



The Hon. Cameron Dick MP
Minister for State Development, Manufacturing,
Infrastructure and Planning

Our ref: OUT18/7659

Your ref: A386630

1 William Street
Brisbane QLD 4000
PO Box 15009 City East
Queensland 4002 Australia
Telephone +61 7 3719 7200
Email statedevelopment@ministerial.qld.gov.au
www.dsdmip.qld.gov.au

Mr Neil Laurie
The Clerk of the Parliament
Parliament House
Corner of Alice and George Streets
BRISBANE QLD 4000

Email: TableOffice@parliament.qld.gov.au

Dear Mr Laurie

Thank you for your letter of 5 November 2018 regarding petition 2990-18: Review of the South East Queensland Regional Plan. I understand that the petitioners are concerned about overdevelopment within the Moreton Bay Regional Council local government area (LGA), particularly the potential impacts of the recent proposal to rezone land at Warner (known as the Warner Investigation Area) on native flora and fauna.

I note the request by the petitioners for a review of the *South East Queensland Regional Plan 2017 (ShapingSEQ)* with respect to the population building requirements, reflected in *ShapingSEQ*'s dwelling supply benchmarks, for the Moreton Bay Regional Council LGA. The petitioners also request a review of how Moreton Bay Regional Council (the council) identifies new growth areas and the lack of infrastructure to support such development. I would like to address these matters below.

ShapingSEQ

As a high-level strategic planning document, *ShapingSEQ* provides direction to local government for their planning schemes about how growth is to be managed across SEQ. It does not specify zones for a particular land use, but rather more broad directions about how growth will be accommodated, how many expected dwellings need to be planned, and what key regional values need to be protected.

It remains the responsibility of local governments, in consultation with their communities, to determine how these broad directions are reflected in local planning and development outcomes. This includes determining the appropriate form and distribution of densities that are delivered through the planning schemes and neighbourhood plans.

Regional plans are generally reviewed every five to seven years. On this basis, a review of *ShapingSEQ* would see a new plan delivered sometime between 2022 and 2024. Should the dwelling supply benchmarks for SEQ change significantly prior to this review, this will be considered and may lead to amendments in terms of how growth is accommodated.

Allocation of new growth areas and infrastructure

Under *ShapingSEQ*, the Urban Footprint identifies sufficient land to accommodate SEQ's urban development needs to 2041. However, it is important to note that the Urban Footprint is not an

urban zone and does not imply that all land can be developed for urban purposes. Land within the Urban Footprint may be unsuitable for urban purposes for a range of reasons including physical constraints. It is the responsibility of local governments, through their planning schemes, to determine the most appropriate zoning for urban land purposes.

ShapingSEQ also informs the planning and prioritisation of infrastructure in SEQ, seeking to ensure that land use and infrastructure are integrated to deliver more complete communities.

Local government development decisions

It is the role of local governments to determine how *ShapingSEQ* dwelling supply benchmarks can best be accommodated within their LGA and to determine the most appropriate zoning for individual land parcels. The LGA development assessment process determines the extent and suitability of development for each site.

Should the petitioners have concerns about the assessment of specific development applications, I would encourage them to contact the council. The council is responsible for deciding most development applications in the LGA through its role as assessment manager under the *Planning Act 2016*.

I would like to note that on 11 October 2018, I advised the council that it may not proceed with the proposed planning scheme amendment known as Major Amendment No. 1. I was not satisfied that the amendment – which sought, among other matters, to implement the outcomes of planning for the Warner Investigation Area – achieved the purpose of the former *Sustainable Planning Act 2009*, or that it did not adversely affect a state interest.

The council's proposal to rezone areas of existing bushland for urban development purposes would have had an impact on already declining koala populations, something the Queensland Government is committed to addressing through the planning framework. In making my decision, I have asked the council to work with the Department of State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning to ensure that future development aspirations align with the Queensland Government's Koala Conservation Response.

It is open to the council to propose new amendments to its planning scheme, in which case the council will be required to repeat the public consultation process. I note that my decision regarding Major Amendment No. 1 does not prevent development applications from being made in the areas which were subject to the amendment. These applications can continue to be considered on their merits by the council.

I would like to thank the petitioners for raising this matter with me and I trust this information is of assistance.

Yours sincerely



CAMERON DICK MP
Minister for State Development, Manufacturing,
Infrastructure and Planning