

Consultation Report			
Submission Reference Number	Submission summary	Officer comment	Recommendation
<b>Victory Heights Local Development Area – Proposed Zoning Amendments</b>			
1	<p>The submitter does not support the proposed change to zoning in the Victory Heights Local Development Area (LDA).</p> <p>The submitter states that they would like their property to be zoned Rural Residential in accordance with what was proposed under the first round of public consultation.</p>	<p>Objection to the proposed amendments is noted.</p> <p>In considering the submissions on zoning at Victory Heights it should be noted that the purpose of the re-exhibition of this element of Amendment Package 2 was to give notice that: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the originally notified Amendment Package 2 proposal to rezone the area to Rural residential and Limited development (constrained land) zones was no longer being progressed, and,</li> <li>the current Gympie Regional Council Planning Scheme 2013 (Planning Scheme) industrial zonings of this land would remain in place until such time as the overarching issue of industrial land supply was addressed in the new planning scheme.</li> </ul>	<p>It is recommended that the current industrial zonings remain in place.</p>
2	<p>The submitter supports the proposed change to zoning in the Victory Heights LDA, retaining an industrial zoning.</p> <p>The submitter states that the high exposure to the new highway alignment will bring added noise and increased traffic. The submitter believes this would not be desirable for Rural residential living and instead is extremely desirable for industrial development.</p>	<p>Support for the proposed amendments is noted.</p> <p>In considering the submissions on zoning at Victory Heights it should be noted that the purpose of the re-exhibition of this element of Amendment Package 2 was to give notice that: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the originally notified Amendment Package 2 proposal to rezone the area to Rural residential and Limited development</li> </ul>	<p>It is recommended that the current industrial zonings remain in place.</p>

	<p>The submitter states that business will be able to operate without any significant Council infrastructure however they believe residential development would require greater infrastructure. The submitter states that they believe if their property was rezoned to Rural residential this would decrease their property value.</p>	<p>(constrained land) zones was no longer being progressed, and,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the current Gympie Regional Council Planning Scheme 2013 (Planning Scheme) industrial zonings of this land would remain in place until such time as the overarching issue of industrial land supply was addressed in the new planning scheme.</li> </ul>	
3	<p>The submitter supports the proposed change to zoning in the Victory LDA, retaining an industrial zoning.</p>	<p>Support for the proposed amendments is noted.</p> <p>In considering the submissions on zoning at Victory Heights it should be noted that the purpose of the re-exhibition of this element of Amendment Package 2 was to give notice that: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the originally notified Amendment Package 2 proposal to rezone the area to Rural residential and Limited development (constrained land) zones was no longer being progressed, and,</li> <li>the current Gympie Regional Council Planning Scheme 2013 (Planning Scheme) industrial zonings of this land would remain in place until such time as the overarching issue of industrial land supply was addressed in the new planning scheme.</li> </ul>	<p>It is recommended that the current industrial zonings remain in place.</p>
4	<p>The submitter states that they seek the retention of the proposed zoning of Community Purposes zone on Lot 2 SP246429 and Lot 9 MCH342 in the Victory Heights LDA, as was proposed in Amendment Package 2 and consulted on in the first round of public consultation.</p>	<p>Feedback noted.</p> <p>Lot 2 SP246429, owned by Council has been developed and is being used for community purposes. The zoning should reflect the current and anticipated future land use and ownership/tenure.</p>	<p>The following is recommended: -</p> <p>Lot 2 SP246429 - rezone to Community purposes</p>

	<p>Within the Victory Heights LDA there are three government-owned lots. Two (2) of these lots, Lot 3 MPH5103 and Lot 2 SP246429, are Council owned, and the third lot, Lot 9 MCH342, is State-government owned.</p>	<p>Lot 3 MPH5103 is owned by Council but has not been developed for any specific purpose. As at December 2019 Lot 3 was identified within stage 2 of Council’s Strategic Property Management Plan as being potentially surplus to requirements and was nominated for disposal by auction in FY24/25. Accordingly, retention of the current Medium impact industry zone over the land is considered appropriate until such time as the overarching issue of industrial land supply is addressed in the new planning scheme.</p> <p>Lot 9 MCH342 is State owned land. The land is designated as a gravel pit on Council’s property records. In carrying out the State interest review with respect to the originally exhibited proposal to rezone this land to “Community purposes” the State requested that the land be zoned for Extractive industry to reflect its designation as a gravel pit. It is noted that there is today little evidence that Lot 9 has ever been used for that purpose. In response to the State’s request Council officers suggested that an Extractive industry zoning would be inappropriate in what is a relatively closely settled area. Accordingly, retention of the current Medium impact industry zone over the land is considered appropriate until such time as the overarching issue of industrial land supply is addressed in the new planning scheme.</p>	<p>Lot 3 MPH5103 – retain current Medium impact industrial zoning</p> <p>Lot 9 MCH342 – retain current Medium impact industrial zoning</p>
7	<p>The submitter states they support the proposed changes, leaving Victory Heights as a Low and Medium impact industry zone, as well as the removal for structure planning as a requirement.</p>	<p>Support for the proposed amendments is noted.</p> <p>Council resolved at its meeting of 12 February 2020 to remove the LDA boundary and consequentially the</p>	<p>No further Council resolution with respect to the LDA boundary/ structure planning</p>

	<p>The submitter attached their previous 2019 submission outlining their reasoning as to why they believe the area should remain as an industry zoning. The submitters reasoning included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They believe the Background Planning Report’s recommendations states clearly that the area is largely free of constraints and that land should continue to be used for industrial purposes;</li> <li>• Not all uses require services;</li> <li>• It is up to Department of Transport and Main Roads to upgrade State controlled roads for flood immunity.</li> <li>• Not all developments require the whole area to be levelled;</li> <li>• Not all developments require critical mass;</li> <li>• The land is not suited to residential purposes due to the infrastructure surrounding the land including railway line, State controlled roads, the recently started bypass, new interchange, increased volumes in traffic, noise, dust, and lighting;</li> <li>• Zoning changes to residential would devalue the land and businesses in the area.</li> </ul> <p>The submitter states they disagree with the deferral of consideration of any change in zoning to the Victory Heights precinct until a region wide strategic assessment of industrial land supply is completed as part of the 2023 Planning Scheme.</p>	<p>structure planning requirement from the Victory Heights area.</p> <p>In considering the submissions on zoning at Victory Heights it should be noted that the purpose of the re-exhibition of this element of Amendment Package 2 was to give notice that: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the originally notified Amendment Package 2 proposal to rezone the area to Rural residential and Limited development (constrained land) zones was no longer being progressed, and,</li> <li>• the current Gympie Regional Council Planning Scheme 2013 (Planning Scheme) industrial zonings of this land would remain in place until such time as the overarching issue of industrial land supply was addressed in the new planning scheme.</li> </ul>	<p>requirement is required at this time.</p> <p>It is recommended that the current industrial zonings remain in place.</p>
--	--	--	--

8	<p>The submitter states they support the removal of the Local Development Area boundary and for the zoning to remain Medium impact industry zone to allow for future development in the area.</p>	<p>Support for the proposed amendments is noted.</p> <p>Council resolved at its meeting of 12 February 2020 to remove the LDA boundary and consequentially the structure planning requirement from the Victory Heights area.</p> <p>In considering the submissions on zoning at Victory Heights it should be noted that the purpose of the re-exhibition of this element of Amendment Package 2 was to give notice that: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the originally notified Amendment Package 2 proposal to rezone the area to Rural residential and Limited development (constrained land) zones was no longer being progressed, and,</li> <li>• the current Gympie Regional Council Planning Scheme 2013 (Planning Scheme) industrial zonings of this land would remain in place until such time as the overarching issue of industrial land supply was addressed in the new planning scheme.</li> </ul>	<p>No further resolution with respect to the LDA boundary/ structure planning requirement is required at this time.</p> <p>It is recommended that the current industrial zonings remain in place.</p>
15	<p>The submitter objects to the proposed rezoning and seeks that the area be zoned Rural residential, consistent with the zoning that was placed on public display during the first round of public consultation.</p>	<p>Objection to the proposed amendments is noted.</p> <p>In considering the submissions on zoning at Victory Heights it should be noted that the purpose of the re-exhibition of this element of Amendment Package 2 was to give notice that: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the originally notified Amendment Package 2 proposal to rezone the area to Rural residential and Limited development</li> </ul>	<p>It is recommended that the current industrial zonings remain in place.</p>

		<p>(constrained land) zones was no longer being progressed, and,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the current Gympie Regional Council Planning Scheme 2013 (Planning Scheme) industrial zonings of this land would remain in place until such time as the overarching issue of industrial land supply was addressed in the new planning scheme.</li> </ul>	
<b>Section 1.7 Irregular and Infrequent Uses</b>			
5	The submitter states that they hold concerns regarding any use of Rural zoned land in the Mary Valley for the purposes of Motor Sports Facilities and object to any amendment that allows trail bikes.	<p>Feedback and concerns are noted.</p> <p>Consistent with Council’s resolution of 12 February 2020 Amendment Package 2 as re – exhibited during the second consultation period excluded motor sports facilities from draft Section 1.7 – <i>Irregular and Infrequent Uses</i></p> <p>Following the State interest review process, the State government has directed Council to remove all of the amendments relating to irregular and infrequent uses, accordingly this aspect of Amendment Package 2 will not proceed at this time.</p> <p>The issue of irregular and infrequent uses will be addressed in the preparation of the new planning scheme.</p>	It is recommended that the proposed amendments in relation to irregular and infrequent uses not be proceeded with under Amendment Package 2 but rather addressed via the new planning scheme.
6	The submitter states that they hold concerns regarding any use of Rural zoned land in the Mary Valley for the purposes of Motor Sports Facilities and object to any amendment that allows trail bikes.	<p>Feedback and concerns are noted.</p> <p>Consistent with Council’s resolution of 12 February 2020 Amendment Package 2 as re – exhibited during the second consultation period excluded motor sports</p>	It is recommended that the proposed amendments in relation to irregular and infrequent uses not be proceeded

	<p>The submitter details a number of issues that they said have resulted from an increase in trail bikes in the State forests including trespassing onto private property, the cutting of fences on private property, gates left open, erosion, impacts on creek beds and waterways, and amenity impacts.</p>	<p>facilities from draft Section 1.7 – <i>Irregular and Infrequent Uses</i></p> <p>Following the State interest review process, the State government has directed Council to remove all of the amendments relating to irregular and infrequent uses, accordingly this aspect of Amendment Package 2 will not proceed at this time.</p> <p>The issue of irregular and infrequent uses will be addressed in the preparation of the new planning scheme.</p>	<p>with under Amendment Package 2 but rather addressed via the new planning scheme.</p>
9	<p>The submitter states that they are happy Council listened to the concerns of the community and have proposed to remove the allowance of Motor Sports Facilities to occur in the Rural zone as a temporary use. They state bicycle trails and hikes, not motorbikes, will enhance the attraction for visitors.</p>	<p>Feedback is noted.</p> <p>Following the State interest review process, the State government has directed Council to remove all of the amendments relating to irregular and infrequent uses, accordingly this aspect of Amendment Package 2 will not proceed at this time.</p> <p>The issue of irregular and infrequent uses will be addressed in the preparation of the new planning scheme.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the proposed amendments in relation to irregular and infrequent uses not be proceeded with under Amendment Package 2 but rather addressed via the new planning scheme.</p>
10	<p>The submitter states that they hold concerns regarding motor sports in forestry.</p> <p>The submitter states that their property abuts State forest and they have experienced a number of concerns in relation to their livestock and motorbikes. The submitter states that the motorbikes have also caused erosion issues, amenity impacts, and safety concerns that have</p>	<p>The concerns are noted.</p> <p>Consistent with Council’s resolution of 12 February 2020 Amendment Package 2 as re – exhibited during the second consultation period excluded motor sports facilities from draft Section 1.7 – <i>Irregular and Infrequent Uses</i></p> <p>Following the State interest review process, the State government has directed Council to remove all of the</p>	<p>It is recommended that the proposed amendments in relation to irregular and infrequent uses not be proceeded with under Amendment Package 2 but rather addressed via the new planning scheme.</p>

	<p>risen from their experience when riding horses and coming across motorbike riders.</p>	<p>amendments relating to irregular and infrequent uses, accordingly this aspect of Amendment Package 2 will not proceed at this time.</p> <p>The issue of irregular and infrequent uses will be addressed in the preparation of the new planning scheme.</p>	
11	<p>The submitter supports the removal of Theatre Events and Motor Sports Facilities from section 1.7.1.1 of the Planning Scheme.</p> <p>The submitter states that they believe more should be done to regulate noisy and hard to locate activities rather than allow them to occur in the Rural zone without a permit.</p>	<p>Feedback is noted.</p> <p>Following the State interest review process, the State government has directed Council to remove all of the amendments relating to irregular and infrequent uses, accordingly this aspect of Amendment Package 2 will not proceed at this time.</p> <p>The issue of irregular and infrequent uses will be addressed in the preparation of the new planning scheme.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the proposed amendments in relation to irregular and infrequent uses not be proceeded with under Amendment Package 2 but rather addressed via the new planning scheme.</p>
12	<p>The submitter supports the removal of Motor Sports Facilities from section 1.7.1.1 of the Planning Scheme.</p> <p>The submitter states they understand that this matter will be revisited by Council in terms of how to facilitate temporary events to occur at appropriate sites with appropriately managed conditions at a later time and they look forward to making submissions at that time.</p>	<p>Feedback is noted.</p> <p>Following the State interest review process, the State government has directed Council to remove all of the amendments relating to irregular and infrequent uses, accordingly this aspect of Amendment Package 2 will not proceed at this time.</p> <p>The issue of irregular and infrequent uses will be addressed in the preparation of the new planning scheme.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the proposed amendments in relation to irregular and infrequent uses not be proceeded with under Amendment Package 2 but rather addressed via the new planning scheme.</p>



13	<p>The submitter supports the removal of Theatre Events and Motor Sports Facilities from section 1.7.1.1 of the Planning Scheme.</p>	<p>Feedback is noted.</p> <p>Following the State interest review process, the State government has directed Council to remove all of the amendments relating to irregular and infrequent uses, accordingly this aspect of Amendment Package 2 will not proceed at this time.</p> <p>The issue of irregular and infrequent uses will be addressed in the preparation of the new planning scheme.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the proposed amendments in relation to irregular and infrequent uses not be proceeded with under Amendment Package 2 but rather addressed via the new planning scheme.</p>
14	<p>The submitter states that they hold concerns regarding motor bikes accessing properties that hold a State grazing permit.</p> <p>The submitter states that they have experienced a number of issues in relation to their livestock and motorbikes.</p>	<p>The concerns are noted.</p> <p>Consistent with Council’s resolution of 12 February 2020 Amendment Package 2 as re – exhibited during the second consultation period excluded motor sports facilities from draft Section 1.7 – <i>Irregular and Infrequent Uses</i></p> <p>Following the State interest review process, the State government has directed Council to remove all of the amendments relating to irregular and infrequent uses, accordingly this aspect of Amendment Package 2 will not proceed at this time.</p> <p>The issue of irregular and infrequent uses will be addressed in the preparation of the new planning scheme.</p>	<p>It is recommended that the proposed amendments in relation to irregular and infrequent uses not be proceeded with under Amendment Package 2 but rather addressed via the new planning scheme.</p>