ITEM 18  CITY PLANNING
RURAL AND RURAL RESIDENTIAL LANDSCAPE AND ENVIRONMENT PRECINCT
MAPPING REVIEW
PD98/1132/04/07

1 BASIS FOR CONFIDENTIALITY

1.1 I recommend that this report be considered in Closed Session pursuant to section 275 (1) of the Local Government Regulation 2012 for the reason that the matter involves

(h) other business for which a public discussion would be likely to prejudice the interests of the local government or someone else, or enable a person to gain a financial advantage.

1.2 I recommend that the report/attachment be deemed non-confidential except for those parts deemed by the Chief Executive Officer to remain confidential in accordance with sections 171 (3) and 200 (5) of the Local Government Act 2009.

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to advise Council of the outcomes of the Rural and Rural residential landscape and environment precinct mapping review and seek Council endorsement of the recommended policy position:

1. of the revised Rural and Rural residential landscape and environment precinct mapping methodologies; and

2. to use the methodologies to update the Rural and Rural residential landscape and environment precincts on the City Plan zone maps as part of City Plan Major update 2.

The revised methodologies recommended for use in City Plan Major update 2 are:

Rural landscape and environment precinct (RLEP)

1. Merge the following mapping inputs:
   City Plan:
   i. General, Medium and High priority vegetation, and Regulated vegetation where inside biodiversity areas; and
   ii. High priority vegetation where outside biodiversity areas.
   Matters of National Environmental Significance:
   iii. Ramsar sites; and
   iv. Fish habitat areas.

2. Remove the following from the resulting layer:
   i. Agricultural land as identified in the City Plan; and
   ii. Non-contiguous polygons <1000m².
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Rural residential landscape and environment precinct (RRLEP)

1. Merge the following mapping inputs:
   City Plan:
   i. Biodiversity areas; and
   ii. High priority vegetation where outside biodiversity areas.
   Matters of National Environmental Significance:
   iii. Ramsar sites; and
   iv. Fish habitat areas.

2. Remove the following from the resulting layer:
   i. Non-contiguous polygons <1000m².

3 PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is to advise Council of the outcomes of the Rural and Rural residential landscape and environment precinct mapping review and seek Council endorsement of the recommended policy position.

4 PREVIOUS RESOLUTIONS

The City Plan 2015 Special Committee, at its meeting of 18 February 2015 (endorsed by CP15.0325.008 and G15.0402.021) recommended:

... 

2 That Council commences an holistic review of all Rural and Rural Residential ‘Landscape and Environment Precinct’ mapping contained within the draft City Plan 2015 for inclusion as part of Amendment 1.

3 That in regard to areas of policy change:
   a Subject to State support, all identified GIS anomalies in the Rural and Rural Residential Landscape and Environment Precincts be resolved prior to commencement of the City Plan;
   b For the Rural Landscape and Environment Precinct:
      i. All identified new environmental or scenic amenity areas be retained to support hinterland, environment and landscape values, until the findings of an holistic review of the precinct mapping is considered, or otherwise separately resolved as part of consideration of submissions;
      ii. Notwithstanding the above, the precinct mapping east of the Pacific Motorway in Division 1, be amended by removing the identified new and scenic amenity areas recognising that the scenic amenity values in this location are related to rural production activities.

...
Council resolved on 30 May 2017 (G17.0530.018):

2  That Council proposes to commence a major amendment (Major update 2) to the City Plan in accordance with section 117(1) of the Sustainable Planning Act 2009 and Statutory Guideline 01/16 ‘Making and amending local planning instruments’.

3  That the scope list for Major update 2 outlined in Attachment 1 be endorsed.

6  That further reports detailing the City Plan updates for each scope item be brought back for consideration by the City Planning Committee.

5 DISCUSSION

5.1 Background

5.1.1 Overview

The Rural landscape and environment precinct (RLEP) and the Rural residential landscape and environment precinct (RRLEP) were developed for the City Plan to manage issues in relation to Queensland Planning Provisions (QPP) requirements for zone purposes and to provide a better line of sight from overlays through to zoning.

126 submissions about the RLEP and RRLEP were made during the City Plan consultation phase. During review of the submissions, Council recommended changes be made to the precinct mapping and a holistic review of the Rural and Rural residential landscape and environment precinct mapping be completed.

The review was recently completed after new environmental mapping inputs became available for use.

5.1.2 Origins of existing RLEP

The Rural Domain under the superseded Gold Coast Planning Scheme 2003 included a dual purpose being for rural production and protection of environmental and landscape values; however these differing intents were not distinguished in the Domain mapping.

To distinguish the differing intents the 2003 Planning Scheme relied on overlay mapping, primarily ‘OM20 – Conservation Strategy Plan’, which identified areas intended for protection of environmental and landscape values (the majority of the Rural Domain).
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During the preparation of City Plan, the dual purpose of the Rural Domain (environmental protection and rural production) was at odds with the QPP Rural zone which was solely focused on rural production. To resolve this, the RLEP was developed to clearly identify parts of the Rural zone that were primarily intended for protection of environmental and landscape values. Land intended for rural production remained in the Rural base zone.

The mapping of the RLEP in City Plan was developed using the following mapping as a reference:

- City Plan Environmental significance - vegetation management overlay map;
- Koala habitat areas from the City Plan Environmental significance – priority species overlay map;
- Scenic amenity (scores 5-10 only, from the Gold Coast Scenic Amenity Final Mapping Study 2010, Terranean Mapping Technologies, 2010); and
- The latest aerial photography at the time.

A manual approach was taken in order to rationalise issues with accuracy and consistency of the available mapping resources at the time.

The existing RLEP, resulting from this methodology, generally reflects vegetated areas and correlates well with the City Plan’s Environmental significance - vegetation management overlay map and scenic amenity mapping.

5.1.3 Origins of existing RRLEP

The existing RRLEP was also developed to provide greater policy transparency and protection of environmental and landscape values. This was achieved by the delineation of these lands through zoning which allowed different policy settings to be applied.

The resulting RRLEP provides for reduced development intensity to the Rural residential base zone (larger lot sizes and less non-residential land uses envisaged), which serves to better protect lands with significant environmental and landscape values.

The existing RRLEP was primarily created by use of the City Plan’s Environmental significance - biodiversity areas overlay mapping.

5.2 Precinct Mapping Review - Overview

A holistic review of the precinct mapping has been undertaken. The key objective of the review was the development of new mapping methodologies to appropriately:

- maintain the dual purpose of the Rural zone by separating it into rural activity areas and areas where environmental and/or landscape values are significant enough to warrant inclusion in the Rural landscape and environment precinct; and
• separate the Rural residential zone into traditional rural residential areas and areas where environmental and/or landscape values are significant enough to warrant inclusion in the Rural residential landscape and environment precinct.

The new methodologies needed to be repeatable (by avoiding subjective manual steps) and defensible (must have a clear line of sight back to environmental and/or scenic amenity values).

The review examined the current precinct mapping, the critical attributes of the precincts as outlined by their associated City Plan provisions, and discussed these in the context of State planning requirements.

The review identified that a different approach to each precinct was required due to the City Plan (Strategic framework section 3.5.6.1) also requiring rural production to be supported where in appropriate locations. The review considered these to be areas where matters of environmental significance would not be comprised. These are generally areas cleared of vegetation.

Reaching this understanding led to two different sets of criteria to determine the suitability of mapping inputs for each precinct and ultimately two different methodologies being recommended.

It is important to note that the criteria established by the review will remain appropriate for future use however the inputs ultimately used in the methodology may change over time as the range and nature of available inputs changes.

The review also included a ground truthing exercise of current precinct mapping and available mapping resources which validated the approach taken.

Minor investigations into the associated City Plan provisions (from a drafting perspective) were also undertaken.

The review resulted in several key findings which are summarised below by topic.

5.3 Precinct Mapping Review - Key Findings

5.3.1 Key findings in relation to environmental mapping

Following an analysis of the City Plan’s environmental policy, the review considered those environmental values which the City Plan requires to be protected in situ to be significant enough for inclusion in the precincts. The City Plan describes these as biodiversity areas and areas of high value vegetation.

Note that other areas (i.e. areas not requiring protection in situ) which are identified as being of environmental significance by the City Plan Environmental significance overlays will continue to be appropriately protected by the overlays.
The resulting methodology for the RRLEP is primarily comprised of lands identified with these values by City Plan. This is generally consistent with the approach to the RRLEP in City Plan (Versions 1 to 4).

As the purpose of the Rural zone is to primarily provide for rural production, the inclusion of biodiversity areas was not recommended for the RLEP. It was recognised biodiversity areas (primarily Hinterland core habitat and Hinterland to coast critical corridors) cover broad expanses of cleared rural production land, and as such were not an appropriate input for the RLEP.

Matters of State Environmental Significance (MSES) and Matters of National Environmental Significance (MNES) were also reviewed leading to the recommendation to include the following mapping layers into the methodologies:

1. Regulated vegetation (MSES);
2. Queensland fish habitat areas (MNES); and

5.3.2 Key findings in relation to scenic amenity mapping

Following an examination of the scenic amenity mapping, it was recommended this mapping not be used as an input. The main reasons for this decision relate to the following limitations:

- Accuracy – the data uses 10m x 10m satellite data; and
- Currency – the data was published in 2010 but based on earlier input data. Significant changes have occurred since that time, mainly in relation to vegetation cover and land use, reducing the reliability of this mapping.

Use of the scenic amenity mapping to create the RLEP could potentially lead to extensive areas of rural production land being included in the precinct. This would have the effect that new rural production activity could be significantly restricted. Considering the impact of applying the RLEP over rural production lands, a high level of confidence is required in the mapping inputs.

Although the impacts of application of the RRLEP are less significant than the RLEP, a high level of confidence in the mapping inputs is required in order for it to be used for zoning decisions.

Whilst protection of scenic amenity values is important and the available scenic amenity mapping is valuable, it was considered inappropriate to use this mapping for the delineation of the precincts.

It should be noted that there is a very high correlation between environmental and scenic amenity values. As a result, the revised precincts will continue to contain lands that also have very high scenic amenity value. For this reason, drafting changes to remove references to scenic and/or landscape amenity values are not considered necessary as a consequence of not using scenic amenity mapping in the methodology.
During the review, consideration was also given to the nexus between scenic amenity values and zoning. Stakeholder consensus was reached that scenic amenity issues would be more appropriately regulated through an overlay to trigger design responses, rather than as a key driver in determining appropriate land uses through zoning.

It was proposed that the scenic amenity study be updated with a view to creating a scenic amenity overlay map and associated code as part of a future update to City Plan. It is anticipated this overlay would capture scenic amenity values across the City (not just the Rural and Rural residential zones).

Further investigations are required in relation to how City Plan addresses landscape and scenic amenity values.

5.3.3 Findings in relation to associated City Plan provisions

Although the review was predominantly a mapping exercise, a brief review of the related aspects of the planning scheme was also undertaken.

The following drafting suggestions were made for further consideration by Council:

1. clearly articulate the role of the precincts to ensure a clear line of sight between the relevant codes and the Strategic framework; and

2. particularly in the Rural zone, ensure appropriate development is allowed to continue and/or be pursued on sites that may be affected wholly or partly by the precincts.

Further investigations are required in relation to the drafting suggestions which are proposed to be actioned in a future update to City Plan.

5.4 Proposed methodologies for RLEP and RRLEP

The review produced a set of criteria for each precinct to determine suitable mapping inputs. The methodologies below are the results of the application of the criteria. It should be noted that the extent and nature of available mapping inputs will change over time. When that occurs the methodologies identified below will require updating.

Rural landscape and environment precinct

1. Merge the following mapping inputs:
   City Plan:
   i. General, Medium and High priority vegetation, and Regulated vegetation where inside biodiversity areas; and
   ii. High priority vegetation where outside biodiversity areas.
   Matters of National Environmental Significance:
   iii. Ramsar sites; and
   iv. Fish habitat areas.
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2. Remove the following from the resulting layer:
   i. Agricultural land as identified in the City Plan; and
   ii. Non-contiguous polygons <1000m².

Note that step 2(ii) in the methodology is intended to remove relatively small areas from the precinct and make the resulting mapping more appropriate for use on the City Plan zone maps.

Statistics on the revised RLEP using this methodology (based on the latest Environmental significance mapping also progressing through Major update 2) are included below with maps included in Attachment B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing RLEP</th>
<th>Revised RLEP</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total area</td>
<td>22,158.58 ha</td>
<td>18,810.56 ha</td>
<td>-3348.03 ha</td>
<td>-15.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area retained</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,205.06 ha</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area added</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>605.50 ha</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area removed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,953.52 ha</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An example of the proposed mapping changes are presented in Figure 1.

Figure 1 – Example of RLEP changes
ITEM 18 (Continued)
RURAL AND RURAL RESIDENTIAL LANDSCAPE AND ENVIRONMENT PRECINCT
MAPPING REVIEW
PD98/1132/04/07

The red and orange areas combined (RLEP retained and RLEP added) comprise the revised RLEP and are considered to represent a more appropriate delineation of the RLEP.

Vegetation mapping is the only input in this area as shown in Figure 2.

Figure 2 – Example of RLEP inputs

Figure 3 shows another example where change has occurred, primarily due to the methodology only including High priority vegetation where outside of identified Biodiversity areas (vegetated areas in ‘RLEP removed’ are Regulated and Medium priority vegetation).
Figure 3 – Example of RLEP changes

High priority vegetation mapping is the only input in this area...
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Figure 4 – Example of RLEP inputs

Rural residential landscape and environment precinct

1. Merge the following mapping inputs:
   City Plan:
   i. Biodiversity areas; and
   ii. High priority vegetation where outside biodiversity areas.
   Matters of National Environmental Significance:
   iii. Ramsar sites; and
   iv. Fish habitat areas.

2. Remove the following from the resulting layer:
   i. Non-contiguous polygons <1000m².

Statistics on the revised RRLEP using this methodology (based on the latest Environmental significance mapping also progressing through Major update 2) are included below with maps included in Attachment C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing RRLEP</th>
<th>Revised RRLEP</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>% change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total area</td>
<td>3,225.83 ha</td>
<td>3,205 ha</td>
<td>-20.83 ha</td>
<td>-0.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area remaining</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2780.83ha</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UNAUTHORISED RELEASE OF CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS OR INFORMATION may be an offence under the Local Government Act 2009 and other legislation and could result in disqualification from office and a penalty of up to 100 units.
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| Area added  | - | 424.17 ha | - | - |
| Area removed| - | 445 ha | - | - |

An example of the proposed mapping changes are presented in Figure 5.

Figure 5 – Example of RLEP changes

The changes occurring in this area are a result of aligning the RRLEP with the latest City Plan Environmental significance – biodiversity areas mapping as shown in Figure 6.
6 ALIGNMENT TO THE CORPORATE PLAN, CORPORATE STRATEGIES AND OPERATIONAL PLAN

The City Plan is identified as a key deliverable in ensuring the themes of the Corporate Plan are achieved. Accordingly, all the themes (the best place to live and visit, prosperity built on a strong diverse economy and people contribute to a strong community spirit) of the Corporate Plan are applicable.

The City Plan is an initiative in the Operational Plan.

7 GOLD COAST 2018 COMMONWEALTH GAMES IMPACT

Not applicable.

8 FUNDING AND RESOURCING REQUIREMENTS

Not applicable.

9 RISK MANAGEMENT
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This activity supports the mitigation of Planning and Environment Directorate Risk number CO000510:

City Plan delivers inadequate and/or ineffective strategic/development policy (e.g. poor planning, built form, growth, social and environmental outcomes - including flood impacts).

10 STATUTORY MATTERS

10.1 Planning scheme amendment process

The proposed updates to City Plan constitute a major amendment under the Minister's Guidelines and Rules – Under the Planning Act 2016 - July 2017 and are recommended for inclusion in the Major update 2 amendment package.

10.2 State planning instruments

The recommendations of this report are considered to appropriately reflect State interest requirements as prescribed by:

1. Shaping SEQ – South East Queensland Regional Plan 2017 (Regional Plan); and
2. State Planning Policy July 2017

These documents include high level requirements for local governments to appropriately balance rural production, biodiversity and scenic amenity values. State requirements are generally consistent with those in place at the adoption of City Plan. As the recommended precinct mapping remains generally consistent in terms of composition, but with improvements to accuracy, it is considered the recommended updates will improve the degree to which the City Plan supports State requirements.

11 COUNCIL POLICIES

Not applicable.

12 DELEGATIONS

Not applicable.

13 COORDINATION & CONSULTATION

Internal stakeholders were consulted in relation to the mapping review through both an internal working group, and a request for comments/feedback on this agenda report.
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The following table outlines the internal stakeholders that have been involved in the mapping review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and/or title of the stakeholder consulted</th>
<th>Directorate or organisation</th>
<th>Stakeholder position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Coordinator Environment Planning</td>
<td>City Planning Branch, Planning and Environment</td>
<td>Satisfied with recommendations and report contents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Architect</td>
<td>Office of the CEO</td>
<td>Satisfied with recommendations and report contents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 STAKEHOLDER IMPACTS

Policy improvements to the City Plan recommended by this report will form part of the City Plan Major update 2.

External / community Stakeholder Impacts

The community will be consulted when Major update 2 undergoes statutory public notification (with all submissions considered) prior to consideration of adoption.

Additionally, it is proposed the Mayoral Technical Advisory Committee will be informed of the drafted outcomes. This will occur prior to City Plan Major update 2 being presented to Council for endorsement, to submit to the Minister for State Interest Review.

Internal (Organisational) Stakeholder Impacts

Internal stakeholders have been involved with this project since its inception, including input on initial findings and the recommendations provided in this report. Internal stakeholders will continue to be consulted as the update progresses through the statutory process.

15 TIMING

It is anticipated a consolidated Major update 2 package will be presented to Council in the fourth quarter of 2017 prior to submission for State interest review.

16 CONCLUSION

The report has provided an overview of the Rural and Rural residential landscape and environment precinct mapping review and its findings which include recommendations to update the Rural landscape and environment precinct and the Rural residential landscape and environment precinct using new methodologies.
The recommended methodologies:

- Are repeatable as they use an automated process primarily based on the City Plan’s Environmental significance overlay mapping (as opposed to the previous methodologies that involved manual, subjective steps). This ensures the precincts can be easily updated over time when the relevant input mapping changes.

- Are defensible as they are primarily a reflection of the most significant environmental lands in the City, as stipulated by the City Plan’s environmental policy and associated mapping.

- Are generally consistent with the composition of the existing precincts in that:
  - the RLEP remains predominantly comprised of the City Plan’s protected native vegetation; and
  - the RRLEP is predominantly comprised of the City Plan’s mapped biodiversity areas.

- Are considered to comply with statutory requirements.

- For the RLEP, results in:
  - an appropriate split of the rural zone into rural activity areas and areas where environmental and/or landscape values are significant enough to warrant inclusion in the Rural landscape and environment precinct;
  - a significant improvement in the accuracy of the precinct mapping due to the improved accuracy of the updated City Plan vegetation management overlay mapping (also progressing in Major update 2) and automated use of this data; and

- For the RRLEP, results in:
  - an appropriate split of the Rural residential zone into traditional rural residential areas and areas where environmental and/or landscape values are significant enough to warrant inclusion in the Rural residential landscape and environment precinct; and
  - an improvement in the accuracy of the precinct mapping due to the improved accuracy of the updated City Plan biodiversity areas and vegetation management overlay mapping (also progressing in Major update 2) and automated use of this data; and

REDACTED

REDACTED
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RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that Council resolves as follows:

1 That the report/attachment be deemed non-confidential except for those parts deemed by the Chief Executive Officer to remain confidential in accordance with sections 171 (3) and 200 (5) of the Local Government Act 2009.

2 That the Rural and Rural residential landscape and environment precinct mapping methodologies included in Attachment A be used to update the City Plan zone mapping as part of City Plan Major update 2.

3 That the updated Rural and Rural residential landscape and environment precinct mapping be presented to Council as part of City Plan Major update 2 in November 2017.

4 That MTAC be informed of the proposed updates to the Rural and Rural residential landscape and environment precinct mapping.

5 That Council note further investigations will be undertaken in relation to how City Plan addresses landscape and scenic amenity values.

Author: Luke Hancock
Supervising Planner
27 September 2017

Authorised by: Dyan Currie
Director Planning & Environment