

**From:** Anthony Jensen  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 20 May 2009 10:50 AM  
**To:** Mal Griffin  
**Cc:** Garth Nolan  
**Subject:** Mapping dotters  
Mal,

I've outlined the approach for mapping submissions. The following gaps/issues are noted:

- Certainty about all map changes being correctly recorded.
- LGAs not having the opportunity to comment on all map change requests.
- The submission details and comments are yet to be entered into the database.

#### **Approach**

All mapping changes identified through the categorisation process were read to initially determine the property or locality details.

Individual property details were recorded in a spreadsheet. A series of maps were then produced identifying each parcel, using the 32 draft regulatory maps as a base. The corresponding submission number was noted on each identified parcel. A different shading is utilised in the instances where more than 1 submission was received commenting on the land use category of a parcel.

A series of meetings was arranged with each LGA to discuss the recorded map change requests.

Each submission was re-read to determine the details of the suggested land use category amendment and the supporting arguments. The information was then discussed during the meetings with senior officers from each LGA. LGA officers provided broad comments and background history on the identified parcels.

Following the meetings the submission details and comments were entered into the submissions database.

An assessment was made by officers as to whether the identified parcels satisfied the policy context outlined in the draft Regional Plan for defining the boundary of the Urban Footprint, namely:

The Urban Footprint should only be expanded if there is insufficient capacity to accommodate the planned distribution of regional growth.

Minor adjustments should be made to amend the Urban Footprint to reflect changed circumstances, to correct existing anomalies or to recognise constraints.

In instances where there was some merit in considering a land use category change, an additional assessment and investigation was also undertaken considering the operational principles outlined in the draft Regional Plan, namely:

- Land capability
- Natural hazards
- Ecological significance
- Separation from incompatible uses
- Proximity to existing urban areas

The assessment was entered into the database.

All parcels were then presented to executive officers from the Planning Group for comment, utilising the previously produced maps. Parcels which were considered for a land use category amendment were specifically highlighted for comment.

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
Ward No	LGA	Town Locality	Lot Number	Address	Current Zoning	Proposed Zoning	Proposed RDA	Current RGA	Current LUC	Proposed LUC	Summary	SRD Executive comment
1	2005	SUNSHINE COAST	100056537	Windy Road	Water Resource Catchment Area				RURPA	Urban Footprint	Comments: This subject land is suitable for urban development. Assessment: The subject land forms part of the 'Neighbour catchment'. It is considered a necessary rural area and thus not suitable for urban purposes.	Not supported.

RTI RELEASE

2025/03/20 10:00 AM

The Queensland Government made several commitments about the Urban Footprint ahead of the SEQ Regional Plan review. Notably, the Premier publicly indicated the need to make better use of existing urban areas rather than ongoing expansion.

There are 2 overarching reasons for amending the Urban Footprint:

- the Regional Planning Minister resolves there is insufficient land within the Urban Footprint to accommodate the projected urban development needs to 2031, based on stakeholder advice and technical input.
- there are obvious anomalies that need adjustment i.e. existing or new urban areas previously not included within the Urban Footprint.

The draft Regional Plan Urban Footprint was determined by DIP based on existing State and local government studies and strategies. Changes to the Urban Footprint were only made in the following instances:

- existing state and local government studies and strategies demonstrated there is insufficient land to accommodate the urban development needs to 2031
- existing state and local government studies and strategies identified an anomaly or more logical boundary.

The draft Regional Plan outlines principles for identifying potential areas to be included in Urban Footprint. The principles were developed with state agencies and local government and endorsed by the Regional Planning Minister.

The draft Regional Plan incorporated Urban Footprint additions in the following localities:

- Steiglitz on the Gold Coast
- Purga at Ipswich
- Plainland and Gatton North in Lockyer Valley
- Elimbah East and Beachmere in Moreton Bay

The rationale and supporting arguments for the additions are attached. The Urban Footprint additions were submitted through the project governance structure of the review process and ultimately endorsed by the Regional Planning Minister.



081210 UF  
dditions.doc (74 KB).

The public consultation period and completion of additional studies provided further scope for Urban Footprint additions.

All requests received as a submission during the public consultation period were read to initially determine the property or locality details.

Individual property details were recorded in a spreadsheet. A series of maps were then produced identifying each parcel, using the 32 draft regulatory maps as a base. The corresponding submission number was noted on each identified parcel.

A series of meetings was arranged with each LGA to discuss the recorded map change requests.

Each submission was re-read to determine the details of the suggested land use category amendment and the supporting arguments. The information was then discussed during the meetings with senior officers from each LGA. LGA officers provided broad comments and background history on the identified parcels.

Following the meetings the submission details and comments were entered into the submissions database.

An assessment was made by officers as to whether the identified parcels satisfied the policy context outlined in the draft Regional Plan for defining the boundary of the Urban Footprint, namely:

- The Urban Footprint should only be expanded if there is insufficient capacity to accommodate the planned distribution of regional growth.
- Minor adjustments should be made to amend the Urban Footprint to reflect changed circumstances, to correct existing anomalies or to recognise constraints.

In instances where there was some merit in considering a land use category change, an additional assessment and investigation was also undertaken considering the operational principles outlined in the draft Regional Plan, namely:

- Land capability
- Natural hazards
- Ecological significance
- Separation from incompatible uses
- Proximity to existing urban areas

The assessment was entered into the database.

All parcels were then presented to executive officers from the Planning Group for comment, utilising the previously produced maps.

The Executive established a series of potential Urban Footprint additions, which were then progressed through the project governance structure for comment and amendment. The resulting Urban Footprint additions to the final Regional Plan included parcels at the following localities:

- Brighton, Port of Brisbane, Upper Kedron, Karrawatha and Moggill in Brisbane
- Redbank Plains, Wallon and Purga at Ipswich
- Gatton and Helidon in Lockyer Valley
- Eagleby, Park Ridge South, Bahrs Scrub, Greenbank, Logan Village and Jimboomba in Logan.
- Narangba and Cashmere at Moreton Bay
- Lowood and Kilcoy in Somerset
- Cooroy, Palmwoods and Bii Bli on the Sunshine Coast
- Charlton, Cambooya, Finnie and Mt Rascal in Toowoomba.