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## i. Glossary

| **City** | **Description** |
| --- | --- |
| City Plan | *Brisbane City Plan 2014* |
| Council | Brisbane City Council |
| GIC zone precinct | Industry (General industry C zone precinct) |
| TLPI | Temporary Local Planning Instrument |
| The proposed amendment | Major amendment package K or Major K |

## 1.0 Introduction

Statutory public consultation of the proposed amendmentto City Plan was undertaken between 12 July 2021 and 23 August 2021. This included a two-week extension to the public consultation period in response to a coronavirus lockdown.

Council received a total of 44 submissions, all of which were properly made. Of the submissions received, there were submissions of support, support in part, oppose, or out of scope of Major amendment package K.

Matters raised by submitters included:

* Zoning changes
* Overlay changes
* Industry changes
* Park changes
* Heritage changes
* Out of scope.

Note: Submission reference numbers are allocated for identification purposes only and do not represent the total number of submissions received.

It is important to note that the proposed amendment may be subject to further changes required by the Queensland Government during the Minister’s consideration period.

## 2.0 Engagement activities

Council held the following community consultation events during the public notification period:

Talk-to-a-planner session 22 July 2021

Talk-to-a-planner online session 23 July 2021

Talk-to-a-planner session 26 July 2021

Talk-to-a-planner online session 28 July 2021

Talk-to-a-planner session 29 July 2021

Council notified the proposed amendment in the following manner:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Newspaper notification | A public notice appeared in *The Courier-Mail* on 9 July 2021. |
| Council website | Web pages providing detail of the proposed amendment were published and maintained from 12 July 2021. |
| Email | An email was sent to City Plan updates subscribers on 12 July 2021 and on 6 August 2021 to advise of the extension to the public consultation period. |
| Letters to landowners | Letters were sent to affected landowners for all proposed zoning and overlay mapping changes. Letters were also sent to the landowners in the area of The Temporary Local Planning Instrument No. 2 of 2021 (Colmslie Road Industry Precinct). |

## 3.0 Submissions by topic

Information about submissions and how Council has considered and responded to submissions is provided in the tables below. Submissions are arranged by topic.

### 3.1 Zone changes

| Submission Reference | Submission Summary | Response | Change required |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MK-009 | The submitter requests the rezoning of 158 Kianawah Road, Wynnum West (and nearby sites as appropriate), from the Emerging community zone to the Low-medium density residential zone for the following reasons:   * The Wynnum West neighbourhood plan flags the corner of Kianawah Road and Evelyn Road for a neighbourhood centre, with the surrounding area as low-density residential houses and multiple dwellings. * The site has been approved for residential subdivision (A005017936). * City Plan no longer supports multiple dwellings in the Low density residential zone, therefore the description in the neighbourhood plan is most consistent with a Low‑medium density residential zone (LMR1 or LMR2). * Higher residential density surrounding a neighbourhood centre is a desirable outcome and is reflected in the land use strategy of the neighbourhood plan.   The subject site is no longer consistent with the purpose of the Emerging community zone considering development that has occurred. | The Wynnum West neighbourhood plan supports the retention of the Emerging community zone to provide Council and the community the opportunity to assess potential impacts of any future multiple dwelling applications.  No changes are proposed to the site’s or surrounding area’s zoning as part of this submission review. Future changes to zoning may occur where development approvals have been enacted. | No change |
| MK-010 | The submitter supports the proposed rezoning of 118 Padstow Road, Eight Mile Plains, (Lots 64 and 65 on RP905173) from the Emerging community zone to the Low density residential zone. The submitter notes that there is an inconsistency in the proposed zoning map in the amendment package, with only Lot 64 showing as changed on the zone map. The submitter requests that the zone map be changed to identify both Lot 64 and Lot 65 in the Low density residential zone. | The proposed zoning change from the Emerging community zone to the Low density residential zone was initiated by Council as an action from *Brisbane’s Future Blueprint* (BFP) -  *Ensure that suburban development fits in with its surroundings. Audit Emerging Community land and rezone to Low Density Residential land where appropriate.*  The audit assessed the suitability of lots changing from the Emerging community zone to the Low density residential zone against factors such as whether or not the area is in a neighbourhood plan and the number and types of constraints.  On review of the audit findings, it is considered that Lot 65 on RP905173 should also be included in the changes from the Emerging community zone to the Low density residential zone. The zone map is proposed to be amended to include Lot 65 on RP905173 in the Low density residential zone and also in the Dwelling house character overlay. | Change |
| MK-029 | The submitter opposes the proposed rezoning of 48 Scenic Road, Kenmore, and properties to the west near Moggill Creek from the Emerging community zone to the Low density residential zone for the following reasons.   * The zoning should provide a gentle transition to lower density development. * There should be a consistent approach to zoning in this area. * Low density residential lots in the area have been split into very small blocks. The resulting development has altered the character of the area. * There is an important corridor of koala habitat along this stretch of Moggill Creek, which would be threatened by more intensive development. * Request that the Emerging community zone be retained or limit residential densities to five dwellings per hectare where adjoining the Environmental management zone or within 150 m of waterways in the Kenmore area. * More intensive residential development is proposed at the cost of waterway and habitat corridors. | The proposed zoning change from the Emerging community zone to the Low density residential zone was initiated by Council as an action from BFP -  *Ensure that suburban development fits in with its surroundings. Audit Emerging Community land and rezone to Low Density Residential land where appropriate.*  The audit assessed the suitability of lots changing from the Emerging community zone to the Low density residential zone against factors such as whether or not the area is in a neighbourhood plan and the number and types of constraints.  The property at 48 Scenic Road, Kenmore, was identified by the audit as being suitable for a change of zone as it is largely unconstrained and suitable for low-density residential development. The nearby sites on Scenic Road retained in the Emerging community zone were not considered suitable for a change of zone as they are subject to further development constraints.  The Emerging community zone does not prevent development but provides for the possibility of further development, subject to detailed planning, taking into account the surrounding development and any constraints. | No change |
| MK-030 | The submitter opposes the proposed rezoning of 98 Groth Road, Boondall, from the Emerging community zone to the Low density residential zone for the following reasons.   * The piecemeal designation of the site will result in development that does not fit with its surroundings, which conflicts with a high-order outcome of BFP –   *Ensure that suburban development fits in with its surroundings.*   * It will erode housing choice and diversity for the site and the immediate surrounding locality as the planning scheme now bans townhouse development in the Low density residential zone. * It will create inconsistency with the existing development pattern of the local area, which is primarily developed for townhouses, and the Strategic framework relating to housing diversity and ageing in place. * It will result in a poor planning outcome for the community. | The proposed zoning change from the Emerging community zone to the Low density residential zone was initiated by Council as an action from BFP -  *Ensure that suburban development fits in with its surroundings. Audit Emerging Community land and rezone to Low Density Residential land where appropriate.*  The audit assessed the suitability of lots changing from the Emerging community zone to the Low density residential zone against factors such as whether or not the area is in a neighbourhood plan and the number and type of constraints.  The property at 98 Groth Road, Boondall, was identified through the audit as being suitable for a change of zone as it is unconstrained and may be suitable for future development. The surrounding sites retained in the Emerging community zone were not considered suitable for a change of zone under this major amendment, as they have already been subject to development approvals. The proposed Low density residential zone for 98 Groth Road is consistent with residential lots to the north of the site and properties on the eastern side of Groth Road.  The Strategic framework map, SFM-002 Brisbane CityShape 2031 Land Use Strategic Framework Map includes this area in the Suburban Living Area. These areas are generally included in the Low density residential zone in order to achieve the strategic outcome of lower-density residential development. The Low density residential zone does not prevent development from occurring on the site. The intent of the Low density residential zone is to provide for a variety of low-density dwellings.  The proposed amendment also includes a change to the Low density residential zone code to require a structure plan to be prepared for sites more than 7,000 m2. | No change |
| MK-034 | The submitter opposes the proposed rezoning of 44A Scenic Road, Kenmore, from the Emerging community zone to the Low density residential zone for the following reasons.   * If the site was subdivided as allowed by the proposed rezoning, increased stormwater flows would be generated to the adjoining property. * The character of Scenic Road is large, leafy blocks that should be preserved. * Scenic Road serves as a wildlife refuge and is home to an abundance of wildlife, including koalas, echidnas, bandicoots, possums, frogs, many reptiles and bird populations. * The proposed rezoning does not adhere to the BFP principles 4.4 and 4.2. It does not protect the character and heritage of this part of Brisbane, and does not 'fit in with its surroundings'. | The proposed zoning changes from the Emerging community zone to the Low density residential zone was initiated by Council as an action from Brisbane consultation feedback that helped to inform BFP -  *Ensure that suburban development fits in with its surroundings. Audit Emerging Community land and rezone to Low Density Residential land where appropriate.*  The audit assessed the suitability of lots changing from the Emerging community zone to the Low density residential zone against factors such as whether or not the area is in a neighbourhood plan and the number and type of constraints.  The property at 44A Scenic Road, Kenmore, was identified through the audit as being suitable for a change of zone as it is largely unconstrained and suitable for low-density residential development.  The adjoining properties in the Emerging community zone, both adjacent and at the rear, were not considered suitable for a change of zone, as they are subject to further development constraints. The properties backing onto Moggill Creek are also partially located in the Environmental management zone. Any proposed development of these lots would be subject to further detailed planning.  The Emerging community zone does not prevent development but provides for the possibility of further development, subject to detailed planning, taking into account the surrounding development and any constraints.  Any further subdivision of 44A Scenic Road will need to meet the requirements of the Subdivision code, including addressing stormwater requirements and lot sizes.  The intent of the Low density residential zone is to provide for a variety of low-density dwellings. | No change |
| MK-042 | The submitter opposes the proposed rezoning of Emerging community zoned areas to the Low density residential zone for the following reasons.   * It reduces dwelling supply and is contrary to *ShapingSEQ* that indicates that an additional 188,200 homes are required in Brisbane between 2016 and 2041. * The impact on housing supply numbers is not balanced by increased supply elsewhere. * There is no supporting material for the change and this should not occur without evidence indicating that Low density residential is the appropriate use. | The proposed zoning change from the Emerging community zone to the Low density residential zone was initiated by Council as an action from BFP -  *Ensure that suburban development fits in with its surroundings. Audit Emerging Community land and rezone to Low Density Residential land where appropriate.*  The audit assessed the suitability of lots changing from the Emerging community zone to the Low density residential zone against factors such as whether or not the area is in a neighbourhood plan and the number and type of constraints.  The areas identified for possible change from the Emerging community zone to the Low density residential zone are included in the Strategic framework map, SFM-002 Brisbane CityShape 2031 Land Use Strategic Framework Map, as Suburban Living Areas. These areas are generally included in the Low density residential zone in order to achieve the strategic outcome of lower-density residential development. The intent of the Low density residential zone is to provide for a variety of low-density dwellings.  Council is well on track to meet the dwelling supply in the *South East Queensland Regional Plan 2017*. These changes do not impact this delivery. | No change |
| MK-043 | The submitter opposes the proposed rezoning of 112 Groth Road, Boondall, from the Emerging community zone to the Low density residential zone for the following reasons.   * Townhouses are consistent with the street, including adjoining the site. * The Low density residential zone would preclude townhouse development occurring on the site. * This outcome would result in significant inconsistency between development opportunities of the site, and the existing and approved uses on adjoining sites. | The proposed zoning change from the Emerging community zone to the Low density residential zone was initiated by Council as an action from BFP -  *Ensure that suburban development fits in with its surroundings. Audit Emerging Community land and rezone to Low Density Residential land where appropriate.*  The audit assessed the suitability of lots changing from the Emerging community zone to the Low density residential zone against factors such as whether or not the area is in a neighbourhood plan and the number and type of constraints.  The property at 112 Groth Road, Boondall, was identified through the audit as being suitable for a change of zone as it is largely unconstrained and suitable for low-density residential development. The surrounding sites retained in the Emerging community zone were not considered suitable for a change of zone under this major amendment, as they have already been subject to development applications.  The proposed Low density residential zone of 112 Groth Road is consistent with residential lots to the north of the site and properties on the eastern side of Groth Road. | No change |
| MK-049 | The submitter requests rezoning of 6 Cowie Road, Carseldine, from the Emerging community zone to the Low density residential zone for the following reasons.   * The site is in the Bracken Ridge and district neighbourhood plan (Carseldine residential precinct – NPP-001), however there are no specific requirements for the site. * The surrounding adjoining sites and across both roads are zoned Low density residential. * The site is suited for urban purposes and no longer suits the purpose of the zone. * It would facilitate the creation of lots which provide for a variety of low-density dwelling types, which would be suitable given the surrounding zoning and development, along with the site's accessibility and proximity to open space, health care services and a shopping centre. * An application (A005663635) for the subdivision of the site is currently under assessment. The proposed lots are consistent with the Low density residential zone. A structure plan was lodged as part of the development application. * As the subject site has ready access to constructed roads and services (as well as future infrastructure projects), the existing zoning of Emerging community is no longer suitable. | A review of Emerging community sites was undertaken in response to BFP -  *Ensure that suburban development fits in with its surroundings. Audit Emerging Community land and rezone to Low Density Residential land where appropriate.*  The audit assessed the suitability of lots changing from the Emerging community zone to the Low density residential zone against factors such as whether or not the area is in a neighbourhood plan and the number and type of constraints.  In the case of 6 Cowie Street, Carseldine, this property was excluded as it did not meet the above requirements. It is noted that the development application for subdivision of the land has been approved, therefore the property will be included on a list for future investigation for a zoning change to reflect the development approval. Council does not make any planning scheme changes to reflect a development approval until the approval has been enacted. | No change |

### 3.2 Overlay changes

| Submission Reference | Submission Summary | Response | Change required |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MK-001 | The submitter requests that the amendment to the Streetscape hierarchy overlay includes mapping of parking controls on streets, including yellow line areas, categories of parking restrictions, loading zones, pick-up/drop-off areas, metered/unmetered parking areas, hours of operation and time limitations, bus zones and so forth. This mapping would be useful in planning personal transport movements. | The Streetscape hierarchy overlay is a planning instrument to ensure that verges are designed and constructed in accordance with Council's intended outcomes for a particular street type. The overlay does not contain information about how the space is operated or managed, e.g. identification of regulated parking or on-road restrictions. It is not intended for planning personal transport movements.  Council makes some of the information identified available to the public through its open data portal at data.brisbane.qld.gov.au. The data in the portal is not processed to be readily accessible without additional software, however members of the public can use it to produce maps containing the data mentioned in the submission. | No change |
| MK-002 | The submitter requests the significant landscape tree at 8A Croydon Road, Paddington, be removed from the Significant landscape tree overlay as the tree died and had to be removed approximately two years ago with Council approval. | Council's conditions of approval for the removal of the original Significant landscape tree required compensatory replacement planting. The replacement planting was requested so that over time, the values of the original Significant landscape tree will be replaced.  It is noted that no changes were proposed to the Significant landscape tree overlay at this location as part of this proposed amendment. The Significant landscape tree overlay code description will be updated in a future amendment to acknowledge the tree’s status as a replacement planting of a hoop pine (*Araucaria cunninghamii*). | No change |
| MK-003 | The submitter opposes the removal of the Commercial character building overlay from 137 Sylvan Road, Toowong, for the following reasons.   * The property is not suitable for residential use and there is an existing development approval for commercial use (Food and drink outlet (café)). * The property is in close proximity to existing Low impact industry zones, is in the Transport noise corridor overlay and in the Flood overlay (Overland flow sub-category). | The building at 137 Sylvan Road, Toowong, is a pre-1947 building originally constructed as a dwelling and is not a Commercial character building.  It does not fulfil the characteristics of a Commercial character building, including not originally being designed for small-scale commercial activities or for use as a local corner store, it is not built to the front boundary alignment, and does not incorporate an awning over the footpath supported by timber or cast-iron posts.  Removal of the building from the Commercial character building overlay has no impact on any existing lawful and current approvals. | No change |
| MK-005 | The submitter opposes the identification of Honour Avenue, Graceville, between Verney Road West and Mortlake Road, as a Locality street sub-category in the Streetscape hierarchy overlay. This area is single storey (commercial) and character housing. Honour Avenue is a very busy road, with parking now extending up local roads. These local roads leading to Laurel Avenue are used by local children to scoot, ride and walk. The increase in traffic has meant that it is unsafe for children to walk to their local school/train station and they need to be driven. Any development that leads to an increase in traffic along a relatively narrow road that is heavily used by active transport users should not go ahead. | The Streetscape hierarchy overlay is a planning instrument to ensure that verges and verge treatments are designed and constructed in accordance with Council's intended outcomes for a location, taking into consideration the adjoining land uses. Honour Avenue in this location is in a District centre and the Locality street sub-category in the overlay reflects this.  The overlay does not affect the type or scale of development allowed on a site and does not influence the volume of traffic on a road or the number of vehicles parked on the road. The Road hierarchy overlay in City Plan identifies key road types and their classification. | No change |
| MK-007 | The submitter requests that the proposed amendment removes the Pre-1911 building overlay from 31-33 Cleveland Street, Stones Corner. Two dwelling houses on the subject sites were demolished in 2013 under a Development Permit for Building Works (Decision Notice number 00017283), which was issued under the superseded *City Plan 2000*. The Pre-1911 building overlay was incorrectly mapped on the property with the commencement of City Plan and should be removed to reflect the demolition. | The requested change was investigated and the Pre-1911 building overlay was subsequently removed from the property as part of Minor amendment package K, which was adopted by Council on 22 March 2022 and adopted into City Plan on 27 May 2022. | No change |
| MK-008 | The submitter suggests that there are errors in the proposed amendment, including:   * 46 Maynard Street, Woolloongabba, is a heritage-listed house built circa 1888 and does not appear on the Pre‑1911 building overlay map. Nor do most houses of that era in the suburb. * A park with mature trees opposite 46 Maynard Street, which is on Queensland Rail land, does not appear as a significant landscape feature on the Significant landscape trees overlay map. | The Pre-1911 building overlay protects individual residential buildings constructed before 1911 that are not included in the Traditional building character overlay.  Where a building is even more significant and meets one or more of Council's cultural heritage criteria, it is included as a Local heritage place in the Heritage overlay. 46 Maynard Street, Woolloongabba, is correctly included in the Heritage overlay and does not require to be mapped in the Pre-1911 building overlay.  The site opposite 46 Maynard Street Woolloongabba, will be investigated for possible inclusion on the Significant landscape tree overlay as part of a potential future amendment. | No change |
| MK-014 | The submitter requests that Council be responsible for the maintenance of the tree at 21 Cosker Street, Annerley, that is proposed to be included in the Significant landscape tree overlay, as there are significant maintenance issues with potential to damage surrounding properties and constitutes a financial hindrance. | Management of the tree remains the responsibility of the property owner, however Council does not require the property owner of the land on which the tree is located to undertake additional work to this protected vegetation.  If the tree is posing an immediate significant threat, the owner should contact Council for immediate advice. If the tree requires general maintenance, the tree owner should apply for a free, short or long-term permit to undertake works on protected vegetation.  Additional advice is available through the permit application process, on Council's website or by calling Council's Contact Centre on 3403 8888. | No change |
| MK-018 | The submitter opposes the inclusion of three trees (a Blue Quandong and two Hoop Pines) at 487 Boundary Street and 40 Wedd Street, Spring Hill, in the Significant landscape tree overlay, as there is a development approval (A004892414) providing for removal of the trees.  The decision is currently subject to appeal in the Planning and Environment Court, however, Council accepted the removal of these trees as part of the approved development. | The development approval and Planning and Environment Court appeal over the site has been reviewed. It is noted that Council’s approval does allow for removal of the identified trees, and the submitter appeal of Council’s approval has been withdrawn. This site has therefore been included on a list for investigation for a potential future amendment to reflect the development approval. Please note that Council does not make any planning scheme changes to reflect a development approval until the approval has been enacted. | No change |
| MK-033 | The submitter opposes the inclusion of a tree at 39 East Street, Camp Hill, in the Significant landscape tree overlay as the large tree was removed several years ago following a safety incident. At that time, it was identified that the tree was dying and was interfering with sewerage pipes. | Council will no longer proceed with including the fig tree at 39 East Street, Camp Hill, in the Significant landscape tree overlay following confirmation of the tree’s removal.  The loss of this tree is under review by Council’s Compliance team. Council’s decision to no longer pursue the identification of the tree in the overlay has no influence on the outcome of the *Natural Assets Local Law 2003* (NALL) review nor any potential remedy or enforcement action that may result should an offence have occurred.  The removal of this entry in the Significant landscape tree overlay requires changes to the code and mapping. Mapping changes include for adjoining properties at 37 East Street and common property 41 East Street, Camp Hill, and Unit 1 and common property 35 Cambridge Street, Carina Heights. | Change |
| MK-046 | The submitter supports the proposed addition of the Commercial character building overlay on 71 Frasers Road, Ashgrove for the following reasons.   * Both buildings on the property are able to support wider activities than purely residential. * It preserves icons of this type to tell the story of earlier generations.   The submitter has the following concerns relating to the proposed change.   * It may bring additional charges (such as Rates). * The overlay may prevent renting out the Caretaker's residence on the property. | Support noted.  The amendment is proposing to apply the Commercial character building overlay to the property, not changing the zone, which will remain as the Low density residential zone. The overlay does not prevent the rear dwelling from being used for residential purposes.  Rates are calculated based on land valuations and rating categories. Council calculates a rate charge by multiplying the property’s average rateable value (ARV) by a dollar rate. The dollar rate depends on the property’s rating category, based on its main land use. More information on land valuations and rating categories can be found on Council’s website. | No change |
| MK-047 | The submitter opposes the proposed amendments as they are not disclosed to residents. The webpage lists three amendments to map tile 20, being the Commercial character building overlay, Significant landscape tree overlay and the Streetscape hierarchy overlay; however, no specifics of the amendments were provided and none were able to be obtained when contacting Council. | The proposed amendment was made available via the project webpage from the commencement of public consultation. The project webpage provides:   * an overview of the amendment changes * a link to City Plan online to view the detailed text changes * map tiles (via Google maps) that identify what mapping changes (zoning or overlay) may apply to each area. | No change |

### 3.3 Industry changes

##### 3.3.1 Industry changes – Brisbane Industrial Strategy 2019

The following submission issues and responses are organised according to the *Brisbane Industrial Strategy 2019* Action items and amendments to City Plan.

| **Submission Reference** | **Submission Summary** | **Response** | **Change required** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Action 1 - Support large‑format, high‑impact logistics/distribution uses, where they meet appropriate thresholds in the General industry C zone precinct within the ATC and SWIG MIAs.*** | | | |
| MK-016  MK-020  MK-031  MK-037  MK-038  MK-039  MK-041  MK-053  MK-054 | The submitters recommend that the proposed gross floor area (GFA) threshold for development for a warehouse in the General industry C (GIC) zone precinct be reduced or removed for reasons including.   * The proposed threshold hinders renewal, flexibility of use and favours large format warehouse development. * The minimum GFA of 15,000 m2 (per tenancy) caters for a small number of very large industrial uses and there is a need for smaller warehouse uses to provide for 'last mile logistics' uses. * A reduction in the minimum tenancy size will allow businesses to establish warehouses in the GIC zone precinct and allow for growth of the business and future expansions on the same site. * It is more appropriate to limit the impacts of a warehouse rather than the size of the building. * There are few sites in Brisbane where it is feasible to develop a single building and tenancy over 15,000 m2 due to business demand, land availability and costs. * Logistics and distribution companies demand smaller flexible tenancy spaces due to technological advancements allowing for greater intensity of floor space use, reduced operating costs and opportunity to expand within an existing building. * A contemporary and flexible policy framework that keeps pace with the rapidly evolving industrial sector is needed. * Low impact and warehousing uses should be accepted or code assessable development in all industrial zoned land.   Recommended alternatives for warehouse thresholds include:   * A total GFA of 10,000 m2, and minimum tenancy GFA of 3,000 m2. * A minimum GFA of 5,000 m2 (per tenancy/unit). * A minimum warehouse tenancy size of 3,000 m2. | The proposed warehouse threshold balances outcomes to support large-format, high-impact logistics and distribution warehouses with the ongoing need to ensure that capacity remains available in the Industry (General industry C zone precinct) (GIC zone precinct).  There remains a need to preserve GIC zone precinct land to support high-impact industry uses. Preserving these larger sites ensures that Brisbane can remain competitive and flexible in responding to changing industry activities and demand for large-format, high‑impact warehouse uses.  The minimum gross floor area threshold per tenancy is proposed to minimise small multi-tenancy developments occurring in large format warehouse developments. Smaller warehouses are not considered to have the operating intensity or potential impacts on sensitive uses that warrant locating in the GIC zone precinct. Smaller operating tenancies, such as ‘last mile logistics’, can be located on sites in lower-order industry zones and are not considered to have the level of impact to justify a need for the larger sites or consolidation in the GIC zone precinct.  In response to further analysis and testing of development activity, land supply data of GIC zone precinct land, submissions and site visits, it is proposed to change the threshold to 10,000 m2. This proposed reduction in threshold is considered to be more responsive to market demands and availability of land in the GIC zone precinct.  Further investigation into the distribution of industrial zones will be carried out as part of the implementation phase of *Our Productive City: Brisbane’s Industrial Future*. The changes proposed in this package of amendments represents an incremental change as Council undertakes these further investigations. | Change |
| MK-016  MK-031  MK-037  MK-039  MK-041  MK-053  MK-054 | The submitters recommend the removal of the proposed criteria for development for a warehouse to be a ‘major development’ as defined in the Transport, access, parking and servicing planning scheme policy (TAPS PSP) thresholds. | Traffic generation is a key measure of development intensity and impacts to identify warehouse uses that may warrant locating in the Industry (General industry C zone precinct).  Accordingly, a minimum threshold has been adopted to identify development with high traffic generating potential (‘major development’) that is considered to have the operating intensity or potential impacts on sensitive uses that justify locating in the Industry (General industry C zone precinct). This land provides better access to heavy vehicle routes and avoids access through residential and other sensitive zones. | No change |
| MK-020 | The submitter requests warehouse and low and medium impact industry uses be allowed in the GIC zone precinct where the land is located within 500 m of residential areas and cites an example at Pinkenba. | Comments and suggestions regarding the suitability of the Industry (General industry C zone precinct) for lower order industrial uses, where within proximity to residential areas, are noted.  Further investigation into the distribution of industrial zones will be carried out as part of the implementation phase of *Our Productive City: Brisbane’s Industrial Future*. The changes proposed in this package of amendments represents an incremental change as Council undertakes these further investigations. | No change |
| MK-038 | The submitter suggests that industrial precincts within Lytton and Geebung are impacted by the inability to locate warehouse uses in the GIC zone precinct. The average tenancy size in Geebung/Virginia GIC zone precinct is 850 m2, and is primarily warehouse, showroom and retail uses with approximately three large manufacturers in the entire precinct. Global trends show warehousing/distribution and manufacturing can all co-exist within industrial precincts. | Small warehouses are not supported in the Industry (General industry C zone precinct) in the Northern Major Industrial Area (MIA), to preserve opportunities in the precinct to meet manufacturing demand and accommodate high-impact industry and compatible medium-impact industry uses into the future.  The analysis of industry demand projections and supply, undertaken as part of the *Brisbane Industrial Strategy 2019* and to inform the *Our Productive City: Brisbane’s Industrial Future*, identified GIC zone precinct land supply is already constrained in the Northern MIA, with a higher projected demand for manufacturing and high impact industry uses. | No change |
| ***Action 2 - Provide for appropriate non-industrial uses that meet the specific needs of workers and enhance the function of areas where low-impact industry is supported.*** | | | |
| MK-031 | The submitter supports, in part, broadening the scope for small-scale support services and facilities in the industry zone, including food outlets and gyms, trade and industry related education, and small-scale shops. However, the submitter suggests that restricting clientele from only within the zone is unreasonably restrictive and a local catchment would be more appropriate. | Support for the inclusion of non-industrial uses in industrial zones is noted.  In response to submissions, changes are proposed to further clarify provisions for shop, food and drink outlet and indoor sport and recreation uses, including revised requirements limiting the service catchments. | Change |
| MK-038  MK-041  MK-053 | The submitters suggest providing greater flexibility for non-industrial land uses providing a direct nexus to industrial uses. | The proposed amendment gives effect to Action 2 from the *Brisbane Industrial Strategy 2019* to provide for appropriate non-industrial uses that meet the specific needs of workers and enhance the function of areas where low impact industry is supported.  The proposed amendment seeks to clarify the non-industrial uses that may be accommodated in industrial zones as stand-alone uses. The proposed amendment does not limit opportunities for non-industrial ancillary activities to be accommodated in industrial zones, where a direct nexus to an industrial use can be demonstrated.  Limitations on the type, scale and location of stand-alone non-industrial uses ensures that appropriate uses can be accommodated in a manner supporting industrial businesses and workers, while ensuring that the ongoing industrial function of an area is not compromised. | No Change |
| MK-041  MK-053 | The submitters suggest that:   * The amendment does not recognise that industrial suburbs are transitioning to include activated uses after 5pm, including brewery uses with a food and drink outlet or hotel, which provide a vital contribution to the activation of industrial suburbs, as well as reducing crime and antisocial behaviours. * The peak operating times of these uses, as well as indoor sport and recreation uses, are when other industrial operations have ceased. The changes should reflect more appropriate parking demand for these activities considering the parking available in these zones after 5pm. | Hours of operations for shop, food and drink outlet, indoor sport and recreation and ancillary bar and hotel activities are limited in the Low impact industry zone and Industry (General industry A zone precinct) to ensure that operations of non-industrial uses do not result in negative noise impacts on nearby residential zones or sensitive uses. Low impact industry and Industry (General industry A zone precinct) land is generally located on the fringe of industrial areas as a transition to adjacent residential land.  Hours of operation for non-industrial uses, such as shop and food and drink outlet, have not been limited in other industrial zones, including the Industry (General industry B zone precinct) and Industry (General industry C zone precinct), as these areas are located with adequate separation to sensitive uses.  Stand-alone bar and hotel uses are not consistent with the outcomes sought in industry zones.  The request to reduce car parking rates for non-industrial uses is not within the scope of the amendment. Changes to car parking rates as part of this amendment are limited to warehouse.    Alternative hours of operation and car parking rates can be proposed where an application can demonstrate that alternative solutions satisfy the applicable assessment benchmarks. | No change |
| MK-041  MK-042  MK-053 | The submitters support the inclusion of non-industrial uses of indoor sport and recreation, warehouse, and research and technology industry uses in industrial zones, however:   * There are concerns with the size and separation distances for the small-scale non-industrial uses. * The limitations do not enable flexibility, but rather inhibit the establishment of uses that are ancillary to and directly support industrial uses, which does not serve to protect or enhance the industrial sector or facilitate logical development of these area. * The provisions will exclude establishments that are not able to find practical, cost-effective locations elsewhere in the city, and do not provide the needed flexibility for industrial areas. A range of non-industrial uses are seeking locations in industrial areas, and others are a 'secondary' function to an industrial use but may take up more floor space that the primary function, but still require separation from sensitive uses. | Support for the inclusion of non-industrial uses in industrial zones is noted.  The proposed amendment seeks to clarify the non-industrial uses that may be accommodated in industrial zones as stand-alone uses. The proposed amendment does not limit opportunities for non-industrial ancillary activities to be accommodated in industrial zones, where a direct nexus to an industrial use can be demonstrated or the use is not adequately provided for elsewhere in the city.  Limitations on the type, scale and location of stand-alone non-industrial uses ensure that appropriate uses can be accommodated in a manner supporting industrial businesses and workers, while ensuring that the ongoing industrial function of an area is not compromised.  Separation distances ensure that development does not result in the clustering of non-industrial uses and unplanned centres.  In response to submissions, changes are proposed to further clarify where non-industrial uses may be accommodated. | Change |
| MK-056 | The submitter recommends changes to some of the provisions to ensure that small-scale non-industrial uses do not have a detrimental impact on the ongoing operation of existing or intended industries in the Industry zones. | Limitations on the type, scale and location of stand‑alone non-industrial uses ensure that appropriate uses can be accommodated in a manner supporting industrial businesses and workers, while ensuring that the ongoing industrial function of an area is not compromised.  The proposed amendment includes minimum separation distances between indoor sport and recreation and medium impact industry, high impact industry and special industry uses. This ensures that indoor sport and recreation is compatible with nearby existing industrial uses and does not adversely impact on the continued operation of uses that have the potential for off-site air emissions.  In response to submissions, changes are proposed to ensure that non-industrial uses do not compromise the intended function of an industrial area. | Change |
| ***Action 3 – Support ‘research and technology industry’ use in the Mixed use zone to facilitate the evolution of advanced manufacturing.*** | | | |
| MK-042 | The submitter supports changes in the proposed amendment to permit further research and technology industry uses in industrial zones. | Support noted. | No change |
| ***Action 6 – Align car parking rates with contemporary employment densities, technologies and increasing hours of operation.*** | | | |
| MK-016  MK-037  MK-039  MK-041  MK-053  MK-054 | The submitters recommend further reducing car parking rates for warehouses in the Transport, access, parking and servicing planning scheme policy.  The demand for warehouses has a converse relationship to the size of a warehouse, and there should be additional car parking reductions to provide for an efficient use of land for larger warehouse developments.  The following are proposed warehouse car parking rates:   * Option 1:   + 1 space per 100 m2 gross floor area (GFA) where below 5,000 m2 GFA.   + 1 space per 150 m2 GFA where over 5,000 m2 GFA.   + 1 space per 200 m2 GFA where over 10,000 m2 GFA. * Option 2:   + 1 space per 100 m2 GFA where below 7,500 m2 GFA.   + 1 space per 150 m2 GFA where over 7,500 m2 GFA.   + 1 space per 200 m2 GFA where over 15,000 m2 GFA. * Option 3:   + 1 space per 200 m2 GFA where below 15,000 m2 GFA.   + 1 space per 250 m2 GFA where above 15,000 m2 GFA.   + 1 space per 300 m2 GFA where above 30,000 m2 GFA.   Additional information was provided on approved supply and peak demand at sample sites to support a further reduction in car parking rates for warehouses. | The comments and suggestions regarding the revised car parking rates for warehouse uses in City Plan are noted.  The proposed car parking rates have been informed by an industrial trends and demand analysis.  In response to submissions, further analysis of recent development activity and car parking occupancy has been undertaken. Changes are proposed to further reduce the car parking rate for warehouse uses to two spaces per tenancy or lot, plus 1 space per 100 m2 gross floor area up to 7,500 m2 gross floor area, plus one space per 150 m2 gross floor area above 7,500 m2 gross floor area. | Change |
| MK-031 | The submitter supports the change to warehouse car parking rates as it reflects the nature of industrial use, however, considers that a ‘one size fits all’ approach is not appropriate and performance-based solutions should still be considered e.g. to reflect uses that are highly automated or where shift and workforce profiles warrant it. | Queensland Government legislation requires City Plan to be a performance-based planning scheme, ensuring that applicants are provided with the opportunity for alternative solutions that meet the requirements of the performance outcomes.  The proposed amendment does not change this approach. An applicant can choose to comply with the standards in an applicable acceptable outcome or propose an alternative solution considered to still achieve the performance outcome and overall outcomes of an applicable code.  The Transport, access, parking and servicing planning scheme policy provides the necessary guidance and supporting information that may be requested to demonstrate compliance with the code. Where an alternative solution is proposed, a traffic impact assessment prepared in accordance with the Transport, access, parking and servicing planning scheme policy may be required to demonstrate that adequate parking has been provided. | No change |
| ***Action 8 - Enhance the role of Brisbane’s industrial precincts by emphasising their role in meeting evolving industrial demand, facilitate business and infrastructure investment and services needed to attract a skilled workforce.*** | | | |
| MK-015  MK-035  MK-042  MK-044  MK-048 | The submitters oppose the proposed industry changes relating to the Strategic Inner City Industrial Areas, for the following reasons.   * Broadscale tightening of the Strategic framework against alternative uses is excessive, particularly in inner-city areas like Newstead that would better serve the economy and vibrancy of the city through mixed-use development. * Many industries have continued to vacate inner-city industrial areas and there is limited industry left. These redundant industrial areas should be allowed to renew and revitalise as mixed-use areas. * Retaining these areas as low-scale industrial buildings will turn away investment and stop opportunities for new, viable development, urban renewal, the creation of higher value jobs and repositioning the city towards 2032. * Amendments to the Strategic Inner City Industrial Areas do not align with intent of the Brisbane Industrial Strategy Review for increased flexibility. * The proposed changes should be reviewed to permit flexibility for alternative uses in specific locations in response to planning investigations. | The Strategic framework provisions for Strategic Inner City Industrial Areas ensure that existing lawful industries can continue to operate in these areas with certainty and are protected from encroachment from sensitive uses.  The strategic outcomes and the land use strategies under the Strategic framework acknowledge the role of the Strategic Inner City Industrial Areas and their focus on economic activity. This includes an acknowledgment that these areas may accommodate an alternative mix of industry and employment-generating, non-industrial uses where a comprehensive precinct planning process has been undertaken.  In response to submissions, changes are proposed to further clarify where non-industrial uses may be accommodated.  The proposed amendment is a stepped change in response to the *Brisbane Industrial Strategy 2019* and the action items.  Following the review of feedback from the community and stakeholders, *Our Productive City: Brisbane’s Industrial Future* will include recommendations and an implementation program that may include further amendments to City Plan, addressing the flexibility of uses and built form in industry areas. | Change |
| ***Site/Precinct Specific*** | | | |
| MK-015  MK-032  MK-036 | The submitters oppose the industry amendments and specifically refer to concerns for the Newstead area, including:   * Newstead has minimal industry uses remaining, so to only allow industry (with very limited other uses) in the industrial areas stops redevelopment opportunities and would increase land use conflicts. * Newstead should be treated differently given its unique location and that existing land uses would prevent traditional industrial businesses establishing. * Allow changes relating to the Newstead north neighbourhood plan to allow for a more diverse mix of uses and zones. * Stop industry components of Major amendment K as they apply to Newstead, to avoid confusion and uncertainty. | The proposed amendment applies citywide to industrial‑zoned land and does not seek to change locally‑specific provisions, including the Newstead north neighbourhood plan.  Where there is inconsistency between provisions in the neighbourhood plan codes, use codes and other development codes, the neighbourhood plan codes prevail to the extent of the inconsistency.  Queensland Government legislation requires City Plan to be a performance-based planning scheme, ensuring that applicants are provided with the opportunity for alternative solutions which meet the requirements of the performance outcomes.  Council has an obligation to assess an application on its merits, whilst recognising the need to provide for the intended built form, amenity and living environment envisaged by City Plan. | No change |
| MK-020 | The submitter identifies that Industry (General industry C zone precinct) land in Pinkenba is within 500 m of residential areas (including the former Incitec fertilizer manufacturing plant).  The submitter suggests that the Industry code be amended to allow for low impact industry and medium impact industry in this zone precinct, where within 500 m of residential areas, or alternatively rezone General industry C zone precinct areas closer than 500 m to residential areas. | The proposed amendment applies citywide to industrial‑zoned land and does not seek to change locally‑specific provisions, including the Pinkenba—Eagle Farm neighbourhood plan or site-based zoning.  The Pinkenba—Eagle Farm neighbourhood plan recognises that development for high-impact industry within the minimum separation distances to residential areas may continue to be accommodated in Pinkenba, where it can be demonstrated that the use will not significantly impact on sensitive land uses. The encroachment of lower-order industrial activities into precincts identified for high impact or special industry uses is not supported.  Queensland Government legislation requires City Plan to be a performance-based planning scheme, ensuring that applicants are provided with the opportunity for alternative solutions which meet the requirements of the performance outcomes.  Council has an obligation to assess an application on its merits, whilst recognising the need to provide for the intended built form, amenity and living environment as envisaged by City Plan. | No change |

##### 3.3.2 Industry changes – Brisbane Industrial Strategy Review 2021

The *Brisbane Industrial Strategy 2019* was reviewed in 2021 and released as a draft strategy, *Our Productive City: Brisbane’s Industrial Future* for consultation from 21 June to 23 August 2021. The following submission issues and responses address Major K and *Our Productive City: Brisbane’s Industrial Future*, as the Brisbane Industrial Strategy Review (BISR).

| Submission Reference | Submission Summary | Response | Change required |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MK-015  MK-031  MK-032  MK-035  MK-036  MK-040  MK-042  MK-044  MK-048 | The submitters oppose the proposed amendment due to it not aligning with the draft Brisbane Industrial Strategy Review, and for the following reasons.   * The amendment allows for industry uses only, whereas the BISR allows for a combination of industry, residential and commercial uses within the same or separate buildings. * The form and scale of development is different, with small warehouse-style boxes of 15 m maximum height allowed under the amendment, and large integrated tower format allowed under BISR. * Operating hours are restricted to 7am to 7pm, Monday to Saturday, in the amendment, versus 24-hour operations under the BISR. | The proposed amendment is a stepped change in response to the Brisbane Industrial Strategy 2019 action items.  The draft *Our Productive City: Brisbane’s Industrial Future* was released for consultation from 21 June 2021 to 23 August 2021.  Following the review of feedback from the community and stakeholders, *Our Productive City: Brisbane’s Industrial Future* will be finalised to include recommendations and an implementation program that may include further amendments to City Plan addressing the flexibility of uses and built form in industry areas.  These submissions have been forwarded for review as part of the *Our Productive City: Brisbane’s Industrial Future* implementation process. | No change |
| MK-031  MK-036 | The submitters note that the amendment package does not offer any revisions to the current acceptable solutions for building height, which is prescribed as 15 m. To align with the objectives of the draft industrial strategy, consideration should be given to building heights to support the renewal of these precincts in the inner-city areas. | Industrial building and site design provisions, including building heights, will be reviewed as part of the implementation phase of *Our Productive City: Brisbane’s Industrial Future*.  These submissions have been forwarded for review as part of the *Our Productive City: Brisbane’s Industrial Future* implementation process. | No change |

##### 3.3.3 Industry changes – Colmslie Road Industry Precinct

The Queensland government made Temporary Local Planning Instrument No. 2 of 2021 (Colmslie Road Industry Precinct) (TLPI 02/2021) which came into effect on 29 June 2021. The following submission issues and responses address the TLPI.

| Submission Reference | Submission Summary | Response | Change required |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MK-036 | The submitter suggests that the amendment applies blanket planning policy across the city in response to the Colmslie Road Industrial Precinct TLPI.  If the proposed amendment is intended to apply permanently to a discrete planning area (i.e. Colmslie Road industrial estate), this should be reflected in the amendment rather than applying to all Low impact industry zoned land across Brisbane, including inner-city locations. | Council proposed the changes in Major amendment package K in November 2019. The TLPI was prepared by the Queensland Government and gazetted on 29 June 2021.  The Council-proposed changes in Major amendment package K give effect to Action 2 from the Brisbane Industrial Strategy 2019, to provide for appropriate non-industrial uses that meet the specific needs of workers and enhance the function of areas where low impact industry is supported. These changes are intended to apply citywide, not only to a discrete area.  Further investigation and appropriate consultation is required prior to the TLPI being integrated into City Plan. | No change |
| MK-056 | The submitter supports the proposed provisions relating to food and drink outlet, shop and indoor sport and recreation uses, and suggests that additional provisions be included for these uses to ensure consistency with the Colmslie Road Industrial Precinct TLPI.  The submitter specifically recommends excluding outdoor dining/seating areas for food and drink outlet, shop, and indoor sport and recreation uses in the TLPI area.  Qualified support is provided on the basis that further changes are made to the proposed amendment to reflect the economic significance of the TLPI area, and the protection of industrial uses as identified within the TLPI area. | Support noted.  Council proposed the change in Major K in November 2019. The TLPI was prepared by the Queensland Government and gazetted on 29 June 2021.  The proposed amendments do not exclude provision of outdoor dining/seating areas for food and drink outlet uses, as they provide amenity for users of the premises.  Further investigation and appropriate consultation are required prior to the TLPI being integrated into City Plan. | No change. |

### 3.4 Park changes

| Submission Reference | Submission Summary | Response | Change required |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MK-042 | The submitter supports the clarification of the park use as appropriate throughout the city. | Support noted. | No change |

### 3.5 Heritage changes

| Submission Reference | Submission Summary | Response | Change required |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MK-045 | The submitter supports the amendment, however recommends deleting references to the State Assessment and Referral Agency and State heritage places, as under the *Planning Act 2016*, Council does not have jurisdiction over State heritage places or land adjoining a State heritage place. Changes to the following sections are recommended:   * Heritage overlay, Section B – If in the area adjoining heritage sub-category. * SC6.13 Heritage planning scheme policy (PSP).   The submitter supports, in part, the Heritage PSP Sub‑section: 7 Guidelines for the archival recording of Local heritage places, and recommends the following changes.   * Drafting should take account of the Queensland heritage guideline for archival recording to facilitate consistency in the approach for archival recording over local and State heritage places. * Step 1 should be to prepare a scope of work covering the type of recording proposed, the type of photos, inclusion of point cloud surveys or videos of machinery or processes, whether a hard copy file is required etc. This should then be negotiated, agreed and signed off by Council. * Black and white photos are rarely used now, as high‑quality colour photos are available and printed material is also provided less as there are storage issues. Often, only digital files are required. * Define the term "appropriately qualified heritage consultant". It could be defined as a Full International member of Australia ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) and further, if buildings are involved, the person should be a registered architect. * There should also be nomination of where the material is to be stored, such as Council archives, Council project files and/or the local history group. | Support noted.  The further changes suggested by the submitter have been considered and it is proposed to remove references to State heritage places from Section 5 of the Heritage PSP and the Heritage overlay code where appropriate.  Further suggestions for the Heritage PSP (7 Guidelines for archival recording of Local heritage places) have been considered and the following changes have been made.   * Reference to the Queensland Government’s Guideline: Archival Recording of Heritage Places has been inserted. * Inclusion of an early step requiring the applicant to consult with Council to define and determine an agreed scope of work required for archival recording. * Inclusion of a reference to providing archival recordings in digital and printed formats (unless otherwise agreed to by Council) and reference to submission of high-resolution photographs. * A note is included to clarify “appropriately qualified heritage consultant” in the Heritage PSP. | Change |

### 3.6 Out of scope

| Submission Reference | Submission Summary | Response | Change required |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MK-017 | The submitter requests rezoning of 31 Vauxhall Street, Virginia, from the Industry investigation zone to the Industry zone (General industry B zone precinct) for the following reasons.   * The site is within a well-established industrial cluster in Virginia, and is an isolated Industry investigation zoned parcel, flanked on either side by properties in the Industry zone. * A timber warehouse and lower impact business uses are located to the east and west of the premises and generally align with activities anticipated within the General industry B zone precinct, which is the predominant zone precinct on the southern side of Vauxhall Street. * The site has been used for industrial activity for a number of years and features a historic residential building that was recently used as a caretaker’s residence, and office for an approved outdoor storage and industry business. * On 26 May 2021, a Development Permit was issued for Low impact industry and Warehouse uses over the site, involving the development of a new industrial building and car park (Council Reference A005624432), and construction is currently in progress. | The request is not within the scope of the amendment. There are no proposed changes in Major amendment package K to the location reference in this submission.  31 Vauxhall Street, Virginia, will be investigated for possible future zoning amendments as part of a potential future amendment to reflect an enacted development approval. | No change |
| MK-019 | The submitter cannot see where the Queensland Government's new regulatory koala habitat maps for South East Queensland have been incorporated into City Plan, including in Upper Kedron. It is important that City Plan reflects critical biodiversity overlays accurately. | This request is not within the scope of the amendment.  The Queensland Government adopted major reforms to the planning framework in February 2020 to address the loss of koala habitat in South East Queensland. As part of these reforms, the Queensland Government also adopted new koala habitat mapping to inform the implementation of these regulations.  The koala habitat mapping is managed and updated by the Queensland Government annually and applies to the Brisbane local government area. Proposed development identified within the State koala habitat mapping requires assessment by the Queensland Government. Proposed development within the Koala habitat area of the Biodiversity areas overlay in City Plan also requires assessment against relevant City Plan provisions. | No change |
| MK-052 | The submitter opposes the following reference documents in the Infrastructure design planning scheme policy (IDPSP), Chapter 7 Stormwater drainage:   * Urban creek erosion - Guidelines for selecting remedial works 1996 * Urban stormwater management strategy.   The submitter suggests that both documents are now 25 and 20 years old and are no longer reflective of contemporary "best practice".  The submitter requests that the amendment provides more information about the use of modular underground detention systems. There are numerous systems available, and they are a popular choice. If Council’s intent is that only precast concrete underground detention tanks are supported, the policy should be explicit in this regard. If modular plastic storage systems are permissible, the policy should provide specific guidance in relation to the acceptable design parameters for such systems. | The request is not within the scope of the amendment. There are no proposed changes in Major amendment package K to these documents.  The IDPSP lists the specifications for underground detention tanks (Section 7.5.8) and does not explicitly require a concrete tank. If a modular system meets the design requirements, then it is acceptable to use. The IDPSP does not prohibit their use and there have been modular systems previously approved by Council. | No change |
| MK-055 | The submitter questions the classification of El Paso Street, Bardon, as a Neighbourhood street minor sub-category in the Streetscape hierarchy overlay, and could not find information to differentiate between neighbourhood, minor and local roads.  The submitter requests that it be classified as a local road in the road hierarchy network as:   * the street is about 170 m long, ends in a cul-de-sac, caters for only 17 lots and doubts it would carry 1,000 vehicles * Council identifies minor roads as catering for 300 lots and 3,000 vehicles per day, and circulation between surrounding neighbourhoods * the classification would encourage an increase in vehicle use, which is not suitable to the street * the street is different in nature to other neighbourhood and local roads identified in the road hierarchy.   The submitter also raised concerns about a matter relating to a potential proposal to change the future use of an easement over their property as road reserve. | The submission is not within the scope of the amendment. Major amendment package K has not changed the Road hierarchy overlay.  The Streetscape hierarchy overlay serves a different purpose to the Road hierarchy overlay. It is a planning instrument to ensure that verges are designed and constructed in accordance with Council's intended outcomes. The overlay does not influence the volume of traffic on a road.  The submitter was contacted to discuss their query regarding specific concerns to their property regarding easements. | No change |

## 4.0 Conclusion

The submissions received have been considered in the development of the final package of amendments.

It is important to note that the proposed amendment may be subject to further changes required by the Queensland Government during the Minister’s consideration period.