

<b>Submissions Report</b>				
Submission point number	Submission Request	Council response	Outcome	
			Results in a Change?	Parts of Planning Scheme Changed
34.1, 132.1, 135.1, 136.1, 162.1, 200.1, 208.1, 226.1, 228.1, 236.1, 237.1, 247.1, 250.1, 251.1, 268.1, 274.1, 278.1, 295.1	Duplicate submission			
7.2, 23.1, 203.2, 211.1, 280.1	The planning scheme document requires administrative and editorial changes including formatting, correcting numbering, spelling and grammar.	<b>Supported</b> A number of administrative changes and clerical errors need to be corrected in the draft Planning Scheme. These changes and errors should be corrected before adoption.	Yes	Various parts and sections where administrative and editorial changes including formatting, correcting numbering, spelling and grammar, are required.
19.1, 26.1, 143.1, 156.2, 159.1, 184.1, 218.10, 218.11, 218.12, , 220.17, 230.3, 238.1, 314.1	The submitter has made a comment that does not directly or indirectly affect the planning scheme but may have implications for other Council business units.	The comments have been noted.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
269.6	Comments regarding the SEQ Regional Plan and the Urban footprint and Regional landscape and rural production area.	Council is committed to working with the State Government on the update to the Regional Plan, particularly after Council completes a Growth Management Strategy. If amendments to the Regional Plan are made then Council will undertake amendments to its planning scheme in response. Until the Regional Plan is amended, Council is not able to enable policy direction that conflicts with the Regional Plan outcomes.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
267.1, 267.3, 269.1	The submitter has expressed support for the Planning Scheme as a whole or individual parts at a high level.	The submission is noted.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
140.1	Submitter objects to the consultation timeframe and readability of the draft Planning Scheme.	Public consultation of the draft Planning Scheme occurred over 10 weeks and 45 working days. The <i>Planning Act 2016</i> requires a minimum consultation period of 40 business days. The draft Planning Scheme is compiled in accordance with the Minister's Guidelines and Rules. Council invested in an online platform to make the scheme and maps easier to navigate and search. Council notes submitters concerns and will consider future improvements to scheme navigation.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
211.1, 260.227, 260.310-260.314, 260.518, 260.523, 260.550, 260.631-260.633, 260.441, 260.642,	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to various sections of the scheme including Tables of Assessment, Zone codes, use codes, works codes, overlay codes, definitions.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Various changes have been made throughout the codes to make them more concise, consistent, workable and to improve clarity.
<b>1.1 Introduction</b>				
203.6	Submitter requests confirmation that annual events such as the Laidley Spring Festival are categorised as Temporary events and therefore do not require a Material Change of Use. The submitter also raised concerns that the allowance for markets as a Temporary use was not adequate to allow these activities to proceed without planning approval.	<b>Supported</b> Table 1.7-1 of the Draft Planning Scheme outlines temporary uses that do not constitute a Material change of use under the <i>Planning Act 2016</i> and therefore do not require development approval. This table is not an exhaustive list of uses that do not require planning approval, rather other infrequent uses may also not be considered 'development' under the Act. Events such as Laidley Spring Festival, and infrequent tourist activities in rural areas such as 'picking your own pumpkin', do not constitute a Material change of use and therefore can proceed without planning approval are more appropriately dealt with under Council's local laws. Depending on the frequency of activities such as Markets and Roadside stalls, these can constitute Material changes of uses, and amendments can be made to the scheme to ensure these activities can proceed as Accepted development subject to standard requirements.	No	Amendments have been made to the Tables of Assessment to allow Markets (up to two days per week) and Roadside stalls to operate in many parts of the Region without planning approval, subject to meeting some basic requirements.
Table 1.7-1: Temporary uses				
260.324-260.329, 260.322, 260.323, 260.33, 260.596	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes to Temporary uses	Supported	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme

<b>3 Strategic Framework</b>				
3.1.1 Strategic vision				
260.331, 280.2	The Vision Statement is does not adequately address the vision for the region, but addresses enviornmental matters only.	Supported The Vision station can be amended to be a much broader statement reflecting the community's aspirations for the region and addressing economic, social, environmental and community wellbeing.	Yes	The Strategic Vision has been expanded to better reflect the vision for the region.
3.1.2 Strategic Intent				
242.2, 241.16, 263.7	The submitter has made a comment that does not directly or indirectly affect the planning scheme but may have implications for consideration.	The comments have been noted.	No	As a result of this submission, no changes will be made to the Lockyer Valley Planning Scheme.
280.4	Reword 3.2.1 Strategic intent to inclue further clarification around environmental matters	<b>Supported in part</b>	Yes	Council has amended 3.2.1(5)-(7) to include the suggested wording.
<b>Theme 1 Growing Communities</b>				
3.2.1 Element 1 Growth management				
220.1	Section 3.2.1 – Item 2(b) should be amended to list relevant drinking water catchments	Council acknowledges the submission point and has edited the strategic framework accordingly	Yes	Amendments have been made to 3.2.1(2)(b) to include drinking water resource catchments associated with Atkinson Dam, Bill Gunn Dam and Clarendon Dam.
3.2.2 Element 2 Housing choice				
61.2	Request for additional wording to note growth of Withcott is restricted due to the lack of a wastewater network.	<b>Not supported</b> Section 3.2.6.6 Withcott notes the lack of services, including sewerage, restricts Withcott's growth.		No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
235.4, 314.5	The submitter has made a comment that does not directly or indirectly affect the planning scheme but may have implications for consideration.	The comments have been noted.	No	As a result of this submission, no changes will be made to the Lockyer Valley Planning Scheme.
3.2.3.1 Rural areas				
3.2.3.1.2 Rural townships				
260.333	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to all Tables of Assessment, Zone codes, works codes, overlay codes	Supported	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
314.5, 235.4	The submitter has made a comment that does not directly or indirectly affect the planning scheme but may have implications for consideration.	The comments have been noted.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
260.333	Amendments, clarifications and editorial proposed.	Supported	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
3.2.3.2 Rural residential areas				
239.1, 244.1	The submitter has requested that Item 1 from section 3.2.3.2 Rural residential areas be deleted. 1. Subdivision of Rural residential areas are not supported where less than the minimum lot sizes mapped on OM14 Minimum lots size overlay and specified in the Section 9.4.1 Reconfiguring a lot code.	<b>Supported in part</b>	Yes	Section 3.2.3.2 Rural residential areas in response to other submissions and concerns about the minimum lots sizes, and section 3.2.3.2(1) will read as follows: <i>1. Subdivision in the Rural residential zone is limited to the Small, Medium and Large precincts. Any new lots created are of an appropriate size and shape having regard to the minimum lot size for the precinct, and environmental values and natural hazard constraints.</i>
3.2.3.3 Urban areas				
3.2.3.3.2 Urban Towns				
260.334	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes suggested.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
3.2.5 Element 5 Structure plan areas				
260.335	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes suggested.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
3.2.6.2 Grantham				
260.337	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes suggested.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
3.2.6.6 Withcott				
41.3	The Strategic Framework and Flood hazard overlay conflict with each otheras the Flood hazard overlay code restricts the adaptive reuse of existing buildings within the towns. The submitter suggests that amendments could be made t to the Tables of Assessment and the Flood hazard overlay code to allow adaptive reuse of existing buildings without requiring a material change of use application.	<b>Not supported</b> The reuse of buildings within the centre zone for commercial and/or community purposes is many cases can proceed as Accepted development.	No	The Flood hazard overlay and code has been removed from the draft Planning Scheme. Council has committed to reviewing the Flood hazard overlay and code in the near future. Regulation of development within areas of flood hazard will be managed through a TLPI until the new planning scheme is amended to incorporate a new Flood hazard overlay and code.

Theme 2 Prosperous Economy				
3.3.1 Element 1 Activity centres				
260.338	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes suggested.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
3.3.1.1 Circular economy				
235.5	The submitter has made a comment that does not directly or indirectly affect the planning scheme but may have implications for consideration.	The comments have been noted.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
3.3.2.1 Future enterprise and industry areas				
253.2	The submitter has requested that the 'Greater Brisbane Airport' (approval MC2018/0027.01 for Aviation Facility and Community Title Subdivision and Preliminary Approval for an Aviation Facility) be recognised in the Planning Scheme's Strategic Framework, Zone map and Overlays where appropriate.	<b>Not supported</b> Council has a general rule that a zone change is made to recognise development only once the approval has been acted upon. The current expiration date for the approval for this land is 2025. In this regard the site's development for the use is not certain and Council is reluctant to prematurely change the scheme.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
260.339-260.341, 260.346	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
3.3.4.1 Agriculture areas				
314.4	The submitter has made a comment that does not directly or indirectly affect the planning scheme but may have implications for consideration.	The comments have been noted.	No	As a result of this submission, no changes will be made to the Lockyer Valley Planning Scheme.
3.3.4.2 Animal industries				
260.324	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes suggested.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
3.3.4.5 Mining				
260.343, 260.344	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes suggested.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
3.3.5.1 Helidon Reserve				
220.8	Submitters request to edit Strategic Framework, either within Section 3.2.6.3 Helidon or Section 3.3.2 Element 2 – Industry areas and the Overall Outcome within the Special industry zone code – should include new provisions which directly reference the area of Special Industry zones around Helidon being partially located within the Water Supply buffer area, and the need to ensure development is appropriately located, designed, managed and operated to avoid potential adverse impacts to surface waters and groundwaters to protect the drinking water supply.	<b>Not supported</b>	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
3.3.6 Element 6 - Tourism				
260.345	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes suggested.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme

Theme 3 Connecting Infrastructure				
3.4.3.1 Active transport				
197.2	The submitter supports the generally support the Strategic Framework 3.4.3.1 Active transport.	The comments have been noted.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
3.4.6 Element 6 - Service infrastructure networks				
220.3	Section 3.4.6(7) should be amended to reference drinking water supply infrastructure or linkages to Seqwater's Water Security Program.	<b>Supported</b>	No	Amendments have been made to include "consistent with the SEQ Water Security Program 2023".
Theme 4 Sustaining the natural environment				
3.5.1 Element 1 - Climate impacts and effects				
220.4	Section 3.5.1 should be expanded to include direct reference to resilience of water supply catchments.	<b>Not supported</b>	Yes	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
235.6	The submitter has made a comment that does not directly or indirectly affect the planning scheme but may have implications for consideration.	The comments have been noted.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
3.5.2 Element 2 Matters of environmental significance				
280.6	Requests various edits to the overall theme and all elements	<b>Supported in part</b>	Yes	Various edits were made to 3.5 Theme 4 - Sustaining the Natural Environment in response to the submitter.
163.6	The submitter opposes various layers OM3 Biodiversity overlay maps. The submitter has requested that one or more of the following be removed from the property: MLES Biodiversity Area, MSES Koala Habitat Area, MSES Wildlife Habitat, MSES Koala Priority Area.	<b>Not supported</b>	No	Council cannot change MSES and is required to include these. Council has commenced a project to undertake an MLES study. Amendments to the new planning scheme will made as needed in response to that study.
3.5.4 Element 4 - First nations peoples' and indigenous landscapes				
260.347	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes suggested.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
3.5.5 Element 5 - Wildlife conservation				
280.7, 280.8	Revise Strategic Framework 3.5 Sustaining the Natural Environment, including request to edit statement to include 'Ecological corridors and wildlife...'	<b>Supported in part</b>	Yes	Various edits were made to 3.5 Theme 4 - Sustaining the Natural Environment in response to the submitter. Including to 3.5.5.1 <i>Ecological corridors and wildlife habitat areas are protected and connectivity between areas is improved to sustain the long-term health of wildlife across the Lockyer Valley and adjoining regions.</i>
235.7, 314.3	The submitter has made a comment that does not directly or indirectly affect the planning scheme but may have implications for consideration.	The comments have been noted.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
3.5.7 Element 7 - Safety and natural hazards				
220.5	Section 3.5.7 – should be amended to include a direct reference to the protection of natural corridors and drinking water catchments.	<b>Not supported</b>	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
3.5.9 Element 9 Waterways and Water quality				
220.6	Section 3.5.9 – should be amended to include further detail on the water treatment plants in the region, waterway linkages and supply to local population.	<b>Not supported</b>	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
280.9	Revise Strategic Framework 3.5 Sustaining the Natural Environment	<b>Supported in part</b>	Yes	Various edits were made to 3.5 Theme 4 - Sustaining the Natural Environment in response to the submitter.
314.2, 314.6, 235.7	The submitter has made a comment that does not directly or indirectly affect the planning scheme but may have implications for consideration.	<b>Supported</b> The comments have been noted.	No	As a result of this submission, no changes will be made to the Lockyer Valley Planning Scheme.

Theme 5 Living in a great place				
3.6.5 Element 5 Open space, sport and recreation				
220.7	Section 3.6.5 – should be amended to include direct reference to sport and recreation activities minimising impact to drinking catchment / water supply.	Council acknowledges the submission point and has edited the scheme accordingly	Yes	Amendments made to 3.6.5.6(g) in relation to no adverse impact on the drinking water supply catchments and water supply infrastructure.
<b>4 LGIP</b>				
4.3 Priority infrastructure area				
61.1, 263.5	The submitter has provided comments on the Local Government Infrastructure Plan including the Priority infrastructure area.	<b>Not supported</b> The LGIP advertised with the draft Planning Scheme is the adopted 2018 LGIP and will remain until Council undertakes a new LGIP. It is anticipated this will occur during 2024. The comments provided can be considered when a new LGIP is prepared.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
128.1	The submitter his supportive of inclusion of a park in LGIP.	The comments have been noted.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
4.5.2 Schedules of works				
260.348	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes suggested.	Supported	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
4.5.3 Editor's note Extrinsic material				
260.349	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes suggested.	Supported	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
4.5.4 List of extrinsic material				
260.35	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes suggested.	Supported	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
<b>5 Tables of Assessment</b>				
5.3.2 Determining the category of development and category of assessment				
163.2	The submitter is concerned that the effect of 5.3.2(4) of land with a split zoning will result in the highest category of assessment regardless of where on the land the dvelopment is proposed.	<b>Supported</b> Amendments can be made to clarify that the category of assessment applies based on the zoning or overlay/s at the site of the development, and not over the land.		Section 5.3.2(4) has been amended as follows: 4. Where an aspect of development is proposed on a site included in more than one zone or overlay, the category of assessment (where assessmet development) for that aspect is the highest category under each of the applicable zones and overlays.
260.351	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes suggested.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
5.3.3 Determining the assessment benchmarks				
260.64, 260.352, 260.605, 260.638	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes suggested.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
5.5.1 Community facilities zone				
260.353-260.357	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes to Table of Assessment.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
5.5.3 Emerging community zone				
260.358-260.362	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes to Table of Assessment.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
5.5.4 Industry zone				
202.2, 260.363-260.365	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes to Table of Assessment.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
5.5.5 Limited development zone				
260.366	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes to Table of Assessment.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
5.5.6 Local centre zone				
260.367-260.376	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes to Table of Assessment.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
5.5.7 Low density residential zone				
260.377-260.382, 260.603, 260.604	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes to Table of Assessment.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
5.5.8 Low-medium density residential zone				
260.383-260.387	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes to Table of Assessment.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme

5.5.9 Major centre zone				
260.388-260.392	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes to Table of Assessment.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
5.5.10 Mixed use zone				
260.393-260.4	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes to Table of Assessment.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
5.5.12 Principal centre zone				
260.401-93-260.406	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes to Table of Assessment.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
235.1	The submitter has made a comment that does not directly or indirectly affect the planning scheme but may have implications for consideration.	The comments have been noted.	No	As a result of this submission, no changes will be made to the Lockyer Valley Planning Scheme.
5.5.13 Rural zone				
203.1	Submitter requests tourism uses such as Tourist parts are more accessible development type and with reduced performance outcomes.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Changes have been made to allow small scale tourist accommodation to proceed within the Rural zone without planning approval from Council, subject to meeting requirements. This includes Nature-based tourism, Tourist parks and Short-term accommodation. For example, Nature-based tourism or a Tourist park for up to five caravan or camping sites as now Accepted development in the Rural zone.
235.3, 279.2	The submitter has made a comment that does not directly or indirectly affect the planning scheme but may have implications for consideration.	The comments have been noted.	No	As a result of this submission, no changes will be made to the Lockyer Valley Planning Scheme.
148.1, 148.3, 148.4, 148.5, 148.6	The submitter requests amendments to be undertake in relation to the packaging and processing of vegetables: - create a 'vegetable packaging and processing precinct' to provide for larger scale facilities; - review how the table of assessment for the Rural zone deals with Rural industry and Low impact industries for the packaging and processing vegetation to allow these facilities to proceed as code assessment regardless of scale; - include the Rural use code as an assessment benchmark for these facilities when defined as a Low impact industry.	<b>Supported in part</b> As the planning scheme support agricultural activities in the region, amendments can be made to allow these facilities to proceed as code assessment.	Yes	Amendments have been made to ensure Rural industry and Low impact industries for the packaging and processing of agricultural produce will be code assessable in the Rural zone regardless of whether the produce is sourced from the same land or from elsewhere. It is not considered necessary to create a precinct specifically for this purpose.
203.3	The submitter has requested that the thresholds for a Roadside stall in the Rural zone be reduced.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Changes made to Table 5.5-13: Rural zone allows Roadside stalls to proceed as Accepted development. The Acceptable outcome of the Roadside stall code have also been reviewed and simplified.
145.1, 259.1, 301.2, 302.2, 303.2, 304.2, 306.2, 263.6, 245.2, 203.4	The submitter has requested that the thresholds in Table 5.5-13: Rural zone for Nature-based tourism allow more flexibility. The submitter requests that the threshold in the draft Planning Scheme should be changed to reduce barriers to undertake Nature-based tourism as accepted development. The submitter requests that the threshold should allow for increase in the number of people that are allowed on-site.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Changes have been made to allow small scale tourist accommodation to proceed within the Rural zone without planning approval from Council, subject to meeting requirements. This includes Nature-based tourism, Tourist parks and Short-term accommodation. For example, Nature-based tourism or a Tourist park for up to five caravan or camping sites as now Accepted development in the Rural zone.
260.1, 260.407-260.428, 260.556, 260.599, 260.625	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes to Table of Assessment.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
5.5.14 Rural residential zone				
260.429-260.436	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes to Table of Assessment.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
5.5.15 Special industry zone				
260.437, 260.438	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes to Table of Assessment.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
5.5.16 Sport and recreation zone				
260.439-260.443	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes to Table of Assessment.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
5.5.17 Township zone				
260.444-260.449	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes to Table of Assessment.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
5.6 Categories of development and assessment – Reconfiguring a lot				
66.1, 67.1, 69.1, 74.1, 75.1, 76.6, 77.1, 78.1, 79.1, 81.1, 82.1, 83.1, 84.1, 85.1, 86.1, 87.1, 88.1, 89.1, 90.1, 91.1, 92.1, 93.1, 94.1, 95.1, 96.1, 97.1, 100.1, 101.1, 102.1, 103.1, 104.1, 105.1, 106.1, 107.1, 108.1, 109.1, 110.1, 111.1, 112.1, 113.1, 114.1, 218.1, 260.45, 260.451	The submitter objects to Council raising the category of assessment from code assessment to impact assessment where Rural residential subdivision do not achieved the minimum lot size Table 9.5.1-4: Minimum lot size and dimensions of the section 9.5.1 Reconfiguring a lot code.	<b>Not supported</b> It is appropriate that development is subject to a higher category of assessment where the minimum lot size cannot be achieved and the proposed development is a higher density than that expected by the community. Amendments have been made to the minimum lot size for the Rural residential zone, and the No further subdivision precinct has been greatly reduced.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.

5.7 Categories of development and assessment – Operational Work				
260.452-260.457	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to all Tables of Assessment, Zone codes, works codes, overlay codes	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
280.1	How does the Biodiversity overlay code regulate clearing of vegetation on steep slopes?	In the example provided consideration of 5.7.10 for Steep land overlay section of the table of assessment would also be required. Specifically, a code assessment will be required in addition to requirements for table 5.7.1, unless the clearing meets the definition for 'exempt clearing work'.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
5.8 Categories of development and assessment – Building Work				
260.458-260.464, 260.576	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes suggested for Table of Assessment.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
5.10 Categories of development and assessment – Overlays				
260.467-260.508, 260.529, 260.554, 260.555, 260.569, 260.584, 260.585, 260.594, 260.639	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes to Table of Assessment.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
163.7	The submitter has expressed general support for Table 5.10 Cultural heritage overlay.	The comments have been noted.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
41.2, 263.2	Revise Table of assessment 5.10 Flood hazard overlay to allow economic development of flood resilient precincts of local centres to be balanced against flood impacts, and to allow expansion of uses where there is no increase in GFA. Allow development to be code assessment where there is no increase in internal GFA for the purposes of Agricultural Supplies Store, Bulk Landscape Supplies, Community Use, Garden Centre, Hardware and Trade Supplies, Outdoor Sales, Sales Office, Shop, Veterinary Service.	<b>Not supported</b> Tables of assessment for Local centre zone allow reuse of buildings for some purposes as Accepted development. The Table of assessment for the Flood hazard overlay (Withcott precinct) allows various uses with no change to the category of assessment.	No	The Flood hazard overlay, including the flood precincts and code, have been removed from the draft Planning Scheme. Council has committed to reviewing the Flood hazard overlay and code in the near future. Regulation of development within areas of flood hazard will be managed through a TLPI until the new planning scheme is amended to incorporate a new Flood hazard overlay and code.
230.6, 239.3, 240.3, 241.11, 241.12, 241.15, 244.3, 273.4, 296.3	The submitter opposes the Flood hazard overlay increasing the categories of development and assessment.	Council has committed to reviewing the Flood hazard overlay and code in the near future. Regulation of development within areas of flood hazard will be managed through a TLPI until the new planning scheme is amended to incorporate a new Flood hazard overlay and code.	Yes	The Flood hazard overlay and code has been removed from the draft Planning Scheme. Council has committed to reviewing the Flood hazard overlay and code in the near future. Regulation of development within areas of flood hazard will be managed through a TLPI until the new planning scheme is amended to incorporate a new Flood hazard overlay and code.
6 Zones				
220.1	Include a new Overall Outcome within each of the Zone codes included within the Water Supply Buffer Area (listed in the column to the left), stating: "Development in a water supply buffer area avoids adverse impacts on drinking water supply environmental values."	<b>Not supported</b> This is adequately dealt with under the overlay.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
6.1 Preliminary				
263.1	The submitter has made a comment that does not directly or indirectly affect the planning scheme but may have implications for consideration.	The comments have been noted.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
6.5 Industry zone				
260.509	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes to Zone codes.	Supported	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
6.6 Limited Development Zone				
257.1	The submitter objects to the small number of consistent uses under Table 6.6-1: Consistent uses in the Limited development zone of the section 6.6 Limited development zone.	<b>Not supported</b> The Limited development zone has been used for land that has been subject to land swap/buy-back following disasterous flooding events, and those areas of extreme flood hazard under the Flood hazard overlay. The risk to people and property within these areas is unacceptable and intolerable. It is appropriate that only a small number of low impact land uses are identified as consistent in this zone. However, the Flood hazard overlay and code has been removed from the draft Planning Scheme. Council has committed to reviewing the Flood hazard overlay and code in the near future. Regulation of development within areas of flood hazard will be managed through a TLPI until the new planning scheme is amended to incorporate a new Flood hazard overlay and code.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
6.7 Local centre zone				
260.551, 250.552	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes to Zone codes.	Supported	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme

6.8 Low Density residential zone				
223.1	The submitter has made a comment that does not directly or indirectly affect the planning scheme but may have implications for consideration.	The comments have been noted.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
8.1	The submitter proposes change to the purpose and overall outcomes of the Low density residential zone code.	<b>Supported in part</b> Council is looking to improve the quality of development. The design elements of section 6.8.2(2)(n) are reasonable requirements, and development should have consideration of the character and amenity of neighbours and the surrounding area. In most cases, the standard requirements for site coverage and setbacks apply as per the Queensland Development Code. The draft scheme limits the ability for rear access lots to dominate new designs. Council's intention is not to prohibit rear lots, but better control when and how these are used. Wording within 6.8 Low density residential zone code has been amended to make this clear.	Yes	In this regard wording within 6.8 Low density residential zone code has been amended as follows to make this clear: Section 6.8.2(2)(v) has been amended as follows: <i>v. Subdivision layouts are designed to minimise the creation of new rear access lots (or battle-axe lots). Subdivision ensures that created lots are wide enough to have a front entrance visible from the street to the building. Created lots facilitate climate-responsive building design.</i> Furthermore, 9.5.1(g) of the Reconfiguring a lot code has been amended to provide further clarification around when rear access lots will be accepted.
260.553	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes to Zone codes.	Supported	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
6.10 Major Centre Zone				
256.1	The submitter proposes revisions to the Major centre zone code purpose and overall outcomes, particularly as they relate to Plainland.	<b>Not supported</b> The purpose of the Major centre zone is stipulated under the Planning Regulation. The overall outcomes for the zone are appropriate given the prominence of the Major centres in the region and the quality of development that is expected in these areas.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
6.11 Mixed used zone				
260.511	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes to Zone codes.	Supported	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
6.13 Principal centre zone				
260.512, 260.513	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes to Zone codes.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
6.14 Rural zone				
37.1, 280.11	The submitter proposes changes to the purpose and overall outcomes of the Rural zone code.	Unsupported	Yes	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
259.2, 301.3, 302.3, 303.3, 304.3, 306.3, 245.3, 145.3	The submitter has expressed general support that Rural zone code identifies Nature-based tourism as a consistent use.	The submission is noted.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
37.1	The submitter supports the purpose and overall outcomes of the Rural zone code as they relate to the protection and management of environmental values.	The submission is noted.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
145.3, 245.3, 259.2, 301.3, 302.3, 303.3, 304.3, 306.3	The submitter has expressed general support that Rural zone code identifies Nature-based tourism as a consistent use.	The submission is noted.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
260.514	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes to Zone codes.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
6.15 Rural residential zone				
163.5	Concerns about the inclusion of overall outcomes regarding rear access lots in the RR zone	Supported in part	Yes	In response, the provision has been amended to use 'mimimise' instead of 'prevent', as follows: Subdivision layouts are designed to minimise the creation of new rear access lots (or battle-axe lots). Subdivision ensures that created lots are wide enough for future dwellings to have a front entrance visible from the street to the building. Created lots facilitate climate-responsive building design.
6.18 Township zone				
260.515	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes to Zone codes.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme



Overlays				
230.7, 237.5	Request to include mechanisms where the overlays have been dealt with during the RAL and OW phase	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to the categories of development and assessment for the overlays to allow Dwelling houses within development envelope areas to be accepted development under the overlay
<b>8.1 Preliminary</b>				
280.12	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes suggested to all overlay codes	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
<b>8.2 Agricultural land overlay code</b>				
260.519, 260.52, 260.521, 260.522	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes suggested to all overlay codes	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
<b>8.3 Biodiversity Overlay Code</b>				
260.516, 260.517	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes suggested to all overlay codes	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
267.2, 267.5, 267.6, 267.9, 267.12-267.14, 267.16	The submitter requests changes to the benchmarks.	<b>Not supported</b>	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
261.1, 261.7, 267.8, 267.11-267.21	The submitter is supportive of the 8.3 Biodiversity overlay code benchmarks and overall outcomes.	The comments have been noted.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
<b>8.3.3 Biodiversity code - Assessment benchmarks</b>				
267.2, 267.5, 267.6, 267.9, 267.13, 267.14, 267.16, 267.12	While largely in support of the Biodiversity code, the submission provide comments and recommends some minor changes to the assessment benchmarks.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments have been made to PO1 and and note to AO16.2 of the Biodiversity code.
267.1, 267.7, 267.8, 267.11, 267.15, 267.17, 267.18, 267.19, 267.21	The submitter is supportive of the 8.3 Biodiversity overlay code benchmarks and overall outcomes.	The comments have been noted.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
260.524-260.528, 260.53, 260.595, 260.627, 260.644	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes suggested to all overlay codes	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
<b>8.4 Bushfire Overlay code</b>				
152.1	Submitter seeking approval to manage vegetation within the Bushfire hazard overlay zone.	The <i>Planning Regulation 2017</i> includes clearing exemptions for fire management purposes. Council's planning scheme does not override these exemptions.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
225.1	Submitter suggests the objectives of the Strategic framework are unachievable giving consideration to 8.4 Bushfire overlay	The Bushfire Overlay is mapping provided by the Queensland Government. Council has not locally refined the mapping and does not intend to in the near future. Any proposed development that is affected by this overlay would need to demonstrate how it addresses the potential bushfire risk.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
<b>8.5 Cultural Heritage overlay code</b>				
260.531-260.536	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes suggested to all overlay codes	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
<b>8.7 Flood hazard overlay code</b>				
260.57-260.575, 260.537-260.542	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes suggested to all overlay codes	Council has committed to reviewing the Flood hazard overlay and code in the near future. Regulation of development within areas of flood hazard will be managed through a TLPI until the new planning scheme is amended to incorporate a new Flood hazard overlay and code.	Yes	The Flood hazard overlay and code has been removed from the draft Planning Scheme. Council has committed to reviewing the Flood hazard overlay and code in the near future. Regulation of development within areas of flood hazard will be managed through a TLPI until the new planning scheme is amended to incorporate a new Flood hazard overlay and code.
225.2	Submitter suggests the requirements of the strategic framework are unachievable in correlation with 8.7 Flood hazard	Council has committed to reviewing the Flood hazard overlay and code in the near future. Regulation of development within areas of flood hazard will be managed through a TLPI until the new planning scheme is amended to incorporate a new Flood hazard overlay and code.	Yes	The Flood hazard overlay and code has been removed from the draft Planning Scheme. Council has committed to reviewing the Flood hazard overlay and code in the near future. Regulation of development within areas of flood hazard will be managed through a TLPI until the new planning scheme is amended to incorporate a new Flood hazard overlay and code.
218.9	Submitter objects to the inconsistencies between the Flood hazard overlay map and Council's Flood information portal.	Council has committed to reviewing the Flood hazard overlay and code in the near future. Regulation of development within areas of flood hazard will be managed through a TLPI until the new planning scheme is amended to incorporate a new Flood hazard overlay and code.	Yes	The Flood hazard overlay and code has been removed from the draft Planning Scheme. Council has committed to reviewing the Flood hazard overlay and code in the near future. Regulation of development within areas of flood hazard will be managed through a TLPI until the new planning scheme is amended to incorporate a new Flood hazard overlay and code.
<b>8.9 Infrastructure Overlay code</b>				
220.14	Additional measures for assessable Reconfiguration of Lot	<b>Not supported</b>	No	
260.543-260.549	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes suggested to all overlay codes	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme

8.10 Scenic Landscape overlay code				
260.12-260.18, 260.578, 260.600	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes suggested to all overlay codes	Supported	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
64.1, 67.2, 75.2, 77.5, 76.2, 78.2, 80.1, 86.2, 87.2, 88.2, 89.2, 90.2, 91.2, 92.2, 93.2, 95.2, 96.2, 97.2, 98.2, 99.2, 100.2, 101.2, 102.2, 103.2, 104.2, 105.2, 110.2, 111.2	Revise 8.10 Scenic landscape overlay code to be less prescriptive	Supported	Yes	Amendments have been made to 8.10 Scenic landscape overlay code to remove the requirements relating to materials and finishes, development within 25 metres of a scenic route, and vegetation clearing.
8.11 Steep land overlay code				
260.22-260.27, 260.58-260.583	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes suggested to all overlay codes	Supported	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
8.12 Waterways and water resources overlay code				
61.3	Performance outcome is ambiguous and requires clarification whether relates to connection to sewer	Performance outcome is intended for large scale water treatment facilities.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
260.28-260.31, 260.586-260.59	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes suggested to all overlay codes	Supported	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
8.14 Minimum lot size overlay				
260.637	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes suggested to all overlay codes	Supported	Yes	The precincts of the Rural residential zone are now included on a new map, ZM2, and minimum lot size is no longer an overlay.
9 Development Codes				
9.1 Preliminary				
260.634	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to all use codes.	Supported	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
9.3 Use Codes				
9.3.1 Commercial activities code				
260.32-260.49	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to all use codes.	Supported	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
9.3.2 Communities and recreation activities				
260.14, 260.141, 260.138, 260.139, 260.153, 260.154	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to all use codes.	Supported	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
9.3.3 Dwelling house code				
273.6, 296.5, 242.7, 244.4, 240.4, 239.4, 241.3	Request to amend scheme to be consistent with QDC	Supported	Yes	A03.3 of the Dwelling house code and been amended to make setbacks consistent with Queensland Development Code. The setbacks in the Rural zone remain as 10m.
260.59-260.71, 260.557-260.566	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to all use codes.	Supported	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
9.3.4 Extractive industry code				
260.75-260.78	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to all use codes.	Supported	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
9.3.5 Home-based business code				
260.602, 260.79, 260.8	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to all use codes.	Supported	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
9.3.6 Industry activities code				
260.81- 260.85, 260.635, 260.636	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to all use codes.	Supported	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
9.3.7 Market code				
260.89-260.92	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to all use codes.	Supported	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
9.3.8 Medium density residential uses code				
262.2	The submitter has expressed general support for the assessment benchmarks for Dual Occupancy in 9.3.8 Medium density residential uses code.	The submission is noted.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
260.93-260.131	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to all use codes.	Supported	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
9.3.9 Outstation code				
260.132	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to all use codes.	Supported	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
9.3.11 Retirement and Residential care facilities				
260.142-260.149	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to all use codes.	Supported	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme

9.3.12 Roadside stall code				
260.15-260.152	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to all use codes.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
9.3.13 Rural uses code				
145.4, 245.4, 259.4, 301.4, 302.4, 303.4, 304.4, 306.4	The submitter objects to the Rural uses code where it does not include Nature-based tourism as a use to be assessed against the code. The submitter contends that Nature-based tourism should be recognised as ancillary activity in this code.	<b>Not supported</b> Nature-based tourism is not a rural use, and is not ancillary to the rural use of land. It is a separately defined land use under the <i>Planning Regulation 2017</i> . However, changes have been made to allow small scale tourist accommodation to proceed within the Rural zone without planning approval from Council, subject to meeting requirements. This includes Nature-based tourism, Tourist parks and Short-term accommodation.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
260.155-260.179	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to all use codes.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
220.11	Rural Uses Code / Waterways and the water resources overlay code – amend to include a new Performance Outcome, in line with PO9 of the Seqwater development guidelines: PO9 Development maintains or improves the quality of surface water by adopting measures that exclude livestock from entering a water body where a site is being used for animal husbandry or animal-keeping activities.	<b>Not supported</b>	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
279.1	Revise 9.3.13 Rural uses code to require kennels on lots less than 50 acres to be located at least 8 km from lots of 10 acres or less.	<b>Not supported</b> Kennels are required to be at least 250 metres from sensitive land uses (including Dwelling houses) and 500 metres from land in the Emerging community zone, the residential zones or the Township zone. They are also required to be located and designed to minimise impacts on the amenity.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
9.3.15 Service station and Car wash code				
260.18-260.183	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to all use codes.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
9.3.16 Telecommunications facility code				
260.133-260.137	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to all use codes.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
9.3.17.3 Tourism uses code				
145.2, 245.5, 259.5, 301.5, 302.5, 303.5, 304.5, 306.5	The submitter seeks change to allow for increased flexibility in the form of the accommodation and the types of facilities to be provided by Nature-based tourism. The submitter has expressly requested that: 'Nature-based tourism should...include tents, bush camping, camper trailers, caravans, RV's. It is also requested that the definition for Nature-based tourism allow for self-contained camps that require no to minimal facilities.'	<b>Supported in part</b> Nature-based tourism may include accommodation for tourists, but it is specifically associated with tourism for the 'appreciation, conservation or interpretation' of the natural environment or cultural heritage. The examples of accommodation types provided under the definition for Nature-based tourism are not exhaustive. Furthermore, where accommodation in the form of camping and caravans is not associated with tourism for the 'appreciation, conservation or interpretation' of the natural environment or cultural heritage, this is defined as a Tourist park which is also subject to 9.3.17 Tourism uses code. The facilities required for Tourist parks and Nature-based tourism for up to five camping/caravan sites have been reviewed, but it is appropriate the some facilities are provided for the health, safety and convenience of guests, and for the protection of the environment.	Yes	Amendments have been made to 9.3.17 Tourism uses code in relation to facilities to be provided for guests.
260.2-260.9	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to all use codes.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
9.3.18 Workers' accommodation code				
260.184-260.189, 260.5-260.59	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to all use codes.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme

9.4 Works Codes				
<b>9.4.1 Advertising devices code</b>				
260, 19, 260.601	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to all works codes.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
<b>9.4.2 Building Design Code</b>				
54.3, 242.3, 241.4	The submitter requests the Low density residential zone setback be retained (i.e. equal to the QDC).	<b>Supported in part</b> Under the Dwelling house code, the setbacks for Dwelling houses in the urban areas and Rural residential zone are as per the QDC. The Building design code applies different setbacks for other types of development is proposed. The intent is to protect amenity of existing dwelling houses.	Yes	Amendments made so the setbacks for Dwelling houses in the urban areas and Rural residential zone are as per the QDC.
260.191-260.195, 260.591-260.593, 260.601	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to all works codes.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
<b>9.4.3 Earthworks, filling and excavation code</b>				
260.196-260.204, 260.606-260.614	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to all works codes.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
<b>9.4.4 Environment and amenity code</b>				
260.206-260.208	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to all works codes.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
<b>9.4.5 Infrastructure services code</b>				
260.205, 260.209-260.216, 260.618,	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to all works codes.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
220.13	Infrastructure and services code – Amend the note in AO9.1 as follows: *AO9.1 Development outside a reticulated sewer network service catchment area, has the combined total peak capacity of sewerage treatment of less than 21 equivalent persons and an on-site effluent disposal system is provided that is consistent with the Queensland Plumbing and Wastewater Code. Note—Where there is a conflict between AO9.1, AO9.2, <del>and</del> AO9.3 and AO9.4, the highest setback is always applied.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
<b>9.4.6 Landscaping code</b>				
260.215-260.226	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to all works codes.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
<b>9.4.7 Stormwater management code</b>				
260.228-260.23, 260.62, 260.619	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to all works codes.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
<b>9.4.8 Transport, access and parking code</b>				
260.231-260.245, 260.247-200.259, 260.617, 260.621-260.624	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to all works codes.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme

9.5 Other Development Codes				
9.5.1. Reconfiguring a lot code				
260.26, 260.597, 260.598, 260.261-260.269, 260.271-260.298	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to the code.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
218.6	There is conflict between requirements for cul-de-sac ends and rear lots between PO 15 & PO 16. Infill development states in AO15.1c that 'no rear access lots are located at the end of a cul-de-sac street. Rear access lots states in AO16.1e that 'no more than 2 rear lots are located at the end of a cul-de-sac street. Amend AO15.1c to allow rear lots in line with AO16.1, or amend AO16e to not allow rear access lots at the end of a cul-de-sac street.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	PO15 and PO16 have been combined and reviewed to address this conflict.
262.3	The submitter is supportive of the small lot benchmarks in the 9.5.1 Reconfiguring a lot code.	The comments have been noted.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
161.1, 157.4	The submitter requests changes to allow small lot subdivision in the Rural zone.	<b>Not supported</b> The requested change is in conflict with the <i>Planning Regulation 2017</i> and falls outside of Council's purview for the draft Planning Scheme.	No	
262.3	The submitter is supportive of the small lot benchmarks in the 9.5.1 Reconfiguring a lot code.	The comments have been noted.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
32.3	The submitter proposes change to small lot assessment benchmarks in section 9.5.1 Reconfiguring a lot code to stipulate a maximum of 30% of proposed lots to be small lots rather than requiring small lots to be within 800m of a centre zone.	<b>Supported in part</b> It is considered appropriate that small lot housing be encouraged within those areas close to services available within the centre zones. The category of assessment for subdivision including small lots in the Low medium residential zone has been reviewed, as this should not be dependant on compliant with the Acceptable outcomes of the code.	No	Subdivision in an urban area is now Code assessment if 75% of the lots meet the minimum lot size (decreased from 80%). The minimum lot size in the Low medium density residential zone has been reduced to 350m2.
241.5	The street block design criteria of PO25 cannot be applied successfully to larger lots, i.e. rural residential.	<b>Supported</b> The street block design parameters of the Reconfiguring a Lot Code are from Schedule 12A of the <i>Planning Regulation 2017</i> . These provisions do not apply where the lot being reconfigured is within a Rural residential zone.	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
220.12	Amend Reconfigure a lot code to include additional regulation - onsite STP, stream order set back	Not supported This requirement is managed by the Waterways and water resource Overlay and code.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
218.3	The submitter objects to AO7.1 in 9.5.1 Reconfiguring a lot code, which requires a minimum lots size of 2.5ha where a lot is created by subdivision in the Rural zone using an existing road as a boundary. The submitters suggested that this requirement should be deleted.	<b>Not supported</b> Subdivision in the Rural zone is only allowed when using a road as the new boundary. A minimum lot size of 2.5ha is a very small lot in the Rural zone, but is large enough to accommodate a Dwelling house and associated outbuilding and onsite effluent disposal. A applicant may demonstrate a smaller lot can meet the associated PO of the code.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.

SC1.1 Use definitions				
260.299-260.301	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes to Use definitions	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
181.1	The submitter has expressed support for the changed <b>Home based business</b> definition where it is small scale and does not permit industrial activities. The submitter would like further information included with the definition to indicate non-industrial activities are encouraged.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments have been made to SC1.1. Use definitions to include further examples (and exclusions) of land uses.
145.5, 245.1, 259.3, 301.1, 302.1, 303.1, 304.1, 306.1	The submitter objects to the definition of Nature-based tourism and requested the definition be broadened to include tents, bush camping, camper trailers, caravans, RVs. It is also requested that the definition for Nature-based tourism allow for self-contained camps that require no to minimal facilities. The submitter has also expressed the desire that this type of development be consistent in form and type across Regional Council boundaries.	<b>Not supported</b> Council must use the land use terms and definitions identified in schedule 3 of the <i>Planning Regulation 2017</i> , however the examples of accommodation types provided under the definition for Nature-based tourism are not exhaustive. Furthermore, tourist accommodation in the form of camping and caravans can also be defined as a Tourist park. Changes have been made to allow small scale tourist accommodation to proceed within the Rural zone without planning approval from Council, subject to meeting requirements. This includes Nature-based tourism, Tourist parks and Short-term accommodation.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
203.5	Request to broaden the definition of Short term accommodation to include rural workers' accommodation and rooming accommodation.	<b>Not supported</b> Council may only use the land uses listed and defined in Schedule 3 of the <i>Planning Regulation 2017</i> ; these include definitions for Rural workers' accommodation and Rooming accommodation. However, neither Rural workers' accommodation nor Rooming accommodation is for use by tourists. Rural worker's accommodation is specifically for workers, and Rooming accommodation is residential accommodation in the form of boarding houses, hostels, student accommodation and the like. Rural worker's accommodation is encouraged in the Rural zone and in some circumstances can be accommodated without a planning approval.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
148.2	The submitter requests amendments to Table SC1.1.4 Defined activity groups to include the processing and packaging of agricultural products as a Rural activity and not an Industry activity.	<b>Not supported</b> The processing and packaging of agricultural products is not defined as a Rural industry where the products are sourced from elsewhere. The impacts associated with these uses are similar to those of other industrial uses.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
Table 152: Administrative definitions				
260.302-260.206, 260.632	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes to Administrative definitions	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
Table SC5-1: Designation of premises for development of infrastructure				
260.63	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Amendments made to relevant sections of the scheme
Strategic Framework Maps				
66.3, 69.4, 74.4, 112.3, 113.3, 114.3, 106.4, 107.4, 108.4, 109.4, 163.3, 177.2, 178.2, 179.2, 180.2, 182.2	The submitter has expressed concerns about the mapping of Important Agricultural Areas in areas identified for Rural Residential and Urban purposes.	<b>Supported</b> Council is permitted to locally refine this State mapping layer on the Strategic Framework SFM2 Prosperous economy.	Yes	As a result of this submission, Council has locally refined the Important Agricultural Areas layer on the Strategic Framework SFM2 Prosperous economy.

Zone Maps				
2.1, 9.1, 16.1, 20.1, 33.1, 39.1, 45.1, 50.1, 53.1, 54.1, 56.1, 60.1, 71.1, 121.1, 129.1, 130.1, 137.2, 139.1, 153.1, 158.1, 160.1, 163.1, 165.1, 164.1, 167.1, 173.1, 174.1, 175.1, 186.1, 187.2, 192.1, 198.1, 204.2, 214.1, 216.2, 227.1, 261.1, 270.1, 272.1, 312.1, 313.1	The submitter has expressed concerns about the use of the Limited development zone including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The use of the Limited development zone over part or the whole of a property.</li> <li>Split zoning where the extreme flood risk hazard covers 75% or more of the lot.</li> <li>The zone does not align with the extreme flood hazard.</li> <li>The accuracy of the split zoning where the lot is in the extreme flood risk hazard but not in the Limited development zone.</li> </ul>	<b>Supported</b> The Limited development zone has been used to identify land in urban and Rural residential areas at extreme flood risk in the Flood hazard overlay. Council has committed to reviewing the Flood hazard overlay in the near future, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Removing Warning time and Flood islands from the methodology for assigning Flood risk categorisations and instead this information will be provided on a separate map.</li> <li>Remove the speckling effect that had occurred on the overlay map with the draft scheme.</li> <li>Reconsidering how extreme flood risk is derived including investigating other flood design events.</li> <li>Zoning only land that is in the Extreme flood risk category to Limited development zone, and Council will not proceed with rezoning of all of a property where 75% or more of the property is affected by extreme flood risk. This will result in a greater number of 'split zone' properties and will address numerous submissions which raised this matter.</li> <li>Investigating using a common design event, such as the 1% AEP + Climate Change, and using the 2022 LiDAR.</li> </ul>	Yes	The Flood hazard overlay and code has been removed from the draft Planning Scheme. Council has committed to reviewing the Flood hazard overlay and code in the near future. Regulation of development within areas of flood hazard will be managed through a TLPI until the new planning scheme is amended to incorporate a new Flood hazard overlay and code. The draft planning scheme will progress at this time with land zoned similarly to its zoning under the current planning schemes.
220.16	Submitter suggests changes to zoning of land in the Rural Residential zone to the Rural zone due to dam break impact area.	<b>Not supported</b> The land has development rights under the SEQ Regional Plan.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
11.2, 32.1	The submitter has requested a zone change for land in Plainland to the Major centre zone.	<b>Supported in part</b> The zone change for Lot 1104 SP322383 is consistent with approved development under Preliminary Approval.	Yes	Part of Lot 1104 SP322383 has been included in the Major centre zone.
131.1	The submitter has requested a zone change for land in Plainland to the Major centre zone: Lot 3 to be in the Major centre zone instead of the Mixed use zone. Lot 4 SP184977 to be in the Mixed use zone instead of the Rural zone. Lot 7 RP838994 and Lot 1 RP25697 to be in the Low density residential zone instead of the Rural residential zone.	<b>Not supported</b> The land is appropriately zoned and is consistent with the SEQ Regional Plan. Lot 4 SP184977 is in the Regional landscape and rural production areas of the SEQ Regional Plan and therefore is to be retained in the Rural zone. Lot 7 RP838994 and Lot 1 RP25697 are in the Rural living area under the SEQ Regional Plan.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
291.1	The submitter has requested that their property be include in the Rural residential zone as it is in the Urban footprint land use category under the South East Queensland Regional Plan. The land is currently zoned Rural.	<b>Not supported</b> Inclusion of this land in an urban zone would be premature as the land is not within or adjoining an existing urban area, is not included in the Priority Infrastructure Area under the LGIP, and urban infrastrucutre is not available.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
7.1, 17.1, 27.1, 28.1, 31.1, 43.1, 124.1, 142.2, 150.2, 183.1, 185.1, 187.1, 195.1, 202.1, 220.15, 277.1, 287.1, 297.1, 305.1	Landowner has requested that the zone remains as an equivalent zone under the current Planning Instruments.	<b>Supported</b> The requests are considered reasonable. Some zone changes had been proposed based on flood hazard. The Flood hazard overlay has been removed from the draft Planning Scheme, and Council has committed to reviewing the Flood hazard overlay in the near future. The draft planning scheme will progress at this time with land zoned similarly to its zoning under the current planning schemes. Zoning in these areas will again be reviewed when the new Flood hazard overlay is prepared.	Yes	Changes to zoning of various parcels of land including: Lot 1 RP36790, Lot 99 SP226292, Lot 326 CC121, Lots 0, 1 & 2 GTP1704, Lot 2 RP137204, Lots 4 & 5 RP144910, Lots 3, 5 & 6 RP150188, Lot 1 RP151838, Lots 1 & 2 RP160973, Lots 1 & 2 RP164965, Lot 3 RP165734, Lot 4 RP197814, Lots 20 & 21 RP218189, Lots 12 & 13 RP839369, Lot 1 SP176745, Lot 4 SP330910, Lot 4 SP295715, Lot 411 MC1281, Lots 4 & 5 RP142552, Lot 1 RP176284, Lots 3 & 4 SP295740, Lots 51 & 53 G127, Lot 52 RP228008, Lot 9 SP226678, Lots 1 & 2 RP135761, Lots 225 & 226 CH31564, Lot 998 SP239294, Lots 82-86 CH3125, Lot 203 CC1266, Lots 1-4 RP44796, Lots 3, 110 & 111 L1721, Lots 1 & 2 SP212458, Lot 2 RP25655, Lot 900 SP297197, Lot 200 SP321107, Lot 21 CP894833, Lot 344 SP289040, Lot 1 RP25616
11.2, 32.2, 72.1, 124.1, 131.1, 146.2, 183.1, 190.1, 202.1, 260.312-260.314, 287.1, 290.1, 292.1, 296.1, 297.1, 305.1, 316.1	The submitter has requested a change to the zoning of land.	<b>Not supported</b>	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
263.4, 285.1	The submitter requests land be included in the Emerging communities zone.	<b>Supported in part</b>	Yes	Zones changed to Emerging communities zone for those lots similiary zoned under the current planning instruments. Lot 1 RP25643 remains in the Rural zone.

156.1, 260	Submitter has requested that the zone be changed from Open space zone to Rural residential zone.	<b>Support</b> For Lot 1 RP208721, the proposed request to change the zone does not align with the higher order planning instrument, i.e. the SEQ Regional Plan. However, given the land is in private ownership, it is appropriate for the land to be included in the Rural zone. Inclusion of Lot 1 SP332996 in the Rural residential zone is supported.	Yes	Lot 1 RP208721 included in the Rural zone on ZM1 Zone map. Lot 1 SP332996 included in the Rural residential zone on ZM1 Zone map.
30.1, 49.1, 52.1, 55.1, 282.1, 286.1	The submitter has requested that the zoning of land be changed to a residential zone.	<b>Not supported</b> The current zoning under the draft planning scheme should be similar to that under the existing scheme. It would be premature to include this land in a residential zone. Lot 1 SP212458 and Lot 82 RP815863 can be included in the Emerging communities zone to reflect their current zoning under the Laidley Shire Planning Scheme.	No	<b>Lot 1 SP212458, Lot 82 RP815863</b> are included in the Emerging communities zone.
296.2	The requests a change of zoning of land.	<b>Supported in part</b>	Yes	Lot 2 SP182250 has been zoned Rural residential (Small precinct). The zoning of Lot 109 CH31631 and Lot 5 SP206613 remain as Emerging communities zone, and Lot 999 SP199151 remains as Rural residential zone, but in the Small precinct.
170.1	The submitter requests that land be included in the Mixed use zone instead of the Rural residential zone.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Lot 53 RP863701 is included in the Mixed use zone.
149.1, 154.1, 177.1, 178.1, 179.1, 180.1, 182.1, 196.1, 218.8, 246.1, 283.1, 288.1, 292.1	The submitter requests that the zone be changed from Rural zone to a centre zone or Industry zone.	<b>Supported in part</b> The inclusion of this land in a zone other than Rural is appropriate given the historical use of the land.	Yes	Lots 1 & 2 RP815108, Lots 0 & 1 on GTP100122; Lot 5 GTP103662, Lot 1 RP213654; Lot 3 RP850847; Lot 3 RP850847; Lot 5 SP251042; Lots 6, 8 & 9 RP227400; Lot 11 & 12 SP255665; Lot 14 SP275582 has been included in the Highway precinct of the Mixed use zone.
172.1, 260	Properties purchased under the Resilient Homes Fund Voluntary Home Buy-Back Program (VHBB) should be in the Limited development zone and adding an annotation 'VHBB' to identify that the property was acquired through the Voluntary Home Buy-Back program.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	As a result of this submission, the following lots will be included in the Limited development zone on ZM1 Zones map: Lots 301, 302, 312, 314 & 510 G3422, Lot 15 G3426, Lot 1 RP807366, Lots 158 & 162 CC438, Lot 48 CC451, Lot 100 CSH1737, Lots 305 & 306 G34211, Lot 1 RP130896, Lot 1 RP196783, Lot 16 RP141793, Lot 24 SP185014, Lot 287 RP850334
22.1, 176.1	The submitter has requested the zone change to the Community facilities zone.	<b>Supported</b> The inclusion of the land within the Community facilities zone is consistent with Council's zoning approach for community halls, places of worship and childcare centres.	Yes	As a result of this submission, changes will be made to the ZM1 Zones map of Lockyer Valley Planning Scheme. Lots 14 & 15 SP247674, Lot 7 RP880414
201.1, 253.1, 253.3, 308.1	The submitter has requested that the 'Greater Brisbane Airport' (approval MC2018/0027.01 for Aviation Facility and Community Title Subdivision and Preliminary Approval for an Aviation Facility) be recognised in the Planning Scheme's Strategic Framework, Zone map and Overlays where appropriate.	<b>Not supported</b> Council has a general rule that a zone change is made to recognise development only once the approval has been acted upon. The current expiration date for the approval for this land is 2025. In this regard the site's development for the use is not certain and Council is reluctant to prematurely change the scheme.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
5.1, 12.1, 14.1, 29.1, 35.1, 36.1, 40.1, 47.1, 63.1, 75.1, 76.1, 78.1, 86.1, 87.1, 88.1, 89.1, 90.1, 91.1, 92.1, 93.1, 94.1, 95.1, 96.1, 97.1, 98.1, 99.1, 100.1, 101.1, 102.1, 103.1, 104.1, 105.1, 125.1, 131.2, 133.1, 144.1, 151.1, 157.4, 161.1, 168.1, 170.1, 171.1, 177.1, 178.1, 179.1, 180.1, 182.1, 190.1, 191.1, 196.1, 201.1, 206.1, 215.1, 218.8, 224.1, 233.1, 246.1, 265.1, 271.1, 275.1, 283.1, 284.1, 288.1, 293.1, 299.1, 307.1	Submitter has requested that the zone be changed: 1. to allow subdivision of rural land; 2. from the Rural zone to the Rural residential zone or urban zone and the land is in the Regional Landscape and Rural Protection Area under the SEQ Regional Plan; or 3. from the Rural residential zone to an urban zone and the land is identified as being within Rural Living Area under the SEQ Regional Plan.	<b>Not supported</b> The proposed request to change the zone does not align with the higher order planning instrument, i.e. the SEQ Regional Plan.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
41.1, 262.1	The submitter expressed support for change of the zone from Low impact industry zone under the Grantham Reconstruction Area Development Scheme to the Rural zone.	The comments have been noted. The proposed zoning for this area of Grantham was based on the Flood hazard overlay and the areas of extreme flood risk. The Flood hazard overlay has been removed from the draft Planning Scheme, and Council has committed to reviewing the Flood hazard overlay in the near future. The draft planning scheme will progress at this time with land zoned similarly to its zoning under the current planning schemes. Zoning in this area will again be reviewed when the new Flood hazard overlay is prepared.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
6.1	The submitter expressed support for the inclusion of Forest Hill in the Township zone.	The comments have been noted.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.



262.1	The submitter has expressed support for change of the zone from Emerging communities under the Gatton Shire Planning Scheme to the Low density residential zone under the draft Planning Scheme.	The comments have been noted.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
<b>Overlay Maps</b>				
260.10, 260.11, 260.20, 260.315, 260.316, 260.317, 260.318, 260.319, 260.320, 260.321, 260.567, 260.568, 260.628	Amendments, clarifications and editorial changes made to various sections of the scheme including the overlays.	<b>Supported</b>	Yes	Various changes have been made throughout the codes to make them more concise, consistent, workable and to improve clarity.
<b>OM1 Agricultural land overlay</b>				
157.1, 177.3, 178.3, 179.3, 180.3, 182.3, 253.4	The submitter has expressed concerns about the accuracy of OM1 Agricultural land overlay, or the inclusion of ALC Class A & B soils in areas identified for Rural Residential and Urban purposes. There are also small segments on the map that appear to be left over from editing the original State data including patches that too small to farm and in road reserves.	<b>Supported in part</b> The Agricultural land overlay is based on mapping provided by the State government and is the most accurate mapping Council has available. A Local government may locally refine the State map to help users understand and interpret, where and how state interest policies are applied. In response to this submission Council has locally refined this layer to remove the overlay for small isolated areas of ALC Class A & B soils, and the layer has been removed from urban and rural residential areas.	Yes	In response to this submission Council has locally refined this layer to remove the overlay for small isolated areas of ALC Class A & B soils, and the layer has been removed from urban and rural residential areas.
<b>OM3 Biodiversity Overlay maps</b>				
25.1, 69.3, 70.1, 74.3, 106.3, 107.3, 108.3, 109.3, 119.1, 119.3, 120.1, 120.3, 121.3, 122.1, 122.3, 123.1, 123.3, 124.3, 138.1, 138.3, 152.2, 157.3, 199.1, 252.2, 269.3, 269.4, 269.5	The submitter opposes various parts of OM3 Biodiversity overlay maps. The submitter has requested that one or more of the following be removed from the property: MLES Biodiversity Area, MSES Koala Habitat Area, MSES Wildlife Habitat, MSES Koala Priority Area.	<b>Not supported</b> Council cannot change MSES and is required to include these. Council has commenced a project to undertake an MLES study. Amendments to the new planning scheme will be made as needed in response to that study.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
37.2, 57.1, 166.1, 264.1	The submitter has expressed general support for the environmental aspects of the planning scheme and the Biodiversity overlay maps OM3A, OM3B and OM3C.	The comments have been noted.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
285.2	Submission seeks to apply ecological studies from old approval.	<b>Not supported</b> Council cannot change MSES and is required to include these. Council has commenced a project to undertake an MLES study. Amendments to the new planning scheme will be made as needed in response to that study.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
<b>OM4 Bushfire hazard Overlay maps</b>				
267.2	The submitter has expressed general support for accuracy of OM4 Bushfire hazard overlay.	The comments have been noted.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
80.2, 197.1, 225.4, 281.3	The submitter objects to the use of the State's Bushfire hazard mapping for OM4 Bushfire hazard overlay map. The submitter is concerned that the map has known errors.	<b>Not Supported</b> This is the most accurate mapping available to Council at this time. As more accurate mapping becomes available, amendments can be undertaken to update the overlay.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
<b>OM5 Cultural heritage overlay map</b>				
176.3	In relation to , the submitter requests one or more of the following: 1. Remove local heritage areas from overlay map. 2. Remove local heritage place from overlay map. 3. Removed buffer within 10m of a State/National/World Heritage Place. 4. Online portal incorrectly labels the 10m buffer as 'Within 10m of a State National World Heritage Place'.	<b>Support in part</b> The Local heritage places shown on the overlay are currently listed under the Gatton Shire Planning Scheme and are not being removed. Council is undertaking a cultural heritage study in 2024 and this will inform a new list of Local heritage places and a subsequent amendment to the overlay. It is appropriate that Local heritage areas are removed from the overlay and the code, as the requirements relating to non-heritage building within these areas are onerous and protection of the streetscape and heritage character of these areas is achieved by other measures. The 10m buffer to Local heritage places can be removed, and this buffer correctly labelled.	Yes	As a result of this submission, the following changes have been made to OM5 Cultural heritage overlay map: 1. Removed local heritage areas. 2. Renamed the buffer 'Within 10m of a State National World Heritage Place'. 3. Removed the buffer around Local heritage places.

OM7 Flood hazard overlay				
25.2, 134.2, 202.3	The submitter notes inconsistency between the Overland flow paths on OM7 Flood hazard overlay and OM12A Waterways and water resource catchment overlay – Ecosystems. It is suggested that the Overland flow paths on OM7 Flood hazard overlay are slightly more accurate than those shown on OM12A Waterways and water resource catchment overlay – Ecosystems.	<b>Supported</b> The Flood hazard overlay is being reviewed and this will include a review of overland flow paths to ensure consistency.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
3.1, 4.1, 10.1, 11.1, 13.1, 15.1, 18.1, 21.1, 32.2, 33.2, 38.1, 44.1, 46.1, 48.1, 49.2, 51.1, 52.1, 53.2, 54.2, 55.2, 56.2, 58.1, 59.1, 63.2, 66.4, 75.3, 76.3, 77.3, 78.3, 86.3, 87.3, 88.3, 89.3, 90.3, 91.3, 92.3, 93.3, 94.3, 95.3, 96.3, 97.3, 98.3, 99.3, 100.3, 101.3, 102.3, 103.3, 104.3, 105.3, 112.4, 113.4, 114.4, 115.1, 116.1, 117.1, 118.1, 124.2, 126.1, 127.1, 134.1, 137.1, 142.1, 146.1, 153.2, 155.1, 157.2, 158.2, 165.2, 176.2, 187.1, 188.1, 189.1, 199.2, 204.1, 205.1, 210.1, 210.2, 210.3, 212.1, 213.1, 214.2, 216.1, 261.2, 217.1, 221.1, 225.5, 230.1, 230.5, 231.1, 234.1, 241.7, 242.5, 243.1, 243.2, 249.1, 252.1, 255.1, 266.1, 261.2, 263.3, 262.2, 273.3, 276.1, 287.2, 289.1, 294.1, 294.2, 310.1, 311.1, 312.2, 315.1	The submitter opposes OM7 Flood hazard overlay map that affects their property. The submitter is concerned with one or more of the following issues: 1. The map has numerous errors and should be revised. 2. The map has speckling that will add to over regulation. 3. The map includes risk multipliers (e.g. warning time and islands) that change the level of risk and add to over regulation. 4. The map uses out of date LiDAR information and should be updated before being adopted. 5. The map uses the 2011 flooding in some locations but not all. 6. The flood map was not advertised before being intergrated into the planning scheme. Any amendment to the map should be advertised before the planning scheme is adopted. 7. Other measues have not been considered to mitigate flood hazard.	<b>Supported</b> The Limited development zone has been used to identify land in urban and Rural residential areas at extreme flood risk in the Flood hazard overlay. Council has committed to reviewing the Flood hazard overlay in the near future, including: • Removing Warning time and Flood islands from the methodology for assigning Flood risk categorisations and instead this information will be provided on a separate map. • Removing the speckling effect that had occurred on the overlay map with the draft scheme. • Reconsidering how extreme flood risk is derived including investigating other flood design events. • Zoning only land that is in the Extreme flood risk category to Limited development zone, and Council will not proceed with rezoning of all of a property where 75% or more of the property is affected by extreme flood risk. This will result in a greater number of 'split zone' properties and will address numerous submissions which raised this matter. • Investigating using a common design event, such as the 1% AEP + Climate Change, and using the 2022 LiDAR. Many of the measures listed by the submitter to mitigate flood hazard (education, mitigation works, etc.) are undertaken by Council as part of its ordinary course of business. Council must ensure development is resilient to flood hazard, and the Flood hazard overlay is major tool in achieving that. As mitigation works are undertaken, and flood modelling undertaken, the Flood hazard overlay will be amended to reflect the new level of flood hazard.	Yes	The Flood hazard overlay and code has been removed from the draft Planning Scheme. Council has committed to reviewing the Flood hazard overlay and code in the near future. Regulation of development within areas of flood hazard will be managed through a TLPI until the new planning scheme is amended to incorporate a new Flood hazard overlay and code.
OM10 Scenic landscape overlay map				
1.1, 37.5, 62.1, 64.2, 65.1, 67.2, 68.1, 73.1, 75.2, 76.2, 77.2, 77.6, 78.2, 80.2, 86.2, 87.2, 88.2, 89.2, 90.2, 91.2, 92.2, 93.2, 95.2, 96.2, 97.2, 98.2, 99.2, 100.2, 101.2, 102.2, 103.2, 104.2, 105.2, 110.2, 111.2, 144.2, 199.3, 219.1, 222.1, 232.1, 248.1, 286.2, 300.1, 309.1	The submitter opposes OM10 Scenic landscape overlay map. The submitter is concerned with one or more of the following issues: • The amount of area mapped as having Scenic landscape value, and how the Scenic landscape value, Scenic lookouts and Scenic routes have been derived. • Scenic routes being unsuitable for increased tourist traffic and caravans, and the associated increase in risk of bushfire and littering. • The number of Scenic lookouts and their location.	<b>Supported</b> The OM10 Scenic landscapes overlay is based on the <i>Scenic Amenity of the Lockyer: A community resource for the enjoyment of current and future generations</i> study completed in 2003. The methodology used to derived the overlay can be reviewed. Many of the concerns raised are as a result on the terminology used in relation to 'scenic routes' and 'scenic lookouts'. These issues can be addressed by amending this terminology.	Yes	The following changes have been made to OM10 Scenic landscape overlay: • Amended the methodology for the Scenic Landscape value layer of the overlay and reducing the extent of the area mapped as Scenic landscape value. • Removed the buffers to Scenic routes and Scenic lookouts. • Renamed Scenic routes to Viewing corridors. • All scenic lookouts have been removed, except Cunninghams Crest Lookout and Schultz Lookout • Confined the Viewing corridors and High points to within the road reserve / road corridor such that these do not intrude onto private land.
37.4	The submitter has expressed support for the Scenic landscape values layer of OM10 Scenic landscapes overlay.	To address concerns of other submitters changes have been made to OM10 Scenic landscape overlay including reducing the extent of the area mapped as Scenic landscape value.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.

OM11 Steep slopes overlay map				
1.2, 66.2, 67.3, 69.2, 74.2, 79.2, 81.2, 82.2, 83.2, 84.2, 85.2, 106.2, 107.2, 108.2, 109.2, 110.3, 111.3, 112.2, 113.2, 114.2, 115.2, 116.2, 117.2, 118.2, 119.2, 120.2, 122.2, 123.2, 138.2, 218.5, 225.3, 258.1, 281.1, 283.2	The submitter opposes OM11 Steep slopes overlay map. The submitter is concerned with one or more of the following issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The accuracy of the overlay map.</li> <li>The map should be amended to use the most up to date LiDAR.</li> <li>The administrative layers should be removed.</li> <li>The map should not show dam walls and waterway banks.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Support in Part</b></p> <p>The OM11 Steep land overlay was created using four LiDAR data sets which were combined to create a single digital elevation map. The accuracy of this data is high in some areas and as such identifies creek banks, road batters, swale drains, cut and fill slopes for house construction and dam walls. The final mapping that makes up the Steep land overlay mapping has been refined to reduce the extent of these features. Further accuracy improvements may be obtained by using a consistent LiDAR for the entire region. The flood-related LiDAR data from 2022 would be ideal, though this may not address all concerns raised.</p> <p>The administrative layers (slope up to 15%) are retained as these are informative and provide assistance in assessing compliance with other requirements of the planning scheme.</p> <p>Council will in the future look to update the overlay using the latest 2022 LiDAR, and undertaken a subsequent planning scheme amendment.</p>	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
37.3, 235.2	The submitter has expressed general support for OM11 Steep land overlay.	The comments have been noted.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
OM12A Waterways and water resource				
209.1	The submitter opposes how the waterways are shown on OM12A Waterways and water resource catchment – Ecosystems overlay map. The submitter is concerned the map does not accurately show the location of the waterway, or the map shows the waterway traversing part of the land that has never flooded.	<p><b>Not supported</b></p> <p>OM12A Waterways and water resource catchment – Ecosystems overlay map does not show the extent of the waterways. This map is trigger map for development and is not intended to show the location of the waterway.</p>	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
OM14 Minimum lot size overlay -				
14.2, 242.1, 269.2, 276.2	The submitter has expressed general support or specific support for the minimum lots sizes specified on OM14 Minimum lot size overlay - Precincts.	The submission is noted, however changes have been made to the precincts and minimum lots sizes for the Rural residential zone in response to other submissions.	No	No change is made to the draft planning scheme as a result of this submission.
9.2, 24.1, 25.3, 42.1, 42.2, 43.2, 66.1, 67.1, 69.1, 74.1, 75.1, 76.6, 77.1, 78.1, 79.1, 81.1, 82.1, 83.1, 84.1, 85.1, 86.1, 87.1, 88.1, 89.1, 90.1, 91.1, 92.1, 93.1, 94.1, 95.1, 96.1, 97.1, 98.1, 99.1, 100.1, 101.1, 102.1, 103.1, 104.1, 105.1, 106.1, 107.1, 108.1, 109.1, 110.1, 111.1, 112.1, 113.1, 114.1, 121.2, 141.1, 141.2, 147.1, 150.3, 152.3, 163.4, 168.2, 169.1, 194.1, 193.1, 207.1, 218.2, 218.4, 218.7, 229.1, 239.2, 240.2, 241.1, 242.4, 244.2, 254.1, 267.4, 273.1, 281.2, 296.1, 298.1, 298.2	The submitter opposes OM14 Minimum lot size overlay map. The submitter is concerned with one or more of the following issues: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The map restricts re-subdivision potential in existing Rural residential zone land.</li> <li>The minimum lot size is different compared to the current planning instruments and the existing minimum lot sizes should be retained.</li> <li>The No further subdivision precinct should be removed from the map.</li> <li>The name of the precinct should be the same as the current planning instruments.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Largely supported</b></p>	Yes	Changes have been made in relation to the precincts of the Rural residential zone and the minimum lots sizes. The number of precincts has been reduced from 5 to 4, and the precincts have been renamed. The new map ZM2 Zone Precincts shows the new precincts, and the new minimum lots sizes are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Small - 4,000m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>Medium - 2 ha</li> <li>Large - 4ha</li> <li>No further subdivision - this precinct is limited to an area north of Plainland which is being protected and conserved to accommodate future urban growth.</li> </ol>