
Bundaberg 10 Year Statutory Review Project

**Workshops with Councillors, Internal Staff and External
Stakeholders**

Engagement Outcomes Report

17 July 2024

Prepared by:

Mewing Planning Consultants

Morgan Wilson Planning Consultant

Document Information

Prepared for	Bundaberg Regional Council
Prepared by	Mewing Planning Consultants, Morgan Wilson Planning Consultant
Project Name	Bundaberg 10 Year Statutory Planning Scheme Review
File Reference	MPW2310.R01.003.doc
Job Reference	MPW2310
Date	17 July 2024

Copyright in the whole and every part of this document belongs to Morgan Wilson Planning Consultant and Mewing Planning Consultants (the project team) and may not be used, sold, transferred, copied or reproduced in whole or in part in any manner or form or in or on any media to any person other than by agreement of the project team.

This document is produced by the project team solely for the benefit and use by the client in accordance with the terms of the engagement. The project team does not and shall not assume any responsibility or liability whatsoever to any third party arising out of any use or reliance by any third party on the content of this document.

Our report is based on information made available by the client. The validity and comprehensiveness of supplied information has not been independently verified and, for the purposes of this report, it is assumed that the information provided to the project team is both complete and accurate. Whilst, to the best of our knowledge, the information contained in this report is accurate at the date of issue, changes may occur to the site conditions, the site context or the applicable planning framework. This report should not be used after any such changes without consulting the provider of the report or a suitably qualified person.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Stakeholder engagement process	2
	2.1 Categories of Workshops	2
	2.2 Engagement Format	2
	2.3 Stakeholder Identification	2
3	Summary of Workshop Outcomes	4
	3.1 Workshop 1 – Councillor Workshop	4
	3.2 Workshop 2 – Internal Staff	6
	3.3 Workshop 3 – External Stakeholders Workshop	9
4	Conclusion	13

Appendices

Appendix A Workshop Agenda's

1 Introduction

The Bundaberg Regional Council Planning Scheme commenced in 2015. Under Section 25(1) of the *Planning Act 2016*, a local government must review its planning scheme within 10 years after the planning scheme was made, or if the planning scheme has been reviewed, within 10 years after the planning scheme was last reviewed.

To this end, Council has engaged a consultant team to undertake the 10 year review of the planning scheme. The review of the planning scheme encompasses a range of steps including:

- Review of the local government area setting, considering things such as the levels of growth and demand and changing demographic profiles;
- Identifying the delivery of infrastructure and its alignment with planned and observed growth;
- Analysis of the current legislative environment that underpins the overall governance of the planning scheme and regulatory framework;
- Alignment with the latest State Planning Policy;
- Understanding the strategic direction envisaged by the community and the strategic policy and corporate documents of Council; and
- Review of the operation of the planning scheme and its effectiveness in delivering the desired outcomes.

To ensure that the review identifies key issues, as part of the review it is important that those who work within or administer the planning scheme have an opportunity to provide insights into the content and operation of the planning scheme.

On this basis, a critical part of the review process is the undertaking of consultation with key stakeholders who can provide detailed feedback and insight as to those aspects of the scheme that work well, identify implementation and delivery issues, identify opportunities for improvement, and any other aspects that are commonly encountered that reduce the effectiveness of the planning scheme.

2 Stakeholder engagement process

Stakeholder engagement for the project was included in the review methodology, and was envisaged as being undertaken early in the overall review. This would allow the consultant team to gather feedback on key issues that would assist in focusing the review of the more technical aspects on key issues.

2.1 Categories of Workshops

A total of three (3) workshops were convened, grouped into the following categories:

- Workshop 1 – Councillor Workshop – focusing on key strategic directions for the region and issues of community interest;
- Workshop 2 – Internal Staff Workshop – focusing on issues with the day-to-day operation, implementation and administration of the planning scheme and its effectiveness in regulating development; and
- Workshop 3 – External Stakeholders Workshop – focusing on the experience of working with the planning scheme and potential issues that arise in undertaking development in the region.

2.2 Engagement Format

The engagement format was based on a workshop style approach. This was intended to provide for an open and semi-formal engagement exercise within a collegiate atmosphere, encouraging open discussion and dialogue on a wide range of matters.

The workshops were held on the 9th and 10th of October, 2023. Each workshop ran for approximately 2 hours and included a presentation by the consultant team on the review process, the statutory requirements of the review, identification of potential issues and critical documentation, and the approach and methodology that the review team would be following.

The presentation was followed by facilitated discussion on key issues, seeking identification and detailed feedback from the attendees on key issues that applied to their interactions with the planning scheme.

2.3 Stakeholder Identification

Stakeholders for each workshop were identified collaboratively between the consultant team and Council project officers. In identifying the attendees, the intent was to ensure a broad representation of planning scheme users who would be able to provide insights into various aspects of the planning scheme.

For Workshop 1, the consultant team was provided a session at the recurring Councillor consultation meeting. This approach was to maximise attendance, and also to provide a forum where Councillors could consider and provide feedback on strategic matters that relate to the region¹.

For Workshop 2, a broad range of internal staff were identified. This included town planning staff from the development assessment team, engineering, economic development, cultural heritage and environmental teams.

For Workshop 3, the branch president of the UDIA and the regional manager of Master Builders QLD were approached to assist in identifying potential stakeholders. This was intended to ensure that a broad range of local industry operators (including developers, engineers, town planners, architects, builders, solicitors, etc) were provided an opportunity to comment on the parts of the scheme that they typically interact with.

Table 2.1 identifies the stakeholders who attended each workshop.

Table 2-1 Stakeholders who attended each workshop

Workshop 1 – Councillor Workshop	Councillor Jack Dempsey (Former Mayor) Councillor Jason Bartels Councillor Bill Trevor
---	--

¹ As the local government elections of March 2024 occurred during the preparation of this project, the engagement exercises were attended by relevant Councillors and staff at the time.

	<p>Former Councillor Wayne Honor Councillor Tracey McPhee Former Councillor Greg Barnes Former Councillor Tanya McLoughlin Former Councillor Vince Habermann Councillor Steve Cooper Councillor May Mitchell Councillor John Learmonth</p>
Workshop 2 – Internal Staff Workshop	<p>Amanda Matanovic (Principal Development Engineer) Richard Jenner (Manager Development Assessment) Hugh Byrnes (Principal Planner Development Assessment) Evan Fritz (Manager Strategic Planning) Michael Ellery (Group Manager Development) Stuart Randle (General Manager Infrastructure Services) – Online Arron Walker (Manager Infrastructure Planning) Dwayne Honor (Branch Manager Engineering Services) Narelle D’Amico (Branch Manager Water Services) Sayed Khan (Manager Planning and Delivery) Selina Hill (Cultural Development Officer) Ben Artup (Former Director Strategic Projects & Economic Development) Gavin Crawford (Branch Manager Waste & Recycling Services)</p>
Workshop 3 – External Stakeholders Workshop	<p>Kenny Festing (UDIA Branch President) – Apexx Engineering Consultants Shane Booth - InsiteSJC Tomas O’Malley – Tomas O’Malley Architect David Job – CertcorpDGL Alex Pretorius - MRH Lawyers Rose Deering - Coral Waters Estate Joseph Saunders – RMA Engineers Jesse Zielke – JRZ Homes Michael Randall – Bundy Homes</p>

3 Summary of Workshop Outcomes

A summary of the matters raised in each of the workshops is described below.

3.1 Workshop 1 – Councillor Workshop

The consultant team provided an initial presentation on the review process, the statutory requirements of the review, identification of potential issues and critical documentation, and the approach and methodology that the review team would be following.

The Councillors were provided an opportunity in turn to address the forum, with all Councillors providing input and commentary on specific issues.

Feedback from the Councillor Workshop is summarised in **Table 3.1**. The feedback is presented generally in the order received and there is no ranking or prioritisation to the issues raised.

Table 3-1 Summary of Issues – Workshop 1 – Councillors

ISSUE	STAKEHOLDER COMMENT
GENERAL MATTERS	
LAND AVAILABILITY	Approximately 15,000Ha of residential land available which can accommodate growth
	Smaller townships traditionally provided affordable housing options, additional residential land could be considered in some townships where there are services and facilities in place to support growth
GROWTH	The observed population growth (particularly since Covid-19) is greater than official statistics, and should be considered in preparing the planning scheme
	The region's point of difference is liveability and lifestyle which should be maintained and encouraged to deliver appropriate opportunities for locals and new residents
ECONOMY	The largest growth is in the health and education sectors, with large projects in the planning that will need to be accommodated through the planning scheme
	Tourism is important – air linkages to southern capitals provides opportunity for the southern Great barrier Reef as a focus. Opportunity for increased tourism and value-add associated with rural / agricultural areas.
URBAN FORM	Underutilised port infrastructure, and operation of the State Development Area complicates ability to plan on and around the area in a coordinated manner that reacts to opportunities
	Needs to be a clear policy position within the planning scheme on locations and appropriate lot sizes for higher density living, standard suburban living, rural residential areas
SPECIFIC MATTERS	The planning scheme provides the opportunity to locate development in the right places now, particularly in relation to efficient delivery of infrastructure and immunity to increasing hazards (such as flood or coastal processes)
	LOT SIZE – RURAL LAND

ISSUE	STAKEHOLDER COMMENT
LOT SIZES - RESIDENTIAL	Lot sizes are too small in some coastal township locations to accommodate sheds etc – larger lot sizes (1,500m ² and greater) would allow for lifestyle but maintain amenity
	Small lots below 600m ² are not supported due to potential impacts and community preference for lifestyle blocks that can accommodate sheds/trade tools/boat and RV parking etc
LOT SIZES – RURAL RESIDENTIAL/UNSEWERED	The lot sizes for unsewered blocks is too large and on-site effluent treatment can be achieved in smaller blocks, potentially 800m ² in keeping with older subdivisions
RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE	There are a lot of small parks that are underutilised, and do not provide the type of service that the community wants
	Existing community facilities such as schools could also be utilised as public open space when not in use to better use existing investments
	Preference for less local parks but larger and higher quality district/regional parks for efficiency of delivery and maintenance
MANUFACTURED/RELOCATABLE HOME PARKS	Concerns about the density of this form of accommodation and the lack of integration with the surrounding community
	Concerns around the urban design quality and internalised nature of the use, with better regulation recommended to ensure a higher quality product
	Higher density in the context of the region and has traffic/amenity/social impacts on the surrounding community
TELECOMMUNICATIONS	Telecommunications towers are supported as critical infrastructure, however concerns around the lack of local regulation on location and separation distances (400m is not sufficient in many instances)
	Preference for Council to provide greater regulation around preferred locations and mitigation of impacts (setbacks, locations, colours, screening etc)
NON-RURAL USES ON RURAL LAND	Non-rural uses on rural land are generally supported where they can diversify economic base and do not impact on rural production
	Concerns raised around some forms of tourism uses (AirB&B, camp grounds etc) as the size can be large and they are no longer small or supplementary uses and have amenity and environmental impacts
	Regulation should be provided around scale/timing/location to manage impacts
	Opportunities for complementary uses should be explored around tourism focus areas/infrastructure such as the Rail Trail
BUILDING HEIGHT	Concerns regarding building height in the coastal communities, particularly on the restriction of access to light and breezes
	No appetite for building height increases
SOCIAL HOUSING	Social housing is generally supported however concerns around locations and consolidation of all social housing into single location within a town
	Opportunities for inclusionary housing policy, with social housing provided for within development as a mix of housing types to better integrate with the community

ISSUE	STAKEHOLDER COMMENT
HERITAGE	General support for adaptive re-use of heritage and character buildings
	Support for the planning scheme to better identify neighbourhood character and set out clear requirements
	Concerns around level of assessment for some heritage places and that this stifles use or re-purposing for new opportunities
INDUSTRY	Concerns that the heritage listing and assessment process can be used inappropriately to hinder otherwise supported development, particularly on adjoining land
	The region and particularly Bundaberg is becoming attractive for higher impact industries, and is supported to locate
	Concern that there is a lot of industrial land, however it is not serviced (or able to be economically serviced), or constrained due to interface with incompatible land uses
	Concern about water security and the impact of this on the viability of industry
	Opportunity to identify serviceable and well located industrial land, including potential industrial outcomes near coastal townships

3.2 Workshop 2 – Internal Staff

The consultant team provided an initial presentation on the review process, the statutory requirements of the review, identification of potential issues and critical documentation, and the approach and methodology that the review team would be following.

The workshop was held as an open forum, with the floor open to all commentary. As comments were made, group discussion was guided by the consultant team as facilitators to interrogate issues further and particularly to confirm linkages to the planning scheme.

Feedback from the Internal Staff Workshop is summarised in **Table 3.2**. The feedback is presented generally in the order received and there is no ranking or prioritisation to the issues raised.

Table 3-2 Summary of Issues – Workshop 2 – Internal Staff

ISSUE	STAKEHOLDER COMMENT
GENERAL MATTERS	
CLIMATE CHANGE AND NET ZERO	Council has recently adopted a Net Zero Policy, and there is opportunity for the planning scheme to incorporate the policy principles (such as circular economy, energy efficiency, built environment) where relevant
CONSISTENCY OF DEVELOPMENT WITH THE SCHEME	There is concern that there are aspects of ‘under-development’ particularly in higher density locations, with standard lots and low rise buildings being approved in areas zoned for multiple dwellings and limiting opportunities for future higher density and housing choice options
GROWTH	The observed population growth (particularly since Covid-19) is greater than official statistics, and should be considered in preparing the planning scheme
URBAN FORM AND EFFICIENCY	Concern that development is not well sequenced, which leads to issues with infrastructure roll out and efficiency

ISSUE	STAKEHOLDER COMMENT
	The planning scheme provides the opportunity to locate development in the right places now, particularly in relation to efficient delivery of infrastructure
	There is opportunity for better alignment between the LGIP and growth fronts to ensure that there is an efficient and logical sequence of growth
	Council led master planning of some areas (either existing local plan areas or other pressure points) may be warranted and/or necessary to provide certainty and unlock growth in some areas where there is uncertainty about infrastructure roll out (or alternatively, Council could provide guidance on applicant-led structure planning of particular areas)
	Land fragmentation remains as an issue for infrastructure delivery
INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS	There is concern that the information that supports applications can be lacking, and the scheme could be more definitive in asking for or requiring information or reports to be provided through reference in POs or AOs
SPECIFIC MATTERS	
FLOOD HAZARD	Flood hazard mapping for the planning scheme is based on mapping adopted by resolution and so sits 'outside' of the planning scheme. While there is some benefit in this arrangement (quick to update) there is some question on its legal status (noting that this has never been challenged formally)
	Preference that the new scheme move towards a 'risk based' approach as utilised in other contemporary planning schemes, as opposed to a 'hazard based' approach
	While the overlay mapping and code work there is strong support for continuation of new flood modelling and mapping to better identify at risk areas
PLANNING SCHEME POLICIES	The Planning Scheme Policy for information Council may require is outdated and needs to include additional detail. Potentially could be disaggregated into multiple PSPs for specific matters such as Traffic Impact Assessment, Development Works etc
	The suite of PSPs is limited, and all could be improved to provide further detail and guidance on development outcomes
	Reference to the PSPs in the code could be better used (in conjunction with amended/additional PSPs) to provide further guidance on technical matters and minimise confusion on required standards
CENTRES HIERARCHY	There is concern that development in the Bundaberg CBD has not been appropriately facilitated by the planning scheme, and additional measures should be explored to focus on enabling good development (including, for example, the impact of car parking rates on development potential)
	New centres are not well regulated in the existing scheme in terms of context and function with existing centres
CULTURAL HERITAGE	There is a complicated background to cultural heritage matters in the region, with multiple claimant groups and multiple ILUAs across the region, as well as overlap with neighbouring LGAs
	A First Nations Strategy is required to support and inform the planning scheme, particularly in relation to amendments required to advance Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander interests in accordance with the Planning Act

ISSUE	STAKEHOLDER COMMENT
COASTAL HAZARDS	<p>Concerns that the planning scheme does not provide any guidance on adaptation due to coastal hazards</p> <p>Support for the scheme to provide greater regulation around land use transitions and management of/ response to coastal hazards</p>
	<p>The planning scheme does not address groundwater flooding and this can be an issue within the coastal and riverine environment</p>
LOT SIZES – RURAL AND RURAL RESIDENTIAL	<p>Concerns that unsewered lots are too small (at current 2,000m²) to appropriately deal with on-site treatment</p> <p>Legacy issues due to previous smaller lot sizes being accepted for unsewered required pump-outs and impacting amenity and ecological values</p>
YEILD AND HIGHEST AND BEST USE	<p>There is concern that land is being underdeveloped, particularly in higher density zones. There is support for adoption of minimum yields to ensure that well located higher density zoned land is not fragmented or sterilised for more intense development which will be needed in the future</p>
NON-RURAL USES ON RURAL LAND	<p>Non-rural uses on rural land are generally supported where they can diversify economic base and do not impact on rural production</p> <p>Concerns raised around some forms of tourism uses (AirB&B, camp grounds etc) as the size can be large and they are no longer small or supplementary uses and have amenity and environmental impacts</p> <p>Definitions and Tables of Assessment in the current scheme provide very generous thresholds for ancillary uses that should be reviewed to ensure that non-rural uses remain ancillary</p> <p>Regulation should be provided around scale/timing/location to manage impacts</p>
INDUSTRY	<p>Concern that there is a lot of industrial land, however it is not serviced (or able to be economically serviced), or constrained due to interface with incompatible land uses</p> <p>Opportunity to identify serviceable and well located industrial land, particularly for hard to locate and special industry types</p> <p>There is opportunity for bio-energy and recycling industries however these have particular requirements and could be facilitated through the planning scheme</p> <p>Industrial use thresholds are seen as arbitrary and could be reviewed to reflect local industry types and scales</p>
DWELLING HOUSE CODE	<p>There is confusion within the region around building design provisions in the dwelling house code and crossovers with QDC provisions. It is suggested that many referrals that are required to Council for amenity issues are missed</p>
WASTE MANAGEMENT CODE	<p>Concern that the current code does not reflect best practice or local outcomes, including such things as managing bins on streets, waste storage and pick-up for larger developments, and access arrangements for waste vehicles. There were suggestions that further detail could be included in a new or amended PSP to provide the desired outcomes</p>
VEGETATION CLEARING	<p>The current planning scheme includes a convoluted definition of exempt vegetation clearing which is difficult to interpret</p>

ISSUE	STAKEHOLDER COMMENT
	There is support for MLES vegetation to be identified, mapped and regulated though the planning scheme
RECONFIGURING A LOT	Reconfiguring a Lot applications need greater integration with existing development, and provision of information should be frontloaded so that more detailed understanding of infrastructure delivery, stormwater, civil design is provided and approved as part of the originating DA approval and not left to OPW
STORMWATER	There is support for the existing 'Stormwater Management Guidelines' to be incorporated into a new PSP to ensure that applications deal with this up front
E-PLANNING	There is some support (and general acceptance) that e-planning systems will need to be adopted
URBAN DESIGN	The planning scheme does not include detailed guidance on urban design, and additional urban design principles could be helpful particularly in the interface between private and public areas
	Potential for a PSP to be prepared that provides a regionally specific set of principles

3.3 Workshop 3 – External Stakeholders Workshop

The consultant team provided an initial presentation on the review process, the statutory requirements of the review, identification of potential issues and critical documentation, and the approach and methodology that the review team would be following.

The workshop was held as an open forum, with the floor open to all commentary. As comments were made, group discussion was guided by the consultant team as facilitators to interrogate issues further and particularly to confirm linkages to the planning scheme.

Feedback from the External Stakeholders Workshop is summarised in Table 3.3. The feedback is presented generally in the order received and there is no ranking or prioritisation to the issues raised.

Table 3-3 Summary of Issues – Workshop 3 – External Stakeholders

ISSUE	STAKEHOLDER COMMENT
GENERAL MATTERS	
OPERATION	The planning scheme is generally appropriate and user friendly, particularly in comparison to other schemes.
IMPLEMENTATION	There is some concern that the implementation of the scheme is too rigid with a focus on strict compliance with Acceptable Outcomes, and not enough flexibility or regard given to performance based solutions
	There is some frustration with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • timing of advice and assessment through the DA process; • perceived lack of pragmatism to achieve outcomes; • minimal guidance being provided on acceptable alternatives when an AO cannot be met
SPECIFIC MATTERS	

ISSUE	STAKEHOLDER COMMENT
DUAL OCCUPANCY AND SECONDARY DWELLING	This type of development is required to assist in providing housing stock and improving affordability, however the application of the planning scheme can make this difficult
	Changes to lot size for a duplex and review of controls on adjoining boundaries would assist in facilitating additional dual occupancy development
TURTLE REQUIREMENTS	Lighting requirements for development in proximity to Turtle nesting areas can make development of higher intensity development hard i.e. requiring significant buffering or setbacks that impact on viability
AIRPORT PLANS OF DEVELOPMENT	There are a number of historical plans of development (PODs) adjacent to the airport (e.g. Kensington Gardens POD). It would be simpler to deal with these if they were consolidated into the planning scheme
AGRICULTURAL BUFFERS POLICY	There is concern that the buffer requirements are not warranted in all instances, and there is insufficient flexibility in the application of the buffer requirements that can impact on setbacks/separation distances and viability
	Simple reconfigurations also can get caught by the policy and require significant works or interfere with operation of ag land
EMERGING COMMUNITY ZONE	There is concern that there are either no structure plans, or that the structure plans are not detailed enough to provide certainty and guidance for development in these areas
	Council led structure planning and delivery of critical infrastructure would be appreciated in unlocking new greenfield development and providing certainty for industry and community
	The current approach leads to all development being done as individual parts and may require temporary infrastructure which is expensive and not good for community or Council
PARKING RATES	Parking rates are applied rigidly and do not reflect actual operation and use within the region
	Provision of parking within CBD sites is very hard due to historical lot layout and pattern of existing buildings. Alternative approaches such as consolidated street parking many assist in unlocking CBD development
	Currently achievement of rigid waste management and car parking requirements is driving CBD design which is not a good outcome
WASTE MANAGEMENT	A waste management policy (and associated SPP) would assist in providing greater outcomes based design approaches.
	Waste management requirements are onerous particularly in larger developments and impact design outcomes and viability, however alternate approaches are rarely approved and often stop development proceeding
	Currently achievement of rigid waste management and car parking requirements is driving CBD design which is not a good outcome
HIGHER DENSITY OPPORTUNITIES	There is concern that good opportunities for higher density development is not being taken advantage of. Examples of well located land in proximity to services/facilities being zoned as low density residential were provided (including in proximity to shopping centres etc)

ISSUE	STAKEHOLDER COMMENT
	The industry sees support and interest for medium density residential from clients and community, however there are limited opportunities in the current scheme for this type of development (or at least to do easily)
	Zoning for medium density residential would be appreciated to facilitate a missing middle type of product and reasonable densities
URBAN DESIGN	Potential for a PSP to be prepared that provides a regionally specific set of principles, current scheme is quite silent and would assist in forming a baseline for assessment
	Figures and drawings in the scheme assist in understanding urban design outcomes
ACCEPTED DEVELOPMENT SUBJECT TO REQUIREMENTS	The intent is understood, however there are issues where there are no empirical provisions or no AO is provided – how does an applicant know whether they comply and increases risk on owners and builders for enforcement actions
	ASTR needs to be very simple for simple and low risk development
FAST TRACK PROCESS	A fast track process could potentially be put in place for low risk and simple development such as sheds, dwellings, dual occupancies, or where development is consistent with the zone outcomes
	A simplified code or compliance assessment would in some instances be simpler as Council can still assess and approve, there would be certainty for all parties
GENERALLY IN ACCORDANCE	Not clear whether this service is still offered, however this or similar would be good for industry to ensure compliance
	Support for provision of written advice from Council confirming a development satisfies the requirements for Accepted subject to requirements to provide certainty for owners and certifiers
FURTHER APPROVALS REQUIRED AFTER ROL/MCU	There is frustration that quite detailed plans/management plans etc are provided and approved as part of a planning approval (ROL/MCU), however further detail is still required at a later stage
	Industry would prefer that if detailed design is done upfront, it is approved and should not require additional plans/studies in OPW
LOT SIZE	There is support for a minimum lot size of 600m ² , which is considered appropriate for the regional context
	Smaller lots should also be provided for – in accordance with the QDC small lot code (lots less than 450m ²) where in appropriate locations
COMMUNITY TITLE SUBDIVISION	There is limited local demand for these types of development, however should be simplified to align with standard ROL process and not require concurrent MCU involving detailed house/dwelling design
COASTAL TOWNSHIPS	Concern that the coastal townships are growing but are not well connected to the services and employment of Bundaberg
	Coastal townships have very little employment opportunity, and additional zoning for industry or other employment types would assist in self-containment (given the low connectivity)

ISSUE	STAKEHOLDER COMMENT
FLOOD HAZARD OVERLAY	There is concern that the criteria and standards used in the flood hazard overlay (Q100 plus climate change) is too onerous and restricts development
	Flood hazard overlay relies on assessment of cumulative impacts, however this is hard to assess given that it is unclear what future developments will occur and how they impact the flood performance of a catchment
	There is an observed misalignment between MDR in flood exposed areas – any increase in intensity available under the zone cannot be achieved once the overlay is triggered. There should be an audit of zones and the flood overlay to ensure that higher density zoning can deliver
	The planning scheme does not address groundwater flooding and this can be an issue within the coastal and riverine environment
HERITAGE	Industry has limited local expertise and it can hinder otherwise simple development
STORMWATER	There is support for the use of inter allotment drainage where topography and existing development makes street discharge difficult/impossible
	There is support for provision of greater guidance on stormwater management systems and what is acceptable to Council – perhaps through a PSP
STANDARD CONDITIONS	There is concern that standard conditions are relied upon that do not capture the individual requirements of a development site and do not assist in achieving good outcomes

4 Conclusion

The engagement workshops were a useful exercise in seeking to gain a wide range of feedback from multiple scheme users.

It is noted that the planning scheme is not the only mechanism that Council has to facilitate development and seek to achieve the strategic goals for the region. In this regard, responses to some of the comments provided during the workshops will not be a matter for the planning scheme, or will have some crossover with other Council obligations or processes.

In terms of matters that fall within the planning scheme, the following are the major matters identified during the workshops that have a common theme and that may be further considered during the review:

- Lot sizes – there is a wide range of views on what are appropriate lot sizes. It will be important that the planning scheme continues to provide for a wide range of lot sizes appropriate to each area and consistent with delivering housing choice and affordability;
- Centres Development – the CBD of Bundaberg has not been the focus of development activity, and the intent to create a more dense, mixed use principal centre has not been realised to date. Provisions relating to parking, waste management and built form are seen as problematic and may be further considered to balance development viability and good public outcomes;
- Development Density – there is some tension between stakeholders on the merits of housing density. The planning scheme may be re-calibrated to identify locations where higher density is achievable (in close proximity to services/employment/facilities etc) as well as providing greater design guidance that minimises negative impacts on local character and identity;
- Sequencing of greenfield development – the roll out of greenfield development has become problematic, with lack of infrastructure connections and planning reducing the certainty of developers to proceed and creating costly interim infrastructure servicing costs. The preparation of more detailed master plans, structure plans, and infrastructure servicing plans will assist in identifying priority growth locations, allow for coordinated infrastructure planning and delivery, and minimise reliance on temporary infrastructure;
- Non-rural uses in rural areas – the Bundaberg region has a large rural hinterland and coastal plain that offers opportunity for tourism and other ventures that take advantage of the character and landscape features. While these complementary land uses are supported, it will be important to ensure that the type, scale, and intensity of these uses is consistent with the location and does not inadvertently cause interference with rural production, natural landscapes, or character and amenity;
- Industry Land – there is agreement that serviced industrial land is in short supply, and identification of additional land or investigation of servicing options will be required;
- Planning Scheme Policies – the current planning scheme has a relatively small number of Planning Scheme Policies (PSPs) that address issues broadly. More specific PSPs may be warranted in relation to matters such as waste management, stormwater management, urban design and preparation of flood hazard impact reports;
- Coastal Hazards – the Bundaberg Region is subject to a range of coastal hazards, and has recently completed a Coastal Hazard Adaptation Strategy (CHAS) which provides recommendations on responding to coastal processes. The inclusion of relevant aspects of the CHAS within the planning scheme may assist in appropriately managing the transition and adaptation of areas subject to intolerable hazard;
- Recreation and open space – local parks that have been provided are of low quality and are underutilised. Consolidation of parks into larger and more highly embellished facilities would potentially minimise maintenance costs as well as provide destination parks and facilities that support community liveability;
- Urban Design – urban design is an important aspect of development, and contributes to the amenity and liveability of a place. Good urban design should be based on a local context, and support a cohesive and consistent urban design language that reinforces local character and identity;
- E-plan – many contemporary planning schemes are using an e-planning portal to host their planning schemes and provide an interactive user interface. In addition to providing good access for the

community and developers, these e-planning systems can also provide additional functionality for Council in terms of drafting amendments, managing versions, and other day to day tasks.

APPENDIX A

WORKSHOP AGENDAS

BUNDABERG PLANNING SCHEME STATUTORY REVIEW PROJECT

INTERNAL STAFF WORKSHOP

9 OCTOBER AUGUST 2023

ATTENDEES: EVAN FRITZ (BUNDABERG REGIONAL COUNCIL)
BETHANY WILLIAMS-HOLTHOUSE (BUNDABERG REGIONAL COUNCIL)
BILLY GLOVER (BUNDABERG REGIONAL COUNCIL)
OTHER PROFESSIONAL STAFF TBC (BUNDABERG REGIONAL COUNCIL)
MORGAN WILSON (MORGAN WILSON PLANNING CONSULTANT)
LEO MEWING (MEWING PLANNING CONSULTANTS)

AGENDA

1. INTRODUCTIONS
2. CONTEXT OF THE STATUTORY REVIEW
3. THE REVIEW APPROACH TO BE UNDERTAKEN
4. IDENTIFICATION AND DISCUSSION OF KEY PLANNING SCHEME WORKABILITY MATTERS FOR REVIEW FOCUS
 - i. GAPS – SUFFICIENT REGULATORY GUIDANCE IN THE SCHEME?
 - II. PROBLEM USES
 - III. PROBLEM CODES
 - IV. LEVELS OF ASSESSMENT – CALIBRATED CORRECTLY? APPROPRIATE PROVISIONS FOR ASTR DEVELOPMENT?
 - V. CUSTOMER INTERACTIONS – TYPICAL COMPLAINTS?
 - VI. PSPS – RELEVANT, UP TO DATE, PROVIDE APPROPRIATE GUIDANCE?
 - VII. OPPORTUNITIES – WHAT COULD BE BETTER? ARE THERE OTHER SCHEMES THAT WORK WELL?
5. STRATEGIC ISSUES – DOES THE SCHEME ADDRESS AND REFLECT COUNCIL STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS ON HOUSING/BUSINESS/INDUSTRIAL/ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS
6. ANY OTHER QUESTIONS

BUNDABERG PLANNING SCHEME STATUTORY REVIEW PROJECT

STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP

10 OCTOBER AUGUST 2023

ATTENDEES: EVAN FRITZ (BUNDABERG REGIONAL COUNCIL)
BETHANY WILLIAMS-HOLTHOUSE (BUNDABERG REGIONAL COUNCIL)
BILLY GLOVER (BUNDABERG REGIONAL COUNCIL)
SHANE BOOTH (INSITE SJC)
JOSEPH SAUNDERS (RMA ENGINEERS)
TOMAS O'MALLEY (TOMAS O'MALLEY ARCHITECT)
DAVID JOB (CERTCORP DGL)
ROSE DEERING (CORAL WATERS ESTATE)
ALEX PRETORIUS (MRH LAWYERS)
KENNY FESTING (APEXX ENGINEERING CONSULTANTS / UDIA BUNDABERG BRANCH PRESIDENT)
STEVE COATES (COATES CONSTRUCTION)
JESSE ZIELKE (JRZ HOMES)
MICHAEL RANDALL (BUNDY HOMES)
MORGAN WILSON (MORGAN WILSON PLANNING CONSULTANT)
LEO MEWING (MEWING PLANNING CONSULTANTS)

AGENDA

1. INTRODUCTIONS
2. CONTEXT OF THE STATUTORY REVIEW
3. THE REVIEW APPROACH TO BE UNDERTAKEN
4. IDENTIFICATION AND DISCUSSION OF KEY PLANNING SCHEME MATTERS FOR REVIEW FOCUS
 - I. PROBLEM USES
 - II. PROBLEM CODES
 - III. ZONING – ENOUGH AND APPROPRIATE
 - IV. LEVELS OF ASSESSMENT – CALIBRATED CORRECTLY?
 - V. MANAGING HAZARDS AND ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS
 - VI. DEALING WITH COUNCIL – HELPFUL/RESPONSIVE, EFFICIENT
 - VII. OPPORTUNITIES – WHAT COULD BE BETTER? ARE THERE OTHER SCHEMES THAT WORK WELL?
5. ANY OTHER QUESTIONS