue to monitor the number of car parking spaces being provided and the concerns raised by submitters. Council has determined to undertake a broader review of the Next generation neighbourhood precinct and will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
	A18971566* A18963519 * Pro-forma letter			
1.5	A18965216	<p><b>Minimum off-street parking requirements</b></p> <p>Request for each household to have a minimum of two off-street car parking spaces.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The intent for Next generation neighbourhoods is to provide a mix of residential uses, tenure and densities on a variety of lot sizes to provide housing choice and affordability for different lifestyle choices and life stages to meet diverse community needs. It is intended that these communities will include retail, commercial and community uses and therefore promoting active transport is an important consideration in this precinct. Council will continue to monitor the number of car parking spaces being provided and the concerns raised by submitters.</p>	No
1.6	A18854702	<p><b>Impact of increasing density in Petrie</b></p> <p>Concern for the capacity of current infrastructure to cope with increased density in Petrie.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Petrie centre includes land that is subject to the planning scheme and land subject to the Mill at Moreton Bay Priority Development Area (PDA). The Mill at Moreton Bay PDA is supported by an infrastructure plan to identify the requirements to support the growth of the PDA.</p> <p>The planning scheme includes provisions to ensure developments that are proposed are assessed against their impact on infrastructure.</p> <p>Council's Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP) identifies future infrastructure required for the road, stormwater and open space networks which Council manage. Council will continue to plan for future infrastructure including upgrades, to support an increasing population.</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
1.7	A18853164	<p><b>Visual impact assessment and concept of General residential zone - Next generation neighbourhood precinct</b></p> <p>Concern that the visual impact assessment will have bias in favour of the developer and won't be effective without rigorous scrutiny from Council.</p> <p>Concerns were also raised that the concept of the Next generation neighbourhood precinct, as an area allowing for high density living, is flawed.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments, as advertised, sought to provide further guidance in relation to information Council may need to consider alternative outcomes, for example in relation to setbacks and building height. Where a visual impact assessment is required the elements of the visual impact assessment will be appropriately assessed during the development assessment process.</p> <p>The planning scheme sets the intention for future development in the region over the next 20 years. The intent of Next generation neighbourhoods is to provide housing choice in the form of detached housing on a range of lot sizes and attached housing. These residential uses are expected to be supported by accessible retail, commercial and community uses.</p> <p>The existing character of a Next generation neighbourhood is intended to change over time as these areas develop. The street network in Next generation neighbourhoods will be well connected, permeable and legible with a grid-like form. Buildings will address the street and non-residential uses will have activate frontages.</p> <p>Next generation neighbourhoods have local, neighbourhood and district parks, primary schools and community activities and are complemented by adjacent open space areas and areas of environmental value.</p> <p>Council will monitor the effects of the new visual impact assessment provisions to determine if any further changes to the planning scheme are warranted in the future.</p>	No
1.8	A18978372	<p><b>Visual impact assessment</b></p> <p>Concern the visual impact assessment is unnecessary for code assessable developments.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised included provisions that a visual impact assessment <u>may</u> be required to assist in the assessment of development applications where buildings and structures propose alternative setbacks or building height. A visual impact assessment will not necessarily be required in all instances.</p> <p>Council will monitor the effects of the new visual impact assessment provisions to determine if any further changes to the planning scheme are warranted in the future.</p>	No
1.9	A18963419	<p><b>High rise development design provisions</b></p> <p>Recommendation to consider alternate design provisions for high rise development along the Redcliffe foreshore.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
			<p>However, as part of the proposed amendments to the planning scheme and Planning Scheme Policies (PSPs) a note which states that a visual impact assessment may be required to assess a particular building or structure was introduced.</p> <p>A visual impact assessment requires the consideration of all built form matters (e.g. height, setbacks, site cover, building bulk and mass, articulation, roof form and other design aspects) from a variety of perspectives (or public view points) to demonstrate the proposals ability to meet the intended outcomes for the area.</p> <p>Council will monitor the effects of the new visual impact assessment provisions to determine if any further changes to the planning scheme are warranted in the future.</p>	
1.10	A18978879	<p><b>Townhouse developments in low-medium density residential areas</b></p> <p>Request for a ban on townhouses that are interspersed with homes in low-medium density residential land.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The planning scheme sets the intention for the future development over the next 20 years. The intent of Next generation neighbourhoods is to provide housing choice in the form of detached housing on a range of lot sizes and attached housing. These residential uses are expected to be supported by accessible retail, commercial and community uses.</p> <p>The existing character of a Next generation neighbourhood is intended to change over time as these areas develop. The street network in Next generation neighbourhoods will be well connected, with a grid-like form. Buildings will address the street and non-residential uses will have activate frontages.</p> <p>Next generation neighbourhoods are intended to have local, neighbourhood and district parks, primary schools and community activities and are complemented by adjacent open space areas and areas of environmental value.</p>	No
1.11	A18977144 A18977160	<p><b>Development in General residential zone - Urban neighbourhood precinct</b></p> <p>Questions how the design of unit blocks was approved in the General residential zone - Urban neighbourhood precinct.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Information relating to specific development applications can be requested by contacting Council.</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
1.12	A18977144 A18977160	<b>Setbacks in General residential zone - Urban neighbourhood precinct</b>  Concerns that the side setback requirements are insufficient and recommends setbacks should be a minimum of 4 metres for up to 5 storeys and an additional 0.5 metre setback for every additional storey.	<b>No change - Not amendment related</b>  The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.  The General residential zone - Urban neighbourhood precinct supports increased residential density and will change in character over time. The planning scheme provides setbacks that achieve the intended higher density character of the precinct.	No
1.13	A18977144 A18977160	<b>Noise restrictions on air conditioners</b>  Recommendation for strict noise level controls for air conditioners if all units are placed in the same area.	<b>No change - Not amendment related</b>  The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.  A noise impact assessment can be required for multiple dwelling developments (e.g. units). Typically, these assessments do not specifically evaluate impacts from mechanical plant and air conditioning but rather refer to requirements for further assessment when detailed design is available. A related condition is generally applied to the development permit.  In circumstances where no noise impact assessment is required, specific provisions of the <i>Environmental Protection Act</i> relating to noise from air conditioning equipment can be applied to address noise concerns.	No
1.14	A18963161	<b>Preservation of General residential zone - Suburban neighbourhood precinct</b>  Request the General residential zone - Suburban neighbourhood precinct be preserved and no land use changes be permitted including changes to dwelling types and development footprint.	<b>No change - Not amendment related</b>  The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.  Council has an obligation to plan for population and employment growth in accordance with the South East Queensland Regional Plan 2017 ( <i>ShapingSEQ</i> ). As part of a broader regional growth solution, the General residential zone - Suburban neighbourhood precinct seeks to support houses on traditional residential lots (e.g. generally 600m <sup>2</sup> lots), houses on narrow lots and dual occupancies where dispersed within the streetscape. Multiple dwellings (e.g. townhouses) only establish in the Suburban neighbourhood precinct where on land within 400m walking distance to a higher order or district centre or train station.	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
1.15	A18978372	<p><b>Setback performance outcome</b></p> <p>Request for building mass, articulation and landscaping to be considered in the Performance Outcome for setbacks.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The current planning scheme includes requirements for building mass, articulation and landscaping in relation to the proposed use and the applicable zone.</p> <p>Further, as part of the proposed amendments to the planning scheme and Planning Scheme Policies (PSPs) a note which states that a visual impact assessment may be required to assess a particular building or structure was introduced.</p> <p>A visual impact assessment requires the consideration of all built form matters (e.g. height, setbacks, site cover, building bulk and mass, articulation, roof form and other design aspects) from a variety of perspectives (or public view points) to demonstrate the proposals ability to meet the intended outcomes for the area.</p>	No
1.16	A18978372	<p><b>Building height</b></p> <p>Request that lift overruns and support infrastructure be excluded from the building height calculation.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The definition of building height clarifies that lift overruns, air conditioners and the like, are excluded from the measurement of building height.</p>	No
1.17	A18979919	<p><b>Amenity of residential areas in Petrie</b></p> <p>Concern that the green character and amenity of Petrie is being lost and request for Council to influence developers into greener quality developments.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The planning scheme recognises the benefits of vegetation particularly for increasing biodiversity outcomes and amenity in urban environments including help to reduce urban temperatures.</p> <p>Depending on the type of development, the planning scheme provides a range of provisions that protect the significant environmental values (mapped vegetation and habitat trees) and promote green developments through deep planting zones, landscaping within front setbacks and provision of street trees.</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
1.18	A18978155 A18978669	<b>Efficient use of land in General residential zone - Urban neighbourhood precinct</b>  Recommend the proposed additional Overall Outcome relating to the efficient use of land should be deleted as the existing codes are sufficient.	<b>No change - Amendment related</b>  The proposed amendments as advertised sought to ensure the efficient use of land, specifically, where measures such as density do not apply (density relates to the creation of dwellings). This additional outcome is considered appropriate as it intends to prevent the underutilisation and inefficient use of land in the General residential zone - Urban neighbourhood precinct. These areas are typically well serviced by infrastructure, including public transport as well as retail, commercial and community uses, and these opportunities should be maximised. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed	No
1.19	A18978155 A18978669	<b>Duplication of Overall Outcome for non-residential uses</b>  Concern that the proposed Overall Outcome for non-residential uses to ensure that car parking does not dominate the street duplicates other provisions.	<b>No change - Amendment related</b>  The proposed amendments as advertised, included changes to the Overall Outcomes (OO) to ensure the location of car parking does not dominate the street. These proposed amendments are not considered to be a duplication but rather are intended to clarify the expected outcome, ensuring that development provides an appropriate balance in the siting of buildings and car parking areas. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.	No
1.20	A18978155 A18978669	<b>Unclear Overall Outcome for non-residential uses</b>  Objection to the proposed Overall Outcome for non-residential uses to ensure car parking does not dominate the street as the term "dominate" is not clear.	<b>No change - Amendment related</b>  The proposed amendments as advertised, included changes to the Overall Outcomes (OO) to ensure the location of car parking does not dominate the street. These proposed amendments are not considered to prohibit car parking being visible from the street but rather are intended to clarify the expected outcome, ensuring that development provides an appropriate balance in the siting of buildings and car parking areas and positively contributes to the streetscape. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.	No

## Theme 2 - Recreation and Open Space Zone

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
2.1	MBRC	<p><b>Consequential amendments related to the proposed amendment to reduce the assessment requirements for Community Care Centre</b></p> <p>Consequential amendments related to the proposed amendment to clarify that the zone code is not the assessment benchmark for land uses in Recreation and open space zone, where on council owned or controlled land and in accordance with a council masterplan.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised sought to clarify that the assessment benchmark for uses occurring in accordance with a council approved master plan is not the zone code. Therefore, proposals of this nature are accepted development, and not subject to the requirements (referred to as RADs) in the zone code. Accordingly, consequential formatting amendments are required for clarity and consistency. These further changes relate to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the heading/title in the table of assessment to remove the wording 'subject to requirements';</li> <li>the inclusion of an Editor's note where the use is accepted development to clarify that development approval is not required; and</li> <li>Table 1.7.7.1, as this table lists the circumstances for which particular land uses are accepted development within the planning scheme. The uses to be accepted development and the circumstances for them to be accepted development within the Recreation and open space zone have been included in this table.</li> </ul> <p>These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes

Theme 3 - Rural Zone

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed <i>(Yes or No)</i>
3.1	MBRC	<p><b>Administrative error</b></p> <p>Text has been incorrectly added. The text is already present in and correctly marked-up in the appropriate locations.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The text that has been duplicated in the wrong section of the code has been removed. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes

## Theme 4 - Rural Residential Zone

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
4.1	A18963109	<p><b>Reduce setback distances</b></p> <p>Suggests that the setback distances for outbuildings should be reduced to give greater flexibility to residents. Requests setbacks be reduced to what they were under the Caboolture ShirePlan.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised included adjusted minimum setback distances applying to the Rural residential zone. These minimum setbacks are intended to allow for greater flexibility whilst retaining the character of the zone. Where a proposal seeks alternative setbacks, an application can be made to Council and will be assessed against the corresponding Performance Outcome (PO). Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p>	No
4.2	A18963046	<p><b>Supports setback distance amendments</b></p> <p>Support for the proposed changes to the setback distances.</p>	<p><b>No Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Support noted.</p>	No
4.3	A18964029	<p><b>Supports Rural residential amendments</b></p> <p>Support for the proposed amendments to the Rural residential zone code.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Support noted.</p>	No
4.4	A18963359 A18979839	<p><b>Increase setback distances</b></p> <p>Recommends that the setback distances for outbuildings and secondary dwellings are increased in the Rural residential zone.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised included adjusted setback distances applying to the Rural residential zone. These setbacks are intended to allow for greater flexibility whilst retaining the character of the zone. Accordingly, it is considered that the amendments as proposed are appropriate and no further changes are proposed.</p>	No
4.5	A18965133	<p><b>Site cover</b></p> <p>Concern that RAD7 (site cover) in the Rural residential zone code is too lenient and will have a detrimental effect on the expected character of the zone.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised included alternate site cover allowance applying to the Rural residential zone. The amended criteria are intended to allow for greater flexibility whilst retaining the character of the zone.</p> <p>The proposed amendment refers to total roofed area rather than site cover to ensure all roofed structures are calculated. It is considered that the changes made reflect the desired Overall Outcomes (OO) for the zone. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p>	No
4.6	A18965136	<p><b>Secondary dwellings - proximity to primary dwelling</b></p> <p>Concern that the requirement for a secondary dwelling to be within 50m of the</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Secondary dwellings are listed in the planning scheme as being included within a dwelling house. Accordingly, secondary dwellings are to be used in conjunction with and subordinate to a dwelling house.</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		primary dwelling cannot be achieved in some cases in the Rural residential zone due to topographical constraints.	<p>To ensure the connection with the primary dwelling is retained the planning scheme sets a maximum distance the secondary dwelling can be separated from the primary dwelling. It is acknowledged that this is not achievable in every instance.</p> <p>Where a proposal seeks a greater separation distance, an application can be made to Council and will be assessed against the corresponding Overall Outcome (OO). Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p>	
4.7	A18965136	<p><b>Secondary dwellings - RADs</b></p> <p>Concern that for Rural residential properties located close to the rear boundary it is not possible to avoid locating a secondary dwelling between the primary dwelling and the road.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>In the Rural residential zone, a secondary dwelling is not required to be located behind the primary dwelling. This requirement only applies to more urbanised areas and seeks to ensure that the primary dwelling and secondary dwelling appear as one house from the street. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p>	No
4.8	A18978669 A18978155	<p><b>Rural residential - Dwelling house</b></p> <p>Supports the editor's note added to part 5.5.11.1 Rural residential zone as it limits the provisions a dwelling house is assessed against. Concern that the numbering of RADs is not correct.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised included an editor's note that clarifies which existing Requirements for Accepted Development (RADs) apply to a dwelling house. The numbering of the RADs within the planning scheme will be updated before the amendment is adopted.</p>	No
4.9	A18963359	<p><b>Secondary dwellings - lawful point of discharge</b></p> <p>Concern that stormwater from secondary dwellings is not being discharged to a lawful point.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The planning scheme contains Requirements for Accepted Development (RAD) that ensure any new, or changes to existing, stormwater from a site is conveyed to a point of lawful discharge without causing actionable nuisance to any person, property or premises.</p>	No

## Theme 5 - Township Zone

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
5.1	A18826078 A18963459 A18964656 A18964708 A18964742 A18964766 A18964834 A18964861 A18929020 A18940130 A18970957 A18979946 A19117522	<b>Multiple dwellings</b>  Concerns regarding the addition of the multiple dwelling land use to the Township zone - Township residential precinct code. Concern that multiple dwelling developments will not provide a benefit to the unique character of these communities.	<b>No change - Amendment related</b>  The proposed amendment as advertised sought to improve consistency within the planning scheme. In Section 5 Tables of Assessment within the current adopted MBRC Planning Scheme, multiple dwellings in the Township residential precinct are identified as code assessable and therefore require approval from Council. The intended purpose of this precinct as articulated through the Overall Outcomes also states that medium density uses can occur provided they are located within easy walking distance of a full range of services provided in a Township centre precinct (not a convenience precinct), are dispersed within the streetscape and do not result in a concentration of these residential uses within one street.  The proposed amendment to Overall Outcome K in the Township residential precinct code to list 'Multiple Dwellings - if within 800m of the Township zone - township centre precinct' as a form of development expected within this precinct, has been included to ensure consistency within the code. It is also noted that land uses for Residential care facilities, Retirement facilities (which are considered to be medium density residential uses) are also expected to occur within this precinct.  Multiple dwellings within this precinct are subject to design criteria that are intended to maintain the existing character of the precinct. The proposed amendment as advertised also included a new Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) for Township Character and references to this PSP within the Township residential precinct code. This new PSP outlines the expected design outcomes for development in the Township residential precinct. It aims to ensure that new development reflects the unique character of these areas. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.	No
5.2	A18826078	<b>Rear setbacks</b>  Concern that the removal of a 6m setback requirement will impact on the character of the area by allowing more intense urban development.	<b>No change - Amendment related</b>  The proposed amendment as advertised specifies that rear setbacks are to be in accordance with the Queensland Development Code (QDC). The QDC rear setbacks for lots over 450m <sup>2</sup> are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• For a dwelling 4.5m tall or less on a lot with a frontage width greater than 15m the rear setback is 1.5m under the QDC.</li><li>• For a dwelling 4.5m to 7.5m tall on a lot with a frontage width greater than 15m the rear setback is 2m under the QDC.</li></ul> It is considered that the proposed amendment will allow additional flexibility for dwelling houses within this precinct, which are often located on lot sizes similar to the Coastal communities precinct in the General residential zone. It is considered that the setback distance will achieve the intended outcomes for the Township zone and aligns with the new Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) for Township Character. The PSP for Township Character states that "new development in the Township residential precinct should incorporate traditional	No

			township scale, form, design and front setbacks in order to achieve consistency with the surrounding township character." Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.	
5.3	A18965393	<p><b>Retirement villages</b></p> <p>Concern that development of a retirement village will reduce the appeal of the Samford township.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Government's Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Retirement facilities in the Township residential precinct are subject to approval from Council. Further, the intent behind allowing them to establish within the precinct is to accommodate changing resident needs and allow people the opportunity to age in place, rather than having to move away from established family, friend and community networks.</p>	No

## Theme 6 - Dwelling House Code

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
6.1	MBRC	<p><b>Secondary dwellings on corner lots</b></p> <p>Request for revision of the note relating to secondary dwelling car parking on corner lots as the exemption relates only to the co-location of car parking.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to the note to clarify that the exception relates only to the co-location of car parking spaces for secondary dwellings. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
6.2	A18965133	<p><b>Built to boundary walls on lots of 450m<sup>2</sup></b></p> <p>Request that the note in RAD7 (built to boundary walls) in relation to when a concurrence agency response from Council is required be amended to include lots with an area of 450m<sup>2</sup>.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>This matter has been recorded for future consideration. Council will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.</p>	No
6.3	MBRC	<p><b>Grammatical error</b></p> <p>Request for a comma to be added to the domestic outbuilding provision.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Amendments will be made to include correct punctuation.</p>	Yes
6.4	A18952279 A18979760 A18972755	<p><b>Support for minimum car space openings</b></p> <p>Support for proposed amendment to allow double garages on lots less than 12.5m.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Support is noted.</p>	No
6.5	A18791159	<p><b>Maximum car space openings - garages</b></p> <p>Request Council reconsider its policy to allow narrow lots to have only a double garage and front door visible on single storey dwellings.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised made allowance for double garages to be located on lots less than 12.5m wide where they are appropriately designed.</p> <p>To avoid the need for an application to be lodged with Council for this matter a single storey dwelling must have a maximum garage opening of 50% of the frontage width. Where a proposal exceeds this, an application to Council would be required and it would be assessed against Council's intent for garages and carports to not dominate the street frontage; maintain opportunities for surveillance from within the dwelling; contribute to the intended character of the streetscape; and be separated to facilitate on street parking. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p>	No
6.6	A18964729	<p><b>Maximum car space openings - carports</b></p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		Recommends the requirements for maximum car space openings be revised to only apply to openings in front of the main building line, with any additional covered car space openings to be recessed behind the main building line.	<p>The proposed amendments as advertised included clarification that maximum car space openings requirements apply to garage and carport openings where within 20m of the site frontage. The intent of this requirement is to ensure that covered car parking spaces that are visible from the street are appropriately designed.</p> <p>Where a proposal is within this specified distance and exceeds the maximum openings, an application to Council would be required and it would be assessed against Council's intent for garages and carports to not dominate the street frontage; maintain opportunities for surveillance from within the dwelling; contribute to the intended character of the streetscape; and be separated to facilitate on street parking. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p>	
6.7	A18979760	<p><b>Setbacks to covered car parking space</b></p> <p>Concern the instances for reduced front setbacks to covered car parking spaces are too limiting and request Council consider removing the footpath width and maximum lot size.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised included the introduction of a reduced setback to covered car parking spaces in specific circumstances. These specific circumstances are intentional as they would result in alternatives to Councils preferred outcome for a 5.4m setback in a limited number of instances ensuring variety along the streetscape without compromising the desired streetscape outcomes. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p>	No
6.8	A18979760	<p><b>Setback measurement</b></p> <p>Recommendation for Council to consider measuring side and rear setbacks to the wall instead of outermost projection to encourage subtropical design.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The planning scheme provides the opportunity for a range of dwelling house designs. Setbacks measured to the outermost projection ensure that all parts of the dwelling house are appropriately setback from neighbouring properties. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p>	No
6.9	A18965291	<p><b>Driveway widths - visitor car parking</b></p> <p>Request for driveway widths to match the garage widths to provide for visitor parking.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised continue to regulate the width of driveway crossovers, applying restrictions to ensure they do not dominate the street, result in excessive hard stand areas or prevent on-street parking. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p>	No
6.10	A18965133	<p><b>Driveway widths - crossover and driveway note</b></p> <p>Suggest that the note relating to crossovers and driveways in RAD8 be reinstated.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council has further considered the matter raised, and amendments have been made to reinstate the existing note in relation to when a concurrence agency response from Council is required. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
6.11	A18965133	<b>Driveways</b>  Suggest that the driveway provisions in RAD10 have been made redundant by proposed amendments to Planning Scheme Policy - Integrated design (Appendix A).	<b>No change - Not amendment related</b>  The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.  While the requirement is also included in the proposed amendments to Planning Scheme Policy - Integrated design (Appendix A), the duplication within the Dwelling house code does not create a conflict. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.	No
6.12	A18965133	<b>Access and driveways</b>  Suggests that the site access and driveway provisions in RAD11 have been made redundant by proposed amendments to Planning Scheme Policy - Integrated design (Appendix A).	<b>Change - Amendment related</b>  Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to clarify the intent of the proposed amendments and remove inconsistencies in provisions.  The proposed amendment to the planning scheme and planning scheme policies as advertised seek to simplify the requirements for crossovers and driveways for dwelling houses.  However, based on submissions received it is acknowledged that the proposed amendments have not simplified the requirements and have created conflicting provisions. Accordingly, the provisions relating to crossovers and driveways and site access and driveways will be revised. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.	Yes
6.13	A18979760	<b>Support for built to boundary walls</b>  Support for built to boundary allowance of 80% if adjoining Lot type A.	<b>No change - Amendment related</b>  Support is noted.	No
6.14	A18979701	<b>Built to boundary walls - optional built to boundary walls</b>  Request for "required" to be replaced with "permitted" for proposed amendments to 'built to boundary walls' to cover instances for optional built to boundary walls.	<b>No change - Amendment related</b>  The proposed amendments as advertised included a requirement that built to boundary walls be constructed in accordance with existing approvals. Where an optional built to boundary wall is identified on an approved plan of development, this will remain optional and be subject to the requirements in the code. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.	No
6.15	A18965133	<b>Built to boundary walls - grammatical error</b>	<b>Change - Amendment related</b>	Yes

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		Suggest a revision to the grammar of the proposed built to boundary amendments.	Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to correct grammatical errors. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.	
6.16	A18965133	<b>Built to boundary walls - Editor's note</b>  Suggests a review of the Editor's notes for built to boundary walls to correct wording and interpretation errors and avoid conflicts with other requirements.	<b>No change - Not Amendment related</b>  The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.  The Editor's note is for information purposes only and is not a requirement of the planning scheme.	No
6.17	A18963661	<b>Support for carports within front setback</b>  Support for proposed amendments to allow carports within the front setback on older homes.	<b>No change - Amendment related</b>  Support is noted.	No
6.18	A18964007	<b>Carports within front setback - request for 500mm setback</b>  Requests carport setbacks be 500mm from front boundary in older parts of Redcliffe.	<b>No change - Amendment related</b>  The proposed amendments as advertised included a reduced front setback for open and unenclosed carports if the Dwelling house was built before 2005.  Where a proposal does not meet the circumstances for this reduced setback, an application to Council would be required and it would be assessed against Council's intent for garages and carports to ensure covered car parking spaces and domestic outbuildings that are visible from the street or public place are of a scale, location and built form that is consistent with the existing streetscape and character of the precinct and avoids dominating or otherwise negatively impacting the streetscape or adjoining properties.  Council will monitor the effects of the new provisions to determine if any further changes to the planning scheme are warranted in the future.	No
6.19	MBRC	<b>Carports within front setback - clarification on carport exemption</b>  Request further clarification that the carport exemption relates to the front setback only.	<b>Change - Amendment related</b>  Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to the provision to clarify the reduced setbacks relate to the front setbacks for open and unenclosed carports for Dwelling houses built before 2005.	Yes
6.20	A18965096	<b>Carports within front setback - provision for alternatives</b>	<b>No change - Amendment related</b>  The proposed amendments as advertised included a reduced front setback for open and unenclosed carports if the Dwelling house was built before 2005.	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		Objection to the proposed amendments regarding carports as they should be allowed at the front boundary provided they do not impede road access, neighbours and remain open.	<p>Where a proposal does not meet the circumstances for this reduced setback, an application to Council would be required and it would be assessed against Council's intent for garages and carports to ensure covered car parking spaces and domestic outbuildings that are visible from the street or public place are of a scale, location and built form that is consistent with the existing streetscape and character of the precinct and avoids dominating or otherwise negatively impacting the streetscape or adjoining properties.</p> <p>Council will monitor the effects of the new provisions to determine if any further changes to the planning scheme are warranted in the future.</p>	
6.21	A18963647 A18963911 A18965291 A18791159 A18964691 A18965342	<p><b>Carports within front setback - allowances for all dwellings and lot types</b></p> <p>Various submitters raised concerns and suggestions relating to carports within the front setback. The matters raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On narrow lots;</li> <li>• For all dwellings;</li> <li>• Dwellings built before 2015;</li> <li>• Built to boundary;</li> <li>• Within North Lakes.</li> </ul>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised included a reduced front setback for open and unenclosed carports if the Dwelling house was built before 2005.</p> <p>Where a proposal does not meet the circumstances for this reduced setback, an application to Council would be required. It would be assessed against Council's intent for garages and carports to ensure covered car parking spaces and domestic outbuildings visible from the street or public place are of a scale, location and built form that is consistent with the existing streetscape and character of the precinct. Also that garages and carports avoid dominating or otherwise negatively impacting the streetscape or adjoining properties.</p> <p>Council will monitor the effects of the new provisions to determine if any further changes to the planning scheme are warranted in the future. The proposed amendments do not apply to North Lakes as that area has its own development controls set out in the Mango Hill Development Control Plan.</p>	No
6.22	A18964729	<p><b>Carports within front setback - age and lawful approval</b></p> <p>Questions how to confirm the age and lawful approval of adjoining carports, without increasing cost and time delays.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised included a reduced front setback for open and unenclosed carports if the Dwelling house was built before 2005.</p> <p>Where information regarding the age and lawful approval of adjoining carports is not readily available it is suggested that you contact Council.</p>	No
6.23	A18965133	<p><b>Carport provisions - height</b></p> <p>Suggests that the carport height provision be located with carport setback exception provisions.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
			The Dwelling house code includes a number of provisions relating to carports. These are set out in the code based on the aspect being regulated. Accordingly, it is appropriate for the height of carports and other domestic outbuildings to be specified in a separate provision.	
6.24	A18965128	<p><b>Carport provisions - increase of allowances</b></p> <p>Recommendation to increase allowances for carports.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised included a reduced front setback for open and unenclosed carports if the Dwelling house was built before 2005.</p> <p>Where a proposal does not meet the circumstances for this reduced setback, an application to Council would be required and it would be assessed against Council's intent for garages and carports to ensure covered car parking spaces and domestic outbuildings that are visible from the street or public place are of a scale, location and built form that is consistent with the existing streetscape and character of the precinct and avoids dominating or otherwise negatively impacting the streetscape or adjoining properties.</p> <p>Council will monitor the effects of the new provisions to determine if any further changes to the planning scheme are warranted in the future.</p>	No
6.25	A18963305	<p><b>Assessment of carports</b></p> <p>Requests that carports should not require Council approval.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>A carport in the General residential zone only requires development approval if it does not comply with one or more of the relevant Requirements for Accepted Development (RAD) in the Dwelling house code. If the carport complies with all the relevant RADs, then no development approval is required to be obtained from Council.</p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised included a reduced front setback RAD for open and unenclosed carports if the Dwelling house was built before 2005.</p> <p>Council's intent in setting requirements for garages and carports is to achieve a positive streetscape outcome consistent with the intended future character of the precinct and avoid dominating or otherwise negatively impacting on the streetscape or adjoining properties.</p>	No
6.26	A18963911	<p><b>Height of domestic outbuildings - calculation of mean height</b></p> <p>Request for clarification of how to calculate mean height.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to include an Editor's note to clarify that the calculation of mean height is defined in the Queensland Development Code (QDC). These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
6.27	A18964729	<p><b>Height of domestic outbuildings - mean height allowance</b></p> <p>Request for the mean height of carports in front of the main building line to be increased to 3.0m to cater for tall 4WDs, boats and</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised seek to ensure the height of carports located in front of the main building line are designed to reduce the amenity impacts on adjoining properties and not dominate the streetscape.</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		caravans and apply to the façade/front elevation facing the street.	<p>Council will monitor the effects of the amended provisions to determine if any further changes to the planning scheme are warranted in the future.</p> <p>However, to assist in interpretation an Editor's note will be included to clarify that the calculation of mean height is defined in the Queensland Development Code (QDC).</p>	
6.28	A18964847 A18965305 A18963889 A18965327 A18965159 A18964615 A18964677 A18965278 A18978372 A18963875 A18964991 A18964683 A18965260 A18964896 A18963817 A18965322 A18965128 A18965078	<p><b>Secondary dwellings</b></p> <p>Various submitters raised concerns and suggestions relating to secondary dwellings. The matters raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Density;</li> <li>• Size (increase and decrease);</li> <li>• Purpose and occupancy;</li> <li>• Setbacks;</li> <li>• Building height;</li> <li>• Fencing (internal and boundary);</li> <li>• Orientation and relationship with primary dwelling;</li> <li>• Regulation;</li> <li>• Consultation;</li> <li>• Existing approvals;</li> <li>• Additional land requirements;</li> <li>• Maximum number per street;</li> <li>• Off-street parking;</li> <li>• Access and driveways;</li> <li>• Letterboxes;</li> <li>• Utilities;</li> <li>• Rates;</li> <li>• Addresses;</li> <li>• Waste bins;</li> <li>• Drainage; and</li> <li>• Landscaping.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Change in Part - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council has further considered the matters raised by submitters regarding secondary dwellings in general and Council has determined to undertake a broader investigation into secondary dwellings and will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020. Further, any future proposed amendments to the planning scheme will be publicly advertised and the community will be able to make further submissions for Council's consideration.</p> <p>Many of the matters raised did not relate to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. Therefore, for any matters not related to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time.</p> <p>In light of the investigation to be undertaken in the future and the matters raised in the submissions received, Council will not proceed with the proposed amendments as advertised in relation to the definition of <i>other essentials for living</i> and the removal of the 45m<sup>2</sup> maximum GFA. Additionally, the Dwelling house code Overall Outcome will be updated to reflect the existing two size requirements to ensure consistency throughout the code.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, Council will proceed with the amendment, as advertised, for secondary dwellings to provide a designated car parking space.</p> <p>These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
6.29	A18972755	<b>Secondary dwelling Overall Outcomes</b>	<b>Change in part - Amendment related</b>	Yes

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		Recommends the Overall Outcomes of the Dwelling house code should remain unchanged in relation to secondary dwellings to allow flexibility.	<p>Council has further considered the matters raised by submitters regarding secondary dwellings in general and Council has determined to undertake a broader investigation into secondary dwellings and will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.</p> <p>In light of the investigation to be undertaken in the future and the matters raised in the submissions received, Council will amend the Overall Outcome in the Dwelling house code to be consistent with the Performance Outcome (PO). This amendment will reflect the existing two size requirements subject to the frontage widths.</p> <p>These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	
6.30	A18965133	<p><b>Secondary dwelling provisions</b></p> <p>Questions why the requirement for no more than one secondary dwelling is not reinforced in the Performance Outcome.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The requirement for only one secondary dwelling per dwelling house is included within the land use definition of dwelling house. Duplication within the code is not considered necessary.</p>	No
6.31	A18972755	<p><b>Casual surveillance and car parking for secondary dwellings</b></p> <p>Suggests the removal of amendments relating to casual surveillance as they conflict with the secondary dwelling parking requirements.</p>	<p><b>Change in part - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to clarify the instances where a secondary dwelling is required to provide a habitable room window for casual surveillance. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
6.32	A18965133	<p><b>Casual surveillance</b></p> <p>Questions if habitable room windows are required on each level and the correlation between the individual and multiple window size.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised remove the requirement for each level to have a habitable room window as double storey dwellings on narrow lots were unable to meet this requirement. The proposed amendments relate to the size of the window and provide options for different window configurations, while maintaining opportunities for casual surveillance.</p> <p>Council will monitor the effects of the amended provisions to determine if any further changes to the planning scheme are warranted in the future.</p>	No
6.33	A18965133	<p><b>Definition of car parking space</b></p>	<p><b>No change - Not Amendment related</b></p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		<p>Recommendation for a definition of car parking space to be added to the planning scheme.</p>	<p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Car parking is defined in the Queensland Development Code (QDC) and therefore duplication within the code is not considered necessary.</p>	

## Theme 7 - Residential Uses Code

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Propose (Yes or No)
7.1	A18977144 A18977160 A18963391 A18963853	<p><b>Car parking requirements for multiple dwellings</b></p> <p>Concern that car parking rates for multiple dwellings are insufficient and request additional parking provisions, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 spaces per unit;</li> <li>• Additional visitor parking.</li> </ul>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Multiple dwellings are a use included within a range of residential zones and precincts. Generally, these precincts are in proximity to services and public transport.</p> <p>The planning scheme provides a minimum car parking rate per dwelling for multiple dwelling developments. This minimum rate is an Example (E) only and alternate solutions can be proposed. However, this matter has been recorded for future consideration. Council will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.</p>	No
7.2	A18972755	<p><b>Private open space - objects and structures</b></p> <p>Recommendation for further clarification on the requirement for private open space to be free from objects and structures.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to the Example (E) to clarify that the minimum area and dimension of private open space is required to be clear from utility and non-recreational structures. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
7.3	A18972755	<p><b>Private open space - Performance Outcome</b></p> <p>Recommendation for a review of the open space Performance Outcome as the proposed amendments are too broad and conflict with other outcomes.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to clarify the additional design requirements only apply to ground floor private open space in specific circumstances.</p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised allow for ground floor private open space to adjoin an access street or unconstructed road where it is not intended to be constructed provided the open space is appropriately designed and screened.</p> <p>These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
7.4	A18972755	<p><b>Design of walls</b></p> <p>Recommend the prescribed maximum length of walls only apply to walls adjoining a public street or different zone.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised sought to ensure a high standard of built form is achieved for all building interfaces including between buildings as well as with the public realm. The wording of the Performance Outcome (PO) is considered appropriate to achieve this outcome while still allowing flexibility.</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Propose (Yes or No)
			Council will monitor the effects of the new provision to determine if any further changes to the planning scheme are warranted in the future	
7.5	A18965278	<p><b>Integration plan</b></p> <p>Request for all residential development applications to be accompanied by an integration plan in accordance with Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) - Neighbourhood design.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised seek to ensure large scale residential developments appropriately integrate with the surrounding neighbourhood and provide connections that benefit the wider community where applicable.</p> <p>While an integration plan is not required for developments on lots less than 6,000m<sup>2</sup>, other provisions are applicable to smaller developments to ensure they are connected to, and form part of, the neighbourhood. Accordingly, no further amendments are proposed.</p>	No

## Theme 8 - Reconfiguring a Lot Code

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
8.1	A18845103	<p><b>Caboolture West local plan - Reconfiguring a lot</b></p> <p>Concern regarding the Caboolture West local plan table of assessment for Reconfiguring a lot (RAL) does not include the overarching 'any other instance not listed in this table' provisions which is listed within other Tables of Assessment.</p> <p>Request clarification on the level of assessment for RAL within Caboolture West in all precincts.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>This matter has been recorded for future consideration. Council will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.</p>	No
8.2	A18845103 A18970077	<p><b>Minimum dwelling density for Morayfield South urban area</b></p> <p>Request to review the Performance Outcome stipulating a minimum site density of 45 dwellings per hectare in the Morayfield South urban area.</p> <p>Suggests that a minimum site density of 25 dwellings per hectares is more appropriate.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The existing policy position for the portion of Morayfield South outlined on figure 6.2.3.2.2.1 is that higher density outcomes are achieved to ensure the efficient use of land in areas anticipated to be well serviced with retail, commercial and community uses. This increased density will also provide housing mix and diversity to meet the needs of the future community.</p>	No
8.3	A18845103	<p><b>Extractive Resources Haulage Route Development</b></p> <p>Concern was raised that the MBRC Planning Scheme has not been updated to align with the State Planning Policy (SPP) 2017, specifically in relation to development in Extractive Resources Haulage Routes.</p> <p>Request to amend the scheme to align with the SPP 2017.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The proposed amendment to the MBRC Planning Scheme as advertised did not include changes to ensure full integration with the State Planning Policy (SPP).</p> <p>This matter has been recorded for future consideration. Council will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
8.4	A18965291 A18978879	<b>Objection to small lots in Next generation neighbourhood precinct</b>  Objection to the small lot sizes within the General residential zone - Next generation neighbourhood precinct.  Concern that aesthetics and the existing residential community is not being taken into consideration with townhouse and small lot developments.	<b>No change- Not amendment related</b>  The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.  The intent for Next generation neighbourhoods is to provide a mix of residential uses, tenure and densities on a variety of lot sizes providing housing choice and affordability for different lifestyle choices and life stages to meet diverse community needs. It is intended that these communities will include retail, commercial and community uses and therefore promoting active transport is an important consideration in this precinct. Council will continue to monitor the housing outcomes that are occurring in Next generation neighbourhoods.  This matter has been recorded for future consideration. Council will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.	No
8.5	A18970077 A18979619	<b>Lot types within Next generation neighbourhood precinct</b>  Concern there is insufficient flexibility allowed in the lot type and size mix in the General residential zone - Next generation neighbourhood precinct. Consider that this lack of flexibility does not appropriately consider the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• restrictions on site (i.e. slope);</li> <li>• innovative dwelling design;</li> <li>• market requirements;</li> <li>• practical construction requirements.</li> </ul>	<b>No change - Not amendment related</b>  The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.  Lot types listed within the Next generation neighbourhood precinct are considered suitable for delivering the intent of the precinct to provide housing variety. Further, these lot types are provided as an Example (E) within the code, therefore, alternatives (to respond to sloping land) can be considered through the development assessment process. Council will continue to monitor the effects of the provision to determine if any further changes to the planning scheme are warranted in the future.	No
8.6	A18963949 A18974759 A18977176	<b>Vegetation clearing/replanting</b>  Concern regarding vegetation removal by developers and the replanting requirements within the region/planning scheme. Consider that the Environmental overlay is not protecting vegetation from developers.  Request parks and green space are linked through development.	<b>No change - Not amendment related</b>  The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.  The criteria within the Reconfiguring a Lot codes of the planning scheme, seeks to ensure lots are designed to incorporate native vegetation and habitat trees in allotment layouts and design.	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
			<p>Other outcomes within the code relate to the provision of safe, unimpeded and convenient wildlife movements and avoiding further fragmentation of native vegetation. The intention of these outcomes is to preserve park and green space through development and maintain wildlife habitat and linkages.</p> <p>Further, the planning scheme also requires where native vegetation loss is unavoidable within the Matters of Local Environmental Significance (MLES) waterway and MLES wetland buffers, environmental offsets are required at a 1:1 ratio.</p>	
8.7	A18965393	<p><b>Creating small lots within Township</b></p> <p>Concern regarding small lots being created within Township zones.</p> <p>Request to maintain existing character lot sizes within Samford, Mount Mee and Dayboro.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>In accordance with the current MBRC Planning Scheme, lot sizes within the Township zone - Township residential precinct are intended to maintain a lot density of 11 lots per hectare. Lot sizes at this density average at approximately 600m<sup>2</sup>, which is generally consistent with the existing lot sizes within the Township zone - Township residential precinct.</p>	No
8.8	A18952279	<p><b>Mitigation measures between Emerging community and Rural residential zoned land</b></p> <p>Objection to the proposed requirements to mitigate potential amenity issues between Emerging community and Rural residential zoned land.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised sought to respond to potential amenity issues where development in the Emerging community zone adjoins land in the Rural residential zone. Where the Example (E) is not achieved, alternate solutions can be proposed. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p>	No

## Theme 9 - Works Code

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
9.1	A18965254	<p><b>Stormwater provisions</b></p> <p>Concerns regarding the new Schedule 10 providing outdated material. It has been recommended that Schedule 10 is updated to reflect new studies for best stormwater outcomes.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised sought to provide Stormwater design standards to be utilised in developments. Schedule 10 has been prepared in accordance with the State Planning Policy (SPP) for Stormwater management design objectives. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p>	No
9.2	A18973914	<p><b>Flood planning level inconsistency</b></p> <p>Concern was raised that Performance Outcomes (POs) and Examples (Es) are inconsistent with the Flood hazard overlay code. In particular the inclusion of a minimum 3000m<sup>2</sup> area within the Rural residential zone conflicts with the requirements of the Flood hazard overlay.</p> <p>It was recommended the new PO and Es are deleted, as concerns will be addressed under the Flood hazard overlay code.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council have further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to clarify the intent of the new provision. The Examples (E) have been removed to avoid contradictions within the planning scheme. However, the Performance Outcome (PO) will be retained as it is relevant in the context of the Works code and addresses matters not necessarily covered by the Flood hazard overlay code. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
9.3	A18973914	<p><b>Stormwater design</b></p> <p>Concern has been raised that the rewording of the Performance Outcome (PO) in relation to drainage systems will not allow for alternative solutions for stormwater design.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised included stormwater design standards. The intent of the amended Performance Outcome (PO) is to ensure developments align with the additional detail set out in the Planning Scheme Policy (PSP). In the event a desired outcome is unachievable, a performance-based assessment against the Overall Outcome (OO) may be applicable. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p>	No
9.4	A18973914	<p><b>Road widths</b></p> <p>Concern was raised that the proposed Example (E) in relation to construction of council-controlled road frontages does not align with the requirements of the Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) - Integrated design - Appendix A for road width requirements. It was recommended that clarification and consistency is provided through a review of the E.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council have further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to clarify development road width requirements. The amendments to the Performance Outcome (PO) and Example (E) were proposed to ensure consistency with the works criteria. However, to achieve this intent the proposed E will be removed as it is not considered necessary in the context and application of the Works code. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
9.5	A18973914	<p><b>Stormwater quality in Rural residential zone</b></p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		Concern was raised about the un-necessary stormwater treatment in developments in the Rural residential zone, where treatment of the roads would be sufficient. It was recommended that the State Planning Policy (SPP) is readdressed and amendments made accordingly.	The proposed amendments as advertised sought to clarify stormwater quality requirements for the Rural residential zone. Council's policy position, in accordance with the State Planning Policy (SPP), is to provide stormwater treatment within the Rural residential zone, for lots and roads. This policy has not been altered by the proposed amendment, therefore this is a consistent policy approach. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.	

## Theme 10 - Works Criteria

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
10.1	MBRC	<p><b>Stormwater quality Requirements for accepted development Urban</b></p> <p>Recommend update to new stormwater quality provision to ensure consistency and improve clarity in Requirements for accepted development (RAD) for Urban areas.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council have further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to provide clarity for users and consistency with other provisions within the scheme. The intent of the proposed amendment was to ensure alignment with 'deemed to comply solutions' published in Water by Design and development triggers in Council's Total Water Cycle Management Plan. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
10.2	MBRC	<p><b>Stormwater quality Requirements for accepted development Rural</b></p> <p>Recommend update to new stormwater quality provision to ensure consistency and improve clarity in Requirements for accepted development (RAD) for Rural areas.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council have further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to ensure alignment with 'deemed to comply solutions' published in Water by Design and development triggers in Council's Total Water Cycle Management Plan.</p> <p>The provision will be reworded to improve clarity for users and provide consistency with other provisions within the scheme.</p> <p>Further, the term 'urban purpose' in Rural living precinct will be removed as it creates confusion around compliance with the provision in areas that are not zoned for an urban purpose in accordance with the <i>Planning Regulation 2017</i>.</p> <p>The note relating to Schedule 10 is not relevant in this context. Therefore, the note is being removed.</p> <p>The current note, relating to 25% impervious area, contained within the Caboolture West Local Plan - Rural living precinct will be removed to ensure consistency with the Rural residential zone provisions. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
10.3	MBRC	<p><b>Stormwater quality Performance Outcome Urban</b></p> <p>Recommend update to new stormwater quality provision to ensure consistency and improve clarity in the Performance Outcome (PO) for Urban areas.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council have further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to improve clarity for users and provide consistency with other provisions within the scheme.</p> <p>The note is also proposed to be amended as the wording was inconsistent with other notes within the scheme. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
10.4	MBRC	<p><b>Stormwater quality Performance Outcome Rural areas</b></p> <p>Recommend update to new stormwater quality provision to ensure consistency and</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council have further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to improve clarity for users and provide consistency with other provisions within the scheme. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		improve clarity in the Performance Outcome (PO) for Rural areas.		
10.5	MBRC	<p><b>Stormwater quality Performance Outcome Rural areas</b></p> <p>Recommend update to new stormwater quality provision to ensure consistency and improve clarity in the Performance Outcome (PO) for Rural areas.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council have further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to improve clarity for users and provide consistency with other provisions within the scheme.</p> <p>Further, the term 'urban purpose' will be removed as it creates confusion around compliance with the provision in areas that are not zoned for an urban purpose in accordance with the <i>Planning Regulation 2017</i>.</p> <p>The note and reference to 25% impervious area is confusing and does not provide further clarity on the requirements. Therefore, it is recommended to remove the note, and replace it with a new note consistent with the Rural residential zone. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
10.6	MBRC	<p><b>Stormwater quality Performance Outcome Caboolture West - Rural living precinct.</b></p> <p>Recommend update to new stormwater quality provision to ensure consistency and improve clarity in Performance Outcome (PO) Caboolture West - Rural living precinct.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council have further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to improve clarity for users and provide consistency with other provisions within the scheme. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
10.7	A18845103 A18952279 A18968964 A18972946 A18973914 A18978155 A18978669 A18970077 A18979864	<p><b>Flood free road access</b></p> <p>Concern was raised that the proposed new Performance Outcome (PO) and Example (E) requiring flood free road access in minor storm events is unreasonable and adds significant cost, particularly in relation to smaller developments and rural residential developments.</p> <p>Additionally, concern was raised there is no clear definition for 'flood free access' and lack of clarity to determine 'access roads' to and from development sites. Further, clarification is required in relation to the difference between 'trafficable access' and 'flood free access' as these terms attract different requirements in the scheme.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised sought to ensure developments provide flood free access. The intent of these provisions is to ensure new roads are flood free in minor or frequent events and trafficable in major or less frequent events. It should be noted this provision is not associated with the Flood hazard overlay, therefore where the overlay is applicable, additional provisions will also apply.</p> <p>In relation to whether these works would be trunk infrastructure or non-trunk infrastructure will depend on the particular circumstances of the development proposal. Road upgrades identified as trunk infrastructure in Council's Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP) could be offset. If Council determines that works to upgrade a road to provide flood free access is non-trunk infrastructure, an applicant can make a conversion application under section 139 of the <i>Planning Act 2016</i> to convert non-trunk infrastructure to trunk infrastructure.</p> <p>Council is not able to fetter its discretion on deciding a development application or conversion application which will be decided in the future based on the particular circumstances of the development proposal.</p> <p>For small scale development, where upgrading a road is not reasonable or relevant, assessment against the Overall Outcomes may be appropriate.</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
			It is acknowledged that there is no definition for 'flood free access' within the MBRC Planning Scheme. However, the terminology is common within Queensland Urban Drainage Manual (QUDM) and the development industry when referring to stormwater requirements for a minor storm event. QUDM outlines the requirements for a road to be trafficable. The use of these terms in this context is considered appropriate. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.	
10.8	A18845103 A18952279 A18968964 A18972946 A18978155 A18978669 A18970077	<b>Frontage works</b>  Recommend reviewing the need for, and requirements of, the proposed Performance Outcome (PO) and Example (E) requiring frontage works for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed PO and E will unreasonably increase the frontage works requirements on developers, including requiring works on road frontages that do not adjoin or provide access to the subject development.</li> <li>The PO and E will require the premature design of roads when the overarching road network design is incomplete.</li> <li>The PO and E will result in construction of roads which become the responsibility of Council, although they will remain unused.</li> <li>Clarity is required in relation to credit applicability.</li> <li>The reference to the PSP would be more appropriate in an Editor's note.</li> <li>Greater flexibility should be provided in the wording to allow for alternative road design outcomes.</li> </ul>	<b>Change - Amendment related</b>  Council have further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to provide clarity on the intent of the Performance Outcome (PO) and Example (E). To ensure developments upgrade adjoining road frontage to the proposed development, the wording of the PO will be amended to clarify that the provision relates to roads adjoining the proposed development. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.  The design requirements for new roads, to join existing roads within 20 metres is considered to be a reasonable requirement. Council considers a number of matters during the application process including, where roads will be required, the overarching road network including timing as well as the ongoing maintenance of these roads.  In relation to credits, they are only available for trunk infrastructure in Council's Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP).  The reference to the Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) within the PO is considered appropriate as the outcomes Council are seeking are outlined in this PSP in greater detail and with explanatory information. In the event a desired outcome is unachievable, a performance-based assessment against the Overall Outcome may be applicable. It is considered that adequate flexibility is provided.	Yes
10.9	A18972946	<b>Local Government Infrastructure Plan included in Performance Outcome</b>  Request that Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP) upgrades and	<b>No change - Amendment related</b>  The proposed amendments as advertised sought to provide clarity on road design requirements. This matter is appropriately addressed in the planning scheme as the Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP)	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		requirements are clearly indicated in frontage works Performance Outcome (PO) to indicate where credits are applicable.	requirements are clearly set out in Section 4 and the associated mapping. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.	
10.10	A18952279 A18973914 A18970077 A18845103 A18964729 DSDMIP	<p><b>Retaining walls/Earthworks</b></p> <p>Concerns were raised regarding the 1 metre maximum earthworks requirement. Request for concessions where lots are affected by difficult topography.</p> <p>Recommend removal of the proposed Example (E) and/or retention of the existing E allowing 1.5 metre retaining walls.</p> <p>Concerns were raised about inconsistency between the Reconfiguring a Lot (RAL) and Material Change of Use (MCU) codes.</p> <p>Concerns were raised about unnecessary complexity and inconsistency with the National Construction Code.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to remove the new earth retaining provisions and retain the existing provision in the current version of the planning scheme. In response to the submissions received and further investigation, the Performance Outcomes (POs), Examples (Es) and Requirements for Accepted Development (RADs) within the current version of the planning scheme will be retained with the additional note for residential zones. The note is intended to clarify that cut and fill within a dwelling footprint is not specified. It is considered that the existing PO achieves the desired outcomes for positive streetscapes and high level of amenity therefore no change is proposed. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
10.11	A18952279 A18968964 A18972946 A18970077	<p><b>Integrated Traffic Assessment (ITA) requirements</b></p> <p>Request a review of the proposed amendment, particularly in relation to the Integrated Traffic Assessment (ITA) triggers identified in the note and that a case by case approach be taken.</p> <p>Concern the proposed triggers will capture developments that are not intended to be included and result in an unreasonable cost imposed.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council have further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to clarify an Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) may be required. The Performance Outcome (PO) requires that a proposed development appropriately mitigate its impact on the existing road network. It is acknowledged that an ITA will not be required in every instance. The note will be amended to clarify that an ITA may be required depending on the circumstance of the proposed development. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
10.12	MBRC	<p><b>Remove duplicate Performance Outcome - Upgrade works</b></p> <p>Performance Outcome PO2 relating to upgrading of works (whether trunk or non-trunk). PO2 is a duplication of the new</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council have further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to remove a duplicate Performance Outcome relating to upgrade works. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		Performance Outcome relating to upgrade works.		
10.13	A18952279 A18972946	<p><b>Wildlife movements</b></p> <p>Concern regarding additional costs associated with providing wildlife movement infrastructure to comply with the proposed Performance Outcome (PO) relating to street design and layout.</p> <p>Request for wildlife movement requirements to be dealt with under the Environmental areas overlay provisions, and associated Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) rather than the PO provision.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council have further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to clarify the intention of the new or amended provision. The Environmental areas overlay manages mapped environments of significance. However, not all wildlife corridors are mapped in an overlay or can be protected by the Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) - Environmental areas and corridors.</p> <p>Further protection may be required for these areas, and through the proposed provision, wildlife movements outside of the overlay can be preserved.</p> <p>Wildlife movement infrastructure is not intended to be required on all road reserves. The Performance Outcome (PO) will be amended to clarify that wildlife movement infrastructure be accommodated where relevant. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
10.14	A18965278 A18973914	<p><b>Stormwater runoff</b></p> <p>Concern was raised with the term 'or annoyance' being removed from the Stormwater requirement provisions. There is concern that this terminology allows for greater flexibility in considering discharge locations, which may also result in impacts from stormwater runoff on neighbouring lots.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised sought to align the terminologies in the planning scheme in accordance with Queensland Urban Drainage Manual (QUDM). The terminology in QUDM has been changed from nuisance or annoyance to 'actionable nuisance'. It is considered that the term 'actionable nuisance' allows for any reasonable and relevant concerns in relation to stormwaters legal point of discharge to be raised and considered.</p> <p>This matter is appropriately addressed in the proposed amendments to the planning scheme. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p>	No
10.15	A18968964	<p><b>Stormwater quality treatment in Rural residential zones</b></p> <p>Recommend further consideration of the new Performance Outcome (PO) for stormwater within the rural residential zone.</p> <p>Concern the proposed PO will reduce flexibility and that the intended outcomes for stormwater quality devices is not clear.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised sought to provide clarity on Stormwater quality treatment. The proposed provision aligns with the existing policy intent for stormwater quality devices in Rural residential zones. In the event a desired outcome is unachievable, a performance-based assessment against the Overall Outcome (OO) may be applicable. It is considered that adequate flexibility is provided for stormwater quality devices. Accordingly, no further amendments are proposed.</p>	No
10.16	A18968964	<p><b>Intersection upgrades - Performance Outcome</b></p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council have further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to provide clarity in relation to the applicability of the provision. The intention of the Performance Outcome (PO) and</p>	Yes

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		<p>Request for review of the intent and requirements set out in the revised Performance Outcome (PO) for intersection upgrades.</p> <p>Concern regarding small-scale developments being required to upgrade existing intersections.</p> <p>Recommend clarification be provided to the PO regarding when upgrades are applicable.</p>	<p>Example (E) is to provide clarification and design standards for new intersections. The provision will be amended to clarify that this PO only relates to new intersections. Further changes also include reference to the relevant Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) and Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) in the PO to ensure consistency. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	
10.17	A18968964 MBRC	<p><b>Intersection upgrades - spacing</b></p> <p>The proposed wording of a new example omitted the inclusion of distance measurements for intersection spacing. Recommend the inclusion of the measurements for this Example.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council have further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to include the measurements required to appropriately inform how compliance with the PO may be achieved. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
10.18	MBRC	<p><b>Intersection upgrades - duplication</b></p> <p>Suggest there is a duplication in proposed wording that is unnecessary and confusing.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council have further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to correct the duplication of an intersection measurement within the Example.</p>	Yes
10.19	A18972946	<p><b>Laneways adjacent to parks</b></p> <p>Concern regarding the cost impacts the proposed new Performance Outcome (PO) and Example (E) requiring laneway lots to have a dedicated pathway where adjoining a park will have on the development industry. It is suggested that the requirement for dedicated pathways as road reserve will result in a loss of creditable area and will impact the yield of development. Deletion of the provision is suggested.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments, as advertised, sought to align laneway design with the Australian Post access requirements. In accordance with Australia Post requirements, mailboxes must have unrestricted access for services to be provided to all residents. Where laneway housing products are adjoining a park, the lack of any road reserve between the park and dwelling house prevents access by Australia Post.</p> <p>A laneway access is generally connected to dwelling house garages, which restricts the ability to locate water metres and electrical boxes. Therefore, access to water meters and electrical boxes require access via the park land adjacent. Having a footpath dedicated as road reserve allows for unrestricted access to these services.</p> <p>The proposed provision is considered appropriate as it ensures access to services. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p>	No
10.20	A18973063 A18972971	<p><b>Bio-retention basins within riparian areas</b></p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		<p>Concern raised that the new Performance Outcome (PO) for stormwater management facilities will restrict development potential.</p> <p>Riparian areas should be considered an appropriate location for stormwater management facilities that will not impede channel bed and bank erosion.</p>	The proposed amendment as advertised sought to protect the value of riparian areas from being degraded as a result of bioretention systems or other stormwater functions. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.	
10.21	A18973063 A18972971	<p><b>Detention basins</b></p> <p>Concern has been raised that the amended Performance Outcome (PO) and Example (E) will restrict the ability to stage a development, providing temporary stormwater management facilities on site.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendment as advertised sought to clarify the desired outcomes for constructed detention basins in the region. The amended Performance Outcome (PO) and Example (E) are not considered to restrict the ability for developments to provide temporary stormwater management facilities for staged developments. Temporary stormwater management facilities will be considered on their merit. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p>	No
10.22	A18973914	<p><b>Development footprint</b></p> <p>Concern regarding the use of the term 'Development footprint' in relation to drainage systems as this is not defined and will create confusion. Request no Example (E) be specified.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council have further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to clarify the intent. It is acknowledged that the use of the term 'development footprint' may be confusing in this context. The Example (E) will be amended to retain the existing term 'private lots'. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
10.23	A18973914	<p><b>Rural residential stormwater requirements</b></p> <p>Recommend removal of the Performance Outcome (PO) for overland flow paths to incorporate pedestrian paths within the Rural residential zone.</p> <p>Concern the proposed PO includes unreasonable requirements for footpaths within rural residential areas.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council have further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to provide clarity on the intention. The intent of the amended Performance Outcome (PO) and Examples (Es) is to provide overland flow paths for stormwater events. The use of these overland flow paths for safe pedestrian and cyclist access is a secondary function.</p> <p>The Rural residential zone commonly includes the provision of pedestrian pathways, while the Rural zone does not include this benchmark as pedestrian paths are less common in the Rural zone.</p> <p>The E will be amended to remove the word 'Pathways' as it is superfluous in this context. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
10.24	A18970077 A18979864	<p><b>Road design</b></p> <p>Objection to the proposed Performance Outcome (PO) for street design and construction as there is concern it does not</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised sought to provide clarity on road design requirements. The intent of the amended Performance Outcome (PO) is to ensure developments align with the content set out in the Planning Scheme Policy (PSP). In the event a desired outcome is unachievable, a performance-based</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		<p>provide flexibility for alternative outcomes for road design. Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) road typologies do not provide alternative outcomes, therefore flexibility should be included.</p> <p>Concern regarding interpretation of the provision has also been raised. Confirmation of how small-scale developments will be impacted by upgrade works has been requested. Exclusion of small-scale developments from upgrade requirements set out in provision has been requested.</p>	<p>assessment against the Overall Outcome (OO) may be applicable. It is considered that adequate flexibility is provided. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p>	
10.25	A18970077	<p><b>Stormwater</b></p> <p>Objection to the proposed Performance Outcome (PO) requiring developments to consider developed upstream catchments. This is considered to be an unreasonable imposition on development, rather each development should be required to mitigate their own flows.</p> <p>It is requested that these provisions be amended accordingly.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised included stormwater drainage requirements. The Performance Outcomes (POs) and Examples (Es) for minor and major stormwater drainage requirements have been prepared in alignment with the Queensland Urban Drainage Manual (QUDM).</p> <p>Consideration of developed upstream catchments is considered to be vital for future stormwater planning. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p>	No
10.26	A18970077	<p><b>Soil disturbances</b></p> <p>Concern the proposed Example (E) relating to soil disturbances is limiting and not practical, particularly for a large development with stages. Recommend the E is removed.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised sought to provide clarity on earthwork requirements. The Example (E) is only one way of achieving the Performance Outcome (PO). Accordingly, alternatives to the E can be considered and will be assessed against the PO. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p>	No
10.27	A18978669 DSDMIP	<p><b>Movement network</b></p> <p>Concern raised that the proposed movement network provision is a double up of requirements under 'access provisions' to provide adequate and safe road networks. Also, that the figures should be located</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council have further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to provide transparency and clarity on the Movement network requirements. The images have been reallocated to within the planning scheme as Figures within each applicable code.</p> <p>The new movement network Performance Outcomes (PO) and Examples (E) will be utilised to specifically address the Movement network figures. Furthermore, the access provisions of each zone code do not</p>	Yes

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		<p>within the planning scheme rather than the PSP.</p> <p>Request the removal of the proposed provisions.</p>	<p>reference the Movement network figures, therefore both provisions operate as separate requirements. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	
10.28	<p>MBRC</p> <p>DSDMIP</p>	<p><b>Remove redundant diagram</b></p> <p>Proposed updated movement network diagrams have been moved from Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) - Neighbourhood design into the relevant sections of the planning scheme. The updated diagrams included a revised version of the Deception Bay Mixed Industry and Business figure. The original figure needs to be removed from the two instances it occurs within the planning scheme and the reference within the Example (E) to refer to the name of the new figure.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council have further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to provide transparency and clarity on the Movement network requirements. The figure has been replaced with the most up to date version. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes

## Theme 11 - Mapping

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
			<b>SCHEDULE 2 - MAPPING</b>	
11.1	MBRC	<p><b>Schedule 2 Mapping provides a Map index and links to Strategic Framework, Zone, Local Plan, Overlay and Other Plan Maps</b></p> <p>The Schedule was not updated to reflect the new Overlay and other changes to scheme maps proposed as part of the amendment including listing new maps and reordering appropriately.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Further changes are proposed in order to reflect the proposed amendment as advertised. Schedule 2 Mapping, Schedule 2.5 Overlay maps and Schedule 2.6 Other plan maps have been amended to include new changes to the names of other maps.</p>	Yes
			<b>HERITAGE AND LANDSCAPE CHARACTER OVERLAY</b>	
11.2	MBRC	<p><b>Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) - Heritage and landscape character proposed change</b></p> <p>Recommend amendment to the mapping or PSP to ensure consistency in referencing a heritage place.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to reflect the correct lot and plan description for the Grape vine at Lawnton.</p> <p>Further investigation has revealed that the vine has been relocated to a nearby site. Further changes will be made to Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) - Heritage and landscape character and Overlay map - Heritage and landscape character to maintain the protection of this heritage item. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
			<b>COASTAL HAZARD OVERLAYS</b>	
11.3	A18926729	<p><b>Toorbul and Donnybrook erosion prone areas</b></p> <p>Request amendments to the Coastal hazards (erosion prone area) overlay mapping as there is concern this is inconsistent with State Planning Policy (SPP) Interactive mapping - noting the comment within the consultation version maps which states the maps are outdated (2015).</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation.</p> <p>As part of the Coastal Hazard Adaptation Strategy (CHAS) Council is undertaking further investigations into the need for new coastal hazard models, including erosion and storm tide. This will take into consideration the outcomes of the seawall audit which was undertaken in 2016 and which is used when undertaking infrastructure planning.</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		Specifically, concerned with the effects on many properties within the Toorbul and Donnybrook Community.  Also concerned Council is yet to fulfil a 2015 commitment to carry out a seawall audit to inform a localised Erosion Prone Area Study.	The CHAS project will include future consultation with residents and stakeholders to identify the community values, assets and services that may be affected by coastal changes; determine coastal hazard consequences and possible risks; and consider and review management and adaptation options for our coastline.  This matter has been recorded for future consideration. Council will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.	
			<b>ROAD HIERARCHY OVERLAY</b>	
11.4	A18965020	<b>Road Hierarchy Map Overlay - Update</b>  Requests amendment to the Road hierarchy overlay mapping to reflect Sovereign Drive, Narangba as a Council collector road.	<b>No change - Not amendment related</b>  The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.  It is understood that Sovereign Drive forms part of the Narangba Heights Development. As this development is ongoing no change to the overlay map will be considered until the works are completed.  This matter has been recorded for future consideration. Council will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.	No
			<b>FLOOD HAZARD OVERLAY</b>	
11.5	A18965056	<b>Flood Hazard Overlay amendment request - Beverley Court, Lionheart Court and others between Dohles Rocks Road and Wagner Road, Griffin</b>  Submitter requests amendment to the Flood hazard overlay mapping to reflect new ground levels at recently completed developments in the location of Beverley Court, Lionheart Court and others between Dohles Rocks Road and Wagner Road, Griffin.	<b>No change - Not amendment related</b>  The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.  Council recognises that the Flood Hazard Overlay mapping may not appropriately reflect changes in ground level that have occurred as a result of recent developments within Beverley Court, Lionheart Court and others between Dohles Rocks Road and Wagner Road, Griffin.  A request to change the Flood hazard mapping or a Flood Check Property Report may be made if the mapping displayed in the planning scheme requires review due to changes in ground level since the commencement of the planning scheme in 2016. A request for mapping change form can be found on Council's 'MBRC Planning Scheme' webpage. While this 'mapping change request' process will not result in	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
			<p>an automatic change to the map, if considered favourably, it will provide confirmation of the flood risk present as determined by Council.</p> <p>This matter has been recorded for future consideration. Council will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.</p>	
11.6	A18965062	<p><b>Flood Hazard Overlay amendment request - Lot 961 SP297418 and properties at Premier Place, Imperial Crescent, Splendid Parade and Palatial Crescent, Narangba</b></p> <p>Submitter requests amendment to the Flood hazard overlay mapping and Overland flow overlay to reflect new ground levels at recently completed developments on Lot 961 SP297418 and other properties in Premier Place, Imperial Crescent, Splendid Parade and Palatial Crescent, Narangba.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Council recognises that the Flood hazard Overlay mapping may not appropriately reflect changes in ground level as a result of recent developments at Premier Place, Imperial Crescent, Splendid Parade and Palatial Crescent, Narangba.</p> <p>A request to change the Flood hazard mapping or a Flood Check Property Report may be made if the mapping displayed in the planning scheme requires review due to changes in ground level since the commencement of the planning scheme in 2016. A request for mapping change form can be found on Council's 'MBRC Planning Scheme' webpage. While this 'mapping change request' process will not result in an automatic change to the map, if considered favourably, it will provide confirmation of the flood risk present as determined by Council.</p> <p>This matter has been recorded for future consideration. Council will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.</p>	No
11.7	A18965079	<p><b>Flood Hazard Overlay amendment request - Majestic Crescent, Griffin</b></p> <p>Submitter request amendment to the Flood hazard overlay and Overland flow overlay mapping to reflect new ground levels at recently completed developments at Majestic Crescent, Griffin</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Council recognises that the Flood hazard Overlay mapping may not appropriately reflect changes in ground level as a result of recent developments at Majestic Crescent, Griffin.</p> <p>A request to change the Flood hazard mapping or a Flood Check Property Report may be made if you believe the mapping displayed in the planning scheme requires review due to changes in ground level since the commencement of the planning scheme in 2016. A request for mapping change form can be found on Council's 'MBRC Planning Scheme' webpage. While this 'mapping change request' process will not result in</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
			<p>an automatic change to the map, if considered favourably, it will provide confirmation of flood risk present as determined by Council.</p> <p>This matter has been recorded for future consideration. Council will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.</p>	
11.8	A18973063	<p><b>Flood Hazard Overlay amendment request - 10 Greensill Road, Albany Creek</b></p> <p>Submitter requests amendment to the Flood hazard overlay mapping to reflect new ground levels at recently completed developments at 10 Greensill Road, Albany Creek.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Council recognises that the Flood hazard Overlay mapping may not appropriately reflect changes in ground level as the result of recent developments at the identified site, 10 Greensill Road, Albany Creek.</p> <p>A request to change the Flood hazard mapping or a Flood Check Property Report may be made if you believe the mapping displayed in the planning scheme requires review due to changes in ground level since the commencement of the planning scheme in 2016. A request for mapping change form can be found on Council's 'MBRC Planning Scheme' webpage. While this 'mapping change request' process will not result in an automatic change to the map, if considered favourably, it will provide confirmation of the flood risk present as determined by Council.</p> <p>This matter has been recorded for future consideration. Council will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.</p>	No
11.9	A18980794	<p><b>Flood Hazard Overlay amendment request - 20-116 Forest Hills Drive, Morayfield</b></p> <p>Submitter requests amendment to the Flood hazard overlay mapping to reflect ground levels as per flood survey provided for properties located at 20-116 Forest Hills Drive, Morayfield.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Council recognises that the Flood hazard overlay mapping may not appropriately reflect changes in ground level as the result of a recent independent flood survey for 20-116 Forest Hills Drive, Morayfield.</p> <p>A request to change the Flood hazard mapping or a Flood Check Property Report may be made if you believe the mapping displayed in the planning scheme requires review due to changes in ground level since the commencement of the planning scheme in 2016. A request for mapping change form can be found on Council's 'MBRC Planning Scheme' webpage. While this 'mapping change request' process will not result in</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
			<p>an automatic change to the map, if considered favourably, it will provide confirmation of the flood risk present as determined by Council.</p> <p>This matter has been recorded for future consideration. Council will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.</p>	
11.10	A18957287	<p><b>Flood Hazard Overlay amendment request - 7-13 Learmonth Street, Strathpine. Lot 3 on SP308736</b></p> <p>Submitter requests amendment to the Flood hazard overlay mapping to reflect drainage works and adjusted flood hazard at recently completed developments at 7-13 Learmonth Street, Strathpine.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Council recognises that the Flood hazard overlay mapping may not appropriately reflect changes in ground level as the result of recent developments at 7-13 Learmonth Street, Strathpine.</p> <p>A request to change the Flood hazard mapping or a Flood Check Property Report may be made if you believe the mapping displayed in the planning scheme requires review due to changes in ground level since the commencement of the planning scheme in 2016. A request for mapping change form can be found on Council's 'MBRC Planning Scheme' webpage. While this 'mapping change request' process will not result in an automatic change to the map, if considered favourably, it will provide confirmation of the flood risk present as determined by Council.</p> <p>This matter has been recorded for future consideration. Council will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.</p>	No
11.11	A18980794	<p><b>Flood hazard Overlay amendment request - 20-116 Forest Hills Drive, Morayfield</b></p> <p>Submitter requests amendment to the Flood hazard overlay for 20-116 Forest Hills Drive, Morayfield – Lot 28 on RP826455 to recognise existing bridges on the property.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Council recognises that the Flood hazard overlay mapping may not appropriately reflect changes in ground level due to structures not previously recognised as present on 20-116 Forest Hills Drive, Morayfield (Lot 28 on RP826455).</p> <p>A request to change the Flood hazard mapping or a Flood Check Property Report may be made if you believe the mapping displayed in the planning scheme requires review due to changes in ground level since the commencement of the planning scheme in 2016. A request for mapping change form can be found on Council's 'MBRC Planning Scheme' webpage. While this 'mapping change request' process will not result in</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
			<p>an automatic change to the map, if considered favourably, it will provide confirmation of the flood risk present as determined by Council.</p> <p>This matter has been recorded for future consideration. Council will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.</p>	
			<b>WALKING DISTANCE OVERLAYS</b>	
11.12	A18952279	<p><b>Support of Walking Distance (Train Station) Overlay</b></p> <p>Support for the proposed amendment to include Walking Distance train stations Overlay.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Supported noted.</p>	No
11.13	A18972243	<p><b>Walking Distance (Centre) Overlay amendment request</b></p> <p>Request amendment to Centre walking distance overlay applicable to 3/ 640 Albany Creek Rd, Albany Creek).</p> <p>Specifically, to be included in Centre walking distance overlay (400m).</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The Centre walking distance overlay seeks to represent approximate walking distance catchments of 400m (5minutes) and 800m (10minutes) from higher order and district centres. These catchments seek to capture approximate actual walking distance acknowledging obstacles (e.g. where a train line or highway runs through for example) that impact walking distance.</p> <p>The purpose of the overlay is to support an increase in the number of people living and working in proximity to public transport. To achieve this, the overlay is used in the planning scheme to alter levels of assessment and car parking rates in urbanised areas, such as the General residential zone, as it acknowledges the presence of public transport within a comfortable walking distance. This approach is consistent with Council's current policy position. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p> <p>It should be noted that through the development assessment process, a performance-based assessment is undertaken. This presents an opportunity for a proposal to further justify why alternate requirements to those specified in the planning scheme should be considered (e.g. reduced car parking rates due to proximity to public transport).</p>	No
11.14	A18851734	<p><b>Walking Distance (Train Station) Overlay amendment request</b></p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised sought to represent approximate walking distance catchments of 400m (5minutes) and 800m (10minutes) from train stations. These catchments seek to capture approximate</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		Request to amend Overlay - Walking Distance Train Station to include property located at 50-60 Twin View Road, Elimbah.	<p>actual walking distance acknowledging obstacles (e.g. where a train line or highway runs through for example) that impact walking distance. This approach is consistent with Council's current policy position. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p> <p>It is noted that this overlay is used in the planning scheme to alter levels of assessment and car parking rates for urbanised areas, such as the General residential zone as it acknowledges the presence of public transport with in a comfortable walking distance. 60 Twin View Rd, Elimbah is contained within the Rural zone, accordingly the effect of the overlay mapping on this site would be inconsequential.</p>	
			<b>BUILDING HEIGHT OVERLAY</b>	
11.15	A18916658	<p><b>Building Heights Overlay - Locate high-rise buildings away from coast</b></p> <p>Recommends the buildings heights should increase with distance from the water with high-rise buildings sited further from the coast.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Many factors are considered when determining the most appropriate building height for a particular area or site. These considerations include but are not limited to Council's long-term vision for that area (expressed through the planning scheme's Strategic Framework), community expectations, existing land uses, and values and constraints. Development within coastal areas are assessed through the development assessment process against the outcomes specified in the planning scheme as applicable to the type of development and the specific site.</p>	No
11.16	A18964931	<p><b>Building Heights Overlay amendment request - 743-757 Deception Bay Road, Rothwell</b></p> <p>Support the rezoning of the property 743-757 Deception Bay Road, Rothwell from Centre zone - Specialised centre precinct to District centre precinct.</p> <p>Request amendment to the Building heights overlay mapping to reflect a building height of 21m.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised included the site mapped as having a maximum building height of 12m. District centres throughout the region have been allocated different heights dependent on the character and built form of the immediate area. Given the surrounding low density, low rise residential land uses, a mapped maximum of 12m is considered appropriate for this site. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p>	No
11.17	A18854702	<p><b>Building Heights Overlay - Petrie</b></p> <p>Request for review of building heights and related density around 17 Young St, Petrie.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		Concern regarding potential impacts on local character, amenity and infrastructure provision and capacity.	<p>Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Building height adjacent to 17 Young St, Petrie and within the surrounding area have increased due to their inclusion within The Mill at Moreton Bay Priority Development Area (PDA). This area is identified as being within 'Mill Central' in the PDA. Mill Central is envisaged to include activities and land uses that will support the centre and adjoining residential areas. To support these land use changes, the PDA also seeks to fast-track transit-oriented development outcomes around the existing Petrie Town Centre and land near the Kallangur and Lawnton train stations.</p>	
11.18	A18977144 A18977160	<p><b>Request to review building heights allowed within Woody Point</b></p> <p>Request review of building heights in Woody Point.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The identified site is currently contained within the General residential zone - Urban neighbourhood precinct with a mapped maximum building height of 21m and a minimum of 5m. This building height aligns with the intent of the Urban neighbourhood precinct to contain a variety of residential uses at a higher density than what currently exists. It should be noted that mapped building heights are expressed in metres only. The number of storeys within that maximum building height is not regulated by the planning scheme.</p> <p>The intent for urban neighbourhoods is that they will change over time to higher density uses. This is due to their strategic location, physical attributes, such as proximity to services and facilities, and capacity for change to more walkable, compact and sustainable communities. Building height within these areas is important to achieve the intent for these areas.</p> <p>This matter has been recorded for future consideration. Council will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.</p>	No
11.19	A18965124	<p><b>Building Heights Overlay amendment request - 9 Elizabeth Avenue, Clontarf</b></p> <p>Request amendment to the building heights overlay map from 12m to 21m for property located at 9 Elizabeth Avenue, Clontarf in consideration of existing and surrounding land uses.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>9 Elizabeth Avenue, Clontarf is currently included in the Centre zone - Local centre precinct. The current maximum building height is 12m. Many factors are considered when determining the most appropriate</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
			<p>building height for a particular area or site. These considerations include but are not limited to Council's long-term vision for that area (expressed through the planning scheme's Strategic Framework), community expectations, existing land uses, and values and constraints. Considering the current zoning and surrounding context the current mapped building height is appropriate.</p> <p>This matter has been recorded for future consideration. Council will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.</p>	
11.20	A18972243	<p><b>Building Heights Overlay amendment request - 3/640 Albany Creek Road, Albany Creek</b></p> <p>Submitters request amendment to building heights overlay to 12m at 3/640 Albany Creek Rd, Albany Creek.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>640 Albany Creek Rd, Albany Creek is currently included in the General residential zone - Suburban neighbourhood precinct with a mapped maximum building height of 8.5m. Considering the current zoning and surrounding context the current mapped building height is appropriate.</p>	No
11.21	A18963419	<p><b>Requests review of building heights in Redcliffe</b></p> <p>Submitter supports higher building heights but requests review of the locations that support high rise building heights to facilitate views to the sea and allow separation between buildings.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Many factors are considered when determining the most appropriate building height for a particular area or site. These considerations include but are not limited to Council's long-term vision for that area (expressed in the planning scheme's Strategic Framework), community expectations, existing land uses, and values and constraints. Development proposals seeking an alternative building height are assessed through the development assessment process against the outcomes specified in the planning scheme. Council will continue to monitor the effect of building heights within the region and the concerns raised by submitters.</p> <p>This matter has been recorded for future consideration. Council will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.</p>	No
11.22	A18979760	<p><b>Building Heights Overlay amendment request - Newport</b></p> <p>Request Building heights overlay mapping reflect a 12m maximum rather than an 8.5m</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		maximum over the full Newport site.	<p>matter does not relate to the proposed amendments Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Many factors are considered when determining the most appropriate building height for a particular area or site. These considerations include but are not limited to Council's long-term vision for that area (expressed in the planning scheme's Strategic Framework), community expectations, existing land uses, and values and constraints.</p> <p>A change in the maximum building height on Overlay map - Building heights is considered premature given the recent and continuing development occurring within the identified site.</p> <p>Development proposals seeking alternative building heights are assessed through the development assessment process against the outcomes specified in the planning scheme.</p>	
11.23	A18963710	<p><b>Requests information regarding zoning for Redcliffe and building height allowable for Redcliffe Parade</b></p> <p>Requests Council give consideration to building heights within Redcliffe Parade. Specifically, to remain at 5 stories max, and requests information regarding zoning within Redcliffe.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Sites along Redcliffe Parade are included within the Redcliffe Kippa-Ring Local Plan - Redcliffe seaside village precinct and General residential zone - Next generation neighbourhood precinct. The mapped maximum building heights for these zones are 39m and 12m respectively. Many factors are considered when determining the most appropriate building height for a particular area or site. These considerations include but are not limited to Council's long-term vision for that area, community expectations, existing land uses, and constraints.</p> <p>Development proposals seeking alternative building heights are assessed through the development assessment process against the outcomes specified in the planning scheme.</p> <p>It should be noted that mapped building heights are expressed in metres only. The number of storeys within that maximum building height is not regulated by the planning scheme.</p> <p>This matter has been recorded for future consideration. Council will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.</p>	No
			<b>RURAL RESIDENTIAL LOT SIZES OVERLAY</b>	
11.24	A18963845	<b>Rural Residential Lot Size Overlay amendment request - Church Road, Eatons Hill</b>	<b>No change - Not amendment related</b>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		<p>Submitter requests consideration for a mapping change within Church Road area of Eatons Hill to allow minimum lot sizes of 3000m<sup>2</sup> instead of the current 6000m<sup>2</sup> to allow for further development opportunities in the area.</p>	<p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Properties within the Church Road area of Eatons Hill are zoned Rural residential with a minimum lot size of 6000m<sup>2</sup> on Overlay map - Rural residential lot sizes. This minimum lot size designation is consistent with the surrounding zoning and minimum lot sizes within the area.</p> <p>Many factors are considered when determining the appropriate rural residential minimum lot size. This includes but is not limited to, values and constraints, and the existing settlement pattern of the area. This particular area is identified as containing high environmental values, namely koala habitat and Matters of State Environmental Significance (MSES) identified within the Environmental areas overlay map. MSES includes certain environmental values that are protected under Queensland legislation and are to be protected from development impacts and cannot be offset. Further fragmentation of these areas may result in the loss of habitat and wildlife corridors.</p>	
11.25	A18963478	<p><b>Rural Residential Lot Size Overlay amendment request - Williamson Road, Morayfield</b></p> <p>Requests amendment to minimum lot size from 6000m<sup>2</sup> to 3000m<sup>2</sup> to facilitate subdivision within the Rural residential zone south of Williamson Rd, Morayfield.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Properties south of Williamson Road, Morayfield are zoned Rural residential with a minimum lot size of 6000m<sup>2</sup> on Overlay map - Rural residential lot sizes. This minimum lot size designation provides a buffer and transition in lot sizes from land having a minimum lot size of 3000m<sup>2</sup> (north of Williamson Street) lots and land to the south, being zoned Rural zone and containing Matters of State Environmental Significant (MSES) and Matters of Local Environmental Significance (MLES).</p> <p>It is noted that subdivision in the area resulting in a smaller lot size than what is currently designated on Overlay map - Rural residential lot sizes were approved under a previous planning scheme.</p>	No
			<b>ZONE MAPPING</b>	
11.26	A18964828	<p><b>Rezoning request - 94 Old Mt Samson Road, Samsonvale</b></p> <p>Requests rezoning of 94 Old Mt Samson Road, Samsonvale from the Rural zone to</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		the Rural residential zone.	<p>matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Council's intention in its prior response to your request to have the zone designation reversed in 2015, was for the land to remain within the Rural zone as it is consistent with the zoning of surrounding land in the area.</p> <p>This area is also located within the Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area (RLRPA) under the State Government's Southeast Queensland Regional Plan 2017 (<i>Shaping SEQ</i>). Shaping SEQ protects lands within the RLRPA from encroachment by inappropriate development, particularly urban and rural residential development.</p> <p>To ensure that the planning scheme appropriately advances Shaping SEQ, land that is within the RLRPA has generally been placed in the Rural zone.</p> <p>Accordingly, Council considers the matter is appropriately addressed within the planning scheme.</p>	
11.27	A18860718 A18993583	<p><b>Rezoning request - Narangba Industrial Estate</b></p> <p>Request amendments to the zoning within the Narangba Industrial Estate. Specifically, request an increase of the area covered by the Industry zone - Restricted industry precinct.</p> <p>Concern that the current zoning does not appropriately reflect or protect, the many longstanding high impact and special industries that operate throughout the estate.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Government's Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>However, as per advice provided in 2017 and in a recent meeting with Council's senior planning staff on 18 September 2019, Council will undertake further investigations into the zoning and development controls within the planning scheme in relation to the Narangba Industrial Estate subject to future Council consideration.</p> <p>An update on the progress of this further investigation will be provided by August 2020.</p>	No
11.28	A18851734	<p><b>Rezoning request - 50-60 Twin View Road, Elimbah</b></p> <p>Request rezoning of 50-60 Twin View Road, Elimbah from Rural zone to General residential zone in the future.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Government's Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The property in question is zoned Rural due to the property being outside of Council's Priority Infrastructure Area, which identifies the area prioritised for the provision of 'trunk' infrastructure (larger, significant infrastructure that supports growth and is shared between developments). Further, the property is within the</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
			<p>Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area (RLRPA) under the State Government's South East Queensland Regional Plan 2017 (<i>ShapingSEQ</i>).</p> <p>Shaping SEQ protects lands within the RLRPA from encroachment by inappropriate development, particularly urban and rural residential development. To ensure that the planning scheme appropriately advances ShapingSEQ, land that is within the RLRPA has generally been placed in the Rural zone. Accordingly, it is considered that this matter is appropriately addressed in the planning scheme.</p>	
11.29	A18849125	<p><b>Rezoning request -328 Boundary Road, Dakabin</b></p> <p>Request to change zoning for a property located at 328 Boundary Rd, Dakabin.</p> <p>Request to change the zoning of the property from Rural Residential to General residential zone.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The Rural residential zoning on this site is considered to be appropriate, and consistent with the surrounding area.</p> <p>Further, it should be noted that this area is in proximity to the existing high and medium impact industrial uses at Narangba. The State Planning Policy - Planning for safety and resilience to hazards - Emissions and hazardous activities and associated guidelines outline separation distances from industrial activities to residential uses. This is further clarified in the planning scheme through Overlay map - Rural residential lot sizes which designates that no further reconfiguration of a lot is to occur in this area. This overlay seeks to ensure this area provides a buffer to these industrial activities and limits the intensification of development accordingly.</p>	No
11.30	A18853164	<p><b>Request for review of Next generation neighbourhood densities within Margate and Redcliffe</b></p> <p>Request to review application of General residential - Next Generation Neighbourhood precinct. Particularly Margate and Redcliffe.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The designation of the Next generation neighbourhood precinct considers, amongst other things, the capacity for the area to change; the current and future character of the locality; the street network; access to public transport; proximity to services, facilities and infrastructure; population and employment projects; and values and constraints. It is the strategic intent of the planning scheme to identify areas close to urban neighbourhoods and activity centres which have the capability and capacity to support change over time.</p> <p>Council will continue to monitor the effect of Next generation neighbourhood outcomes within the region and the concerns raised by submitters.</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
			This matter has been recorded for future consideration. Council will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.	
11.31	A18965074	<p><b>Rezoning request -751 Gympie Road, Lawnton</b></p> <p>Request rezoning of 751 Gympie Road, Lawnton Lot 1 on SP133255 from Industry zone - Mixed industry and business precinct to Centre zone - Specialised centre precinct.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The Strategic Framework seeks to prevent the expansion of specialised activity centres into adjoining place types unless otherwise designated in the Strategic Framework or as a result of further investigation and planning for a particular 'planning area' or land use strategy identified in the Strategic Framework. This site is contained within the Enterprise and Employment place type; accordingly, the current zoning is consistent with future intent for this area and is considered appropriate</p>	No
11.32	A18970521	<p><b>Consideration for inclusion as Next generation neighbourhood</b></p> <p>Requests rezoning of the Elimbah Investigation Area to General residential zone - Next generation neighbourhood precinct.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The Strategic Framework appropriately addresses Council policy with regard to the Elimbah investigation area in sections 3.13.6.4 and 3.13.6.4.1. The investigation area for Elimbah is within the inter-urban break and is not contained within the urban footprint under the South East Queensland Regional Plan 2017 (<i>ShapingSEQ</i>). It is considered that this area is appropriately reflected in the planning scheme.</p>	No
11.33	A18978239	<p><b>Rezoning request - 166 Deception Bay Rd, Deception Bay</b></p> <p>Requests amendment to the zone designation of 166 Deception Bay Road, Deception Bay to allow subdivision and parking of heavy vehicles like cranes and excavation equipment.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The identified site is currently included in the Rural zone. The Southeast Queensland Regional Plan 2017 (<i>ShapingSEQ</i>) has identified this land within the Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area. The regional plan applies restrictions on the use of rural land preventing inappropriate fragmentation and protection from urban development and rural residential subdivision.</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
			The property is appropriately zoned considering the surrounding land uses. It is considered that this matter is appropriately addressed in the planning scheme.	
11.34	A18972946	<p><b>Requests removal of Neighbourhood hub designation from Council owned land at 1168-1172 Oakey Flat Road, Narangba</b></p> <p>Requests amendment to the planning scheme to remove proposed Neighbourhood hub designation from Council owned land at 1168-1172 Oakey Flat Rd, Narangba</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to remove the Neighbourhood hub from the site. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
11.35	A18972946	<p><b>Requests justification as to Council's change in zoning</b></p> <p>Requests information regarding Council rezoning 49 Dinterra Avenue, and part of 51 Dinterra Avenue, Ferny Hills from the Environmental management and conservation zone to the Recreation and open space zone.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The western end of 51 Dinterra Ave, Arana Hills is occupied by the Lions Club of Golden Valley Keperra. 49 Dinterra Ave is occupied by a pump station. Both sites are owned by Council. The lots are included in the Environmental management and conservation zone due to more than 80% of the site having remnant vegetation.</p> <p>The majority of the site is identified as containing Matters of State Environmental Significance (MSES) through the Environmental areas overlay. Therefore, regardless of the proposed zone change, the environmental values will continue to be identified and protected through the Environmental areas overlay and the associated assessment criteria.</p> <p>Changing the zone to Recreation and open space is consistent with uses on the site (club and pump station) and provides future development opportunities for the Lions Club of Golden Valley Keperra while protecting the environmental values on the site. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p>	No
11.36	A18980356	<p><b>Rezoning request - 2 Linkfield Road, Brendale</b></p> <p>Request amendment to the designated zoning of 2 Linkfield Road, Brendale from Extractive industry zone to Centre zone - Local centre precinct to reflect an existing development approval.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The current development permits and/or existing use rights enable the continuation of approved and existing uses on site in accordance with the <i>Planning Act 2016</i>. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p>	No
11.37	A18963352	<p><b>Request amendment to Overlay map - Community activities and neighbourhood hubs at 25-27 Raymond Terrace, Deception Bay</b></p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised designated the property as a Community activity on Overlay map - Community activities and neighbourhood hubs. The proposed amendment is considered to accurately reflect the existing use of the site. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		Request amendment to Overlay map - Community activities and neighbourhood hubs to identify 25-27 Raymond Terrace, Deception Bay as a Community activity site to reflect existing squash centre.		
11.38	A18963842	<p><b>Rezoning request - 261 Victoria Avenue, Redcliffe</b></p> <p>Request for amendment to zoning for 261 Victoria Avenue, Redcliffe to allow the operation of a local business.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised identified the property as a Neighbourhood hub on Overlay map - Community activities and neighbourhood hubs to ensure appropriate retail and commercial uses can continue.</p> <p>The MBRC Planning Scheme recognises that residential places should expect to see retail, commercial and community uses that meet the convenience, day-to-day needs of the surrounding community and provide informal and safe meeting places for residents.</p> <p>Clusters of existing retail and commercial uses not of a size and scale to be considered as a Local centre have been zoned according to the surrounding zone and precinct, in this case the General residential zone - Suburban neighbourhood precinct. A local centre generally comprises a full-line supermarket and convenience stores providing 5,000m<sup>2</sup> - 7,000m<sup>2</sup> of retail Gross Floor Area (GFA). An example of a local centre on the Redcliffe Peninsula is the cluster of retail, commercial and health uses located on Elizabeth Avenue/Hornibrook Esplanade, Clontarf.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood hub overlay designation protects existing use rights and ensures appropriate retail and commercial uses can continue to occur as expected.</p> <p>It is noted that the planning scheme for the City of Redcliffe (commenced 1996) zoned the site Local Business. However, the Redcliffe City Planning Scheme (commenced 2005), which succeeded the 1996 planning scheme, zoned the site Low Density Residential.</p>	No
11.39	A18957287	<p><b>Rezoning request - 7-13 Learmonth Street, Strathpine</b></p> <p>Submitter requests amendment to the Centre zone - Strathpine centre precinct to reflect the revised road alignment regarding development at 7-13 Learmonth Street, Strathpine – Lot 3 on SP308736.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Changes in road designation where applicable occurs as part of the development application process. Changes to road mapping generally occur after development is complete in conjunction with engineering and operational works requirements.</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
11.40	A18957287	<p><b>Place Type amendment request - 7-13 Learmonth Street, Strathpine</b></p> <p>Submitter requests change in place type for a section within 7-13 Learmonth Street, Strathpine – Lot 3 on SP308736 from Coast and river lands place type to Activity centre place type to reflect development on the site.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>A change in place type is considered premature given the recent and continuing development is still occurring within the identified site. In any case a change to the Strategic Framework would require further investigation specifically in relation to the values and constrains that may impact the site.</p>	No
11.41	A18965216	<p><b>Objection to Next generation neighbourhood precincts</b></p> <p>Submitter requests Council not implement the Next generation neighbourhood precinct to the Redcliffe Peninsula and maintain current population levels.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Next generation neighbourhoods seek to provide housing diversity to meet different needs of the wide range of people in the region. This is important because it enables neighbourhoods to provide for changing demographics and different levels of affordability for home owners, renters, investors, families, one or two-person households and first home buyers. Housing diversity will also provide different lifestyle choices within the one neighbourhood; catering for the different life stages including families, single people and retirees.</p> <p>The South East Queensland Regional Plan 2017 (<i>ShapingSEQ</i>) sets targets for dwellings for each local government area in South East Queensland, up to the year 2041. The planning scheme provides a strategy to accommodate this growth to 2031 and does not set a population cap for the region.</p>	No
11.42	A18942807	<p><b>Request zoning within Redcliffe village to be amended to Township zone</b></p> <p>Request zoning within Redcliffe seaside village to be amended to Township zone allowing the new Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) - Township character to apply which would assist in retaining the existing character of Redcliffe.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Council acknowledges your support for the new Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) - Township character. However, PSP - Township character is intended only to apply to development in the Township zones located at Woodford, D'Aguilar, Wamuran, Dayboro, and Samford Village. One of the primary purposes of the PSP is to encourage design solutions to reinforce the historic rural Australian country town character of these areas.</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
			Nonetheless, the Redcliffe Kippa-Ring Local Plan - Redcliffe Seaside Village precinct seeks to preserve and encourage development to reflect the existing scale, cultural heritage, and art deco character along Redcliffe Parade, as well coastal landscape and coastal architectural elements to complete the seaside village character.	
			<b>EMERGING COMMUNITY / INVESTIGATION MATTERS</b>	
11.43	A18963424	<p><b>Rezoning request - Warner Investigation Area</b></p> <p>Requests Council revisit the Warner Investigation Area for rezoning to Emerging community zone.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The Warner Investigation Area continues to be identified within the planning scheme's Strategic Framework. As detailed in the Strategic Framework, further investigations are required to determine the development potential and future use of this area. The majority of the area, in the vicinity of Warner Road and to the south, is likely to remain largely rural residential in nature until the area can be developed in an efficient and cohesive manner.</p> <p>Further, it should be noted that there are current development applications within the Warner Investigation Area that are being assessed by Council. Details of these are publicly available on Council's PD Online webpage.</p>	No
11.44	A18963722	<p><b>Objection to rezoning Warner to increase development</b></p> <p>Submitter raises concerns relating to allowing increased development in Warner.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Current development applications within this area are subject to the assessment process outlined in the <i>Planning Act 2016</i>. This process includes assessment against the planning scheme. The land around Warner Road is currently zoned Rural residential and Industry - Light industry precinct. The assessment would take into consideration, amongst other things, traffic impacts and environmental values.</p>	No
11.45	A18979933	<p><b>Rezoning request - Multiple sites within Morayfield</b></p> <p>Request amendment to the zoning from Rural and Rural residential zones to</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		Emerging community zone - Transition precinct for properties within the Pine Valley Investigation Area. Further requests a change in place type from Rural zone to Next generation neighbourhood precinct and the addition of an Activity Centre node adjoining Oakey Flat Road.	<p>matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Rezoning the identified sites to Emerging community zone - Transition precinct and making changes to the Strategic Framework, in consideration of surrounding established zones and land uses at this point would be premature and not align with the intent of the planning scheme.</p> <p>Council has resolved to prepare a Regional Growth Management Strategy 2041 (RGMS2041), a significant priority project for the region. The RGMS2041 will develop evidence-based options that will ultimately outline the preferred sequencing strategy for the region's future expansion areas. Outcomes of this work may inform future amendments to the planning scheme.</p>	
11.46	A18852309 A18852324 A18852940 A18965360	<p><b>Morayfield South - Emerging Community to Rural Residential</b></p> <p>Object to Emerging community zoning and request rezoning of properties within Morayfield South from the Emerging community zone to the Rural residential zone.</p> <p>Submissions also raised concern for the conservation of environmental areas.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Morayfield South is in the Emerging community zone - Transition precinct as this area has been identified as suitable for future urban growth. While identified for urban development in the future, the provision of infrastructure and the resolution of existing site values and constraints need to occur before this area can be further developed.</p> <p>Regarding wildlife habitat within the area, significant portions of land within Morayfield South are currently included in the Environmental Areas overlay as Matters of State Environmental Significance (MSES) and Matters of Local Environmental Significance (MLES). These overlays form part of the planning assessment framework and would need to be considered as part of any future development proposal or planning scheme amendment.</p>	No
11.47	A18978560	<p><b>Burpengary East Investigation Area - Inclusion in Investigation Area</b></p> <p>Requests inclusion of land to the north of Cobb Road and all properties fronting Farry Road within the Burpengary East Investigation Area identified in the Strategic Framework Place Types mapping. Of particular interest are 98,117 and 164-168 Farry Rd, Burpengary East.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>As detailed in the planning scheme's Strategic Framework, the existing Investigation Area (Inside Urban Footprint) at Burpengary East is within the separation distance of future industry zoned land at the North East Business Park, therefore requiring further investigation.</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
			The investigation area identified is considered to provide a contiguous and logical extension to the Next generation neighbourhood place type to the north. The eastern boundary of the existing investigation area was applied in recognition of the large extent of flood hazard that affects the area raised in the submission. It is further noted that this area is heavily fragmented and not conducive to redevelopment over the life of the planning scheme.	
11.48	A18839378	<p><b>Burpengary East Investigation Area - Request rezoning</b></p> <p>Requests information regarding timing for further amendments to the planning scheme in particular rezoning of the Investigation Area to allow urban development</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Council has resolved to prepare a Regional Growth Management Strategy 2041 (RGMS2041), a significant priority project for the region. The RGMS2041 will develop evidence-based options that will ultimately outline the preferred sequencing strategy for the region's future expansion areas. Outcomes of this work may inform future amendments to the planning scheme.</p>	No
11.49	A18965193	<p><b>Rezoning request - Coutts Drive and Ogilvy Road, Burpengary</b></p> <p>Request the zoning of Coutts Drive and Ogilvy Road, Burpengary be revised to either prevent further development or allow higher density development to occur to align with existing development in the area.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Coutts Drive and Ogilvy Road, Burpengary are currently zoned Emerging community zone - Transition precinct. The Transition precinct aims to identify and conserve land that may be suitable for urban development in the future, allowing interim uses that will not compromise the best longer-term use of the land. Development is to maintain a semi-rural character until such time as availability and provision of infrastructure is delivered and relevant site-specific constraints are resolved. Furthermore, subdivision within the area is subject to existing site values and constraints and assessment benchmarks within the applicable zone code.</p> <p>Council has resolved to prepare a Regional Growth Management Strategy 2041 (RGMS2041), a significant priority project for the region. The RGMS2041 will develop evidence-based options that will ultimately outline the preferred sequencing strategy for the region's future expansion areas, including Morayfield South. Outcomes of this work may inform future amendments to the planning scheme.</p> <p>In relation to the protection of environmental values in this area, a significant portion of land within Coutts Drive and Ogilvy Road (larger lots) are currently mapped on the Environmental Areas overlay as Matters of State Environmental Significance (MSES) and Matters of Local Environmental Significance (MLES). MSES</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
			<p>include certain environmental values that are protected under Queensland legislation and are to be protected from development impacts. These overlays form part of the planning assessment framework and will need to be considered for any development to occur.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that some of the matters raised relate to a current development application that has been lodged with Council. For further information in relation to this application can be found on Council's <i>PDOnline</i> webpage.</p>	
11.50	A18963453	<p><b>Objection to the increased densities and subdivisions allowed within the Joyner area</b></p> <p>Requests amendment to prevent smaller lots being created in areas originally sold with larger blocks, specifically within the Joyner North and Joyner South areas.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Land generally north of Gordons Crossing Road, west of Youngs Crossing Road and south of Prothero Road is in the General residential zone - Suburban neighbourhood precinct.</p> <p>Land within the Suburban neighbourhood precinct is generally located some distance from public transport and major services and amenities therefore is not suitable for a major increase of people living in these areas. Further, Suburban neighbourhoods are generally not places that are expected to undergo significant change.</p> <p>However, it is acknowledged that the planning scheme sets parameters for what constitutes low density, low rise, detached housing for suburban neighbourhoods. This generally results in minimum lot sizes of 600m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>It is also acknowledged that in some areas of the region, where larger land parcels exist, these parameters represent an opportunity for some intensification of dwellings from what currently exists. These circumstances are not wide spread throughout the region.</p> <p>Council will continue to monitor the effect of Suburban neighbourhood outcomes within the region and the concerns raised by submitters in this location.</p>	No
			<b>GREEN NETWORK / WILDLIFE PROTECTION</b>	
11.51	A18965204	<p><b>Objection to Joyner - Emerging Community Zone</b></p> <p>Objects to zoning land within Joyner to facilitate development where the area is</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		mapped as a Matter of State Environmental Significance (MSES) and koala habitat.	<p>matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>This area is in the Emerging community zone - Transition precinct. The purpose of the Transition precinct is to identify and conserve land that may be suitable for urban development in the future, allowing interim uses that will not compromise the longer-term use of the land. Once serviced by all local government networks, including water and sewer the Transition precinct is to provide a mix of dwelling types to support a density range of between 11 lots and 25 lots per hectare.</p> <p>Regarding wildlife habitat within the area, significant portions of land within Joyner are currently mapped in the Environmental areas overlay as containing Matters of State Environmental Significance (MSES) and Matters of Local Environmental Significance (MLES). These overlays form part of the planning assessment framework and will need to be addressed as part of any future development application. Any future urban residential development on the site is also required to comply with the State Government's koala habitat requirements in the <i>Planning Regulations 2017</i>.</p>	
11.52	A18979919 A18963305	<p><b>Objection to lack of retention of the environment</b></p> <p>Requests more green corridors be provided within the region.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission</p> <p>The planning scheme uses a variety of methods to recognise and protect reserves, wildlife areas and wildlife corridors. The planning scheme zones all Council parks and reserves in the Recreation and open space zone. Further, Council also zones Crown land and additional Council owned land in the Environmental management and conservation zone.</p> <p>The Environmental areas overlay identifies areas that have been designated as Matters of State Environment Significance and Matters of Local Environmental Significance. The Environmental offset receiving areas overlay is also intended to result in linking green areas to result in corridors throughout the region. These overlays represent the region's key ecological corridors and form part of the planning assessment framework.</p>	No
11.53	A18977176 A18964570	<p><b>Increase identified green spaces within the Region</b></p> <p>Requests more places within the Region be identified and preserved for natural greenspace and that linkages between existing green areas be enhanced partly to support wildlife movement.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
			<p>The Environmental areas overlay identifies areas that have been designated as Matters of State Environment Significance and Matters of Local Environmental Significance. These overlays form part of the planning assessment framework.</p> <p>Further, the Environmental offset receiving areas overlay map is intended to result in linking green areas within the region. As set out in the Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) - Environmental areas and corridors, Council's identified Environmental offset receiving areas overlay map represents the region's key ecological corridors that are the major pathways for wildlife in the region. More information regarding Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy which has been developed to ensure the maintenance of a healthy natural environment as our region grows can be found at; <a href="https://www.moretonbay.qld.gov.au/Services/Reports-Policies/Green-Infrastructure-Strategy">https://www.moretonbay.qld.gov.au/Services/Reports-Policies/Green-Infrastructure-Strategy</a></p>	

## Theme 12 - Flood and Coastal Hazard Overlay Codes

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
12.1	MBRC	<p><b>Consistency in Figures/Images</b></p> <p>Update new Figures/Images at the rear of the Flood Overlay Code to include headings above the image and the "Popup full image" option.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Further changes will be made to formatting for consistency.</p>	Yes
12.2	MBRC	<p><b>Formatting - Request amendment to include additional point</b></p> <p>Correct formatting error in relation to Park or permanent plantation provisions.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to correct this formatting error. Section 8.2.2 (b) (iii) will be separated into two points.</p> <p>These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
12.3	MBRC	<p><b>Structural engineering report requirements</b></p> <p>Request to retain the requirement that a structural engineering design report be provided where development is proposed in the High-risk flood overlay.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to clarify the need for a structural engineer's report within high risk flood areas regardless of velocity due to the increased risk associated with these areas. The amendment as advertised for Medium risk areas will remain unchanged in line with the QDC MP 3.5 guidelines.</p> <p>Notes will be amended in PO2 and PO11 accordingly.</p> <p>These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
12.4	MBRC	<p><b>Flood hazard - Application of stormwater infrastructure filling exemption</b></p> <p>Recommend refinement of the note permitting filling to clarify who can action the provision and where this can be applied.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to clarify the policy intent around fill requirements in flood hazard, specifically the exceptions to no filling permitted.</p> <p>These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
12.5	MBRC DSDMIP	<p><b>Coastal hazard - Application of stormwater infrastructure filling exemption</b></p> <p>Recommend refinement of the note permitting filling to clarify who can action the provision and where this can be applied.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to clarify the policy intent around fill requirements in coastal hazard, specifically the exceptions to no filling permitted.</p> <p>These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
12.6	A18963226  Individual Submission	<b>Request to further mitigate increased flood levels resulting from development</b>  Requests Council consider the impacts of development within Excelsior Park and Hunter Valley Heights to flood levels on the identified site at 41 Rangeview Rd, Morayfield and within Sheep Station Creek.	<b>No change - Not amendment related</b>  The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.  The planning scheme seeks to minimise the risk to life, property, community, infrastructure and the environment from flood hazard by limiting and managing development in areas where flood hazard risk is identified.  It is considered that this matter is appropriately addressed in the planning scheme. Flood information relating to specific sites or areas can be obtained through Council's website or by viewing the Flood hazard overlay mapping within the planning scheme.	No
12.7	A18976540  A18978155  A18978669	<b>Request for amendments to the Flood hazard overlay code to enable development within Medium risk areas</b>  Requests the Flood hazard overlay code be amended to enable Multiple dwelling development and earthworks within the Balance area and Medium risk area of the Flood hazard overlay.	<b>No change - Amendment related</b>  The proposed amendments as advertised sought to clarify where and under what circumstances earthworks can occur in the Medium risk flood area and Balance area. Council considers the amendments to 8.2.2.2 (c) (v) are consistent with the policy intent to address Flood hazard.  Further amendments to Table 8.2.2.4 are proposed to improve clarity within the planning scheme. It is considered that this matter is appropriately addressed in the proposed amendments to the planning scheme. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.	No
12.8	A18978574	<b>Request to retain 40-42 Hawthorne St, 11-13 Samuel St and 63-65 Georgina St, Woody point within the Drainage Investigation Area</b>  Submitter requests amendments to the Woody Point Drainage Investigation Area to include 40-42 Hawthorne St, 11-13 Samuel St and 63-65 Georgina St, Woody Point. Concern was raised that the investigation reports informing the proposed exclusion of these properties were not included as part of the consultation material.	<b>No change - Amendment related</b>  Drainage Investigation Areas (DIAs) were established within the planning scheme to recognise that there may be potential for infrastructure solutions, works and/or building design to help reduce the extent and degree of flood risk, while facilitating appropriate redevelopment/intensification of an area.  As recognised in your submission the proposed amendments as advertised included removal of DIA 5 in Woody Point. Through Phase 1 of the drainage investigation area process reports were prepared to identify potential infrastructure and or built form solutions for Council to consider. These reports were used to assist Council in determining whether an economically feasible solution existed. Upon consideration Council determined the works required to mitigate the risks for this DIA were not supported as they did not represent a practical and cost-effective flood risk mitigation solution.  The reports prepared for Council's consideration contain confidential information and are therefore not publicly available. However, it should be noted that elements of the works identified in the feasibility study were consider to offer significant improvements to flood risks in Woody Point park and adjacent areas. These elements have been included in the forward works program.	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
			Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.	
12.9	A18978574	<p><b>Request flexibility in earthworks provisions in Flood hazard areas</b></p> <p>Request that earthworks requirements not be limited by the overlay but rather be based on demonstrating that earthworks will not have an adverse impact on the site and surrounds</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The suggested change to allow filling is considered to be inconsistent with Council's policy position.</p>	No
12.10	A18970077	<p><b>Request amendments to the Performance Outcomes and Table 8.2.2.4 within the Flood hazard overlay code</b></p> <p>Request amendments to various components of the Flood hazard overlay code citing conflicts within the code, particularly in relation to PO20 and PO22 when assessed under operational works for reconfiguring a lot.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised sought to clarify the policy position. The policy position is clear and intentional regarding filling in medium risk flood hazard areas. It is considered that this matter is appropriately addressed in the proposed amendments to the planning scheme.</p> <p>Road construction is required to meet engineering standards and assessed accordingly through the development assessment process. The Overall Outcomes (OOs) are taken into consideration when determining whether to allow fill associated with a road whereby S8.2.2.2, 2(c)(v) allows earthworks where associated with a previous approval (RAL) depending on the context and site constraints. To ensure developments in identified risk areas have flood free access the provision is required.</p>	No
12.11	A18971967	<p><b>Request amendments to include notes within Section 8.2.2.1 and 8.2.2.2 to clarify inconsistencies in flood hazard mapping</b></p> <p>Requests notes be added to the code to clarify that sites recently constructed in accordance with development approvals may be identified as affected by the Flood hazard overlay mapping, however the Flood Check Property Reports should be considered the point of truth</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>It is acknowledged that site conditions vary over time with approved development. There currently exists a note in 8.2.2.2 2.e that refers to information on the flood hazard and flood planning level for individual sites being available on Council's flood check development report. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p>	No
12.12	A18972755	<p><b>Support for changes within the Flood hazard overlay code, particularly PO18 and PO20</b></p> <p>Supports amendments which include medium flood hazard to be included in</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Support noted.</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		minimum lot size calculations in the Rural residential zone, and the inclusion of flexibility within infrastructure provisions.		
12.13	A18973466	<p><b>Formatting - Flood hazard overlay code review</b></p> <p>Requests various amendments to the Flood hazard overlay code to support development for 24 Beaconsfield Street, Margate.</p> <p>Formatting error in 8.2.2.2 Purpose.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Some of the matters raised are not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation.</p> <p>As some matters do not relate to the proposed amendments Council has determined no change can occur at this time.</p> <p>Council has further considered the matters raised that do relate to the amendment, and further formatting amendments have been made to section 8.2.2.2. of the Flood hazard overlay code to include 'or' to distinguish between the different zones and precincts allowing reconfiguring a lot.</p> <p>These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
12.14	A18973466	<p><b>Requests new provision be added to the 8.2.2.2 Purpose (2) (c) (iii)</b></p> <p>Requests amendment be made to assist with its effectiveness in resolving the issue of the conflict between the hazard and the underlying zoning and precinct.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Stormwater infrastructure for land within the Medium risk area and not located in a drainage investigation area is appropriately addressed within Table 8.2.2.4 which includes a note stating '<i>Note - filling is only permitted where for the creation of stormwater infrastructure such as detention basins, bioretention and levees.</i>'</p> <p>PO22 (b) addresses the risks to the site and the applicable benchmarks. It is considered that this matter is appropriately addressed in the proposed amendments to the planning scheme.</p>	No
12.15	A18973466	<p><b>Request an additional point be added in Purpose 8.2.2.2 (2) (c) (v)</b></p> <p>Requests additional outcome between existing B and C, that would then work cooperatively with Table 8.2.2.4 in its current form. Further, a corresponding change then should be made to Table 5.10.2.1 Levels of assessment and assessment criteria for the flood hazard overlay.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised sought to reflect the policy position in relation to stormwater infrastructure. Council considers the Performance Outcomes (POs) of the Flood hazard overlay code and associated Table 8.2.2.4 for fill requirements appropriately address the provision of stormwater infrastructure within flood hazard areas.</p> <p>Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p>	No

## Theme 13 - Service Stations

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
13.1	A18963949 A18852309 A18852324 A18852940	<b>Number and location of service stations</b>  Concern there are too many service stations located in proximity to each other and that there should be more strict regulations over where they can be located.	<b>No change - Amendment related</b>  The proposed amendment as advertised increased the level of assessment for service stations to impact assessment in all General residential zone precincts and all Centre zone precincts except the Specialised centre precinct. When impact assessable they are assessed against the Strategic Framework and the relevant zone code. Public notification is also required in accordance with the <i>Planning Act 2016</i> . In addition to this, a new Performance Outcome (PO) has been added to the planning scheme that guides the location and design of service stations.  These additions to the planning scheme will increase the level of scrutiny placed on development applications for service stations, helping to ensure that sensitive land uses including houses and child care centres are not unduly impacted.  Council will monitor the effects of the new provisions to determine if any further changes to the planning scheme are warranted in the future.	No
13.2	A18852940 A18852309 A18852324	<b>Health and safety</b>  Concern that residents do not want to live near petrol stations because of the health and safety risks involved.	<b>No change - Amendment related</b>  The proposed amendment as advertised increased the level of assessment for service stations to impact assessment in all General residential zone precincts and all Centre zone precincts except the Specialised centre precinct. When impact assessable they are assessed against the Strategic Framework and the relevant zone code. Public notification is also required in accordance with the <i>Planning Act 2016</i> . In addition to this, a new Performance Outcome (PO) has been added to the planning scheme that guides the location and design of service stations.  These additions to the planning scheme will increase the level of scrutiny placed on development applications for service stations, helping to manage impacts and mitigate adverse effects on residential uses.  Council will monitor the effects of the new provisions to determine if any further changes to the planning scheme are warranted in the future.	No

## Theme 14 - Car Parking Rates

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
14.1	A18963078	<p><b>Request amendment to car parking rates for Squash Centres</b></p> <p>Submitter requests consideration for amendment to car parking rates for squash centres citing 20 spaces per court is unrealistic.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised sought to clarify that for determining the car parking rate for Indoor sport and recreation (where courts) that the lesser of either 3 spaces per 100m<sup>2</sup> or 20 spaces per court is required.</p> <p>The car parking rate for Indoor sport and recreation is an Example (E) within the code which refers to Schedule 7. As an E, it is only one way of meeting that aspect of the Performance Outcome (PO). Alternatives can be considered and assessed against the corresponding PO.</p> <p>Accordingly, no further changes are proposed, however, Council will monitor the effects of the new provisions to determine if any further changes to the planning scheme are warranted in the future.</p>	No
14.2	A18979760	<p><b>Request to amend car parking rates in Schedule 7 for Display homes</b></p> <p>Submitter requests a review of the carparking rates for display homes. Specifically, car parking should be reduced where streets through a display village remain open and display dwelling driveways are fenced off.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to clarify that the greater of 3 spaces per display dwelling and 3 spaces per 100m<sup>2</sup> GFA applies, rather than both. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration</p>	Yes
14.3	A18979760	<p><b>Request to amend car parking rates for Sales office in Next generation Neighbourhood Precinct</b></p> <p>Request the Next Generation Neighbourhood Precinct, Sales Office Requirements for accepted development (RAD) link to Schedule 7 rather than Table 6.2.6.3.5 Car parking spaces.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>It is noted that the car parking requirements for Sales office in the Next generation neighbourhood precinct is calculated at a greater rate than that within Schedule 7. Furthermore, it is acknowledged Schedule 7 is the benchmark for carparking within the RAD's for Suburban neighbourhoods. This matter has been recorded for future consideration. Council will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.</p>	No

## Theme 15 - Other Guidance Changes

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
15.1	A18965210	<p><b>Consequential amendment to Centre precinct to reflect change in zone</b></p> <p>Recommendation to change the Strategic Framework, Section 3.14.11, paragraphs 6 and 8 to recognise the site has been changed from Centre zone - Specialised centre precinct to Centre zone - District centre precinct. Also request the addition of Overall outcomes specific to the new District centre.</p> <p>Note that a District centre icon is required to be placed on Strategic Framework - Settlement Pattern Map 3.6.1.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to the Strategic Framework to reflect the new District centre precinct in Rothwell. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
15.2	MBRC	<p><b>Remove typographical and alignment amendment errors</b></p> <p>Recommendation to remove duplicate text in second paragraph 'Editor's note - Editor's note' and update terminology to be consistent with the <i>Planning Act 2016</i>.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to correct a typographical error and a <i>Planning Act 2016</i> terminology. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
15.3	MBRC	<p><b>Improve clarity by removing example</b></p> <p>Recommend removing example provided in Table of Assessment as it does not provide any value and is inconsistent with similar situations within the table.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to ensure there is clarity and consistency throughout Table 5.7.1, by including the example within an editor's note. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
15.4	A18890854	<p><b>Large and significant developments should be impact assessed developments</b></p> <p>Objection to the broad application of code assessment, citing that huge developments that completely change the character of the whole suburb can remain code assessable.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		Recommendation that any development which is large or significant needs to be assessed through the impact assessment process.	<p>The planning scheme and associated mapping set Council's intentions for the type of development expected in different parts of the region. Levels of assessment are determined based on these future expectations and subject to the type of land use.</p> <p>It is noted the extent of code assessable use rights were previously publicly notified when the planning scheme was prepared and publicly advertised in 2014 and 2015.</p>	
15.5	A18972946	<p><b>Conflict between zone codes, RAL codes and Table 1.7.7.1 with regards to accepted land clearing</b></p> <p>Submission suggests there is direct conflict resulting from the proposed amendments to Table 1.7.7.1, which have not been reflected in the same wording used within the Zone and RAL Codes.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>However, this matter has been recorded for future consideration. Council will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.</p>	No
15.6	A18965210 A18964931	<p><b>Consequential amendment to reflect Centre precinct change in zone code</b></p> <p>Recommendation to change Sections 6.2.1.2(4)(b) and (d) to recognise the proposed change of the centre south of Morris Road West on Deception Bay Road from Centre zone - Specialised centre precinct to Centre zone - District centre precinct.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to reflect the new District centre precinct designation in the Centre zone code. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
15.7	A18985927	<p><b>Consequential amendments to various portions of the scheme to give effect to the proposed neighbourhood hub designation on Lear Jet Drive, Caboolture</b></p> <p>Consequential amendments are required to various portions of the scheme to give effect to the proposed neighbourhood hub designation on Lear Jet Drive, Caboolture.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to allow the proposed Neighbourhood hub designation of the Lear Jet Drive site to be actioned.</p> <p>By supporting Office and Shop land uses, the proposed amendments will largely align this Neighbourhood hub with how the planning scheme addresses the Categories of assessment and assessment benchmarks for Neighbourhood hubs within other zones and precincts.</p> <p>These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
15.8	A18963161	<p><b>Growth needs to be coordinated and undertaken in a systematic and progressive manner</b></p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		<p>Suggest growth needs to commence from the centre of major growth hubs and progress outwards, including in relation to the progression of multiple dwelling developments.</p> <p>Concern that if this systematic approach is not taken then large developments may be constructed in isolation of services and will look out of place.</p>	<p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The planning scheme seeks to encourage the right development in the right locations in order to achieve the long-term vision for the region. The Strategic Framework seeks to increase the diversity of land uses, and residential densities, occurring on land in and around activity centres.</p> <p>However, this change is gradual and can take a number of years to come to fruition. Further, the progress and take up rate are subject to market forces and the intentions of individual land owners. This can result in some irregularity in development within these identified areas until such time as the vision is realised. Council will continue to review and monitor urban growth around centres and throughout the entire region to determine if any further changes to the planning scheme are warranted in the future.</p>	
15.9	A18957287	<p><b>Increase density allowance on Key Site B in Strathpine</b></p> <p>Recommend change to Performance Outcome PO84 of the Centre zone - Strathpine centre precinct code to support high density residential uses within Key site B.</p> <p>Concern Medium density residential is out of step with the maximum building height of 27 metres and a number of Overall Outcomes.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The Performance Outcomes (PO) for Key site B relate to the preferred outcomes for the interfaces along the eastern and southern boundaries of the site. The POs are considered appropriate to ensure acceptable outcomes for surrounding development while allowing flexible outcomes within the Key site, particularly when considered in the context of the Overall Outcomes.</p>	No
15.10	A18963853	<p><b>Out of zone development</b></p> <p>Concern that large developments are occurring in inappropriate zones, bypassing the purpose of the zone.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>In some instances, applicants seek a 'Variation request', which is a statutory process enabled by Queensland legislation. Variation requests are used to request a variation to the requirements of the planning scheme and associated zoning. Councils are obliged to consider these applications and assess them against all relevant matters, including, but not limited to the entire planning scheme during assessment. These types of development applications are required to undertake public notification in accordance with the <i>Planning Act 2016</i>.</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
15.11	A18963710	<p><b>Retain historical design of Redcliffe Parade buildings</b></p> <p>Recommends that the historical design of each existing building within Redcliffe Parade be retained.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The Heritage and landscape character overlay map and the Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) - Heritage and landscape character identify certain buildings within Redcliffe Parade as being culturally and historically significant. Through the planning scheme and PSP, heritage values are afforded protection when development is considered. The PSP is reviewed by Council from time to time to ensure the policy remains up to date, relevant and accurate. However, a review of the policy was not part of this amendment process.</p>	No
15.12	A18964729	<p><b>Overland flow paths</b></p> <p>Request for open carports that do not increase the surface level by 100mm from natural ground level to be acceptable development.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Where development is proposed within an overland flow path, Council requires an applicant to ensure the development does not increase the potential for flood damage from overland flow either on the premises or other premises, public lands, watercourses, roads or infrastructure.</p>	No
15.13	A18965078	<p><b>Alignment to the Planning Act 2016 - Clarification for concurrence assessment</b></p> <p>Recommendation to change reference to section 17(b) of the <i>Planning Regulation 2017</i> (the Regulation) to sections 8(5) and 8(6) of the <i>Planning Act 2016</i>.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>However, this matter has been recorded for future consideration. Council will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.</p>	No
15.14	A18965078 A18965133	<p><b>Concurrence Assessment reference to Schedule 9 of the Regulations</b></p> <p>Requests clarification on relevant section of the <i>Planning Regulation 2017</i> to confirm</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		applicable concurrence assessment triggers and assessment benchmarks for concurrence assessment for Dwelling houses.	not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.  However, this matter has been recorded for future consideration. Council will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.	
15.15	A18965078	<b>Alignment to the Planning Act 2016 - Building works and preliminary approvals</b>  Recommends amendment to editor's note within Section 1.6 to remove reference to the issuing of preliminary approvals for building work.	<b>No change - Not amendment related</b>  The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission. However, this matter has been recorded for future consideration. Council will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.	No
15.16	A18965078	<b>Building works requiring code or impact assessment</b>  Questions when building works trigger the requirement for a Development permit, and how the planning scheme then deals with concurrence assessment matters in these instances.	<b>No change - Not amendment related</b>  The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.  The planning scheme provides numerous points of guidance as to when a proposal for building works would trigger assessment by Council as either an assessment manager or a concurrence agency. For example, the proposed amendments as advertised included an editor's note to some tables of assessment identifying which requirements for accepted development (RAD) are applicable for a concurrence agency response in the event they are not being complied with. Specific numbering of RADs will be finalised prior to adoption.	No
15.17	A18965078	<b>Colour coding of different assessment requirements</b>  Questions whether the planning scheme could colour co-ordinate matters where variances to the requirements for accepted development (RAD) constitute either a planning application or a concurrence application.	<b>No change - Amendment related</b>  The planning scheme provides numerous points of guidance as to when a proposal for building works would trigger assessment by Council as either an assessment manager or a concurrence agency. For example, the proposed amendments as advertised included an editor's note to some tables of assessment identifying which requirements for accepted development (RAD) are applicable for a concurrence agency response in the event they are not being complied with. Specific numbering of RADs will be finalised prior to adoption.	No
15.18	A18965078	<b>Approvals reflected within the planning scheme</b>	<b>No change - Not amendment related</b>  The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		Requests clarification as to whether a development permit is required by resolution to be adopted into a planning scheme to be given effect.	<p>and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The <i>Planning Act 2016</i> does not require Development permits to be adopted into a planning scheme to be given effect. However, section 10 of the planning scheme provides guidance as to when other planning instruments are to be used for the assessment of certain applications in certain locations.</p>	
15.19	A18965078	<p><b>Reflect regulated requirements</b></p> <p>Concern that the planning scheme contradicts itself by noting in section 2.4 that the regulated requirements have not been reflected in this planning scheme, but within the End Notes states that as of 3 July 2017 the planning scheme reflects the terminology of the regulated requirements.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>On 27 June 2017, the planning scheme was updated to reflect the terminology used in the <i>Planning Act 2016</i> and the <i>Planning Regulation 2017</i>. However, it was left to the discretion of each local government as to whether their planning scheme would adopt the regulated requirements.</p> <p>Accordingly, and as stated in section 2.4, the planning scheme does not include all of the regulated requirements at that time. This was an intentional decision by Council.</p>	No
15.20	A18965078	<p><b>Short-term Accommodation</b></p> <p>Requests information as to whether purpose-built Air B&amp;B buildings are a Short-term accommodation land use.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Council recognises the importance of tourism and the provision of holiday dwellings in the region. Platforms like Air BnB and Stayz, and traditional real-estate agents providing a variety of dwellings for short-term letting has led to a rise in popularity of holiday letting in the region.</p> <p>The use of residential houses and units for short-term accommodation can present amenity issues. In some cases, they may also present noise and nuisance concerns for neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The State government are currently considering options on the best way to achieve a balanced approach to these uses. Whilst Council awaits further information from the State, Council has established the following interim arrangements:</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
			<p>1. The existing use rights for Dwelling houses constructed under previous schemes to function as an Airbnb or equivalent are recognised;</p> <p>2. Dwelling houses constructed under the provisions of the current planning scheme that function as an Airbnb or equivalent are considered to be Short-term accommodation, only where they are used as short-term (rental) accommodation for more than 120 days in a calendar year.</p> <p>The above relates to a position on the relevant land use definitions in the former and current planning scheme, as they relate to those uses.</p> <p>This directive is intended to remain in effect, until the State Government complete their review into the matter.</p>	
15.21	A18965201	<p><b>Preserve Recreation and open space zones</b></p> <p>Recommends preserving the Recreation and open space zones to ensure these spaces are made available for future generations.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The planning scheme regulates the use of land identified within the Recreation and open space zone through the relevant codes, and also the Strategic Framework. This seeks to ensure Recreation and open space zones are protected and available for current and future generations.</p> <p>Further, the Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP) sets out the minimum requirements to ensure sufficient parks are provided in new development areas.</p>	No
15.22	A18965201	<p><b>Growth around centres, and services within walking distance</b></p> <p>Recommends the planning scheme goes further in preventing urban sprawl, by ensuring walking access to commercial centres and services, and by developing dense urban centres that meet the needs for residents of all ages.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The MBRC Planning Scheme's Strategic Framework provides a 20-year vision for the future settlement pattern and location of economic activity, associated infrastructure and the protection and enhancement of the region's environmental values. Specifically, section 3.14.10 provides the framework for growth in Urban neighbourhoods, seeking to increase densities close to Activity centres and public transport.</p> <p>Furthermore, Council is presently implementing the Incentivising Infill Development Policy, which seeks to promote and encourage exemplar design outcomes in proximity to train stations and centres to leverage existing infrastructure and services</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
			Council will continue to review and monitor urban growth around centres and throughout the entire region.	
15.23	A18965201	<p><b>Adaptable multi-use high rise buildings</b></p> <p>Recommends high rise buildings take on a range of functions and reflect the township character.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The planning scheme seeks to facilitate a mix of uses within our centres and urban neighbourhoods including allowing for high rise buildings to accommodate a mix of uses. Further, the planning scheme requires buildings to be designed in such a way as to be able to adapt to accommodate a variety of uses over the course of their life.</p>	No
15.24	A18965201	<p><b>Infrastructure is inadequate</b></p> <p>Concern the region has grown too quickly without ensuring the required infrastructure is in place for the residents.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The planning scheme's Strategic Framework provides a 20-year vision for the future residential settlement pattern and location of economic activity, associated infrastructure and the protection and enhancement of the region's environmental values. The Framework also specifically requires that Urban neighbourhoods are to have the level of services and infrastructure to support the growth and increased intensity of activity, as well as providing safe, vibrant and attractive public realms.</p> <p>The Strategic Framework and supporting development codes place a strong focus on infill development. Infill development allows new development to leverage off existing infrastructure that may be underutilised. Where greenfield development occurs, Council will work with service providers, State Government and developers to ensure the appropriate infrastructure is delivered in a timely and effective manner without burdening existing communities.</p> <p>Council will continue to review and monitor urban growth around centres and throughout the entire region.</p>	No
15.25	A18970521	<p><b>Remove references to the Inter-urban break relating to Elimbah from Strategic Framework</b></p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		Recommends that references to the Inter-urban break be removed from the wording associated with the Elimbah Investigation area within Section 3.13.6.4 (e) of the Strategic Framework.	<p>and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The State Government's South East Queensland Regional Plan 2017 (<i>ShapingSEQ</i>) provides an indicative boundary for the inter-urban break and the Elimbah Potential Future Growth Area. A joint project with the State Government is underway in response to the actions specified in the regional plan.</p> <p>Until the extent of the inter-urban break is determined, no amendments will be made in relation to this matter. The existing wording within the planning scheme reflects Council's intent in relation to retaining the integrity of the inter-urban break.</p>	
15.26	A18970521	<p><b>Include Future Urban Growth Area notation for Elimbah</b></p> <p>Requests amendments to the planning scheme to recognise Elimbah as an identified Potential Future Urban Growth Area within the South East Queensland Regional Plan 2017 (<i>ShapingSEQ</i>).</p> <p>The submitter requests the inclusion of the following wording as an additional bullet point to Section 3.13.6.4.1: "(iv) is an area identified in Shaping SEQ as Potential Future Urban Growth Area."</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Government's Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The planning scheme identifies potential future growth areas as "investigation areas". While this is not a defined term it is taken to be consistent with the South East Queensland Regional Plan's (<i>ShapingSEQ</i>) Potential Future Growth Area designation. An investigation area is identified at Elimbah.</p> <p>ShapingSEQ identifies Elimbah as a Potential Future Growth Area and explains that the identification of these areas is not a development commitment, nor does it imply that all, or any part of these areas, will be made available for urban development in the future. These areas are identified indicatively and have no cadastral definition.</p>	No
15.27	A18965210	<p><b>Support for planning scheme</b></p> <p>Support for the proposed amendments as it relates to the centre at Rothwell.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Support noted.</p>	No
15.28	A18979760	<p><b>Modify Definition of Primary Frontage</b></p> <p>Support for the change to the definition of 'Primary frontage', in that the change would provide recognition that a previous development approval (e.g. Reconfiguring a Lot) can require a certain frontage to be the primary dwelling.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised sought to provide clarity when identifying the primary frontage. Initial investigations indicate that the instances in which this matter could potentially become an issue are low, accordingly a change is not warranted at this time.</p> <p>The definition would not prevent a condition of an approval clarifying which frontage is to be considered as the primary frontage at the time of the lot's creation and original build.</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		However, the submission requests that this should be elevated above the test of equal road frontages.	Council will monitor the effects of the new provisions to determine if any further changes to the planning scheme are warranted in the future.	
15.29	A18963550	<p><b>Affordable housing options to include caravans and tents</b></p> <p>Recommends that alternative housing options, for example caravans and tents, should not only be allowed but encouraged to help people find affordable housing options within the region.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The planning scheme seeks to ensure that new development, is designed and carried out in a way that will enhance the streetscape character, the enjoyment of a locality and the general amenity of the immediate area. In this instance, it is not considered that the encouragement of typically temporary structures, such as tents and caravans, for the use of permanent residence in residential areas would further the purpose of the planning scheme.</p> <p>However, the planning scheme provides for a mix of housing types catering for a wide variety of needs and levels of affordability, including multiple dwellings, dual occupancies and secondary dwellings as well as allowing for a variety of lot sizes. This flexibility provides increased opportunities for community, non-for-profit housing providers and the State Government to deliver housing in an efficient, cost effective and timely manner.</p>	No
15.30	A18963550	<p><b>Impartial aesthetics assessment</b></p> <p>Recommends that where a development is not 'grossly unsightly' or a 'hazard', that it ought to be approved even in the face of criticism from neighbours.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The planning scheme seeks to ensure that new development is designed and carried out in a way that will enhance the streetscape character, the enjoyment of a locality and the general amenity of the immediate area.</p> <p>Comments received from the public in relation to a proposed development are always taken into consideration. The appropriate weight is given to the comment through numerous factors including the relevant legislative process, the relevance of the comments to the assessment criteria, as well as other relevant matters.</p>	No
15.31	A18965343	<p><b>Multiple small homes on large properties</b></p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		Recommends enabling multiple small homes on a large property where each dwelling provides their own solar energy, water tank and other services.	<p>and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The planning scheme provides for a mix of housing types catering for a wide variety of needs and levels of affordability, including multiple dwellings, dual occupancies and secondary dwellings as well as allowing for a variety of lot sizes. This flexibility provides increased opportunities for community, non-for-profit housing providers and the State Government to deliver housing in an efficient, cost effective and timely manner.</p> <p>The planning scheme requires connection to urban services, where available. Installation of solar panels and rain water tanks are not regulated by the planning scheme.</p>	
15.32	A18993583	<p><b>Reverse amenity protection for Industrial uses</b></p> <p>Recommendation to make amendments to the planning scheme to provide appropriate reverse amenity protections for the Narangba Industrial Estate.</p> <p><b>Increase Support for Narangba Innovation Precinct within Strategic Framework</b></p> <p>Recommendation to change Strategic Framework to provide certainty and support for growth of the lawfully established business operations within the Narangba Industrial Estate.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related - Further investigation</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>However, as per advice provided in 2017 and in a recent meeting with Council's senior planning staff, Council will undertake further investigations into the zoning and development controls within the planning scheme in relation to the Narangba Industrial Estate subject to future Council consideration.</p> <p>An update on the progress of this further investigation will be provided by August 2020.</p>	No
15.33	A18916658	<p><b>Waterfront development strategy</b></p> <p>Recommends establishing a 'zone' along the waterfront with a depth of 500m that accommodates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• tourist and residential activities at the waterfront;</li> <li>• short-term accommodation buildings and shopping centres in the centre; and</li> <li>• public transport at the rear.</li> </ul>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>However, the planning scheme includes the Redcliffe seaside village precinct within the Redcliffe Kippa-Ring local plan code. The purpose of the precinct is to create a strong focus on leisure, entertainment and culture for locals and tourists. The purpose of the precinct and the associated assessment criteria may encourage development to adopt some of the suggestions listed within the submission.</p> <p>Further information on the precinct is available within section 7.2.1.1 of the MBRC Planning Scheme.</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
15.34	A18916658	<p><b>More greenspace, shading and community facilities and spaces.</b></p> <p>Recommends more areas for natural and created shade, more recreation facilities which could be divided into age categories.</p> <p>Submission also suggests 'public health complexes' with saunas, pools, barbecues near shopping centres.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The planning scheme contains various assessment criteria and provisions seeking to encourage more effective green space and open space areas in private open space and public open space. Supporting these provisions are the planning scheme policies. Specifically, Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) - Integrated Design - Appendix D Landscape Design and Street Trees seeks to provide the criteria, standards and guidance to facilitate a high standard of built form, visual interest and engaging and functional spaces.</p> <p>It is also noted that Indoor sport and recreation uses are able to establish in all Centre zone precincts, subject to the relevant application and approval process.</p> <p>Furthermore, Council has recently released a draft version of The Mill Built Form Guidelines, which seeks to achieve many of the outcomes listed within the submission. Further information on The Mill Built Form Guidelines is available on Council's website.</p>	No
15.35	A18972946	<p><b>The planning scheme conflicts with the Regulations in regard to vegetation clearing</b></p> <p>The submission requests that Council align the development which Council identifies as accepted development in Table 1.7.7.1 of the planning scheme with the <i>Planning Regulation 2017</i> (the Regulation). The submission refers to clearing work which is included in the definition of essential management in the Regulation to provide an example of the stated inconsistency between the development included in Table 1.7.7.1 of the planning scheme and the Regulation.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised sought to clarify the vegetation clearing requirements. The accepted development identified in Table 1.7.7.1 of the planning scheme is not the same as the development which is identified as essential management in the Regulation.</p> <p>The effect of including essential management in Schedule 21 (Exempt clearing work) of the Regulation is different to the inclusion of operational work, clearing vegetation, not associated with a material change of use or reconfiguring a lot as accepted development in Table 1.7.7.1 of the planning scheme.</p> <p>The Regulation does not categorise essential management as prohibited, assessable or accepted development. Therefore, there is no conflict between the Regulation, which does not categorise essential management, and the planning scheme, which categorises certain operational work, clearing vegetation, not associated with a material change of use or reconfiguring a lot as accepted development.</p> <p>The identification of the accepted development in Table 1.7.7.1 of the planning scheme is appropriate.</p>	No
15.36	A18972946	<p><b>Clearing within the Environmental management and conservation zone is accepted development</b></p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Given operational work carried out by a Local Government or the State Government is for a public purpose, it is common in planning instruments that a development application is not required for such work. An example of</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		The submission requests that the proposal to make the identified work accepted development be removed and that a development application be required for the proposed work.	<p>this work is the construction of a road. As a matter of policy, it is not considered in the public interest that a Local Government be required to make a development application to itself for the construction of a road.</p> <p>The identification of the work as accepted development however does not affect or diminish the need to obtain any other necessary approvals required by law. If approvals such as under the <i>Nature Conservation Act 1992</i> or <i>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> were required, the need for these approvals would not be affected by the identification of the work as accepted development in the MBRC Planning Scheme.</p> <p>The identification of the accepted development in Table 1.7.7.1 of the MBRC Planning Scheme is appropriate.</p>	
15.37	A18972243	<p><b>Modify definition of 'Frontage'</b></p> <p>Recommends amendment to the definition of frontage to cater for lots within a community title development scheme.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The definition for 'frontage' has been worded to address boundaries abutting a road reserve and achieve the best possible road frontage outcomes through the provisions of the scheme. By altering the definition to include common properties, the intent is compromised, as direct visibility and identification of a building entrance across common property is not always achievable.</p>	No
15.38	A18972243	<p><b>Modify definition of 'Walking distance'</b></p> <p>Recommends amendment to the definition of walking distance to remove reference to primary frontage when measuring walking distances.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised sought to introduce a definition of 'walking distance' to address the Overlay mapping for pedestrian walkability between a centre or train station and a site.</p> <p>The intent of the note within the definition is to clarify the need for the primary frontage to be within the overlay map's range. As the overlay map seeks to promote increased density within walking distance of a centre or train station, the lots affected by the overlay may have increased development potential. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume in order to develop, access to the site would be required via the primary frontage. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p>	No
15.39	A18972946	<p><b>Impact on land supply calculations</b></p> <p>Request for information on how the rezoning of land from General residential zone to Community facilities, Recreation and open space, and Environmental</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		management and Conservation land will impact Council's land supply calculations.	<p>Land supply calculations are updated periodically. If the proposed zoning amendments are adopted, they will be incorporated into land supply calculations at an appropriate time.</p> <p>The Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP) and associated extrinsic material, which inform land supply calculations, do not form part of the current planning scheme amendments. The LGIP2 process that will include new/updated planning assumptions is underway and once complete will be the subject of a planning scheme amendment and public notification.</p> <p>It is important to note that land supply calculations, including those that will inform LGIP2, do not only consider zone designations. Numerous issues are taken into account such as constraints from overlays, land tenure and existing committed non-residential land uses such as parks.</p>	
15.40	A18839378	<p><b>Update statements relating to Burpengary East Investigation Area</b></p> <p>Requests Council review the wording within the Strategic Framework referring to Burpengary East Investigation Area in relation to the following aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• as an investigation area;</li> <li>• that it is outside of the Priority Infrastructure Area;</li> <li>• that limited network planning has been undertaken; and</li> <li>• that water and sewer services are not available.</li> </ul>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>The submission identifies site-specific infrastructure investigations and approvals that have taken place on an adjacent site. The Strategic Framework identifies certain infrastructure planning has only occurred to some parts of the investigation area. In the absence of significant, whole of area infrastructure planning, the existing descriptions in relation to infrastructure are considered appropriate.</p>	No
15.41	A18839378	<p><b>Timing of amendments to allow urban development in Burpengary East Investigation Area</b></p> <p>Requests an update on the timing for further amendments to the planning scheme to allow urban development in Burpengary East Investigation Area.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>Council has resolved to prepare a Regional Growth Management Strategy 2041 (RGMS2041), a significant priority project for the region. The RGMS2041 will develop evidence-based options that will ultimately outline the preferred sequencing strategy for the region's future expansion areas. Outcomes of this work may inform future amendments to the planning scheme.</p>	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
15.42	A18952279	<p><b>Support for removal of Council approval for excavation and filling less than 20m<sup>3</sup> and driveways</b></p> <p>Support for proposed amendment removing the need for Council approval for excavation and filling less than 20m<sup>3</sup> and driveways.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Support is noted.</p>	No
15.43	A18965074	<p><b>Industry Zone Code</b></p> <p>Recommendation to amend the Industry zone code to broaden the scope of uses specifically for Lot 1 SP133255 and related consequential amendments to the code.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>It is considered that the Mixed industry and business precinct has been applied in appropriate locations and that the related code contains appropriate provisions for guiding development in these areas. However, Council will continue to monitor the outcomes being achieved in this precinct and will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.</p>	No
15.44	A18979686	<p><b>Support for planning scheme</b></p> <p>Support for the proposed amendments as many of the proposed amendments will increase the usability and functionality of the planning scheme and simplify the development assessment process.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Support noted.</p>	No

## Theme 16 - Planning Scheme Policies

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Changes Proposed (Yes or No)
			<b>PSP - HERITAGE AND LANDSCAPE CHARACTER</b>	
16.1	A18929100 A18963862 A18963161	<b>Additional Heritage sites</b>  Request for additional historical locations/places/buildings to be included in the Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) - Heritage and landscape character including Samford and Petrie.	<b>No change - Not amendment related</b>  The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.  Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) - Heritage and landscape character is reviewed by Council from time to time to ensure the policy remains up to date, relevant and accurate. However, a review of the policy was not part of this amendment process, therefore will remain in its existing format.	No
16.2	A18963862 A18963161	<b>Historical values</b>  Concern regarding the protections of specific historical buildings as well as the existing character of an area. Request to ensure the protection of heritage values, including those listed in the Planning Scheme Policy (PSP). Request development applications consider maintaining buildings of historical and cultural values rather than being removed or relocated.	<b>No change - Not amendment related</b>  The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.  The Petrie Post Office House is identified as having heritage and cultural values within the MBRC Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) - Heritage and landscape character and The Mill at Moreton Bay Priority Development Area (PDA) Development Scheme. Through these planning documents, heritage values are afforded protection when development is considered.  PSP - Heritage and landscape character is reviewed by Council from time to time to ensure the policy remains up to date, relevant and accurate. However, a review of the policy was not part of this amendment process, therefore will remain in its existing format.	No
16.3	MBRC	<b>Heritage PSP proposed change</b>  Recommend amendment to the Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) to reflect the correct Survey Plan (SP) number of the heritage place.	<b>Change - Amendment related</b>  Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to reflect the correct lot and plan description for the Grape vine in Lawnton. Further investigation has revealed that the vine has been relocated to a nearby site. Further changes will be made to the Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) and Overlay map - Heritage and landscape character to maintain the protection of this heritage item. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.	Yes
			<b>PSP - FLOOD AND HAZARD OVERLAND FLOW</b>	

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Changes Proposed (Yes or No)
16.4	MBRC	<p><b>Flood technical reports - Structural engineering design report</b></p> <p>Recommend amending written description of reporting requirements for flood technical reports with the proposed amendments to the corresponding table.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council have further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to reflect the amendments in Table 2 - Technical reports within Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) - Flood hazard, coastal hazard and overland flow. Changes to section 3.2 of the PSP are required to align with the changes made in Table 2, creating consistency within the PSP. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.</p>	Yes
16.5	MBRC	<p><b>Flood technical reports - Site based (localised) coastal engineering report</b></p> <p>Recommend amending written description of reporting requirements for flood technical reports with the proposed amendments to the corresponding table.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council have further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to Section 3.3 to reflect the amendments in Table 2 - Technical reports within Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) - Flood hazard, coastal hazard and overland flow. Changes to section 3.2 of the PSP are required to align with the changes made in Table 2, creating consistency within the PSP. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.</p>	Yes
16.6	A18890854	<p><b>Sea level rise</b></p> <p>Concerns regarding the sea level rise and consequential policies addressed in the scheme are not factual. Request for further research into sea level rise for the region, and to not adopt the State Planning Policy (SPP) requirements.</p>	<p><b>No change - Not amendment related</b></p> <p>The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Governments Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.</p> <p>In accordance with the South East Queensland Regional Plan 2017 (<i>Shaping SEQ</i>) and the State Planning Policy 2017 (SPP), climate change is an issue that all local governments need to address within planning schemes and planning scheme policies. The MBRC Planning Scheme was prepared to reflect the 2014 SPP. A change in Council's policy position on sea level rise or reflecting the 2017 SPP are not part of this proposed amendment.</p>	No
16.7	MBRC	<p><b>High risk area</b></p> <p>Request to remove '**' from 'High risk area' in Flood hazard overlay for 'New development' to align with Code.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to ensure consistency between the planning scheme and Planning Scheme Policy (PSP). The proposed amendments as advertised allow for 'New developments' within High risk area of the Flood hazard overlay to not required a Structural Engineering Design Report where the maximum flow velocity exceeds 1.5m/second. This is inconsistent with the Flood hazard overlay code. Therefore, the '**' associated with the High-risk area is to be removed to align with the Flood hazard code. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.</p>	Yes

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Changes Proposed (Yes or No)
16.8	MBRC	<p><b>Velocity in Minor works</b></p> <p>Concern was raised that 'minor works' required a higher level of technical reporting than a 'new development' in accordance with <i>Table 2 Technical reports</i>. Request to include a reporting threshold consistent with 'new development'.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to ensure consistency between the planning scheme and Planning Scheme Policy (PSP). The proposed amendments as advertised allow for 'New developments' within the Medium risk area of the Flood hazard overlay to be exempt from a Structural Engineering Design Report in certain circumstances. However, this same exemption does not apply for Minor works such as extensions.</p> <p>A further change has been made to clarify the requirements reflected within the Flood hazard overlay code and provide consistency between the PSP and Flood and Coastal hazard overlay codes. These changes to the PSP will be provided to the State Government for its information.</p>	Yes
16.9	MBRC	<p><b>New development heading</b></p> <p>Request to remove the proposed amendments to specify Material Change of Use and Reconfiguring a Lot in the heading 'New development' in <i>Table 2 Technical reports</i> as it is considered too prescriptive and would potentially exclude Building works from complying with requirements.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to ensure consistency within the Planning Scheme Policy (PSP). The proposed amendment as advertised sought to provide clarity on what constitutes a 'New development'. However, Building works and Operational works can also be 'New development' and should be captured by the heading 'New development'. A further change has been made to remove the proposed new text in brackets to align with the existing headings in a simplified format. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.</p>	Yes
			<b>PSP INTEGRATED DESIGN - APPENDIX A</b>	
16.10	A18965133	<p><b>Standard drawings</b></p> <p>Concern that the referenced standard drawings are incorrect, irrelevant and contain conflicting information.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised included construction standards for driveway and crossovers. Moreton Bay Regional Council (MBRC) does not have any alternate standard drawings for driveway crossovers at this point in time. The planning scheme refers to the Institute of Public Works Engineering Australasia (IPWEA) drawings as well as AS2890.1. The reference to these drawings is current in this instance. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p>	No
16.11	A18965133	<p><b>Self-assessable driveways</b></p> <p>Concern regarding Note only applying where driveways are 'self-assessable' when it should apply in all instances. Concern also raised that 'self-assessable' is old terminology and should be updated in accordance with the <i>Planning Act 2016</i>.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to align wording with the <i>Planning Act 2016</i>.</p> <p>Driveways and pedestrian crossovers are not always 'self-assessable'. The guidelines for self-assessable works are in accordance with Council's current policy position, therefore no further change is required.</p> <p>Further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.</p>	Yes

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Changes Proposed (Yes or No)
16.12	A18965133	<b>Pedestrian access during construction</b>  Concern was raised that the provision of a pedestrian path during crossover construction cannot be enforced. Recommend additional note to condition compliance with the requirements.	<b>No change - Amendment related</b>  The proposed amendments as advertised sought to provide safety standards while driveways and crossovers are under construction. The planning scheme allows for the assessment manager to condition compliance with the requirements set out in the Planning Scheme Policy (PSP). Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.	No
16.13	MBRC	<b>Impervious area parameters</b>  Suggest a further amendment to improve clarity of requirements in the new table to determine the fraction impervious area for each zone in relation to the Rural residential zone.	<b>Change - Amendment related</b>  Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to clarify the intent of the proposed amendment. A further change has been made to the table to clarify the circumstances where the lot is exactly 6000m <sup>2</sup> and up to and including 2ha in area. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.	Yes
16.14	A18965133	<b>Grammatical and formatting changes</b>  Request to amend lowercase letters to capital letters where incorrect and remove the word 'as' from the section.	<b>Change - Amendment related</b>  Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to correct minor grammatical errors. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.	Yes
16.15	A18965133	<b>Grammatical and formatting changes</b>  Request to change heading text of Section 14.1 of the Planning Scheme Policy - Integrated Design - Appendix A from 'Driveway crossover and driveway' to 'Requirements for accepted development for driveways and driveway crossovers'.	<b>No change - Amendment related</b>  The proposed amendments as advertised included the heading for section 14 of the Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) - Integrated Design - Appendix A 'Driveway crossover and driveway. As not all driveway crossovers are accepted development subject to requirements, introducing a change to the heading to would be unnecessary. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.	No
16.16	A18965133	<b>Grammatical and formatting changes</b>  Request to amend uppercase letters to lowercase letters where incorrect and change wording to align with the <i>Planning Act 2016</i> .	<b>Change - Amendment related</b>  Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to correct minor grammatical errors. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.	Yes
16.17	A18965133	<b>Grammatical and formatting changes</b>  Request to align the terminologies with <i>Planning Act 2016</i> .	<b>Change - Amendment related</b>  Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to correct the use of the superseded terminology 'self-assessable', to align with the <i>Planning Act 2016</i> . These further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.	Yes
16.18	A18965133	<b>Grammatical and formatting changes</b>  Request to amend lowercase letters to capital letters where incorrect.	<b>Change - Amendment related</b>  Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to correct minor grammatical errors. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.	Yes

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Changes Proposed (Yes or No)
16.19	A18965133	<b>Grammatical and formatting changes</b> Request to remove terminology 'and driveways' from Planning Scheme Policy (PSP).	<b>No change - Amendment related</b> The proposed amendments as advertised include driveway crossovers and driveways to be included in the Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) to ensure clarity and for safety reasons when constructing and locating this infrastructure. Accordingly, no further amendments are proposed.	No
16.20	A18965133	<b>Grammatical and formatting changes</b> Request to change the wording to provide clarity on where crossovers may be located.	<b>No change - Amendment related</b> The proposed amendments as advertised included crossover location requirements. The existing format for the driveway location not being directly adjoining a painted or concrete traffic island achieves the intended outcome. While the suggested rewording would achieve an accurate outcome, the current formatting is simplified. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.	No
16.21	A18965133	<b>Grammatical and formatting changes</b> Request to amend lowercase letters to capital letters where incorrect.	<b>Change - Amendment related</b> Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to correct minor grammatical errors. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.	Yes
16.22	A18965133	<b>Grammatical and formatting changes</b> Request to amend lowercase letters to capital letters where incorrect	<b>Change - Amendment related</b> Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to correct minor grammatical errors. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.	Yes
16.23	A18965133	<b>Grammatical and formatting changes</b> Request to amend uppercase letters to lowercase letters where incorrect.	<b>Change - Amendment related</b> Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to correct minor grammatical errors. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.	Yes
16.24	A18965133	<b>Grammatical and formatting changes</b> Request to include new subparagraph where it is believed to be missing.	<b>Change - Amendment related</b> Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to provide clarity on construction requirements. The requirement for a barrier with warning flags is required when the construction site is unattended as a safety requirement. Therefore, the inclusion of an additional subparagraph as suggested to address when the site is attended is unnecessary. However, for clarity, it is proposed to amend 'between sunset and sunrise' to 'outside of work hours'. This ensures the warning barriers are in place when the site is unattended. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.	Yes
16.25	A18965133	<b>Grammatical and formatting changes</b> Request to amend lowercase letters to capital letters where incorrect.	<b>Change - Amendment related</b> Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to correct minor grammatical errors. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.	Yes

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Changes Proposed (Yes or No)
16.26	A18965133	<b>Grammatical and formatting changes</b>  Request to amend lowercase letters to capital letters where incorrect.	<b>Change - Amendment related</b>  Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to correct minor grammatical errors. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.	Yes
16.27	A18965133	<b>Grammatical and formatting changes</b>  Request to amend lowercase letters to capital letters where incorrect.	<b>Change - Amendment related</b>  Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to correct minor grammatical errors. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.	Yes
16.28	A18965133	<b>Grammatical and formatting changes</b>  Request to amend lowercase letters to capital letters where incorrect.	<b>Change - Amendment related</b>  Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to correct minor grammatical errors. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.	Yes
16.29	A18965133	<b>Grammatical and formatting changes</b>  Request to amend lowercase letters to capital letters where incorrect.	<b>Change - Amendment related</b>  Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to correct minor grammatical errors. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.	Yes
16.30	A18965133	<b>Implications of compliance criteria</b>  Concern regarding 'Construction' compliance criteria being unachievable due to timing (i.e. post construction). Request for reconsideration and re-wording of 'Construction' requirements for driveway crossovers.	<b>Change - Amendment related</b>  Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to clarify the intent of the construction requirements. The proposed amendments as advertised seek to ensure clarity on construction criteria for crossovers. Section 14.1.1.3 of the Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) sets out the criteria for construction of a driveway crossover.  It is proposed to re-word criteria in order to specify an achievable timing for each point. Minor changes to the wording have also been made to achieve alignment with the intent of the section. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.	Yes
16.31	A18978669	<b>Intersection management</b>  Request Council standard requirements for intersection corner radii be reinstated in the Intersection management table.	<b>Change - Amendment related</b>  Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to clarify intersection radius requirements. The intersection radius detail was previously located in <i>Intersection Management and Pedestrian Crossings</i> Table of the Planning Scheme Policy (PSP); however, the proposed new Table 12 <i>Intersection Management</i> has remained silent on the requirements. Therefore, a note has been included to reference Austroads for the required intersection radius. It is further noted that Austroads was misspelt and has been corrected. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.	Yes

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Changes Proposed (Yes or No)
16.32	A18970077	<p><b>Road typologies (reduce)</b></p> <p>Request reduction in the road typology widths for Access Residential, Living Residential, and Contemporary Residential.</p> <p>Concern road typology widths have increased and are unnecessarily generous as design and servicing requirements do not require the widths proposed.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendment as advertised included road typologies. The road typologies outlined in Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) - Appendix A are the appropriate width for each typology and in accordance with Council's current policy position. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p>	No
16.33	A18963853 A18965291	<p><b>Road typologies (increase)</b></p> <p>Concern was raised for existing small lot developments having narrow roads, restricted street parking and traffic flows. Request for road widths to be increased in new developments.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised included road typologies. The road typologies outlined in Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) - Integrated design - Appendix A are the appropriate width for each road typology and are in accordance with Council's current policy position. It is acknowledged that these typologies apply to new developments and those approved under the MBRC Planning Scheme. There are developments within the region with narrower road widths, such as in Griffin and Narangba, that were assessed and approved in accordance with superseded planning scheme requirements rather than the current MBRC Planning Scheme. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p>	No
16.34	A18970077	<p><b>Direct lot access</b></p> <p>Request to allow direct lot access of up to 6,000 vehicles per day. Concern the restriction on vehicles is inconsistent with industry standards and does not increase the level of the road function to 'trunk'.</p>	<p><b>No change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>The proposed amendments as advertised sought to confirm the allowable direct lot access. The existing direct lot access allows up to 3999 vehicles without Council consideration, while 4000 to 5999 are considered at Council's discretion. Therefore, 6000 vehicles per day can be supported with Council approval. These thresholds are considered appropriate given the impact direct lot access can have on traffic environments. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p> <p>Furthermore, the direct lot access requirements outlined in Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) - Appendix A are considered an appropriate number of vehicles per day, and in accordance with Council's current policy position. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.</p>	No
16.35	A18973914	<p><b>Pavement base layer</b></p> <p>Recommend alignment of compaction requirements between Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) - Integrated Design - Appendix A and PSP - Operational works and bonding procedures.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council have further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to clarify the pavement base layer requirements. In accordance with Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) - Operational works and bonding procedures, the compaction for a pavement base layer is to be 100%, however there is an inconsistency with PSP - Integrated design - Appendix A which states 102%. Therefore PSP - Integrated design - Appendix A has been amended to be consistent. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.</p>	Yes
16.36	MBRC	<p><b>Driveway loading</b></p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p>	Yes

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Changes Proposed (Yes or No)
		Recommend alignment within Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) - Integrated design - Appendix A - Streets, roads and utilities for driveway loading design requirements.	Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to clarify driveway loading design requirements. In accordance with Section 13.11 <i>Design Basis</i> of PSP - Integrated design - Appendix A - Streets, roads and utilities, the loading for a driveway is to be 2.5 x 103, this error has been amended accordingly. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.	
			<b>PSP - INTEGRATED DESIGN - APPENDIX C</b>	
16.37	A18965029 A18973914	<b>Minor drainage design (ARI)</b>  Request to reduce 10-year Annual Recurrence Interval (ARI) design to 2 or 5-year design to reduce developer cost on stormwater infrastructure and maintenance costs for Council. Questions how downstream constraints will be approved with increase to stormwater requirements.	<b>No change - Amendment related</b>  The proposed amendments as advertised include alignment of the stormwater infrastructure design requirements. The current <i>Minor System Design</i> table requires a variety of immunities and stormwater requirements across zones within the Moreton Bay region. The intent of the changes is to align the urban areas with one another to provide a standard immunity level for 10-year events. Furthermore, these changes align with the requirements defined in the Queensland Urban Drainage Manual (QUDM).  It is further noted that downstream constraints need to be addressed in the development application process, regardless of the proposed changes. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.	No
16.38	A18973914	<b>Easements</b>  Concern regarding expanding the scope of requirement for 4m wide easements to be for 'any other services' rather than only for an additional Sewer pipe <225mm diameter. Recommend removal of proposed amendment.	<b>No change - Amendment related</b>  The proposed amendments as advertised sought to clarify the intent of easement requirements. Sewer and water are provided by Unitywater, a separate entity to Council, therefore 'sewer pipe' has been removed from the easement width requirements. However, this term has been replaced with 'any other services' to capture consideration of these services within easements without specifying infrastructure regulated by another entity. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.	No
16.39	MBRC	<b>Image removal</b>  Request for image to be removed. All references to the following figure have been deleted but the image is still there.	<b>Change - Amendment related</b>  The proposed amendments as advertised sought to delete a figure from Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) - Integrated design - Appendix C. The intent to remove the image from the document was clear as all references to the image were marked for deletion. Accordingly, the figure has been deleted. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.	Yes
16.40	A18973914	<b>Major system</b>  Request further clarification of Council's expectation from the new text in section 1.7.4.1 Major System. Request clarity if the data required is for flood modelling or Council's internal flood mapping.	<b>No change - Amendment related</b>  The proposed amendments as advertised sought to provide clear parameters for determining the Defined Flood Event (DFE). The guidance set out in the Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) provides clarity on expectations for both internal and external purposes, including flood modelling and Council's internal flood mapping. Accordingly, no further amendments are proposed.	No
			<b>PSP - INTEGRATED DESIGN - APPENDIX D</b>	

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Changes Proposed (Yes or No)
16.41	A18972946	<b>Landscape dedication</b>  Concern that dedication of vegetation screening as road reserve will reduce development viability. Request landscape buffer areas be included in road reserve widths where achievable.	<b>No change - Amendment related</b>  The proposed amendments as advertised sought to ensure landscaping dedications to Council where appropriate. The parameters set out in the Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) - Integrated Design - Appendix D specify that land <u>may</u> be dedicated to Council when maintenance of landscaping is a concern. This is not an onerous outcome as it will not be implemented in all instances. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.	No
16.42	A18972946	<b>Mosquito landscape buffer</b>  Concern regarding the method used to identify the mosquito landscape buffer zone. Lack of clarity impacts on the ability to include potential additional cost at conception stage. Request the landscaping in mosquito buffer zones requirements be removed from the Planning Scheme Policy (PSP).	<b>No change - Amendment related</b>  The proposed amendments as advertised sought to ensure mosquito buffer zones are provided where necessary. Council does not have overlay mapping to indicate mosquito breeding grounds, nor does the planning scheme contain provisions to request buffer zones.  However, the purpose of section 5.5 Landscaping in mosquito buffer zones is to provide guidance for development proposals that mosquito breeding areas may be an issue. This section of the PSP will be used for guidance on a case by case basis, when mosquito breeding is a potential issue. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.	No
			<b>PSP - NEIGHBOURHOOD DESIGN</b>	
16.43	A18972892 A18978155 A18978669	<b>Movement networks</b>  Concern has been raised that the proposed movement networks are out of date and require updating.	<b>No change - Amendment related</b>  The proposed amendments as advertised included Movement network images to detail indicative road and pedestrian layouts in specific areas where growth or land use changes are anticipated or where the movement network outcomes may be difficult to determine due to existing constraints or road layouts. These images are indicative only and outline one way to achieve movement within an area. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.	No
16.44	MBRC	<b>Next generation neighbourhood precinct density</b>  Request for alignment of density requirements between the Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) and Next generation neighbourhood codes.	<b>Change - Amendment related</b>  Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to align the Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) with changes made to the planning scheme. In response to submissions received, the proposed change to remove maximum site density from the Next generation neighbourhood precinct is not proceeding. Accordingly, changes to the PSP - Neighbourhood design are required to ensure consistency between the PSP and zone code. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.	Yes
			<b>PSP - ENVIRONMENTAL AREAS AND CORRIDORS</b>	
16.45	A18972946	<b>Environmental matters</b>  Concern raised that vegetation sizes (trunk diameter) have not been specified in the Planning Scheme Policy (PSP), thereby	<b>No change - Not amendment related</b>  The proposed amendments as advertised sought to provide further information on environmental matters. The inclusion of the heading 'Matters not spatially represented' relates to the need to provide information regarding the geographical locations of Matters of National Environmental Significant (MNES) not available or complete	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Changes Proposed (Yes or No)
		opening up assessment criteria for non-koala habitat trees (i.e. decorative garden). Request to remove the requirement for 'matters not spatially represented' where they are external to mapped overlays.	in mapping. Commonwealth Government legislation protects MNES regardless of whether the area has been mapped as containing or supporting the MNES values.  Due to the absence of geographical information for all MNES it is not possible to include all MNES in the Environmental areas overlay, therefore the new heading as proposed, is considered to be appropriate. Accordingly, no further changes are proposed.	
16.46	MBRC	<b>Ecological assessment report table</b>  Concern was raised about the Ecological assessment report table not clearly conveying the intentions of when a report would be required. Request for amendments to the table to clarify when assessment reports are required.	<b>Change - Amendment related</b>  Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to ensure clarity within the Planning Scheme Policy (PSP). The proposed amendments as advertised sought to outline when vegetation management plans are to be submitted as part of the application assessment process. It is acknowledged that this intent is not clear in the table. Accordingly, a further amendment has been made to simplify and clarify the table, while maintaining the policy objectives. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.	Yes
16.47	MBRC	<b>Vegetation clearing clarification</b> Suggestion that 'where habitat trees and vegetation cannot be avoided...' should be changed to 'Where the clearing of habitat trees and vegetation cannot be avoided'.	<b>Change - Amendment related</b> Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to ensure clarity within the Planning Scheme Policy (PSP). The proposed amendments, as advertised, sought to clarify that vegetation removal was to occur where it cannot be avoided. Accordingly, a further amendment has been made to clarify that the sentence relates to clearing of vegetation. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.	Yes
			<b>PSP - OPERATIONAL WORKS AND BONDING PROCEDURES</b>	
16.48	A18973914	<b>Deferred works</b>  Concern regarding the flexibility for providing concrete footpaths as deferred works. Request clarification of the intent of the proposed removal of concrete footpaths from deferred works.	<b>Change - Amendment related</b>  Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to enable footpaths to be considered by Council for deferred works. An additional note has been added to further clarify that topography and alignment of driveways and footpaths will be a key consideration for this item. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.	Yes
16.49	A18973914	<b>Terms and conditions additional requirements</b>  Concern regarding new or additional requirements in the terms and conditions of the Planning Scheme Policy (PSP). Recommend relocating sections to the body of the PSP for clarity and consistency.	<b>No change - Amendment related</b>  The proposed amendments as advertised seek to ensure Operational works and bonding procedures are detailed within the appropriate PSP. The 'Terms and Conditions' attached to Appendix D - 'Request for on maintenance', are a concise summary of the requirements in Section 4 - Maintenance Requirements and Security of the PSP, and do not include any additional requirements. Accordingly, no further changes are required.	No
			<b>PSP - RESIDENTIAL DESIGN</b>	

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Changes Proposed (Yes or No)
16.50	MBRC	<p><b>Next generation neighbourhood precinct density</b></p> <p>Request for alignment of density requirements between the Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) and Next generation neighbourhood codes.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment related</b></p> <p>Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to align the planning scheme policy with changes made to the planning scheme. The advertised change to remove maximum site density from the Next generation neighbourhood precinct is not proceeding. The changes to the Planning Scheme Policy (PSP) - Residential design are to ensure alignment between the PSP and zone code. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for its information.</p>	Yes

## Theme 17 - Not Amendment Related

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
17.1	A18749925	<b>Footpaths</b> Request for a footpath from Cliffdale Avenue to the Deception Bay Library.	<b>No change - Not planning scheme related</b> The matter raised is not regulated by the planning scheme. Your feedback has been referred to the relevant department within Council for further consideration.	No
17.2	A18963902	<b>Bicycle Path connections</b> Request for bicycle path connections throughout the Moreton Bay Region.	<b>No change - Not planning scheme related</b> The matter raised is not regulated by the planning scheme. Your feedback has been referred to the relevant department within Council for further consideration.	No
17.3	A18963939	<b>Traffic calming measures</b> Request for traffic calming measures on multiple roads in Clontarf.	<b>No change - Not planning scheme related</b> The matter raised is not regulated by the planning scheme. Your feedback has been referred to the relevant department within Council for further consideration.	No
17.4	A18963111	<b>Pedestrian crossing</b> Request for a pedestrian crossing to be installed outside Caboolture Hospital.	<b>No change - Not planning scheme related</b> The matter raised is not regulated by the planning scheme. Your feedback has been referred to relevant department within Council for further consideration.	No
17.5	A18963161	<b>Improved Roads</b> Request for new or improved roads to be established in and out of Strathpine. Concern that Gympie Road is not handling the pressure placed upon it.	<b>No change - Not planning scheme related</b> The matter raised is not regulated by the planning scheme. Gympie Road is a state-controlled road and upgrades are determined and undertaken by the Queensland Government. Council will continue to work with the State Government to ensure services and infrastructure are delivered in an efficient and effective manner. Your feedback has been referred to the relevant department within Council for further consideration.	No
17.6	A18965144	<b>Road infrastructure improvements</b> Concern that residential growth in Redcliffe is not matched by increases in schools, hospitals, road infrastructure and other vital services.	<b>No change - Not amendment related</b> The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Government's Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission. Your feedback in relation to road infrastructure in Redcliffe has been referred to the relevant department within Council for consideration.	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
			The planning and delivery of public schools and hospitals is undertaken by the Queensland Government however, Council will continue to work with the State Government to ensure services and infrastructure are delivered in an efficient and effective manner.	
17.7	A18826078	<b>Bypass road in Samford</b>  Request for a bypass road in the Samford area.	<b>No change - Not planning scheme related</b>  The matter raised is not regulated by the planning scheme. Your feedback has been referred to the appropriate area of Council for further consideration.  Your feedback has been referred to the relevant department within Council for further consideration.	No
17.8	A18853164	<b>Infrastructure and population growth</b>  Concern that existing infrastructure cannot keep up with the increasing population.	<b>No change - Not amendment related</b>  The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Government's Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.  Council's Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP) identifies future infrastructure required for the road, stormwater and open space networks which Council manage. Council will continue to plan for future infrastructure including upgrades, to support an increasing population.  Your feedback has been referred to the relevant department within Council for further consideration.	No
17.9	A18963129  A18963305	<b>Additional recreation facilities</b>  Requests for additional recreational spaces and playground equipment.	<b>No change - Not amendment related</b>  The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Government's Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.  Council's Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP) identifies future infrastructure required for the road, stormwater and open space networks which Council manage. The LGIP identifies the desired standards of service for embellishments for parks including skate opportunities, youth activity spaces and play areas. Council will continue to plan for future infrastructure including upgrades, to support an increasing population.  Your feedback has been referred to the relevant department within Council for further consideration.	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
17.10	A18963305	<b>Carport costs</b>  Concerned that the costs of builder's fees and Council fees are too high for the approval of carports.	<b>No change - Not planning scheme related</b>  The matter raised is not regulated by the planning scheme. Your feedback has been referred to the appropriate area of Council for further consideration.  Council's fees and charges are reviewed yearly.	No
17.11	A18963325  A18963359	<b>Rates methodology</b>  Requests for changes to Council's methodology for calculating property rates when a secondary dwelling is built.	<b>No change - Not planning scheme related</b>  The matter raised is not regulated by the planning scheme. Your feedback has been referred to the relevant department within Council for further consideration.	No
17.12	A18963359	<b>Records of secondary dwellings</b>  Recommends that Council should have a record of building certification for secondary dwellings which is available to neighbouring properties.	<b>No change - Not planning scheme related</b>  The matter raised is not regulated by the planning scheme. Your feedback has been referred to the relevant department within Council for further consideration.  Planning approvals involving building work are shown on PD online; however, building approvals are not. If you are concerned that the construction of a building is not compliant with Council requirements, you can call Council on (07) 5433 2640.	No
17.13	A18979919  A18916658	<b>Shade</b>  Requests for more shade in the region from trees or structures.	<b>No change - Not amendment related</b>  The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Government's Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.  The planning scheme and planning scheme policies contain requirements and guidance information in relation to landscaping, including deep planting zones, the provision of street trees and the retention of native vegetation wherever possible. This matter is considered to be adequately catered for within the planning scheme.  Council will monitor the effects of the existing planning scheme provisions to determine if any further changes to the planning scheme are warranted in the future.	No
17.14	A18963853	<b>Train station car parking</b>  Concern that there is not enough car parking for train stations.	<b>No change - Not planning scheme related</b>  The matter raised is not regulated by the planning scheme. Train station car parking areas are provided by Queensland Rail as they are a Queensland Government infrastructure item.	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
17.15	A18977144 A18977160	<b>Oversailing</b> This submission mentions the issue of oversailing (where a crane overhangs surrounding properties). It is suggested that developers need an oversailing license which is signed by the affected residents. It is also suggested that developers should be required to submit plans to indicate when and where the crane will oversail other properties.	<b>No change - Not planning scheme related</b> The matter raised is not regulated by the planning scheme. Council does not require applicants to lodge plans showing oversailing locations or times. Crane operators require a license to operate this type of machinery. Council are not the regulating authority for these practices.	No
17.16	A18965375	<b>Information sheet wording</b> Objection to the use of the term 'proposed development' within the information sheet for the residential uses code.	<b>No change - Not amendment related</b> The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Government's Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.  The information sheet for the Residential uses code provided during consultation used the term 'proposed development' throughout. Proposed development refers to development applications that are either with Council for assessment but have not been decided or development applications that have been approved but not constructed.	No
17.17	A18979919 A18854702 A18926729	<b>Public consultation</b> Request for the opportunity for more frequent and longer engagement on planning matters.	<b>No change - Not amendment related</b> Council undertakes public consultation for planning scheme amendments as required by the Planning Act and the Queensland Government's Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR). However, your feedback is acknowledged. This matter has been recorded for future consideration. Council will update submitters on the progress of this matter before August 2020.	No
17.18	A18965210	<b>Extinguishment of an easement</b> Request for the existing easements at 743-757 Deception Bay Road, Rothwell to be extinguished in order to allow for a walkable centre.	<b>No change - Not planning scheme related</b> The matter raised is not regulated by the planning scheme. The MBRC Planning Scheme does not determine or action the surrender of easements. This is regulated by the Land Title Act 1994. The parties burdened and benefited by the easement must sign an agreement to surrender it. The relevant forms can be accessed through the Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy website.	No
17.19	A18709754	<b>Telecommunication tower</b> Requests further consideration of a telecommunications tower planned for Hipathites Road in Samsonvale. The	<b>No change - Not planning scheme related</b> Telecommunications facilities can be located in the Rural zone provided that they meet the relevant planning scheme requirements. Telecommunication facilities must be designed and operated in a manner that does	No

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		property owners are opposed to its construction as they moved to their property to avoid EMF radiation.	not cause human exposure to electromagnetic radiation beyond the current limits outlined in federal legislation.  Your feedback has been referred to the relevant department within Council for further consideration.	
17.20	A18963780	<b>Brothels</b>  Concerns regarding brothels in residential or commercial areas.	<b>No change - Not amendment related</b>  The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Government's Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.  Brothels are discouraged in all areas of the Moreton Bay Region and are subject to high levels of scrutiny during development assessment. Furthermore, Brothels are prohibited development under the <i>Planning Regulation 2017</i> if proposed within 200m of a residential area, residential building or a public building.	No
17.21	A18737226	<b>Building / development compliance</b>  Recommends Council should have 'qualified building inspectors'.  Suggests that Council undertakes 'land drilling' before new dwellings are constructed.  Recommends that built to boundary walls should have Council approved 'wall footings'.	<b>No change - Not planning scheme related</b>  The matters raised are not regulated by the planning scheme. In relation to building inspections, these are undertaken by private building certification companies. Private building certifiers inspect and approve building work under state legislation.  With regard to land drilling, Council is not responsible for undertaking drilling or soil testing in areas that are not identified as having landslide hazard. In relation to 'built to boundary walls', the planning scheme provides guidance on the location and size of built to boundary walls as well as the amenity impacts of them. The design of wall footings for built to boundary walls is not within Council's jurisdiction.	No
17.22	A18916658	<b>Community facilities</b>  Request for more community facilities for exercise and recreation.	<b>No change - Not amendment related</b>  The matter raised is not related to the proposed amendments. To ensure appropriate community consultation and transparency around changes to the planning scheme, the Queensland Government's Minister's Guidelines and Rules (MGR) includes limits around the matters Council can change post consultation. As this matter does not relate to the proposed amendments, Council has determined no change can occur at this time in response to this submission.  Council's Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP) identifies desired standards of service for community facilities and public parks. The LGIP also identifies the desired standards of service for community facilities and embellishments for parks.  Your feedback has been referred to the relevant department within Council for further consideration.	No

## Theme 18 - State Interest Review Matters

### Conditions

	Conditions	Timing	Council response
	<b>State Planning Policy (SPP) 2017 - State interest: Development and construction - Policy 8</b>		
18.1	<p>Retain the current zoning (General residential zone) on the western portion of land described as Lot 5 SP240478, fronting Wararba Crescent, Caboolture. To remove any doubt, do not rezone this land to Community facilities zone.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> This land is surplus state-owned land which was not required for the completion of the Caboolture Police Station. Public benefit outcomes on state-owned land are achieved by appropriately zoning the land.</p>	Prior to giving the proposed amendment to the Minister requesting approval to adopt.	<b>Change made.</b>
	<b>SPP - State interest: Natural hazards, risk and resilience (flood hazard) - Policy 2</b>		
18.2	<p>Provide evidence that Council has conducted a fit-for-purpose risk assessment in accordance with <i>AS/NZS ISO31000:2009 Risk Management</i>.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> This assessment is required to identify and achieve an acceptable or tolerable level of risk for personal safety and property in natural hazard areas.</p>	Prior to giving the proposed amendment to the Minister requesting approval to adopt.	<b>Evidence to be provided.</b>
	<b>South East Queensland Regional Plan 2017 (<i>ShapingSEQ</i>) - Chapter 3, Part B: The regional growth pattern</b>		
18.3	<p>Retain the current zoning (Rural zone) on land described as Lot A AP20953, at 863 Caboolture River Road, Upper Caboolture. To remove any doubt, do not rezone this land to Emerging community zone.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> This land is within the Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area (RLRPA), as identified in <i>ShapingSEQ</i> - Map 7 Regional land use categories. <i>ShapingSEQ</i> states that the RLRPA is to be protected from inappropriate development, particularly urban and rural residential development. Any change to an urban zone within the RLRPA must be supported by sufficient justification against the requirements contained within <i>ShapingSEQ</i>.</p>	Prior to giving the proposed amendment to the Minister requesting approval to adopt.	<b>Change made.</b>
	<b>Planning Act 2016 section 4(e)</b>		
18.4	<p>Retain the following figures and all references to the figures (for example, in the Reconfiguring a lot code for the General residential zone - Next generation neighbourhood precinct) within the planning scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Figure 1 - Dakabin</li> <li>b) Figure 2 - Griffin</li> <li>c) Figure 3 - Mango Hill East</li> <li>d) Figure 4 - Murrumba Downs</li> <li>e) Figure 5 - Narangba east</li> <li>f) Figure 6 - Rothwell</li> </ul> <p>To remove any doubt, do not move these figures to a planning scheme policy.</p>	Prior to giving the proposed amendment to the Minister requesting approval to adopt.	<b>Change made.</b>

	Conditions	Timing	Council response		
	<p><u>Reason:</u> The figures provide direction about traffic and transport movement, which is specifically required by the associated provisions in the planning scheme. As such, the figures form part of the regulation within the planning scheme, not as a support to the planning scheme. As per section 4(e) of the Planning Act, planning scheme policies should be used to support the benchmarks and policies of the planning scheme. It is not the intent that a planning scheme policy replaces the regulation in a planning scheme.</p>				
	<p><b>Planning Act 2016 section 8(5) and the Building Act 1975</b></p>				
18.5	<p>Remove the new Performance Outcome (PO) and Example (E) relating to retaining structures, wherever it occurs throughout the proposed amendment. For example, the PO and E which has been added after PO64 in Table 6.2.1.1.1 Assessable development - Caboolture centre precinct:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="163 526 982 1052"> <tr> <td data-bbox="163 526 569 1052"> <p><b>PO</b></p> <p>All earth retaining structures are to be certified as being designed and constructed in accordance with relevant Australian Standards and Building Code requirements.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="569 526 982 1052"> <p><b>E</b></p> <p>Retaining walls are designed and certified by a RPEQ so that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the minimum design life (the period assumed in design for which a structure or structural element is required to perform its intended purpose without replacement or major structural repairs) for the earth retaining structure is that specified in Australian Standard AS 4678 Earth-retaining structures;</li> <li>b. earth retaining structures within the land and around areas of cut on or near the boundaries of the site must be designed to allow for live and dead loads associated with the land/premise's current occupancy and use;</li> <li>c. where the adjoining land use rights or zoning allows for industrial uses a minimum live load of 25kPA must be allowed in the design of the retaining structure for these adjoining premises.</li> </ul> <p>Note - Retaining walls will only be approved following submission of a full detailed design certified by a RPEQ.</p> </td> </tr> </table> <p><u>Reason:</u> Retaining walls are regulated through the building assessment provisions. Therefore, in accordance with section 8(5) of the Planning Act, they must not be included in the planning scheme, unless allowed under the <i>Building Act 1975</i>.</p>	<p><b>PO</b></p> <p>All earth retaining structures are to be certified as being designed and constructed in accordance with relevant Australian Standards and Building Code requirements.</p>	<p><b>E</b></p> <p>Retaining walls are designed and certified by a RPEQ so that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the minimum design life (the period assumed in design for which a structure or structural element is required to perform its intended purpose without replacement or major structural repairs) for the earth retaining structure is that specified in Australian Standard AS 4678 Earth-retaining structures;</li> <li>b. earth retaining structures within the land and around areas of cut on or near the boundaries of the site must be designed to allow for live and dead loads associated with the land/premise's current occupancy and use;</li> <li>c. where the adjoining land use rights or zoning allows for industrial uses a minimum live load of 25kPA must be allowed in the design of the retaining structure for these adjoining premises.</li> </ul> <p>Note - Retaining walls will only be approved following submission of a full detailed design certified by a RPEQ.</p>	<p>Prior to giving the proposed amendment to the Minister requesting approval to adopt.</p>	<p><b>Change made.</b></p>
<p><b>PO</b></p> <p>All earth retaining structures are to be certified as being designed and constructed in accordance with relevant Australian Standards and Building Code requirements.</p>	<p><b>E</b></p> <p>Retaining walls are designed and certified by a RPEQ so that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the minimum design life (the period assumed in design for which a structure or structural element is required to perform its intended purpose without replacement or major structural repairs) for the earth retaining structure is that specified in Australian Standard AS 4678 Earth-retaining structures;</li> <li>b. earth retaining structures within the land and around areas of cut on or near the boundaries of the site must be designed to allow for live and dead loads associated with the land/premise's current occupancy and use;</li> <li>c. where the adjoining land use rights or zoning allows for industrial uses a minimum live load of 25kPA must be allowed in the design of the retaining structure for these adjoining premises.</li> </ul> <p>Note - Retaining walls will only be approved following submission of a full detailed design certified by a RPEQ.</p>				

## Formal Advice

	Building assessment provisions in planning schemes	Council Response
18.6	<p>Moreton Bay Regional Council (Council) is advised that during the assessment of the proposed amendment, the Department of State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning (the department) identified that the proposed amendment and the current planning scheme contain provisions about building work that is regulated through the building assessment provisions of the <i>Building Act 1975</i> (Building Act).</p> <p>Section 8(5) of the <i>Planning Act 2016</i> (the Planning Act) states that a local planning instrument must not include a provision about building work, to the extent the building work is regulated under the building assessment provisions, unless allowed under the Building Act.</p> <p>To assist Queensland Councils in addressing this issue more broadly, the department will be working with the Department of Housing and Public Works to undertake a state-wide review of building assessment provisions in planning schemes. The outcomes of this review will provide a pathway forward for Council to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) identify instances in the planning scheme which do not comply with section 8(5) of the Planning Act</li> <li>(ii) assist in rectifying any non-compliance through a future amendment to the planning scheme.</li> </ul>	<p>Council acknowledge the Chief Executive's formal advice and confirms its willingness to work with the Department of State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning (DSDMIP) and the Department of Housing and Public works on a review of building assessment provisions in the planning scheme. Council welcomes the opportunity to discuss the role of existing provisions and to receive clarity around a common understanding of the practical application of the term 'building work'.</p> <p>In response to this advice, Council has supported changes to the proposed amendment which seek to reduce or remove incidences where the proposed amendment contains provisions about building work which are regulated through the building assessment provisions. This includes compliance with Chief Executive condition 5. and changes in response to DSDMIP's informal advice (received 30 August 2019).</p>

## Additional Advice

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response (Recommendation and rationale)	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
18.7	DSDMIP	<p><b>Correct editorial error</b></p> <p>Recommends definitions for Drainage Investigation Area and Drainage master plan are included in the scheme.</p> <p>Identifies editorial error in third line of note immediately preceding the new text.</p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment Related</b></p> <p>Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to the note to correct the identified grammatical error.</p> <p>Council will consider incorporating definitions for Drainage Investigation Area and Drainage master plan in a future amendment to the planning scheme.</p> <p>These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.</p>	Yes
18.8	DSDMIP	<p><b>Remove reference to <i>Sustainable Planning Regulation 2009</i></b></p>	<p><b>Change - Amendment Related</b></p>	Yes

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response (Recommendation and rationale)	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		There is a reference to the repealed <i>Sustainable Planning Regulation 2009</i> . Suggest this is amended to reflect the <i>Planning Regulation 2017</i> .	Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to ensure the reference reflects the appropriate section of the <i>Planning Regulation 2017</i> . These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.	
18.9	DSDMIP	<b>Amend reference to Walking catchment distance</b>  The defined term in Schedule 1 is “walking distance” not “walking catchment distance”. Suggest wording be updated to reflect new definition.	<b>Change - Amendment Related</b>  Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to ensure the defined term is used consistently throughout the planning scheme. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.	Yes
18.10	DSDMIP	<b>Petrie Priority development Area</b>  Recommends consistency in how the Petrie Priority Development Area (PDA) is treated in the planning scheme.  Suggested changes relate to aligning the planning scheme with The Mill at Moreton Bay PDA Development Scheme.	<b>Change - Amendment Related</b>  Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to ensure the Petrie Priority Development Area (PDA) is appropriately referenced and mapped throughout the planning scheme. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.	Yes
18.11	DSDMIP	<b>Clarity on the use of the terms ‘vertical lines’ and ‘rhythm’</b>  Questions how the requirement for redevelopment to incorporate building openings and windows with vertical lines and rhythm is achievable as a Requirement for Accepted Development (RAD). This wording is not clear or measurable.	<b>Change - Amendment Related</b>  Council has further considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to remove the phrase ‘ <i>with vertical lines and rhythm</i> ’. The change will ensure the provisions within the Requirements for Accepted Development (RADs) are clear and measurable. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.	Yes
18.12	DSDMIP	<b>Clarify minimum earthworks requirements</b>  Suggests providing wording that more clearly conveys the intent of these requirements.	<b>Change - Amendment related</b>  Council have considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to clarify the limitations of placing fill in certain circumstances. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.	Yes
18.13	DSDMIP	<b>Clarify car parking requirements for Hotels</b>  Suggests rewording these requirements to make the meaning clear for car parking spaces for a hotel.	<b>Change - Amendment related</b>  Council have considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to clarify how to calculate the required number of car parking spaces for a hotel. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.	Yes
18.14	DSDMIP	<b>Multiple ground level definitions</b>	<b>Change - Amendment related</b>	Yes

#	Issue raised by	Summary of issue	Response (Recommendation and rationale)	Change Proposed (Yes or No)
		Retain only the Ground Level definition from the Planning Regulation 2017, remove additional definitions.  Note: the definition for 'Ground level' in the MBRC scheme is very similar to the definition of Ground level in the Regulation.	Council have considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to remove additional definitions relating to ground level to ensure the planning scheme definitions do not complicate or alter the definition of 'ground level' within the <i>Planning Regulation 2017</i> . These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.	
18.15	DSDMIP	<b>Clarify definition of Net Residential Density</b>  Suggests that the wording of the definition and example for net residential density is unclear.	<b>Change - Amendment related</b>  Council have considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to clarify the definition of Net residential density. This further change will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.	<b>Yes</b>
18.16	DSDMIP	<b>QDC MP1.4</b>  Suggest removal of the Filling or excavation Requirement for Accepted Development (RAD) and Example (E) or include a note to clarify that the provisions do not address building of class 1 (residential dwelling) or 10 (non-habitable structure such as a private garage), and subsequent occurrences of similar provisions throughout the planning scheme.	<b>Change - Amendment related</b>  Council have considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to clarify that building work covered by QDC MP1.4 is excluded from this provision. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.	<b>Yes</b>
18.17	DSDMIP	<b>Building assessment provisions - High water resistance</b>  Remove provisions that regulate materials used for flooring, wherever it occurs throughout the planning scheme.  Buildings located in a storm surge area (Coastal hazard overlay) can still regulate this matter.	<b>Change - Amendment related</b>  Council have considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to ensure the planning scheme does not mandate 'high water resistance' for buildings captured by the building assessment provisions. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.	<b>Yes</b>
18.18	DSDMIP	<b>Building assessment provisions - Roof drainage</b>  Suggest removing the requirement for roof drainage infrastructure as this falls within the scope of the building assessment provisions.	<b>Change - Amendment related</b>  Council have considered the matter raised, and further amendments have been made to ensure provisions in the planning scheme refer to 'inter-allotment drainage' rather than 'roof and allotment drainage'. These further changes will be provided to the State Government for final consideration.	<b>Yes</b>

End.