



Redland City Council Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP) and Netserv Plan **Amendment**

Public Consultation Report
July 2026



Contents

1.0 Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP) Amendment.....	3
1.1 Public Consultation	3
Table 1 – Submissions Grouped by Amendment Issue	3
Table 2 - Grounds of Submissions and How Council Has Considered and Dealt with Each Submission	4
2.0 Netserv Plan Amendment.....	14
2.2 Public Consultation	14
Table 3 - Grounds of Submission and How Council Has Considered and Dealt with Each Submission	15

1.0 Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP) Amendment

In accordance with the *Planning Act 2016* (PAct), the LGIP is to be reviewed and amended to respond to changes in demand for trunk infrastructure and growth. This is a statutory process in accordance with the *Ministers Guidelines and Rules* (MGR). In 2021, Council resolved to begin the process for an LGIP Amendment, with the following key changes:

- A revised set of planning assumptions, plans for trunk infrastructure, schedule of works, desired service standards of service, and a new financial model.
- This applies to the whole of the local government area.

1.1 Public Consultation

Public consultation for the LGIP Amendment was undertaken from 2 to 29 March 2026 in accordance with the MGR and in conjunction with the Netserv Plan Amendment.

During the public consultation period, eight (8) submissions were received, all of which were properly made. In accordance with Chapter 5, Part 3, Section 11.3 of the MGR, Council has considered these submissions.

This report outlines the grounds of the submissions and details how Council has considered each submission (refer to Table 2). For reporting purposes, submissions have been grouped into categories in accordance with Table 1 below, rather than reported on individually.

Table 1 – Submissions Grouped by Amendment Issue

Issue	Item number in amendment package	Number of properly made submissions
Planning Horizon	Sections 4.1, 4.2	1
Planning Assumptions	Section 4.2	2
Priority Infrastructure Area (PIA)	Section 4.3	4
Schedule of Works (SOW)	Section 4.5	3
Desired Standards of Service (DSS) - Parks	Section 4.4	1
General Submission Matters		7

Table 2 - Grounds of Submissions and How Council Has Considered and Dealt with Each Submission

Amendment	Submission and Grounds	Analysis	Change(s) in response to submission(s)
Planning Horizon	The submission is concerned the PIA details infrastructure up to 2031, which is less than the 15-year period that should be covered under the MGR. The submitter recommends a longer outlook on infrastructure planning to ensure any additional costs, priorities, or opportunities are accounted for.	Council acknowledges the requirement to plan for a minimum of 15 years and up to 30 years of development projections in accordance with the MGR, Chapter 5, Part 6, Section 32.3. At the time of commencing this LGIP Amendment in 2022, approximately 10 years of development capacity had been identified (from 2021). Through the State Interest Review process, the State Government accepted this planning horizon as appropriate in the circumstances. Notwithstanding this, Council acknowledges this feedback and will consider this matter in the next review of the LGIP.	No change.
Planning Assumptions	The submission does not support the underlying analysis and investigatory findings of the LGIP and Netserv Plan Amendment. Key concerns raised include: - Slower population growth - The submission states the projected population growth since early 2000's does not reflect the high level of demand and current population growth. This growth rate contrasts significantly with rates in Brisbane, Sunshine Coast, Ipswich, and Logan, and is considered similar to a small regional town, such as Warwick. - Impacts of this lower population projections - The	Council utilised the most accurate and up-to-date data at the time of commencing the amendment process in early 2022. The population dataset available was derived from the Queensland Government Statistician's Office (QGSO), being Government Projected Population (Medium Series) 2016–2041 (dated 2018). While acknowledging the limitations of the dataset availability at the time, Council engaged PIE Solutions in January 2022 - an expert consultancy with a decade of experience to undertake the Development Projections	No change.

Amendment	Submission and Grounds	Analysis	Change(s) in response to submission(s)
	submission states this underestimation of population growth would result in a significant underutilisation of existing lands within Redlands, making houses more unaffordable and rents higher. Another impact is lessening Council's focus on future trunk infrastructure planning and forward-thinking infrastructure plans for PIAs and Priority Development Areas (PDA). The submitter recommends reviewing the population trajectories, including ultimate development outcomes, by adding additional population growth in the corridors from Victoria Point and Woodbury Estate to Sheldon Mount Cotton.	Modelling. This work established appropriate planning assumptions, including population projections, based on the best available dataset. Through the State Interest Review process, the State Government accepted both the population data and the modelling approach applied. Although new figures were released by QGSO in a 2023 edition, it was not considered reasonable, practical or required to re-commence the amendment at that time. Council values this feedback and notes that new and revised data are being developed through the current regional planning review. Where appropriate, future reviews of the LGIP will consider and incorporate updated information.	
	The submitter states the differences in the dwelling assumptions in the LGIP Amendment to those dwelling projections provided by the Queensland Government Statistician's Office, ShapingSEQ, and the average dwelling approvals over the last seven (7) years. The submission recommends the differences be reviewed to remove uncertainty and achieve alignment.	Council utilised the data available at the time of commencement of the amendment process (see above responses to population projection). Similarly, it was not considered reasonable, practical or required to recommence the LGIP amendment each time new or revised data emerges. It is considered that some of these dwelling figures more accurately reflected the circumstances at the time than other datasets.	No change.

Amendment	Submission and Grounds	Analysis	Change(s) in response to submission(s)
		For example, the increased dwelling assumptions of 4,537 in the LGIP Amendment are still greater than that of the average number of SEQRP 2023 projected to 2046, being 3,960. Similarly, Council appreciates this feedback and where appropriate and relevant, any future LGIP review is to address latest datasets in projection modelling.	
Priority Infrastructure Area (PIA)	The submission states the PIA in the LGIP Amendment demonstrates little desire to explore anything outside what currently exists or has been approved over the last 10 -20 years.	The PIA adopted by Council must accommodate growth for at least 10 years, but no more than 15 years, pursuant to Section 34.3 of Chapter 5 of the MGR.	No change.
	The submissions seek declaration of a new PDA and/or expansion of the PIA to include land covering Giles, Heinemann and Double Jump Roads, including a property at 29 Double Jump Road, otherwise known as 53-63 Giles Road. This recommendation for new PDAs and/or PIA inclusion are based on the following factors: - Existing water infrastructure services between Victoria Point and Woodbury Estate, Spring Acre and Double Jump Road along Heinemann Road to Sheldon Mount Cotton create opportunities to expand the PIA or PDA or both. - Water and sewer infrastructure in the LGIP mapping shows logical connection and expansion for master estate developments	A PDA is declared by the State Government under the <i>Economic Development Queensland Act 2012</i> (EDQA 2012). Council does not have the legislative authority to declare PDAs and, as such, this matter falls outside the scope of the LGIP and planning scheme amendment process. The PIA boundary is identified to prioritise urban development as required by the MGR, Section 34. The exclusion of lands at Giles, Heinemann and Double Jump Roads within the PIA boundary in this LGIP Amendment primarily reflects the prevailing rural zoning for these areas as at the time of amending the LGIP.	No change.

Amendment	Submission and Grounds	Analysis	Change(s) in response to submission(s)
	along these roads.		
	The submission states the PIA does not consider the Southern Thornlands area despite being under a PDA. In addition, the PIA shows little/no indication of releasing or seeking new development which results in concern to locals due to demand-pull experience on housing and rental prices.	The Southern Thornlands PDA was declared by the Deputy Premier in 2023, subsequent to the commencement of this LGIP Amendment. While this and other PDAs were excluded from the LGIP Amendment at that time, Council has considered the projected growth of development within PDAs declared pursuant to the EDQA 2012 outside the LGIP amendment.	No change.
	The submission urges active infrastructure planning for areas beyond the present PIA to ensure Council is well placed to accommodate and integrate future urban development.	Council appreciates this suggestion. While active infrastructure planning beyond the PIA boundary within the LGIP, its provision in these areas is facilitated, where appropriate, through infrastructure agreements executed with developers. Council acknowledges this feedback and will consider this matter, where relevant and appropriate, in the next review of the LGIP.	No change.
Schedule of Works (SOW)	The submission suggests the proposed inclusion of a new future recreation park T3(M) at 5-23 Lind Street, Thornlands, affects the development potential and economic value of the land.	The new future recreation park T3(M) has been identified as trunk infrastructure necessary to service the projected urban growth, in accordance with the MGR. Its inclusion at this location is informed by	No change.

Amendment	Submission and Grounds	Analysis	Change(s) in response to submission(s)
		forecast population growth, catchment analysis for the locality, associated demand for public open space and recreation facilities, and desired standards of service. There are currently two (2) existing parks within an 800m radius - Conley Avenue Park (T3) and Tuna Court Park (T3E). However, both parks are constrained in their ability to meet the needs of the existing and future community due to their linear configuration, as well as ecological and access limitations. The provision of an additional park at Lind Street will help address this gap within the residential catchment. This new T3(M) park is included as trunk infrastructure and is eligible to be offset against relevant infrastructure charges in accordance with Council's Adopted Infrastructure Charges resolution.	
	The submission supports proposed new trunk infrastructure in the LGIP Amendment, such as TR-L-108 PFTI (Transport) and new sports parks New-4. However, these new additions are inadequate to cater for larger-scale allotment amalgamation, where some allotments are smaller in nature, but experience expansion of master planned residential estates and new population growth. Additional trunk infrastructure items are therefore recommended.	The LGIP Amendment has been informed by land use assumptions, growth projections and infrastructure network planning at the time of commencement of the amendment. Council acknowledges this and will consider this matter, where relevant and appropriate, in the next LGIP review.	No change.

Amendment	Submission and Grounds	Analysis	Change(s) in response to submission(s)
	The submission asserts that the sewerage infrastructure shows logical capabilities of expansion along Double Jump Road. However, there are no local plans to indicate whether any expansion of sewer has been contemplated for Giles Road, despite the area being ideal for strategic localized planning.	Similar to previous comments, at the time of preparing this LGIP amendment, sewerage infrastructure along Double Jump Road, including the Giles Road area, was not prioritised, as these lands were primarily zoned for regional and agricultural purposes rather than identified within the urban footprint. Based on current growth assumptions and network modelling available at the commencement of the Amendment, no changes to the LGIP Amendment are proposed at this time. Council acknowledges this feedback. Consideration will be made, where relevant and appropriate, in the next LGIP review.	No change.
Desired Standards of Service - Parks	The submission recognises significant changes made to the required standards for trunk public land in this LGIP Amendment. It seeks further time to discuss with Council the changes made to the required standards for trunk public park land. The submission also recommends innovative and flexible delivery models for parks and community facilities, such as co-location to optimise value-for-money outcomes asset holding.	Council undertook public consultation over a period of 30 days, exceeding the MGR requirement of at least 20 days. The statutory process also requires progression of the amendment within defined timeframes. Notwithstanding this, Council welcomes opportunities for further engagement through future LGIP amendments and reviews. Council also welcomes the recommendations regarding innovative and flexible delivery models for parks and community facilities. These approaches will be considered in the future	No change.

Amendment	Submission and Grounds	Analysis	Change(s) in response to submission(s)
		planning processes, where appropriate.	
General Submission Matters	Macleay Island – urgent updates required on footpaths, kerb and channel and repairs to roads and walkways around Orana Street, Benowa Street, Kalara Street, the Bowls Club and MIAC.	The matters raised regarding maintenance, renewal, and potential upgrading of existing local infrastructure falls outside the scope and purpose of the LGIP Amendment. Notwithstanding this, Council appreciates the feedback and has referred the matters to the relevant Council teams for consideration.	No change.
	Islands – urgent need for public transport on all islands.	The planning, provision and funding of public transport services are primarily the responsibility of the Queensland Government. Whilst Council recognises there may be a need to provide public transport to islands, the LGIP and its amendments relate to the planning and delivery of trunk infrastructure at local government level, with transport networks generally limited to local roads and active transport infrastructure, such as cycleways. This provision does not extend to the delivery or operation of public transport services. While this matter raised falls outside the scope of the LGIP amendment, Council acknowledges the feedback and will retain this for advocacy and future consideration with relevant State	No change.

Amendment	Submission and Grounds	Analysis	Change(s) in response to submission(s)
		agencies.	
	Macleay Island – Need for a pedestrian bridge across the creek to link to Lower Coast Road Sandpiper beach with MIAC and Boat Club.	Council acknowledges the importance of safe and accessible pedestrian connections. However, the LGIP is to identify trunk infrastructure necessary to service projected urban growth and population in accordance with the MGR and the Planning Act 2016. At this stage, the pedestrian bridge in this location has not been identified as required trunk infrastructure to support the projected development and population.	No change.
	Macleay Island – Not enough parking, specifically disability spaces at the Jetty Park. Suggest converting part of 85 High Central Road to allow this and have transport services meeting the boat.	Council acknowledges this submission. Similar to the response above, this car park is not identified as part of the LGIP Amendment. Notwithstanding this, Council acknowledges this feedback and has referred the matter to the relevant Council team for consideration.	No change.
	The submission suggests for Council to consider other funding sources, such as RAF. The submission recommends for Council to confirm investment is for the greatest housing delivery benefit.	Council acknowledges the recommendation regarding external funding opportunities. Such opportunities are investigated and pursued where available and appropriate. However, external funding cannot be solely relied upon to fund trunk infrastructure identified in the LGIP.	No change.

Amendment	Submission and Grounds	Analysis	Change(s) in response to submission(s)
		The amendment to the LGIP is strategically aligned with projected growth and development sequencing, informed by population and development forecasts, network capacity, and desired standards of service.	
	The submission states further updates are needed for the LGIP to alleviate housing affordability pressures and severe rental price pressures.	Council values this feedback and is committed to integrated infrastructure and land use planning to support a liveable community in Redland City, including the provision of affordable and diverse housing options. This LGIP Amendment supports and facilitates the recent Redland City Plan Amendment by guiding land use, urban growth and housing development, including increased densities and revised zoning. As part of the new planning scheme, anticipated to be completed by the end of 2028, future LGIP Amendments will continue to align with the City Plan and respond to housing affordability and rental supply pressures, where relevant and appropriate.	No change.
	The submission recommends several approaches based on industry experience to enhance the efficiency of infrastructure delivery, including: ▪ Making best use of past infrastructure charges	Council appreciates the recommendations provided and will consider incorporating them into current practice and future planning, where appropriate and relevant.	No change.

Amendment	Submission and Grounds	Analysis	Change(s) in response to submission(s)
	receipts. ▪ Investing in areas where it is needed the most and ensuring this investment is for the greatest housing delivery benefit. ▪ Benchmarking infrastructure cost assumptions. ▪ Preparing a public summary of past trunk infrastructure projects delivered in relation to the previous LGIP and comparing this to planned LGIP delivery and growth outcomes.		

2.0 Netserv Plan Amendment

In accordance with the *South-East Queensland Water (Distribution and Retail Restructuring) Act 2009*, the Netserv Plan is to be reviewed and amended every five (5) years to align with the South East Queensland Regional Plan. In 2021, Council resolved to begin the process for Netserv Plan Amendment, with the following key changes:

The Netserv Plan has been updated to reflect the planning assumptions that informed the LGIP Amendment, ensuring alignment between the two plans. The revised Netserv Part A document includes:

- Revised planning assumptions (based on Council's updated assumptions and the Infrastructure Demand Model).
- Clarified definition of trunk infrastructure.
- Updated connection area mapping.
- Alignment of desired standards of service with the current SEQ Water Supply and Sewerage Design and Construction Manual.
- Review and update of key development areas.

2.2 Public Consultation

Public consultation for the Netserv Plan Amendment was undertaken between 2nd March to 29th March 2026 in accordance with the *South-East Queensland Water (Distribution and Retail Restructuring) Act 2009* and in conjunction with the LGIP Amendment.

During the public consultation period, eight (8) submissions were received for both the LGIP and Netserv Plan Amendment. Only one (1) submission was received specifically for the Netserv Plan Amendment. Council has considered this submission.

This report is to outline the grounds of the submission and detail how Council has considered the submission (refer to Table 3).

Table 3 - Grounds of Submission and How Council Has Considered and Dealt with Each Submission

Amendment	Submission and Grounds	Analysis	Change(s) in response to submission
Netserv Plan	The submission recognises changes made to the Netserv Plan. It seeks further time to discuss with Council the changes made.	Council undertook public consultation over a period of 30 days, being more than the mandatory minimum timeframe of 20 business days in accordance with the <i>South-East Queensland Water (Distribution and Retail Restructuring) Act 2009</i>. The statutory process also requires progression of the amendment within defined timeframes. Notwithstanding this, Council welcomes opportunities for further engagement through future Netserv Plan amendments and reviews.	No change.