

REDLAND CITY COUNCIL  
UDIA QLD REDLANDS ADVISORY PANEL

## JOINT WORKING GROUP

*Cleveland Administration Building,  
Cassim Rooms  
Cnr Bloomfield & Middle Streets, Cleveland  
1.30pm to 3.00pm – 13 February 2024*

**Attendees**

Louise Rusan, Martin Zaltron, David Jeanes,  
Wade Oestreich, Kevin Abey, Stephen Hill, Cathy Ross,  
Giles Tyler, Darcy Modina, Leanne Weekes, Shane Talty,  
Craig Hurley, Grace Brooks, Michael Loney.

**Apologies**

Cr Rowanne McKenzie, Cr Wendy Boglary, Vaughn Bowden,  
Paul McManus, Rose Mosley, Philip Mann, Jonathan Miers.

**Minute taking**

Leeanne Krabbe

**Chair**

David Jeanes – RCC

# Minutes

No.	Item	Introduced by
	Chair opened the meeting at 1.38pm	Chair
1.	Welcome and apologies	Chair welcomed the attendees
2.	Minutes from previous meeting	Previous Minutes discussed and endorsed
3.	Action items from previous meeting	Action items discussed and updated
4.	<p><b>Update on LGIP</b></p> <p><b>1. Status of implementation of current LGIP</b></p> <p><b>2. Status of LGIP amendment</b></p> <p><b>RCC – Performance of current LGIP</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council has delivered \$57.17m worth of trunk infrastructure jobs in the past 5 years.</li> <li>• \$19.49m has been offset for developer contributed trunk infrastructure over that time.</li> <li>• Expenditure has been approximately 52% of the LGIP 10-year program for the same period but does not include the Panorama/Wellington roadworks duplication job.</li> <li>• Charges received represent approximately \$60m which shows a deficit in cost recovery.</li> </ul> <p><b>RCC – LGIP Amendment (LGIP 2.0)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The amendment is practically complete (just finalising the mapping). We aim to have it on an agenda for the new Council possibly as early as May.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost recovery is forecast to be lower than the current LGIP largely due to construction costs significantly outpacing the Maximum Adopted Charge (MAC).</li> <li>• The new LGIP will have a clear strategy on what infrastructure items are developer contributed or council delivered for clarity and budgeting purposes.</li> <li>• Of particular note, in terms of the review of Desired Standards of Service, the new Civic and Open Space Infrastructure Manual (COSIM) informs LGIP 2.0 which targets park function and catchment demographics to better support the effective and sustainable implementation of the Open Space Strategy.</li> <li>• Statutory amendment process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Council has been liaising with the State on a way-forward for LGIP 2.0 given the significant resources already expended.</li> <li>○ It is proposed to continue with the LGIP amendment to the City Plan as an “provisional” update until such time as we have clarity around the implications of the SEQ Regional Plan Review, draft Redlands Housing Strategy, Southern Thornlands Development Area and any flow on to necessary City Plan changes.</li> <li>○ The statutory amendment process will require the usual State interests checks and public exhibition.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>UDIA QLD – Focus/prioritise where developments are going to occur, and the infrastructure is available. Mapping has been done for future works upgrades and will show anticipated timing and cost estimates.</p>	<p><b>ACTION RCC</b> – Accommodate a dedicated presentation for UDIA (subject to available resources)</p>
<p><b>5.</b></p>	<p><b>DA Review</b></p> <p>Update by RCC – Engineering and Environmental Assessment continues to be fully staffed.</p>	

<p>Review discovered internal and external issues across the board. Summary of key findings discussed, along with proposed process changes to assist in the streamlining of applications prior to Councils technology upgrades, with phase 1 expected to be completed mid-May. Current statistics show RCC remains below the Queensland average on timeframes for decisions in almost all categories.</p> <p>RCC expect changed processes to go live in May including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communications and changed website</li> <li>• Requirement for all correspondence to a single inbox</li> <li>• More details to come</li> </ul> <p>UDIA QLD – If a park was only ticked on form.</p> <p>RCC will offer Civil and/or landscaping or BOTH combined.</p> <p>UDIA QLD – Will RCC be looking at doing third party certification for approving survey plans – example being Moreton Bay City Council?</p> <p>RCC is not looking at third party certification of survey plans.</p> <p>UDIA QLD - If RCC introduce a pre-start meeting checklist similar to BCC, will applicants still be required to submit road opening approval applications separately?</p> <p>RCC need to prepare an RCC checklist and meet back with representatives such as UDIA QLD to see where efficiencies can be gained.</p> <p>UDIA QLD - Due to the delay in receiving bank guarantees for bonds, can we just submit the approved amount between Council and ourselves.</p> <p>RCC need to seek clarification and will come back to the Group.</p>	<p><b>ACTION RCC</b> - Pre-start meeting checklist to be prepared and meet with representatives to see where efficiencies can be gained.</p> <p><b>ACTION RCC</b> – Seek clarification on Bank guarantees for bonds.</p> <p><b>ACTION RCC</b> - Further consider how other parties can be included to receive correspondence.</p>
--	---

	<p>UDIA QLD - Where is the outbound correspondence going back to on the supplied State Government form?</p> <p>RCC – The State Government form only asks for applicant. Hence Council can only send statutory correspondence to the applicant listed on the form.</p> <p>RCC Cr Boglary asked if in this review, if small Mum and Dad applicants could also be consulted?</p> <p>RCC completing case studies and would be happy for Councillors to send through any they had.</p> <p>UDIA QLD appreciate Council is looking into this area and willing to work and test with developers for efficiencies and improvements to be gained with developers, consultants, and contractors. This can only improve relationships.</p>	<p><b>ACTION RCC</b> – Respond to Mum and Dad cases provided by Councillors.</p>
<p><b>6.</b></p>	<p><b>Current stats on application numbers and DA workloads</b></p> <p>The number of development applications has remained consistent over the last 5 years.</p> <p>Planning enquiries exceeded 10,800.</p> <p>Pre-Lodgement meetings averaging 100 per annum.</p> <p>New residential dwelling applications averaging just under 1000 per annum.</p> <p>Over the last 5 years the split between dwelling houses and other residential forms has averaged 76% houses and 24% other.</p>	

UDIA QLD indicated it is increasingly difficult to deliver financially viable medium density residential product.

Redland City Council		Number		
Year (ending June 30)	Houses	Other	Total	
2023-24 FYTD (December)	470	115	585	
2022-23	687	336	1,023	
2021-22	969	118	1,087	
2020-21	833	323	1,156	
2019-20	631	118	749	
2018-19	490	227	717	

**7. SEQ Regional Plan**

RCC advised it had lodged a submission on the draft SEQRP. The submission, supported by a consultant review, demonstrated the City had sufficient spare dwelling capacity to accommodate the new proposed SEQRP dwelling targets without a need for Southern Thornlands to be included in the Urban footprint. The submission also highlighted a number of concerns with the proposed inclusion of Southern Thornlands including potential impacts on koalas and EPBC legislation, land fragmentation and the ability to service the area and fund critical infrastructure particularly in regard to wastewater and road upgrades.

Following the recent release of the final SEQ Regional Plan and the decision to include Southern Thornlands in the urban footprint and designate the area as a category one – SEQ Development Area, Council has organized further meetings with both EDQ and the Planning Department to discuss

	<p>how planning investigations of the area are expected to progress and the likelihood of a PDA declaration.</p> <p>UDIA – questioned whether the City would be able to continue to deliver the overall dwelling targets to 2046.</p> <p>Council noted it was satisfied it had adequate existing supply to deliver its housing target of 19,800 new dwellings by 2046. The inclusion of Southern Thornlands in the Urban Footprint and the likely recommendations of the Redlands Housing Strategy, if progressed, are expected to add significant additional dwelling supply to the city. Recognizing these circumstances Council does not envisage any challenges in achieving its dwelling targets.</p> <p>Potential opportunities for State Government funding to support planning work to bring forward housing supply was broadly discussed including potential opportunities under the proposed State Housing fund. Council officers noted that it was likely council would actively pursue any potential funding opportunities from the State government if available. UDIA supported Council seeking potential funding sources.</p> <p>Council officers noted a Mayoral Minute was tabled last September seeking a Right to Information request seeking further information on the MULTI model used to inform the dwelling and population projections included in the then draft SEQ RP and information outlining the reasons for the potential inclusion of Southern Thornlands in the urban footprint. A 100-page document was subsequently provided with approximately 60-70 pages redacted. Recognizing the limited information particularly in relation to Southern Thornlands, Council has subsequently sought an external review of the information provided.</p>	
<p><b>8.</b></p>	<p><b>City Plan Amendments</b></p> <p>RCC provided an update on its amendments, noting several amendments are currently with the State undergoing various stages of the state interest</p>	

	<p>review process. It was noted that a number of these were first lodged for state interest review in 2022.</p> <p>Council introduced an affordable housing policy in December 2023, which included a range of discounts to development fees and infrastructure charges of 50 %. The package also included a proposed City Plan amendment to reduce the site area required for a dual occupancy from its current 400 sqm per dwelling unit to 350 sqm.</p> <p>A pause notice has been received in regard to this simple amendment requiring potentially significant changes, including requested changes to the purpose and overall outcomes of the Low-Density Residential zone code. The pause notice appears to be in conflict with a recent letter sent from the State Planner seeking assurances from Council officers that we will work proactively with the State in prioritizing City Plan amendments, which potentially increase housing availability by using Section 18 of the Planning Act. A copy of the State letter and Council response will be included in the February General Meeting.</p> <p>There is general concern across the region in regard to the length of time being taken by the State to progress amendments. There also appears to be a concern across the region with setting timeframes for completion of SEQRP related amendments this year, without having received State provided correspondence</p>	
<p><b>9.</b></p>	<p><b>Redlands Housing Strategy</b></p> <p>Awaiting the final release of the strategy which is expected to occur in the first quarter of 2024. Council officers have recently been advised the state is currently seeking feedback from QYAC on the draft strategy.</p>	



	<p>Once finalized by the State the RHS will be presented to the new Council to consider its position on progressing /implementing the recommended actions in the final strategy.</p>	
<p><b>10.</b></p>	<p><b>Cleveland revitalisation</b></p> <p>RCC provided an update with Fourfold Studio engaged. With the Covid pandemic and interest rate rises, Council has been working with local businesses, the development industry, landowners, and the community for the future revitalisation of the Town Centre, noting Cleveland has one of the oldest demographics in the Redlands.</p> <p>With a 15,000 increase to the Redland city population since 2016 with 60% of those in the 60+ age bracket. There is a prime opportunity to get the Town Centre moving in a different direction to see other opportunities, with a mix of tenancies and new ideas. Developments are happening on the periphery and the challenge is keeping business's open with the core priority being the top of Bloomfield and Middle Street. Event related themes are proposed including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bloomfield blooms – options to activate the park and have shops spill out on the street.</li> <li>• Arts and crafts to bring together with shop owners to sell their pieces.</li> <li>• Shop front refresh – redoing the way the shops are presented to the street and passing foot traffic, with possible multiple tenancies.</li> </ul> <p>RCC's core function is to assist with organising and providing a framework and support with gaining approvals.</p> <p>UDIA QLD – It would be difficult for additional residential developments with current barriers to development feasibility.</p>	<p><b>ACTION RCC</b> – RCC to hold an offline meeting with UDIA QLD and RIC to further discuss in the coming months.</p> <p><b>ACTION RCC</b> – Share details of opportunity for partners</p>

	<p>City Plan anticipates and allows for an increase in resident numbers in the centre , further development is encouraged. An increase in resident numbers will enhance the Cleveland centre vitality.</p> <p>UDIA queried if RCC have we looked at opportunities for partners.</p> <p>RCC have looked with URBIS for opportunities for partners and how that could be achieved. Happy to share these details once available.</p>	
<b>11.</b>	<p><b>Potential to review Council’s fee and charges schedule.</b></p> <p>UDIA QLD – Smaller subdivision proposals are being affected by the Environmental Significance overlay fees. Would RCC review these higher fees on smaller projects?</p>	<p><b>ACTION UDIA QLD</b> – Provide recent example for RCC review.</p> <p><b>ACTION RCC</b> – Happy to review and respond to UDIA QLD.</p>
<b>12.</b>	<p><b>General Business</b></p> <p><b>RCC</b> - Community residences – Council is currently considering its options in regard to a recent Planning and Environment Court decision in relation to a recently constructed ‘community residence” in Cleveland. Community residences are currently an exempt form of development under the Planning Act. While Council recognizes the importance of providing this form of housing it is concerned the current provisions fail to consider built form, design, height, siting, and setback requirements as well as overlays.</p>	<p>Chair</p>

<b>13.</b>	<b>Future meetings and items foreshadowed for discussion.</b>  <b>Date to be advised.</b>  <b>Meeting closed 3.16pm</b>	<b>Chair</b>
------------	---	--------------