

19.1 PROPOSED CITY PLAN AMENDMENT PACKAGE - ENVIRONMENTAL CORRIDORS

Objective Reference:

Authorising Officer: Louise Rusan, General Manager Community & Customer Services

Responsible Officer: David Jeanes, Group Manager City Planning & Assessment

Report Author: Jodi Poulsen, Principal Environmental Strategic Planner

Attachments:

1. **Drafting Principles to Inform a Proposed Major Amendment of City Plan to Incorporate the Wildlife Corridors Plan (WCP)**
2. **Table 1. Comparison with other SEQ Local Governments - Levels of Assessment by Development/Use**
3. **Table 2. Comparison with other SEQ Local Governments - Relevant ASTR Criteria by Development Requirement**

The Council is satisfied that, pursuant to Section 275(1) of the *Local Government Regulation 2012*, the information to be received, discussed or considered in relation to this agenda item is:

- (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.

PURPOSE

Redland City Council has finalised and adopted the *Wildlife Connections Plan – 2017 (WCP)* and Action Plan. The action plan included an action to “Review City Plan to determine any necessary consequential amendments”. In resolving to adopt the WCP, Council prioritised the review of the City Plan to ensure any consequential amendments were included as part of the first amendment package brought to Council following the commencement of City Plan. The purpose of this report is to:

- outline the findings of the review undertaken to incorporate the WCP into the City Plan
- seek Council approval to make a major amendment to City Plan to incorporate the outcomes of the WCP review in accordance with Part 4 Clause 16.1 of the Ministers Guideline and Rules under the *Planning Act 2016*, and
- Seek Council approval on drafting principles to inform the major amendment to the City Plan to incorporate the outcomes of the WCP review.

BACKGROUND

History and Context of the Wildlife Connections Plan (WCP)

The main driver for the Wildlife Connections Plan (WCP) is the Natural Environment Policy POL-3128 (NEP), which was adopted by Council on the 3rd of June 2015. At the time of adopting the NEP, Council also resolved to:

“Prepare updated strategies and plans to progress the Green Living and Natural Environment policies, giving priority to:

a. Koalas;

b. Corridors and Networks;

c. *Urban Trees;*

d. *Offsets; and*

e. *Enhancing the Visitor Experience by unlocking the value of protected areas for health and wellbeing, while conserving biodiversity;”*

In order to deliver on this resolution, the WCP was prepared and formally adopted by Council on the 21st February 2018. The WCP identifies core habitat areas and around 145 corridors across both the urban and rural parts of the city that provide the connections between them. These corridors are ordered hierarchically as:

- Established Corridors
- Regional Riparian Corridors
- Coastal foreshore corridors
- Enhancement Corridors
- Enhancement Corridors in Known Development Areas
- Stepping Stone Corridors

The Action Plan that supports the WCP prioritises particular actions for each of the corridors, by identifying gaps and pinch points and priority outcomes for identified priority corridors under each of the above categories. These actions are proposed to be implemented across the city. Prioritisation for implementation of the Action Plan does not focus on either urban or rural areas, but is based on the following considerations (*Wildlife Connections Action Plan – Corridor Descriptions and Locations* p5):

1. All areas of Core Habitat are a high priority for protection and rehabilitation. All actions within the Action Plan can be implemented in the identified Core Habitat areas;
2. The Established, Regional Riparian Corridors and Coastal Foreshore are the highest priority corridors for protection and rehabilitation;
3. The Enhancement Corridors are the second highest priority corridors for protection and rehabilitation;
4. The Stepping Stone Corridors are a lower priority for protection and rehabilitation;
5. All corridor rehabilitation and enhancement of buffer areas should follow South East Queensland (SEQ) Ecological Restoration Framework (SEQ Catchments, 2012); and
6. All corridor rehabilitation and enhancement of buffer areas must take into account fire management planning.

The WCP includes a number of outcomes, one of which is to review the City Plan. The action listed to achieve this outcome is to *Review City Plan to determine any necessary consequential amendments*. This action is nominated as ‘immediate’, which means it should happen within 12 months of the adoption of the Wildlife Connections Strategy.

State regulatory framework

The State government has a suite of statutory instruments, which set out a framework for protecting and managing vegetation in Queensland. This is primarily the *Vegetation Management Act 1999* (VMA), *Planning Act 2016* (PAct) and *Planning Regulation 2016* (PReg) but also includes the *Nature Conservation Act 1992* (NCA).

These instruments work together; the VMA sets out categories of assessable vegetation, and makes some vegetation clearing exempt from regulation (mapped as Category X on Regulated Vegetation mapping). The PReg then also makes clearing of regulated vegetation categories either; accepted development, accepted subject to requirements, or assessable development. These provisions allow for the types of clearing that are likely to occur in Redland City, that is:

- Clearing related to managing rural land (e.g. clearing for fences, roads or tracks, fire management and mitigation, maintaining infrastructure, managing risk to people and property)
- Clearing related to urban development and urban uses (clearing related to a development approval for an MCU or RaL, residential clearing, clearing for urban purposes on freehold land)

The State also sets out particular requirements for protecting habitat for koalas under the PReg. This calls up State mapping of koala habitat (categorised into high, medium and low value bushland habitat or high and medium value rehabilitation habitat) and makes clearing of non-juvenile trees in bushland habitat areas prohibited development. The PReg then sets out provisions to avoid and mitigate impacts in other habitat areas. It is important to note that the trigger for this is levels of assessment set by local government planning schemes. That is, the provisions only apply where a planning scheme makes development assessable.

In addition to this, the *Nature Conservation Act 1992* establishes the protected plants framework and sets out the circumstances under which a clearing permit is required for clearing protected plants. Other instruments, including the various State Codes, State Planning Policy – July 2017, the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* and a range of other legislation may also impose certain obligations on land owners and managers, for example, with respect to cultural heritage. Each instrument regulates various aspects of vegetation and any associated clearing.

These instruments establish a linear regulatory framework for vegetation management. That is, the legislation works together to protect vegetation and where the provisions of one statutory instrument may allow clearing, such clearing may be prohibited under another instrument. The provisions of the various instruments must be read within the context of a development application to determine which legislation prevails.

The result is that there is vegetation that is not regulated by the State; vegetation not mapped as koala bushland habitat, and where the clearing is exempted by the VMA or accepted development under the PReg. The City Plan's Environmental Significance overlay includes the State's regulated vegetation mapping and koala habitat mapping as Matters of State Environmental Significance (MSES) and locally refined Regional Ecosystem (vegetation) mapping and koala habitat mapping as Matters of Local Environmental Significance (MLES). Therefore, making vegetation clearing assessable development where it is mapped in the Environmental Significance (ES) overlay ensures that the regulation of vegetation in the City (whether by the State or by RCC) is generally consistent and complementary, rather than duplicating regulation.

Local framework

City Plan commencement on the 8th of October 2018 identifies conceptual high order corridors in its Strategic Framework mapping.

In implementing these corridors, the City Plan relies on the combination of Environmental Management, Conservation and Recreation and Open Space zones as well as the environmental

significance overlay and waterway corridors and wetlands overlay. These map where habitat values are, but also include provisions within their respective codes to ensure that assessable development does not prevent wildlife movement across the landscape.

Performance Outcomes PO13-PO17 of the Environmental Significance overlay code also includes provisions that address ecological corridors:

- Development contributes to the restoration of waterway or land based ecological corridors, where they would significantly enhance the health and resilience of habitat and wildlife on and near the site.
- Corridors have sufficient width to maintain viable wildlife or habitat linkages (Acceptable Outcome is that Ecological corridors have a minimum width of 100m).
- Development incorporates opportunities for revegetation to enhance habitat condition, biodiversity and wildlife movement.
- Enhancement plantings and landscaping utilise endemic native species which replicate or complement the composition of the habitat it is connected to, unless this would increase bushfire risk.
- Where clearing occurs, it is sequenced and undertaken in a manner that provides opportunities for fauna to vacate affected land.

While the City Plan includes provisions in the relevant codes, implementation is limited as the corridor data wasn't available at the time of drafting the City Plan to provide certainty about the location, condition, value and priority of the city's land based corridors.

Regionally consistent approach

Redlands has followed the same approach as most other local governments in South East Queensland; setting out priorities and management of corridors in a strategic policy document, with a component implemented through development and land use regulation in its planning scheme.

The main tool local governments use to reflect corridor maps is overlays. All other SEQ local governments also make vegetation clearing code assessable. Other planning schemes in the region also regulate uses with those that have the greatest potential to fragment corridors and undermine habitat function made either accepted subject to requirements, or code assessable. Attachment 2 includes tables that outline how other SEQ local governments are regulating corridors through their planning schemes. These tables provide examples of options for the integration of the WCP into the City Plan. These options are described in the following section.

Integration of WCP and City Plan

The WCP sets out Council's policy in relation to the protection and enhancement of the City's most critical and important habitat areas; being core habitat areas and the connections between them.

For the most part, the achievement of policy outcomes set out by the WCP will be achieved through actions such as working with land owners to protect and consolidate corridors and habitat on private land, the strategic acquisition of property in high priority areas and Council's own planting and habitat enhancement projects and programmes on public land.

City Plan also has an important role to play in facilitating WCP outcomes. The City Plan sets out Council's statutory planning framework to manage land use and development across the City for

the next 25 years. City Plan does this by establishing a framework that seeks to ensure that future development outcomes provide for liveable communities and housing, safety and resilience to hazards, efficient and effective infrastructure, protects the natural environment and heritage as well as providing for economic development outcomes. Effectively integrating the WCP into City Plan will ensure that consideration is given to protecting and enhancing critically important habitat areas and corridors in future land use and development decisions.

Nevertheless, policy tensions arise; allowing for development as envisioned in the City Plan will, in some instances, mean that the objectives of the WCP are not able to be achieved. Conversely, ensuring development is effectively managed within core habitat and critical corridors as identified in the WCP will in some instances mean that some forms of development envisioned in the City Plan are unable to be achieved. These policy tensions become evident in rural areas, where Council is aiming to facilitate economic opportunities and the productive use of rural land. It is also evident in urban areas, as Council seeks to consolidate urban development within the existing urban footprint, but where corridors and habitat areas are already constrained and fragmented.

Given that Council has management responsibility of a significant part of the core habitat and higher order corridors it is already committed to a range of projects and programs to restore and enhance these areas requiring financial input and community support. Similarly the WCP action plan commits Council to a range of other actions and programs to restore the City's corridor network on private land. Recognising Council's potential investment in protecting and enhancing the City's key corridors it is considered critical that its planning instruments are appropriately aligned.

Accordingly it is considered that a responsible and balanced approach is required to ensure that development and land use is undertaken in a manner which protects core habitat and key corridors and doesn't prejudice opportunities to enhance and restore by other non-regulatory measures.

The resolution of this policy tension is dependent on an assessment of the risk, to both policy objectives; and consideration of the impact that each has on the other. In some cases, this assessment can be undertaken at a strategic level and will be resolved through the policy translation of WCP into City Plan. For example, by making decisions relating to where and when the WCP objectives will take precedence, and where and when the development opportunities will take precedence. In other instances, this determination will need to be made based on a case-by-case basis, using the regulatory opportunities in City Plan, and by setting out the parameters for assessment of the two policy positions.

ISSUES

Way forward

City Plan's drafting was underpinned by a number of key principles. These included; taking a risk tolerant approach to assessing development, avoiding duplication of regulation, and allowing development to be undertaken in accordance with zoning, while overlays protect identified values.

Being consistent with this approach, there are a number of options to reflect the corridor mapping and implement the strategy and action plan in the City Plan.

This includes resolving issues strategically, by making decisions around the policy translation of the WCP in the City Plan, as well as options to resolve issues on a case by case basis using the regulatory opportunities in the City Plan.

The options for this policy translation are; to show the core habitat and corridor habitat areas in the overlay map as an MLES layer as it appears in the WCP, or to use clipping rules (on all categories, or some categories) to resolve policy tensions in the urban footprint. The other alternative is not to include the WCP into the ES overlay at all. Of course this option would mean that the outcomes of the WCP are highly unlikely to be achieved, or would only be able to be achieved with a significantly increased investment from Council in non-planning scheme measures.

In order to integrate the corridor policy in the WCP into the City Plan, it is proposed to include the core habitat areas and wildlife corridor habitat areas as Matters of Local Environmental Significance (MLES) in the Environmental Significance Overlay. This overlay is the primary mechanism utilised by City Plan to identify and protect environmental values across the City. To ensure consistency the mapping rules that were applied in determining the geographical extent of the existing ES overlay mapped areas are also proposed to be applied to the WCP mapping of MLES. That is:

- Lots less than 1000m² in the urban area, zoned for an urban purpose will not be included in the overlay (with the exception of lots zoned open space, environmental management or conservation zone)
- For the regional riparian zone mapping rules consistent with those applied to the Waterway Corridors and wetlands overlay will be applied – e.g. lots in centre zones and residential zones (less than 1000m²) will not be included in the overlay.

In considering such a change, it is important that Council has a detailed understanding of the number of private properties that are potentially affected.

The majority of properties mapped in the WCP are already mapped by the ES overlay. The additional areas relate to the inclusion of predominantly non vegetated land and buffers in the mapped corridors. The tables below shows that the majority of properties mapped as having some core habitat or corridor value, assuming the proposed City Plan mapping rules are applied, are already shown in the ES overlay. It is also important to note that a number of these properties are also overlapped by the Waterway corridors and wetlands (WW) overlay, which means that the proposed vegetation clearing provisions (no acceptable clearing threshold) will also apply. For example, for core habitat areas, additional vegetation clearing provisions will impact upon 447 rural properties. Of those 447 properties in the rural part of the city only 224 privately owned properties are not already affected by both the ES overlay and WW overlay and would, subject to Council resolution, have additional limits on vegetation clearing.

Assuming the proposed mapping rules are applied, an additional 632 properties across the City will be included in the ES overlay. Of these, 562 are privately owned. Of these privately owned properties, the majority are in the urban footprint (192) and only a small number are in the rural part of the City (35). The remainder are either on North Stradbroke Island (54) or on the Southern Moreton Bay Islands.

Properties already in ES overlay (U = Urban R = Rural)

	Corridor Category	ES overlay				+ WW overlay			
		Private		Public		Private		Public	
		U	R	U	R	U	R	U	R
Mainland	Core habitat	223	519	431	84	152	295	306	57
	Established	216	217	156	45	67	41	115	23
	Regional riparian	164	64	23	40	9	27	6	9
	Foreshore/enhancement/stepping stone	1374	373	521	19	182	136	118	7
SMBI	Core habitat	640	262	197	1669	343	171	89	1456
	Established	190	28	355	320	19	7	73	197
	Foreshore/enhancement/stepping stone	760	76	387	271	167	13	80	67
NSI	Core habitat	52		93		33		57	
	Established	204		9		26		2	
	Foreshore/enhancement/stepping stone	221		52		51		27	
Other Islands	Core habitat	1		12		1		12	
Total		10 339							

Properties proposed to be included in the ES overlay

Ownership	Location	Regional Use	Total
Council / State	Mainland	Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area	13
		Urban Footprint	31
	NSI	Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area	1
	SMBI	Urban Footprint	25
Total Public land			70
Private	Mainland	Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area	35
		Urban Footprint	192
		(blank)	1
	NSI	Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area	54
	SMBI	Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area	1
Urban Footprint		279	
Total Private land			562
Total land			632

The two key regulatory options that exist within the framework set out by the City Plan include regulating:

- The clearing of vegetation
- Other development and uses

What the figures in the tables above demonstrate, is that regulating vegetation clearing in these areas, and considering the assessment of additional development and uses is not likely to impact greatly on achieving the outcomes of the City Plan. However, these few properties represent the

most critical environmental asset for the City, and allowing for clearing and possibly some other forms of development in these areas without regulation does present a significant risk that the outcomes of the WCP would not be able to be achieved without significant investment from Council in implementing non-scheme measures (e.g. land acquisition).

Clearing of vegetation

Currently the City Plan, through the Waterway Corridor and Wetland Overlay Code, seeks to *manage development to avoid significant impacts on matters of National, State and local environmental significance, specific to the environmental values of the waterways and wetlands*. Further, the overlay code seeks to ensure *'riparian vegetation, in stream aquatic ecology and biodiversity along waterway corridors and around wetlands are maintained and enhanced'*. In order to achieve these outcomes all vegetation clearing identified on the ES mapping and included within the Waterway corridors and wetlands overlay map is assessable development requiring an application to Council. Applying a similar approach to the core habitat and corridors identified in the WCP would appear logical and justifiable. Critically, it would ensure consistency with the approach taken to waterway corridors already adopted in the City Plan.

It is important to address vegetation clearing in the urban and the rural areas, as well as the islands; there is a risk that incremental clearing will lead to a significant reduction in both the extent and the health of the core habitat areas and corridor habitat areas.

There are a number of options for how these vegetation clearing provisions could be applied to core habitat areas and corridor habitat areas. These options are:

1. All clearing of native vegetation in core habitat and all corridors types identified in the WCP is assessable development.
2. All clearing of native vegetation in core habitat and/or some corridors types identified in the WCP is assessable development.
3. Continuing to allow for thresholds of acceptable levels of vegetation clearing, which are currently 500m² in certain zones in the urban parts of the City and up to 2500m² in the rural parts of the city.

It is recommended that Council prioritises core habitat and all corridor types as a crucial environmental asset. It is proposed that this priority be set out by making all clearing assessable development in core habitat areas and wildlife corridor habitat areas, option 1 above

Alternatively, if the thresholds of acceptable levels of vegetation clearing are applied within the mapped core habitat and corridor areas, again there is a significant risk that the outcomes of the WCP are highly unlikely to be achieved, or would only be able to be achieved with a significantly increased investment from Council in non-planning scheme measures.

The trigger for assessable vegetation clearing is the ES overlay, and so these provisions need to be considered in the context of the previous section, which outlines options for the ES overlay mapping. That is, clearing will only be assessable where it is mapped on the overlay.

Other development and uses

In regards to uses and other forms of development, relevant zones already make certain kinds of development assessable, in which case the ES overlay also needs to be addressed. Including the core habitat and corridors in the ES overlay would mean that uses that are already assessable (in

the table of assessment for the relevant zone) would also need to address the ES overlay, and any core habitat and corridors which are included.

However, in some instances a number of uses in certain zones are accepted or accepted subject to requirements. For most of these uses, it was recognised that the main threat to MSES or MLES would be as a result of vegetation clearing associated with undertaking the use. Therefore, rather than making the use assessable, City Plan made the clearing assessable when certain thresholds were exceeded. This policy response aligns with the ES overlay map in City Plan, which specifically only mapped existing vegetation and habitat. Council will need to consider whether to achieve the outcome of the WCP requires the inclusion of additional areas, not currently vegetated but identified as being in a core habitat or corridor area.

The critical objective of the WCP is to provide for functional connectivity across the landscape. Some impacts that would affect the functional connectivity of the areas mapped in the WCP include:

- Fragmentation and physical barriers to movement (fences, walls and structures)
- Threats and hazards to wildlife and safe movement (noise, light, vibration, vehicle movements)
- Threats to habitat health and quality (including soil erosion, weed and pest incursion, loss of groundcover or understorey)

Uses that have previously been identified as being accepted development (depending on zone) but have the capacity to result in the impacts as identified are:

Use or development	Accepted development in
<i>Material change of use</i>	
Animal husbandry	Rural zone
Animal keeping	Rural zone
Cropping	Rural zone
Utility installation and telecommunications facilities	All zones
Landing	All zones
Marine industry	CF zone and MI zone
Low impact industry	Mixed use and industry zones
Major electricity infrastructure	Centre and industry
Parking station	CF zone
Service industry	CF zone
Substation	All zones
Tourist park	CF zone
Dwelling houses	All zones
Dual occupancies	All zones
<i>Operational works</i>	
Excavation and fill	All zones

For these uses, the environmental significance overlay is not triggered unless of course the proposal involves clearing above the nominated thresholds. A number of these uses have the potential to impact on the ability to affect the functional connectivity of key corridors and therefore the outcomes of the WCP.

There are alternative options to address the impacts that these uses and development present. One option is to make the development acceptable development, subject to requirements. These requirements would then address specifically the impact from that use, and nominate a measurable minimisation or mitigation measure. For example, for animal keeping and animal husbandry – the level of impact is expected to vary based on the species and number of animals.

Accordingly the acceptable outcome could identify the type of animal and the stocking rate. In circumstances where the acceptable outcome was not achieved the proposed animal keeping/animal husbandry use would elevate to code assessable.

Determining the appropriate level of regulation for certain uses which are currently accepted development is a key challenge in translating the WCP into the City Plan. In this regard it is important to highlight, as noted earlier that while the current waterways overlay in the City Plan makes all native vegetation clearing assessable it does not elevate the level of assessment for any use which is accepted under the relevant zone table. Accordingly based on the current City Plan uses such as dwelling houses, cropping, animal husbandry and animal keeping may be established within the Rural zone as accepted development where located within a cleared section of a waterway without assessment against the waterway overlay code. In making decisions about levels of assessment, it is important to ensure that there is balance between achieving the stated goals of the WCP in protecting and enhancing core habitat and corridors, avoiding over regulation and continuing to support appropriate forms of development consistent with landowner expectations and economic development opportunities. The three options for consideration are:

1. No additional regulation (that is, all uses remain accepted development).
2. Making certain types of development acceptable subject to requirements, in some or all core habitat and corridor types.
3. Elevating certain types of development to be code assessable, in some or all core habitat and corridor types.

As with allowing for clearing in the core habitat and wildlife corridor areas, there is a significant risk associated with the first option that the cumulative impacts of these kinds of development would mean outcomes of the WCP are highly unlikely to be achieved, or would only be able to be achieved with a significantly increased investment from Council in non-planning scheme measures.

The second option is feasible where it is possible to nominate acceptable outcomes that are easily quantifiable, and straightforward to implement, and will ensure that the outcomes of the WCP are able to be achieved. Some examples of these might include:

Use or development	Development requirements
<i>Material change of use</i>	
Animal husbandry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For animals other than livestock • Any structures (sheds, fencing) are located outside the mapped core habitat/corridor area • Any structures (sheds, fencing) are located outside the mapped core habitat/corridor area • Sources of noise/light/vibration are located at an appropriate distance, or are designed appropriately to avoid impact on mapped core habitat and corridor areas • Vehicle access is located at an appropriate distance from mapped core habitat and corridor areas
Animal keeping	
Cropping	
Utility installation and telecommunications facilities	
Landing	
Marine industry	
Low impact industry	
Major electricity infrastructure	
Parking station	
Service industry	
Substation	
Tourist park	
Dwelling houses	
Dual occupancies	
<i>Operational works</i>	
Excavation and fill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertaken at an appropriate distance from

Use or development	Development requirements
	mapped core habitat and corridor areas

Where impacts cannot be managed using development requirements that are readily quantifiable and measurable acceptable outcomes or in circumstances where the accepted outcomes are not achieved, the level of assessment may need to be increased to code assessable. Code assessment will enable the specific particulars of the development to be considered, including:

- the identified value and priority of the corridor area (as set out by the WCP),
- what the likely impact of the proposed development is on the corridor (e.g. associated physical barriers like fencing and other buildings) that will reduce functional connectivity, other sources of impact that will reduce connectivity; including light and noise, or threats to wildlife safety – like vehicles, or other edge effects for example increased weed incursion.
- whether or not minimisation or mitigation measures can be applied, including being required through conditions, to reduce these impacts, for example stock exclusion fencing to separate livestock and wildlife corridor areas, fauna friendly property fencing, locating structures and driveways away from mapped wildlife habitat corridors, and directing light and noise away from mapped wildlife habitat corridors.

Based on above analysis there is evidence that a range of uses may impact on the protection and enhancement of wildlife corridors. Accordingly, there would appear justification to consider elevating the level of certain accepted uses in higher order corridors such as established corridors and regional riparian corridors. As identified in the WCP these are the city’s critical corridors and will be prioritised in the action plans that are currently being developed. Aligning the planning scheme with other non-planning scheme action will be critical to the successful delivery of the WCP.

At this stage, further assessment and evaluation of uses and other development is necessary to identify where potential impacts could be managed by nominating requirements for accepted development, and where a more detailed assessment may need to be made.

STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

Legislative Requirements

The General Major Amendment Package will be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Minister’s Guidelines and Rules, a statutory document under the *Planning Act 2016 and Planning Regulation 2017*.

Risk Management

Undertaking amendments to the planning scheme will ensure the document remains current and consistent with community expectations. Mandatory public consultation requirements for major planning scheme amendments will also ensure the community is given the opportunity to provide feedback on any proposed changes.

Financial

The proposed amendments to the planning scheme will be funded as part of the operating budget of the City Planning and Assessment Group.

People

The staff resourcing required to make the proposed amendments to the Planning Scheme will be primarily drawn from the Strategic Planning Unit of the City Planning and Assessment Group.

Environmental

The proposed amendments are a critical component of ensuring the outcomes of the Wildlife Connections Plan are able to be achieved.

- The wildlife Connections Plan 2018 aims to facilitate connectivity and improve the environmental values of Redland City through a number of key strategic priorities, namely to:
- Represent the major potential areas for habitation and movement of wildlife across the city
- Provide targeted, achievable and prioritised actions to protect and enhance wildlife habitat networks and corridors to allow wildlife movement and dispersal
- Include both terrestrial (land) and riparian (waterway) corridors to consider freshwater, estuarine and coastal foreshore environments
- Provide multiple corridors as alternative links between core habitat patches to account for potential disturbance events (such as fire, storms, flooding, disease and impacts from development) and varying levels of community uptake and implementation of the plan.

Social

Implementing the Wildlife Connections Plan will also provide a social benefit. Although the primary objective of this plan is the identification, protection and enhancement of core wildlife habitat and corridors, consideration is given to how the wildlife corridors interact with the residents of Redland City. Within the description of each corridor information is provided on the community use values, focusing primarily on the recreational uses within the corridor.

Corridor enhancement and rehabilitation actions for residential and reserve areas can also have significant social benefits such as improved open space, more shade, increased connection with nature and greater recreational value and usage of parks and reserves.

The identification of the wildlife habitat networks and corridors also aims to engender local community recognition and acceptance of these areas. This can ultimately lead to greater attachment, ownership and stewardship of local wildlife habitats.

Alignment with Council's Policy and Plans

Redland Council Corporate Plan 2015-2020 establishes a commitment to promoting:

“A diverse and healthy natural environment, with an abundance of native flora and fauna and rich ecosystems, will thrive through awareness, commitment and action in caring for the environment.

- 1. Redland’s natural assets including flora, fauna, habitats, biodiversity, ecosystems and waterways are managed, maintained and monitored.*
- 2. Threatened species are maintained and protected, including the vulnerable koala species.”*

Council understands that key to the delivery of this outcome is the maintenance of sufficient wildlife habitat across the City to support the ecological functions of the flora and fauna that live within or migrate through the Redlands.

On 3 June 2015, Council adopted the Natural Environment Policy POL-3128, consolidating former environmental policies. Council resolved to prepare updated strategies and plans to progress the Natural Environment Policy, identifying a number of priorities; including corridors. This plan will relate to the following sections of the Natural Environment Policy:

“1. Protect, enhance, restore the natural values of the City that include:

- a. Koalas and other native animal and plant populations and habitats;*
 - b. core habitat areas as sanctuaries for wildlife;*
 - c. safe wildlife movement corridors across the landscape;*
 - d. maintaining no net loss of native vegetation as defined in the Vegetation Management Act 1999;*
 - e. biological diversity and ecosystem services;*
 - f. waterways, foreshores, wetlands, coasts, aquatic ecosystems and Moreton Bay;*
- 2. Enhance and restore Council’s protected areas and strengthen the connection between core habitats through public open space plantings, pest management and appropriate street tree planting programs in accordance with SEQ Natural Resource Management targets.*
- 3. A conservation acquisition program that prioritises acquisition of land for rehabilitation, offsets, corridors and long term protection to achieve cost effective environmental outcomes that contribute to facilitating biodiversity conservation (e.g. koala survival) and has community benefits.*
- 4. Manage protected areas to provide the best possible buffering of the City’s natural and cultural heritage values from the impacts of a changing climate.”*

The purpose of the proposed amendments is to ensure that City Plan aligns with Council’s current strategic policy position related to the ongoing protection, management and enhancement of these important connections, which is expressed through the Wildlife Connections Plan.

CONSULTATION

Group Manager, Environment and Regulation Group
Principal Advisor, Environment and Regulation Group
Principal Advisor, Environment Assessment Team
Service Manager, Planning Assessment
Group Manager, Economic Sustainability and Major Projects

OPTIONS

Option One

That Council resolves to:

1. commence a major amendment to City Plan to reflect the principles of the Wildlife Connections Plan 2017, in accordance with Part 4, Clause 16.1 of the Ministers Guideline and Rules under the *Planning Act 2016*;
2. endorse the drafting principles, as outlined In Attachment 1, to inform the proposed major amendment of City Plan;

3. maintain the contents and attachment of this report as confidential until such time that the amendment package is released for public consultation, subject to Council and Ministerial approval.

Option Two

That Council defers further consideration on the integration of the WCP into the City Plan until all actions identified as immediate and short term in the Wildlife Connections Action Plan 2018-2033 have sufficiently progressed.

Option Three

That Council resolves that the City Plan has been reviewed, and it has determined that there are no necessary consequential amendments.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That Council resolves to:

1. commence a major amendment to City Plan to reflect the principles of the Wildlife Connections Plan 2017, in accordance with Part 4, Clause 16.1 of the Ministers Guideline and Rules under the *Planning Act 2016*;
2. endorse the drafting principles, as outlined In Attachment 1, to inform the proposed major amendment of City Plan;
3. maintain the contents and attachment of this report as confidential until such time that the amendment package is released for public consultation, subject to Council and Ministerial approval.

Drafting Principles to inform a proposed major amendment of City Plan to incorporate the WCP

1. Amend the Environmental Significance Overlay to include core habitat and wildlife corridors as a Matter of Local Environmental Significance subject to the following mapping rules:
 - i. All areas identified as Core habitat as mapped in the WCP
 - ii. All established corridors subject to the removal of all lots less than 1000m² within the urban footprint (unless already in an open space, conservation or environment protection zone) All Regional Riparian corridors subject to the removal of all road reserves, community facilities (in urban footprint) and where land use is for a retirement village (excluding Dinwoodie), and from lots that are zoned:
 - Character Residential
 - Tourist Accommodation
 - Principal Centre
 - Major Centre
 - District Centre
 - Local Centre
 - Neighbourhood Centre
 - Specialised Centre
 - Mixed Use
 - Road Reserves
 - Community Facilities in the Urban FootprintClip lots that are less than 1000m² and zoned:
 - LDR - Low Density Residential
 - LMDR - Low Medium Density Residential
 - MDR - Medium Density Residential
 - LI - Low Impact Industry
 - MI - Medium Impact Industry
 - iii. Coastal foreshore, Enhancement and Stepping stone corridors include only where corridor intersects with the current Environmental significance overlay map
2. Amend the Environmental Significance overlay table of assessment to make all vegetation clearing assessable development within core habitat and wildlife corridors as proposed to be depicted on the ES overlay map (based on mapping rules above)
3. Further investigate the need to elevate the level of assessment for a range of uses and other development from acceptable to accepted subject to requirements, or code assessment on land located within established and regional riparian corridors. In accordance with the drafting principles of City Plan this investigation will seek to minimise the level of assessment while ensuring the potential impacts of development are appropriately managed to ensure the protection, enhancement and restoration of these higher order corridors.

Table 1. Comparison with other SEQ local governments – levels of assessment by development/use

Development/use	GCCC	MBRC	BCC
<i>Material change of use</i>			
Animal husbandry	A STR – (If involving 10 or less animals and not involving building work) rural or rural res, industry, EC, extractive, limited development	A - only if regulated by Local Law 2 (Animal management) A STR	A STR
Animal keeping	A STR (if for stables in sport and rec zone) C (If not kennel) – rural, mixed use, industry I - EC, limited development, rural res	A - only if regulated by Local Law 2 (Animal management) A STR	A (if for a cattery for 10 or fewer cats or a kennel for 4 or fewer dogs) C
Cropping	A (if not for forestry for wood production) – Industry, EC, extractives, rural zone C – special purpose zone	A STR (not involving forestry for wood production and if not in Hamlet precinct)	A STR
Utility installation	A (if not a waste transfer station, or refuse disposal or TUA of waste transfer station does not exceed 50m ²) - LDR, MDR, HDR, centres, sport and rec, open space, CN	A (if complying with circumstances for accepted development ¹)	A STR
Telecommunications facilities	A (If located more than 200m from sensitive land use and Located more than 400m from established or approved facility)	A (if complying with circumstances for accepted development) A STR	C
Landing	A (If associated with a non-commercial use)	A STR	C (if in the district zone precinct or the metropolitan zone precinct)
Marine industry	A STR (If not within 50m of a zone for sensitive land uses)	A STR (marine industry precinct)	C in the general industry C zone precinct
Low impact industry	A STR (If not within 50m of a zone for sensitive land uses)	A STR (if using an existing building)	A STR
Major electricity infrastructure	I	A (if complying with circumstances for accepted development)	*

¹ “circumstances for accepted development” include; no structure involved (no new building work, not projecting above surface of the ground), where being undertaken by local government, or the use is temporary or otherwise regulated under a local law

Parking station	C (if only located at ground level)	C (in centre zones) I	C
Service industry	A if (a) establishing in an existing non-residential premises and involving no building work (other than an internal fit-out); and (b) either: (i) located in a Principal centre, Major centre or Specialist centre; or (ii) located in a District centre and commercial operating hours cease by midnight. A STR (if establishing in an existing non-residential premises and involving only minor building work C otherwise)	A STR	A STR
Substation	A	A (if complying with circumstances for accepted development)	*
Tourist park	C (if not in the island resorts precinct or the wildlife park precinct I if camping ground)	I	*

Dwelling houses	A A STR Dwelling house if: (a) on a lot with an area less than 400m ² ; or (b) involving a secondary dwelling with a GFA not exceeding 80m ² C if in Dwelling House overlay and involving building work and: (a) is not on land identified with a height greater than 9 metres on the Building height overlay map; and (b) includes a Partial third storey; and (c) height is no more than 9 metres I if Material change of use for Dwelling house where identified on the Dwelling house overlay map, if involving building work and exceeds: (a) the height identified on the Building height overlay map; or (b) where not identified on the Building height overlay map, either: (i) a Partial third storey; or (ii) 9 metres in height	A STR	A STR
Dual occupancies	A STR where located on: (a) lot/s with dual frontage; or (b) lot/s identified on the Residential density overlay map and have a residential density of RD1 or greater	C (if on lot more than 1000m ²)	C
<i>Operational works</i>			
Vegetation clearing	A STR	C	C (more than 500m ² not associated with dwelling house and in the Priority koala or koala habitat sub-category)
Excavation and fill	C – triggers vary by zone and volume/location	A (if complying with circumstances for accepted development)	C (if filling or excavation where resulting in retaining wall greater than 1m or an increase in depth or height of the ground level or finished design)

			level by 1 verticle m or more, if for an artificial stormwater channel, if other OPW preceding an RoL or MCU which is assessable or if prescribed tidal work) I (if extracting gravel, rock, sand or soil)
--	--	--	---

Key:

A - accepted

A STR – accepted subject to requirements

C - code

I – impact

Table 2 Comparison with other SEQ local governments –relevant ASTR criteria by development requirement

Development Requirement	GCCC	MBRC	BCC
Fragmentation and physical barriers			
Structures (buildings, fences etc)	Building height does not exceed 15m Structures do not exceed 9m Limit to dwelling house	Building heights (set out in overlay map) Limits on secondary dwellings – behind primary dwelling, annexed or located within 10m of primary dwelling, GFA of 45m-55m (based on frontages) Limits on domestic outbuildings (based on lot size)	1 dwelling house and 1 secondary dwelling Secondary dwelling is 80m2 or less GFA and within 20m of dwelling house Building height is 9m and 2 storeys Development fits within approved development footprint plan
Other	Setbacks Sitecover less than 50% 1 dwelling per 400m	Setbacks to be achieved (as per zone) Site cover (as per zone)	Setbacks: Structures set back from boundaries 6m Livestock housed minimum of 15m from residential building on-site and 100m from adjoining premises Roofed area less than 500m2
Threats and hazards			
Noise	Setbacks	Equipment producing audible or non-audible sound housed in enclosed building with sound control measures to ensure no noise can be heard or felt at site boundary	Noise mitigation – operating hours 7-7, not audible from residential/centre zone or sensitive use Wholly indoors or 250m from sensitive zone Where for a sewage pump station or water pump station is 50m from sensitive use, pumps etc below ground level Doesn't increase noise, doesn't increase footprint, no ancillary use and no extensions to buildings
Light		Setbacks	
Vibration			
Vehicle movements		Access ways and driveways in accordance with Australian Standards	Access via primary access point Does not involve unsealed roads, driveways and vehicle manoeuvring areas

Development Requirement	GCCC	MBRC	BCC
Habitat health and quality			
Soil erosion	No removal of regulated vegetation 100m from aquatic areas and wetlands 60m from major waterways 30m from other waterways No removal of habitat for priority species	No clearing or limits on clearing (allows for clearing for dwelling or extension only on lots less than 750m ² , no clearing in waterways or wetlands buffers, – allows for clearing 10m from buildings, 4m from boundary, clearing for bushfire management and clearing weeds)	No relevant STR criteria
Weeds and pests			
Loss of groundcover/impacts on diverse structure			