19.3 SOUTHERN THORNLANDS POTENTIAL FUTURE GROWTH AREA

COUNCIL RESOLUTION 2020/280

Moved by: Cr Julie Talty
Seconded by: Cr Peter Mitchell

That Council resolves as follows:

1. **To note the findings and recommendations of the Southern Thornlands Potential Future Growth Area (STPFGA) Planning Report and Draft Economic Feasibility Assessment Report.**
2. **To confirm its intention to prepare a Major Amendment to City Plan to reflect:**
   a) **the preferred future land use intent of the STPFGA, as outlined in Attachment 4, Option 2 (as amended by Council at its General Meeting and subject to the outcomes of the public consultation activities referenced in recommendation 4 below).**
   b) **the preferred option for giving effect to the amendment is outlined in Attachment 5 (as amended by Council at its General Meeting), Option 1D.**
3. **To request the State Government to consider an interim amendment to the South East Queensland Regional Plan, as outlined in Attachment 5 (as amended by Council at its General Meeting), Option 2D.**
4. **To prepare a community engagement plan to support City-wide public consultation, for a minimum of 30 business days and commencing on 28 September 2020 on the preferred future land use intent of the STPFGA, as outlined in Attachment 4, Option 2.**
5. **To submit to the Planning Minister in accordance with the Ministerial Direction received on 23 July 2020:**
   a) **a written report outlining the outcomes of the investigation of the STPFGA.**
   b) **a statement outlining the proposed major amendments to City Plan as a result of the investigation and the reasons for this position.**
   c) **a community engagement plan outlining a proposed City-wide public consultation exercise on the preferred future land use intent of the STPFGA, as outlined in Attachment 4, Option 2.**
6. **To contact the State Government requesting the establishment of a formal partnership to progress detailed planning of the STPFGA to deliver the preferred future land use intents, stimulate development and facilitate economic recovery in a post COVID-19 environment.**
7. **To undertake a review of the industrial employment projections and industrial land requirements for Redland City to 2041 to ensure sufficient industrial land is available as necessary.**
8. **To consider all submissions received during the public consultation period, for the purpose of informing the proposed Major Amendment to City Plan as referenced in recommendation 2a.**
9. **To maintain this report as confidential until such time as Council has responded to the Planning Minister and commenced City wide consultation in accordance with recommendation 4 above.**

CARRIED 9/1

Crs Karen Williams, Wendy Boglary, Peter Mitchell, Paul Gollè, Julie Talty, Rowanne McKenzie, Tracey Huges, Adelia Berridge and Paul Bishop voted FOR the motion.

Cr Lance Hewlett voted AGAINST the motion.

Cr Mark Edwards was absent from the meeting.

Attachment 4

Southern Thornlands Potential Future Growth Area (STPFGA) – Potential Future Land Use Options

This attachment provides details on the potential future land use options that Council may choose to accommodate in the STPFGA. Specific land uses have been grouped to form precincts, which are each intended to perform a distinct role or function, as outlined below. Each option reflects a different land use mix or precincts with different spatial extents.

Mixed Industry Business Area (MIBA) Precinct

The MIBA precinct is intended to accommodate a broad range of commercial and industrial employment opportunities including professional services, higher order industrial uses (e.g. creative industry and advanced manufacturing), education, training and research facilities, information technology and communication services, office services and service trades. The MIBA precinct is not intended to have a strong industrial land use focus, however certain low impact industrial activities will be supported where adverse amenity impacts (namely noise, odour and dust) can be reduced to an acceptable level. A limited range of ancillary convenience uses (e.g. shops and food and drink outlets) could be established to service the precinct. Development within the MIBA will be reflective of the unique natural setting in which it is located, providing a high quality built form and landscaping elements.

Delivering the MIBA precinct is a long standing goal of Council (i.e. it is not population serving); the precinct would seek to accommodate a diversity of integrated employment generating activities that will increase job self-containment within the City. As outlined by CDM Smith in the Economic Feasibility Assessment, the delivery of a MIBA should ideally be facilitated in the longer term (~15 years) so as to not compromise commercial office take up in the Capalaba and Cleveland principal activity centres in the short term. This timeframe also recognises that significant capacity exists within competitor MIBA precincts in the region to accommodate growth within the short to medium term. CDM Smith indicated in the EFA that that an allowance for 50 hectares of allotments (translating to the identification of approximately 100 hectares of raw land) for MIBA uses would allow for enough scale to assist in ensuring the development of the precinct is financially feasible to a prospective developer. Accordingly, the MIBA Precinct outlined in the following options comprises 50 individual allotments with a total area slightly in excess of 95 hectares.

Intensive Horticulture Precinct

The Intensive Horticulture precinct is the City's preferred location for accommodating production nurseries, lifestyle horticulture (e.g. cut flowers) and intensive fruit and vegetable production. The use includes the storage and packing of produce and plants grown on the subject site. Products generated within the precinct benefit from their proximity to metropolitan markets and may be used as inputs for value-add industries such as food product and beverage manufacturing; industries for which Redland City has existing strengths. Businesses seeking to establish in the Intensive Horticulture precinct will benefit from Redland City's existing branding as a 'clean and green' location.

Development within the Intensive Horticulture Precinct should be designed and sited in a way to minimise its impact on the southern view shed (e.g. from Sirromet Winery) and from vantage points along Mount Cotton Road and Woodlands Drive. The built form is expected to consist of greenhouses and premises that can accommodate vertical farms, as well as storage facilities.

Recognising that Intensive Horticulture is an emerging industry in Australia, CDM Smith did not seek to identify the quantum of land required to support this land use in the EFA. Direction provided in the EFA report did however note that 'in order to protect the amenity values associated with [land in the south of the STPFGA study area]…. uses within this precinct [should] be limited to intensive horticulture and uses that directly complement intensive horticultural production on site, such as tourism and education'. In this regard, the Intensive Horticulture Precinct simply identifies the preferred location for Intensive Horticulture uses to establish in the city, given that the level of assessment for Intensive Horticulture in the Rural Zone of the Redland City Plan is code assessable (if not a mushroom farm).

Education, Training and Recreation Precinct

The Education, Training and Research Precinct is intended to accommodate tertiary education and training facilities, recreation facilities and ancillary accommodation and services. This land use intent is consistent with the existing commentary provided in the Strategic Framework of the Redland City Plan (Section 3.4.1.10). The Education, Training and Research Precinct outlined in the following options covers an area of approximately 155 hectares.

Transport Uses Precinct

The Transport precinct is intended to accommodate transport related uses including transport depots and parking stations, which benefit from direct access to the State Road network. The aforementioned uses are not required to have a nexus with rural production, however may only be established on allotments that contain a dwelling house. The rationale behind this requirement is that premises containing a dwelling house and a stand-alone business are likely to be undertaken in a way that respects the existing residential amenity of the locality, noting that in some instances these businesses are already operating at scale and in proximity to noise impacts from the State Road network. Parts of this precinct contain significant environmental values and will not be suitable for further development. This precinct is not intended to be serviced with infrastructure of an urban standard and it is not envisioned that the area will be provided with access to the reticulated wastewater network.

In the following section, the spatial extent of this precinct is smaller in Option 1 (~22ha) than Option 2 (~49ha).

The STPFGA planning report acknowledges that parts of the STPFGA, namely those with a frontage to Mount Cotton Road, may be suitable locations to accommodate parking stations, transport depots and other similar uses, given the following factors:

- A number of properties within this locality are currently being used for this purpose;
- Currently there are limited opportunities to accommodate this type of development, noting that transport facilities of this nature are generally encouraged to locate in low or medium impact industrial zones; and
- Due to existing and potential amenity constraints (e.g. State road noise, noise and dust from potential future quarry operations) and the lack of available trunk infrastructure (e.g. reticulated wastewater), these allotments are unlikely to be developed for an alternative use in the short-medium term. As such, the existing operations on the site are considered to be reflective of a market need, as well as the highest and best use of the land.

To examine the potential for limited transport-related uses to be accommodated in this locality, further advice was sought from the Queensland Treasury Planning Group. They subsequently advised in correspondence by email that:

> *'The RLRPA provisions of the Planning Regulation 2017 do not prohibit development for the purpose of parking stations or transport depots. Rather, given these uses are considered to be defined as urban activities, such uses would trigger referral to the State where the use exceeds the development thresholds identified under Schedule 10, Part 16, Division 6, Subdivision 2, Section 27F. Where referral to the State is required as detailed above, the use would be considered against the Referral Agency's Assessment Criteria detailed in Schedule 10, Part 16, Division 6, Subdivision 4, Table 2.*
>
> *Alternatively, if the council considers development to an extent greater than the regulatory thresholds appropriate, the council may consider amending the city plan to include the land in an urban zone, consistent with the advice (above) in response to dot point 1.'*

In practical terms, the State advised Council that the regulatory provisions provide for certain urban uses to be considered outside the urban footprint. However, the assessment benchmarks used by the State to assess these applications are a fairly 'high bar' and would in most cases, presumably, serve to discourage prospective landowners from lodging a development application. Alternatively Council is able to amend the planning scheme, subject to a State Interest Review, to include the land in an urban zone that would support the end use envisioned (e.g. low impact industry).

Storage and Larger Scale Home Based Enterprise Precinct

This precinct is intended to accommodate a mixture of uses that enable landowners to generate a higher economic return on their properties than would otherwise be possible and subsequently, additional employment within the STPFGA. The rationale for providing additional land use flexibility in this locality is two-fold:

- It provides land use certainty for land owners that a higher and better use of their land can be achieved; and
- It will facilitate economic development opportunities, albeit small in scale, to occur on these allotments.

More specifically, the uses envisioned range from vehicle storage facilities, (i.e. a parking station), small scale tourist parks or larger scale home based businesses that exceed the nominal thresholds contained in the Redland City Plan home-based business code.

In the following section, the spatial extent of this precinct is larger in Option 1 (~82ha) than Option 2 (~58ha). This reflects the fact that in the officer recommended Option 1, this precinct is identified as an 'Investigation Area' that requires further detailed investigations to be undertaken before the specific intent for the area can be reflected in the Redland City Plan via a major planning scheme amendment. These investigations would seek to establish, as an example, the need for additional parking stations in the City (e.g. to accommodate private recreational vehicles such as motorhomes, campervans and camper trailers) and the quantum of parking Council would be willing to allow on different lot sizes, potentially without requiring a planning application (i.e. as accepted development subject to requirements).

Rural Residential Precinct

The Rural Residential precinct incorporates all land within the STPFGA that is not contained within precincts 1-5. In this precinct, the intent is to facilitate rural residential development by enabling reconfiguration of lots down to a minimum size of 1ha, where certain performance benchmarks are achieved (e.g. a frontage to depth ratio not exceeding 1:4 and no additional driveway access points are proposed). For the majority of landowners within the STPFGA, subdivision is not possible and these areas are likely to remain unchanged for the life of the planning scheme to 2041.

The rural residential precinct provides land use certainty for landowners within the balance of the STPFGA, whilst at the same time acknowledging that there is no intent to provide a higher level of infrastructure service provision than is currently afforded. Officers are suggesting that if Council decides to pursue the establishment of a Rural Residential Precinct through amendments to the Redland City Plan that it should also seek to have this precinct reclassified as a Rural Living Area under *ShapingSEQ.* Further information on this proposal is outlined in Part 2 of Attachment 7.

It is important to note that the Rural Residential Precinct reflects a land use intent generally supported by Councillors during the Councillor visioning workshops in August 2020, however this land use is inconsistent with the outcomes sought by *ShapingSEQ.*

<u>Accommodating a University in the STPFGA</u>

Commentary within the strategic framework of the Redland City Plan makes reference to 'land the west of Taylor Road proximate to Sheldon College [potentially] accommodating tertiary education and training facilities'. To further consider the viability of delivering a tertiary education facility (e.g. a university) within the STPFGA as part of the EFA, CDM Smith was asked to provide preliminary advice.

In summary, CDM Smith advised that university funding models are a complex field of enquiry and vary from university to university, depending on how each institution seeks to position themselves in the marketplace. This is due to the fact that each university has different funding streams, differing perceptions of cost of capital, project life and education delivery etc., so their financial models differ widely.

Instead of considering the feasibility of delivering a university as part of the EFA, CDM Smith indicated that a more nuanced approach would firstly involve scoping out whether there is and what size the market opportunity for a university within the Redlands might be. This would serve as a precursor for assessing feasibility in a broader sense and whether Council would be in a position to 'target' universities that might consider establishing facilities within the city.

On consideration of the information provided, the Strategic Planning Unit deemed that this investigation fell outside the scope of the EFA. However, if this is a matter Council would like to pursue further, there remains an opportunity to allocate funding in a future budget to undertake this exercise as a separate but complimentary body of work.

Potential future land use options

Three different land use options (1-3) are presented for Council's consideration in the following section. Each option is supported by a map that displays the spatial extent of the precincts that comprise it. The precincts have been formulated using information from the following sources:

- The STPFGA Planning Report & Appendices (Mapping) – see Attachment 1;
- The Draft CDM Smith Economic Feasibility Assessment; and
- Visioning workshops undertaken with Councillors during August 2020.

Option 2 most closely resembles the preferred future land use intent for the STPFGA considered as part of the recent Councillor visioning workshops.

Option 1

Option 1 seeks to establish the following precincts within the STPFGA, as identified in Map 1:

- MIBA Precinct;
- Intensive Horticulture Precinct;
- Education, Training and Tourism Precinct;
- Transport Uses Precinct; and
- Storage and Larger Scale Home Based Enterprise Precinct - Investigation Area

For the balance of the STPFGA, the intent is to retain these allotments in the rural zone and leave the existing provisions within the Redland City Plan unchanged.

A summary of the proposed land use precincts and the planning rationale for Option 1 is summarised in the following table.

Precinct	Land Area	Rationale
MIBA	~95ha	• Generally consistent with CDM Smith EFA Report recommendations with regard to preferred location and identification of a longer term opportunity (~15 years) to establish a MIBA at a scale that is likely to be financially feasible for a prospective developer.
Intensive Horticulture	~129ha	• Consistent with CDM Smith EFA Report recommendations, which identified the intensive horticulture sector as a key opportunity for Redland City to further strengthen its position within the food product manufacturing sector, using local product as an input to production. • Provides clarity on Council's preferred location for establishing Intensive Horticulture uses in the city.

Education, Training and Tourism Precinct	~155ha	• Provides clarity on the spatial extent of the area being referred to in the Strategic Framework of the Redland City Plan, as the location is not cadastrally defined. • Incorporates additional land holdings owned by Sheldon College.
Transport Uses Precinct	~22ha	• Due to existing and potential amenity constraints (e.g. State road noise, noise and dust from potential future quarry operations) and the lack of available trunk infrastructure (e.g. reticulated wastewater), these allotments are unlikely to be developed for an alternative use in the short-medium term. As such, the existing operations on the site are considered to be reflective of a current market need, as well as the highest and best use of the land. • The CDM Smith report indicates that the net incremental industrial land demand for transport uses is expected to be 8.5ha by 2041. The identification of a 22ha area takes into account potential constraints in the precinct that may limit development potential.
Storage and Larger Scale Home Based Enterprise Precinct - Investigation Area	~85ha	• In this option, the precinct is identified as an 'Investigation Area' that requires further detailed investigations to be undertaken before the specific intent for the area can be reflected in the Redland City Plan via a major planning scheme amendment.
Rural Zone (unchanged)	Balance Area	• In this option, the existing zoning intent in the Redland City Plan is carried forward for properties identified in the balance area.

Map 1: (Officer recommended option)

Option 2

Option 2 seeks to establish the following precincts within the STPFGA, as identified in Map 2:

- MIBA Precinct;
- Intensive Horticulture Precinct;
- Education, Training and Tourism Precinct;
- Transport Uses Precinct;
- Storage and Larger Scale Home Based Enterprise Precinct; and
- Rural Residential Precinct.

A summary of the proposed land use precincts and the planning rationale for Option 2 is summarised in the following table.

Precinct	Land Area	Rationale
MIBA	~95ha	• Generally consistent with CDM Smith EFA Report recommendations with regard to preferred location and identification of a longer term opportunity (~15 years) to establish a MIBA at a scale that is likely to be financially feasible for a prospective developer.
Intensive Horticulture	~129ha	• Consistent with CDM Smith EFA Report recommendations, which identified the intensive horticulture sector as a key opportunity for Redland City to further strengthen its position within the food product manufacturing sector, using local product as an input to production. • Provides clarity on Council's preferred location for establishing Intensive Horticulture uses in the city.
Education, Training and Tourism Precinct	~155ha	• Provides clarity on the spatial extent of the area being referred to in the Strategic Framework of the Redland City Plan, as the location is not cadastrally defined. • Incorporates additional land holdings owned by Sheldon College.
Transport Uses Precinct	~49ha	• Due to existing and potential amenity constraints (e.g. State road noise, noise and dust from potential future quarry operations) and the lack of available trunk infrastructure (e.g. reticulated wastewater), these allotments are unlikely to be developed for an alternative use in the short-medium term. As such, the existing operations on the site are considered to be

		reflective of a market need, as well as the highest and best use of the land.
Storage and Larger Scale Home Based Enterprise Precinct	~54ha	• This precinct provides landowners with an opportunity to capitalise on their high level of commercial exposure to Duncan or Mount Cotton Road, in a post COVId-19 environment.
Rural Residential Precinct	Balance Area	• The Rural Residential Precinct provides land use certainty for the balance of landowners within the STPFGA. • Recognising there has been a shift in human behaviour and preferences as a result of the ensuing COVID-19 pandemic (e.g. people are increasingly working from home and seeking to physically distance themselves from others), the Rural Residential precinct seeks to provide for a unique range of larger rural lifestyle properties with subdivision potential down to 1ha, provided that minimum frontage and access requirements can be met.

Map 2

Option 3

Option 3 involves amending the spatial extent and land use intent for some or all of the precincts. Accordingly, no supporting map or planning rationale is provided for this option.

Option One

That Council resolves as follows:

1. To confirm that it's preferred land use mix for the Southern Thornlands Potential Future Growth Area (STPFGA) is reflected in Option 1.

Option Two

That Council resolves as follows:

1. To confirm that it's preferred land use mix for the Southern Thornlands Potential Future Growth Area (STPFGA) is reflected in Option 2 subject to the reduction in size of the proposed transport use precinct to align with the spatial extent as depicted in option 1.
2. To support the establishment of large rural residential lots 1 hectare or greater in size that carefully balance development with the protection of natural values, amenity and character and avoidance of bushfire hazard.
3. Council will not support the expansion of the Urban Footprint to accommodate urban residential development in the STPFGA.

Option Three

That Council resolves as follows:

1. To amend the spatial extent and land use intent for some or all of the precincts (Option 3) and confirm that this reflects it's preferred land use mix for the Southern Thornlands Potential Future Growth Area (STPFGA).

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That Council resolves as follows:

To confirm that it's preferred land use mix for the Southern Thornlands Potential Future Growth Area (STPFGA) is reflected in Option 1.

Attachment 5

Part 1: Options for amending the City Plan

In the City Plan, the majority of land within the STPFGA is zoned rural, with some interspersed community facilities and conservation zoned land. This zoning reflects the current land use designation under *ShapingSEQ,* which includes the STPFGA within the Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area (i.e. outside the Urban Footprint). Potential future land use options for the STPFGA are discussed in Attachment 4 and would provide for a broader range of land uses across a number different precincts, each with distinct roles or functions. If Council resolves to change the land use intent for all or certain parts of the STPFGA, a major amendment will be required to the City Plan to reflect this new policy position. It is worth noting that to give effect to a major amendment to the City Plan, Council will need to follow the process outlined in the Minister's Guidelines and Rules, which includes a State Interest Review period and mandatory public consultation activities.

There are a number of ways that the City Plan can be amended to accommodate development that is consistent with Council's preferred future land use mix for the STPFGA. A basic outline of these options, including the foreseen advantages and disadvantages, is outlined in the table below. A basic overview of the options for consideration is outlined below:

- Option 1A: Amend the Strategic Framework only.
- Option 1B: Amend the Strategic Framework, include the MIBA Precinct within the Emerging Community Zone and include the Transport Uses Precinct in a new Precinct (the 'Transport Uses Precinct') within the Low Impact Industry Zone.
- Option 1C: Council puts forward an alternative proposal to amend certain parts of the City Plan, in accordance with its preferred land use mix.
- Option 1D: Amend the Strategic Framework, include the MIBA Precinct within the Emerging Community Zone, include the Transport Uses Precinct in a new Precinct (the 'Transport Uses Precinct') within the Low Impact Industry Zone and include the Storage and the Larger Scale Home Based Enterprise Precinct in the Innovation Zone (a zone that does not currently exist in Redland City Plan but is provided for under the *Planning Regulation 2017).*

City Plan Amendment Option and Description	Advantages	Disadvantages
1A. Amend the Strategic Framework only	• Enables Council to clearly articulate the types of development envisioned within the STPFGA, including relevant conditions (e.g. developer pays for all infrastructure costs in the future MIBA) and assessment parameters (e.g. must not undermine the centres hierarchy). • The amendment is relatively simple to prepare. • Likely to be a streamlined amendment process, as the State Interest Review has a limited scope. • Enables Council to make further amendments to the City Plan in the future, when land use intents for the area (if supported by the State Government), are reflected in the next version of the South East Queensland Regional Plan. • Removes the potential risk of landowners lodging applications for urban activities, in areas that might otherwise be zoned as Emerging Community (e.g. the MIBA Precinct). • Would fulfil Council's *ShapingSEQ* obligations.	• Would prevent a future landowner/developer from lodging a planning application supported by a structure plan to develop the MIBA Precinct, despite the fact that it is recognised as a longer term opportunity (~15 years). • Transport Uses (e.g. Transport Depots and Parking Stations) seeking to establish along Mount Cotton Road would need to satisfy the high performance benchmarks outlined in Schedule 10, Part 16, Division 6, Subdivision 2, Section 27F of the *Planning Regulation 2017.* This may discourage landowners from lodging planning applications, leading to a continuation of existing compliance issues.
1B. Amend the Strategic Framework, include the MIBA Precinct within the Emerging	• Enables the City Plan zoning to be updated prior to changes being reflected in the South East Queensland Regional Plan (i.e. the Urban Footprint being	• To rezone land outside the Urban Footprint, Council must demonstrate a measurable local need and regional justification for the proposal. Such justification will need to

City Plan Amendment Option and Description	Advantages	Disadvantages
Community Zone, include the Transport Uses Precinct in a new Precinct (the 'Transport Uses Precinct') within the Low Impact Industry Zone and retain the existing zoning for the remaining precincts, including allotments located in the balance area of the STPFGA.	expanded to incorporate zones that are urban in nature), following the next review period. • Enables Council to make further amendments to the City Plan in the future, when land use intents for the 'Storage and Larger Scale Home Based Enterprise Precinct' are confirmed and validated against the performance benchmarks in *ShapingSEQ* (demonstrating a measurable local need and regional justification for the proposal). • Would enable a future landowner/developer to lodge a planning application supported by a structure plan to develop the MIBA Precinct. This may 'bring forward' delivery of the MIBA. • Would enable landowners within the Transport Uses Precinct to lodge development applications for transport related urban uses, without triggering referral to the State Government where the use exceeds the development thresholds identified under Schedule 10, Part 16, Division 6, Subdivision 2, Section 27F of the *Planning Regulation 2017* (provided the State Government is willing to expand the Urban Footprint to take in this area, prior to the South East Queensland Regional Plan formal review period).	include that there are no feasible options to unlock areas in the existing Urban Footprint, as required by *ShapingSEQ.* • The Emerging Community zoning may encourage landowners to lodge applications for other urban activities despite the intent for this area being to accommodate a future MIBA. • Would enable a future landowner/developer to lodge a planning application supported by a structure plan to develop all or part of the Emerging Community Zone area. This may 'bring forward' delivery of the MIBA, undermining consolidation of development in the City's existing industry and centre zones. • Recognising the fragmented nature of land ownership within the MIBA Precinct, if the future structure planning process is undertaken by a private sector entity, it may focus on maximizing economic returns rather than what is in the best interest of the community. • Council may be forced to make a decision on the Emerging Community Zone with regard to: o Allocating budget and resources to prepare a structure plan for the MIBA Precinct; or o Encouraging landowners and/or developers to fund and lead the structure planning process, either directly (e.g. through a Council resolution) or

City Plan Amendment Option and Description	Advantages	Disadvantages
	• If the future structure planning process is undertaken by a private sector entity, the costs associated with preparing the structure plan would be borne by that entity. In addition, Council would still retain the right to accept/reject the structure plan and any associated planning application. • Recognises that further planning investigations should be completed to confirm the specific planning intent for the 'Storage and Larger Scale Home Based Enterprise Precinct - Investigation Area', as well as the preferred zoning. • Would fulfil Council's *ShapingSEQ* obligations.	indirectly (e.g. by deciding that Council will not be leading preparation of a structure plan and not confirming whether it will or won't support a developer funded structure plan). • The State Interest Review process is more complicated, relative to Option 1A. • Zoning land for urban purposes may undermine community confidence in the planning system, as this land is currently outside the Urban Footprint.
1C. Council puts forward an alternative proposal to amend certain parts of the City Plan, in accordance with its preferred land use mix.	Not available	Not available
1D. Amend the Strategic Framework, include the MIBA Precinct within the Emerging	• Enables the City Plan zoning to be updated prior to changes being reflected in the South East Queensland Regional Plan (i.e. the Urban Footprint being	• To rezone land outside the Urban Footprint, Council must demonstrate a measurable local need and regional justification for the proposal. Such justification will need to

City Plan Amendment Option and Description	Advantages	Disadvantages
Community Zone, include the Transport Uses Precinct in a new Precinct (the 'Transport Uses Precinct') within the Low Impact Industry Zone and include the Storage and the Larger Scale Home Based Enterprise Precinct in the Innovation Zone and retain the existing zoning for the remaining precincts, including allotments located in the balance area of the STPFGA.	expanded to incorporate zones that are urban in nature), following the next review period. • Enables Council to make further amendments to the City Plan in the future, when land use intents for the 'Storage and Larger Scale Home Based Enterprise Precinct' are confirmed and validated against the performance benchmarks in *ShapingSEQ* (demonstrating a measurable local need and regional justification for the proposal). • Would enable a future landowner/developer to lodge a planning application supported by a structure plan to develop the MIBA Precinct. This may 'bring forward' delivery of the MIBA. • Would enable landowners within the Transport Uses Precinct to lodge development applications for transport related urban uses, without triggering referral to the State Government where the use exceeds the development thresholds identified under Schedule 10, Part 16, Division 6, Subdivision 2, Section 27F of the *Planning Regulation 2017* (provided the State Government is willing to expand the Urban Footprint to take in this area, prior to the South East Queensland Regional Plan formal review period).	include that there are no feasible options to unlock areas in the existing Urban Footprint, as required by *ShapingSEQ*. • The Emerging Community zoning may encourage landowners to lodge applications for other urban activities despite the intent for this area being to accommodate a future MIBA. • Would enable a future landowner/developer to lodge a planning application supported by a structure plan to develop all or part of the Emerging Community Zone area. This may 'bring forward' delivery of the MIBA, undermining consolidation of development in the City's existing industry and centre zones. • Recognising the fragmented nature of land ownership within the MIBA Precinct, if the future structure planning process is undertaken by a private sector entity, it may focus on maximizing economic returns rather than what is in the best interest of the community. • Council may be forced to make a decision on the Emerging Community Zone with regard to: o Allocating budget and resources to prepare a structure plan for the MIBA Precinct; or o Encouraging landowners and/or developers to fund and lead the structure planning process, either directly (e.g. through a Council resolution) or

City Plan Amendment Option and Description	Advantages	Disadvantages
	• If the future structure planning process is undertaken by a private sector entity, the costs associated with preparing the structure plan would be borne by that entity. In addition, Council would still retain the right to accept/reject the structure plan and any associated planning application. • Recognises that further planning investigations should be completed to confirm the specific planning intent for the 'Storage and Larger Scale Home Based Enterprise Precinct - Investigation Area', as well as the preferred zoning. • Would fulfil Council's *ShapingSEQ* obligations.	indirectly (e.g. by deciding that Council will not be leading preparation of a structure plan and not confirming whether it will or won't support a developer funded structure plan). • The State Interest Review process is more complicated, relative to Option 1A. • Zoning land for urban purposes may undermine community confidence in the planning system, as this land is currently outside the Urban Footprint.

As established on page 152 of *ShapingSEQ*, in considering new land for urban purposes outside the Urban Footprint, Council will be required to provide supporting information on the proposed planning scheme amendment to the State Government as part of the State Interest Review process. Amongst other things, this will involve demonstrating a measurable local need and regional justification for the proposal. The detailed local planning must be justified against *ShapingSEQ's* goals, elements and strategies, sub-regional directions, and the Urban Footprint principles. This justification will need to confirm that there are no feasible options to unlock areas in the existing Urban Footprint, which would otherwise enable Council to accommodate its employment planning baselines. As outlined previously, the need for additional employment generating land in Redland City to 2041 has already been flagged in the State Government's LSDM reporting and validated in the Draft CDM Smith EFA, however it is recognised that neither of these reports confirmed where in the City any shortfall of industrial employment supply was required to be located.

Option One

That Council resolves as follows:

1. To confirm that the changes it would like to consider as part of a future major amendment to the City Plan is reflected in Option 1A.

Option Two

That Council resolves as follows:

1. To confirm that the changes it would like to consider as part of a future major amendment to the City Plan is reflected in Option 1B.

Option Three

That Council resolves as follows:

1. To amend the scope of changes proposed to be considered as part of a future major amendment to the City Plan (Option 1C).

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That Council resolves as follows:

1. **To confirm that the changes it would like to consider as part of a future major amendment to the City Plan is reflected in Option 1A.**

Part 2: Options for amending the South East Queensland Regional Plan (*ShapingSEQ)*

As discussed in other sections of this report, the entire STPFGA currently sits outside of the Urban Footprint (i.e. it is designated as a Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area). If the State Government accepts Council's preferred future land use intent for the STPFGA and subsequently, the changes it is proposing to implement as a future major amendment to the City Plan, then it would follow that changes to *ShapingSEQ* would also be required to provide consistency between regional and local planning instruments. It is noted at the outset that the State Government, via the Planning Minister, retains full discretion in determining if Council's proposed changes to *ShapingSEQ* will or won't be supported.

While the standard process for amending *ShapingSEQ* is through the formal review period, which is generally undertaken every 5-7 years, *ShapingSEQ* also provides a mechanism for local governments to consider new land for urban purposes outside of the Urban Footprint 'where [a] detailed planning process has demonstrated a measurable local need and regional justification for the proposal' (p. 152). This section of the report considers options to amend *ShapingSEQ* to reflect and support delivery of Council's preferred future land use mix for the STPFGA. A basic outline of these options, including the foreseen advantages and disadvantages, is outlined in the table below.

- Option 2A: The entire STPFGA remains in the Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area (RLRPA) until *ShapingSEQ* is reviewed and updated, with the Potential Future Growth Area (PFGA) designation retained.
- Option 2B: The MIBA Precinct is incorporated into the Urban Footprint now, with the remainder of the STPFGA being retained in the RLRPA. In addition, the Potential Future Growth Area (PFGA) designation is removed.
- Option 2C: The MIBA, Transport Use and Storage and Larger Scale Home Based Enterprise Precincts are incorporated into the Urban Footprint now, with the remainder of the STPFGA being retained in the RLRPA. In addition, the Potential Future Growth Area (PFGA) designation is removed.
- Option 2D: The MIBA, Transport Use and Storage and Larger Scale Home Based Enterprise Precincts are incorporated into the Urban Footprint now, with the Rural Residential Precinct designated as a Rural Living Area[1] under *ShapingSEQ* and the Intensive Horticulture Precinct being retained in the RLRPA, but defined as a 'Rural Enterprise Precinct'[2] under *ShapingSEQ*. In addition, the Potential Future Growth Area (PFGA) designation is removed.

[1] *ShapingSEQ* designates land in one of three regional land use classifications: Urban Footprint, Rural Living Area or Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area (RLRPA).

[2] A rural precinct is a spatially defined and actively planned area within *ShapingSEQ's* RLRPA. *ShapingSEQ* and the *Planning Regulation 2017* provide for two types of rural precincts: rural subdivision precincts and rural enterprise precincts. See: https://dsdmipprd.blob.core.windows.net/general/shaping-seq-rural-precinct-guideline.pdf

***ShapingSEQ* Amendment Option and Description**	**Advantages**	**Disadvantages**

2A. The entire STPFGA remains in the Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area (RLRPA) until *ShapingSEQ* is reviewed and updated, with the Potential Future Growth Area (PFGA) designation retained.	• Ensures Council's preferred land use settlement pattern is not out of sync with the regional plan.
	• Gives Council time to complete further planning investigations that will inform Council's submission as part of the regional plan review process, such as:
	  ○ where any potential future shortfall of industrial land will be accommodated; and
	  ○ confirming the specific planning intent for the 'Storage and Larger Scale Home Based Enterprise Precinct - Investigation Area', as per Attachment 4, Option 1.
	• Relative to Option 2B, does not provide as much certainty to landowners, as the State's position on Council's proposed future land use mix for the STPFGA would not be confirmed.
	• Reflects the fact that the MIBA represents a longer term (~15 year) opportunity and that an immediate amendment to *ShapingSEQ* is not required.
		• Would prevent a future landowner/developer from lodging a planning application supported by a structure plan to develop the MIBA Precinct, despite the fact that it is recognised as a longer term opportunity (~15 years).
		• Does not acknowledge the short term need for Transport Uses (parking stations and transport depots) along Mount Cotton Road, which are urban in nature.

2B. The MIBA Precinct is incorporated into the Urban Footprint now, with the remainder of the STPFGA being retained in the RLRPA. In addition, the	• Provides clarity to landowners that Council's proposed future land use mix for the STPFGA is supported by the State Government. • Would enable a future landowner/developer to lodge a planning application supported by a	• As part of the amendment process to include land from the Regional Landscape and Rural Production area in an urban zone, as established on page 152 of *ShapingSEQ*, Council must demonstrate a measurable local need and regional justification for the proposal. The detailed local planning must be justified against *ShapingSEQ's* goals, elements and

ShapingSEQ Amendment Option and Description	Advantages	Disadvantages
Potential Future Growth Area (PFGA) designation is removed.	structure plan to develop the MIBA Precinct. This may 'bring forward' delivery of the MIBA. • Removal of the Potential Future Growth Area (PFGA) designation would confirm that the land use intentions for the PFGA to 2041 have been reflected in *ShapingSEQ.*	strategies, sub-regional directions, and the Urban Footprint principles. Such justification will need to include that there are no feasible options to unlock areas in the existing Urban Footprint, which will enable the local government area to accommodate its expansion dwelling supply benchmark or employment planning baselines. Recognising that the CDM Smith report identified the MIBA as a longer term (~15 years) opportunity, it may be difficult to satisfy the State Government requirements. • Does not acknowledge the short term need for Transport Uses (parking stations and transport depots) along Mount Cotton Road, which are urban in nature. • Including land within the Urban Footprint may encourage landowners to lodge applications for other urban activities (e.g. dwelling houses), despite the intent for this area being to accommodate a future MIBA. • This option may limit Council's ability to argue that the MIBA Precinct should not be incorporated within the Priority Infrastructure Area (i.e. making the applicant liable to pay the full cost of servicing the area with trunk infrastructure). • Would enable a future landowner/developer to lodge a planning application supported by a structure plan to develop all or part of the Emerging Community Zone area. This may 'bring forward' delivery of the MIBA, undermining

ShapingSEQ Amendment Option and Description	Advantages	Disadvantages
		consolidation of development in the City's existing industry and centre zones.
2C. The MIBA, Transport Use and Storage and Larger Scale Home Based Enterprise Precincts are incorporated into the Urban Footprint now, with the remainder of the STPFGA being retained in the RLRPA. In addition, the Potential Future Growth Area (PFGA) designation is removed.	• Would enable a future landowner/developer to lodge a planning application supported by a structure plan to develop the MIBA Precinct. This may 'bring forward' delivery of the MIBA. • Acknowledges the short term need for Transport Uses (parking stations and transport depots) along Mount Cotton Road, which are urban in nature. This would enable landowners within the Transport Uses Precinct to lodge development applications for transport related urban uses, without triggering referral to the State Government where the use exceeds the development thresholds identified under Schedule 10, Part 16, Division 6, Subdivision 2, Section 27F of the *Planning Regulation* • In the short term, would enable landowners in the Storage and Larger Scale Home Based Enterprise Precinct to pursue economic opportunities relating to vehicle storage or exceeding the thresholds established in the City Plan home based business code. • Removal of the Potential Future Growth Area (PFGA) designation would confirm that the land use	• As part of the amendment process to include land from the Regional Landscape and Rural Production area in an urban zone, as established on page 152 of *ShapingSEQ*, Council must demonstrate a measurable local need and regional justification for the proposal. The detailed local planning must be justified against *ShapingSEQ's* goals, elements and strategies, sub-regional directions, and the Urban Footprint principles. Such justification will need to include that there are no feasible options to unlock areas in the existing Urban Footprint, which will enable the local government area to accommodate its expansion dwelling supply benchmark or employment planning baselines. Recognising that the CDM Smith report identified the MIBA as a longer term (~15 years) opportunity, it may be difficult to satisfy the State Government requirements. • Including land within the Urban Footprint may encourage landowners to lodge applications for other urban activities, despite the intent for the Emerging Community zone being to accommodate a future MIBA. • Would enable a future landowner/developer to lodge a planning application supported by a structure plan to develop all or part of the Emerging Community Zone area. This may

ShapingSEQ Amendment Option and Description	Advantages	Disadvantages
	intentions for the PFGA to 2041 have been reflected in *ShapingSEQ.*	'bring forward' delivery of the MIBA, undermining consolidation of development in the City's existing industry and centre zones. • This option may limit Council's ability to argue that the MIBA Precinct should not be incorporated within the Priority Infrastructure Area (i.e. making the applicant liable to pay the full cost of servicing the area with trunk infrastructure). • Currently, the specific planning intent for the 'Storage and Larger Scale Home Based Enterprise Precinct - Investigation Area', as well as the most suitable zone, is unclear. This option does not recognise that further planning investigations are required to answer these questions.
2D. The MIBA, Transport Use and Storage and Larger Scale Home Based Enterprise Precincts are incorporated into the Urban Footprint now, with the Rural Residential Precinct designated as a Rural Living Area[3] under *ShapingSEQ* and the	• Would enable a future landowner/developer to lodge a planning application supported by a structure plan to develop the MIBA Precinct. This may 'bring forward' delivery of the MIBA. • Acknowledges the short term need for Transport Uses (parking stations and transport depots) along Mount Cotton Road, which are urban in nature. This would enable landowners within the Transport Uses Precinct to lodge development applications for transport related urban uses, without triggering	• As part of the amendment process to include land from the Regional Landscape and Rural Production area in an urban zone, as established on page 152 of *ShapingSEQ*, Council must demonstrate a measurable local need and regional justification for the proposal. The detailed local planning must be justified against *ShapingSEQ's* goals, elements and strategies, sub-regional directions, and the Urban Footprint principles. Such justification will need to include that there are no feasible options to unlock areas in the existing Urban Footprint, which will enable the local government area to

[3] *ShapingSEQ* designates land in one of three regional land use classifications: Urban Footprint, Rural Living Area or Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area (RLRPA).

ShapingSEQ Amendment Option and Description	Advantages	Disadvantages
Intensive Horticulture Precinct being retained in the RLRPA, but defined as a 'Rural Enterprise Precinct'[4] under *ShapingSEQ*. In addition, the Potential Future Growth Area (PFGA) designation is removed.	referral to the State Government where the use exceeds the development thresholds identified under Schedule 10, Part 16, Division 6, Subdivision 2, Section 27F of the *Planning Regulation* • In the short term, would enable landowners in the Storage and Larger Scale Home Based Enterprise Precinct to pursue economic opportunities relating to vehicle storage or exceeding the thresholds established in the City Plan home based business code. • The specific land use intent espoused in the Intensive Horticulture Precinct aligns with the purpose of the RLRPA Rural Enterprise Precinct, as outlined in the *ShapingSEQ Rural Precincts Guideline*[5]. • The Rural Living Area land use designation under *ShapingSEQ* provides for the establishment of new rural residential development, consistent with the land use intent of the Rural Residential Precinct. • Removal of the Potential Future Growth Area (PFGA) designation would confirm that the land use intentions for the PFGA to 2041 have been	accommodate its expansion dwelling supply benchmark or employment planning baselines. Recognising that the CDM Smith report identified the MIBA as a longer term (~15 years) opportunity, it may be difficult to satisfy the State Government requirements. • Including land within the Urban Footprint may encourage landowners to lodge applications for other urban activities, despite the intent for this area being to accommodate a future MIBA. • Would enable a future landowner/developer to lodge a planning application supported by a structure plan to develop all or part of the Emerging Community Zone area. This may 'bring forward' delivery of the MIBA, undermining consolidation of development in the City's existing industry and centre zones. • This option may limit Council's ability to argue that the MIBA Precinct should not be incorporated within the Priority Infrastructure Area (i.e. making the applicant liable to pay the full cost of servicing the area with trunk infrastructure). • Currently, the specific planning intent for the 'Storage and Larger Scale Home Based Enterprise Precinct - Investigation Area', as well as the most suitable zone, is unclear. This option

[4] A rural precinct is a spatially defined and actively planned area within *ShapingSEQ's* RLRPA. *ShapingSEQ* and the *Planning Regulation 2017* provide for two types of rural precincts: rural subdivision precincts and rural enterprise precincts. See: https://dsdmipprd.blob.core.windows.net/general/shaping-seq-rural-precinct-guideline.pdf

[5] See: https://dsdmipprd.blob.core.windows.net/general/shaping-seq-rural-precinct-guideline.pdf

ShapingSEQ Amendment Option and Description	Advantages	Disadvantages
	reflected in *ShapingSEQ,* providing land use certainty for all landowners within the STPFGA.	does not recognise that further planning investigations are required to answer these questions. • The State Government is unlikely to support the establishment of additional Rural Living Areas within region, given the expansion of rural residential areas fundamentally conflicts with *ShapingSEQ.*

Regardless of the option Council resolves to adopt, in submitting a written report to the Minister with respect to the investigation, Council should also seek to ensure that the State Government removes the (now) redundant statement in the sub-regional outcomes to acknowledge that the requisite investigations have been completed.

Option One

That Council resolves as follows:

1. To inform the State Government that Council's preference is for the entire Southern Thornlands PFGA to be retained within the Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area (Option 2A) and that no changes to *ShapingSEQ* will be required at this point in time; and
2. That as part of the next Regional Plan review process, which is anticipated to occur in the next 2-4 years, a submission will be made to the State Government seeking for the Regional Plan to be amended to reflect Council's preferred land use intents for the STPFGA.

Option Two

That Council resolves as follows:

1. To inform the State Government that Council's preference, as outlined in Option 2B is for an interim amendment to be made to *ShapingSEQ* that:
    a) Incorporates the MIBA Precinct within the Urban Footprint*;*
    b) Retains the balance of the Southern Thornlands PFGA within the Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area;
    c) Removes the Potential Future Growth Area designation for Southern Thornlands; and

Option Three

That Council resolves as follows:

1. To inform the State Government that Council's preference, as outlined in Option 2C, is for an interim amendment to be made to *ShapingSEQ* that:
    a) Incorporates the MIBA, Transport Use and Storage and Larger Scale Home Based Enterprise Precincts within the Urban Footprint*;*
    b) Retains the balance of the Southern Thornlands PFGA within the Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area;
    c) Removes the Potential Future Growth Area designation for Southern Thornlands; and

Option Four

That Council resolves as follows:

1. To inform the State Government that Council's preference, as outlined in Option 2D, is for an interim amendment to be made to *ShapingSEQ* that:
    a) Incorporates the MIBA, Transport Use and Storage and Larger Scale Home Based Enterprise Precincts within the Urban Footprint*;*
    b) Designates the Rural Residential Precinct as a Rural Living Area;
    c) Retains the Intensive Horticulture Precinct within the Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area, but designates this area as a 'Rural Enterprise Precinct';
    d) Retains the balance of the Southern Thornlands PFGA, being the Education, Training and Tourism Precinct, within the Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area; and
    e) Removes the Potential Future Growth Area designation for Southern Thornlands.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That Council resolves as follows:

1. **To inform the State Government that Council's preference is for the entire Southern Thornlands PFGA to be retained within the Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area (Option 2A) and that no changes to *ShapingSEQ* will be required at this point in time; and**
2. **That as part of the next Regional Plan review process, which is anticipated to occur in the next 2-4 years, a submission will be made to the State Government seeking for the Regional Plan to be amended to reflect Council's preferred land use intents for the STPFGA.**