

Consultation Report - Amendment Package 3			
Submission Reference	Submission summary	Officer comment	Recommendation
1. Water Quality	<p>Seqwater has made a submission with respect to the protection of water quality. The submission raises concerns regarding the protection of drinking water from development and associated impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The reduction of water quality in catchments that supply water to drinking water treatment plants (WTPs) can compromise the treatment process, increase treatment costs and threaten public health. In the longer term, a reduction in catchment water quality can require infrastructure upgrades to provide effective treatment and lead to higher on-going operational costs. For any development located in the Water Supply Buffer Area, critical aspects of the development including sewerage treatment and disposal standards, vehicle access, movement and parking areas, setbacks to watercourses, earthworks, vegetation management etc., be suitably located and managed to minimise potential impacts to drinking water catchments. All development should be designed to comply with the Seqwater Development Guidelines, which could also be reflected in the performance outcomes of the of the relevant planning scheme codes. 	<p>Much of the rural area within our region is mapped under the 'water resource catchment' of the <i>State Planning Policy 2017</i> (SPP).</p> <p>Under the SPP, it is a requirement that the environmental values and quality of Queensland waters are protected and enhanced through the policy requirements where development must be located, designed, constructed and operated to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the environmental values of receiving waters.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that effluent disposal, wastewater, erosion etc., including as a result of a Tourist park use on a site can contribute to the reduction of water quality, without proper management.</p> <p>The planning scheme assessment benchmarks should adequately support the protection of water quality in the context of any new development proposed within a catchment area in order to meet the objectives of the SPP State interest for water quality.</p>	<p>To ensure the protection of drinking water quality in the context of Tourist park development, it is recommended that the assessment benchmarks within the applicable planning scheme codes be drafted to ensure consistency with the requirements of the Seqwater Development Guidelines.</p>
2. Zoning	<p>This submission is in support of the proposed zoning amendment of the submitter's (landowner) site from the 'Low Impact Industry' zone, to the 'Residential living' zone.</p>	<p>The submission is noted.</p>	<p>No change to the draft scheme amendment is required in response to this submission.</p>

3. Zoning	This submission is in support of the proposed zoning amendment from 'Low Impact Industry' zone, to 'Residential Living' zone.	The submission is noted.	No change to the draft scheme amendment is required in response to this submission.
4. Zoning	This submission is in support of the proposed zoning amendment from 'Low Impact Industry' zone, to 'Residential Living' zone.	The submission is noted.	No change to the draft scheme amendment is required in response to this submission.
5. Amenity	<p>This submission objects to the proposed changes to increase the number of Tourist park sites as ADSR based on the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a lack of regulation or compensation to council for the damage caused by heavy vans and RV's using poorly maintained council roads. Roads can be dangerous or not adequate to support the use. • The installation of lighting and can use lights all night without any consideration for wildlife or neighbours. • Insufficient provision for emergency evacuation for visitors. • Lack of protection for waterway health. • Insufficient noise control with limited enforceable action/capabilities. 	<p><i>Increased road maintenance</i></p> <p>The current planning scheme requirements for 'Accepted Development Subject t Requirements' include that the development site "provided with direct access to a sealed road that is constructed in accordance with Council's minimum standards detailed in Planning Scheme Policy 1: Development Standards" in order for a new development to be undertaken without a development application.</p> <p>There may be some instances where traffic generated by Tourist park development could be of a scale that is beyond the likely anticipated traffic for rural roads. Unmitigated increased traffic can potentially cause an unacceptable maintenance burden, not normally expected with rural land uses.</p> <p>Where a road is constructed to the full council standard, and sealed, then it is not considered that a Tourist park of up to 8 sites will cause an unacceptable impact. However, where a site is located on a road that is not fully constructed, it is appropriate that a development application be required for a Tourist park use to ensure that the access and road standards can be assessed and consideration can be given to how the proposal might impact on the local road, and be</p>	The concerns raised in the submission are addressed by the proposed amended requirements included within the draft Amendment Package 3.

		<p>managed if necessary.</p> <p><i>Emergency evacuation</i></p> <p>For a tourist park to be accepted development, the planning scheme requires the use to not be located within a mapped hazard area including bushfire and flood hazard. In cases where a site is proposed within a mapped hazard area, a development application will be required.</p> <p><i>Monitoring of water quality</i></p> <p>Water quality is a state interest against which any proposed planning scheme amendment will be assessed by the State Government. As such, Council will need to ensure that its planning scheme and decisions around development comply with requirements of the state planning policy with regards to water quality.</p> <p>It is noted that the ADSR requirements included in the current version of the planning scheme require that any new tourist park must adhere to the following:</p> <p><i>The development is provided with and connected to reticulated sewerage, where within a sewerage service area.</i></p> <p><i>OR</i></p> <p><i>Where not within a sewerage service area, the development is provided with an on-site treatment and disposal system that complies with the Plumbing and Drainage Act 2018.</i></p> <p>The above wastewater requirements are recommended to be retained in the amendment package to reduce risks regarding contamination associated with disposal of wastewater.</p> <p>To be clear, where a site does not have an existing approved wastewater solution for effluent or sewerage, the planning scheme will trigger a development</p>	
--	--	---	--

		application to be lodged where a wastewater solution can be assessed and conditioned as part of the development application.	
6. Amenity	<p>This submission objects to the proposed changes to increase the number of Tourist park sites as ADSR based on the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of monitoring or compliance. • It is not appropriate to facilitate too much tourism or entertainment venues in the Mary Valley. • 48 people on a site at one time is not 'low scale'. • Insufficient police presence to manage amenity issues. 	<p>The submission has been reviewed and it is considered that the increase to 48 people per Tourist Park as ADSR may facilitate unintentional offsite impacts without management strategies implemented (by way of conditions).</p> <p>It is considered appropriate that the maximum number of sites as ADSR remain at four (4) as per the current planning scheme provisions.</p>	<p>The proposed draft amendment package 3 be reviewed to retain the maximum number of sites in a Tourist park development as four (4), consistent with the current planning scheme provisions.</p>
7. Amenity	<p>This submission objects to the proposed changes to the Tourist park provisions included in Amendment Package 3 based on the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Tourist park development should always be required to be assessed under a development application, regardless of the number of sites. • Development of this nature can have multiple impacts including on the environment, degradation of Council roads, light pollution, noise pollution and rural land values. • Further environmental impacts can include vegetation clearing, underground power installation, riverbank earthworks and effluent disposal. 	<p>The proposed amendments included under AM3 for Tourist park development do not reduce the criteria for the prevention of on or off site impacts.</p> <p>The proposed change to increase the number of sites is only considered appropriate where supported by acceptable outcomes to reduce impacts and protect sensitive aspects of a locality, including amenity, infrastructure, water quality and the environment.</p>	<p>The proposed draft assessment provisions for amendment package 3 are considered to adequately control requirements around amenity protection. The increased requirements seek to further limit impacts around:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise • Lighting • Visual amenity and landscaping • Effluent disposal • Vegetation protection • Traffic and road use • Numbers of patron and length of stay

8. Amenity	<p>This submission objects to the proposed changes to the Tourist park provisions included in Amendment Package 3 based on the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The minimum 10ha property size is too small to accommodate a doubling of allowed sites to eight, with up to 48 people, without negative impacts at the property, neighbourhood and community level. • Many 10ha properties across the Council region are on unsealed roads that the Council is already struggling to maintain. Additional traffic will threaten road safety, cause dust nuisance, and exacerbate road maintenance and repair costs to Council and thus ratepayers. • Increased vehicle and human visitation will promote negative environmental, biodiversity and biosecurity impacts, particularly in fragile riparian and remnant habitats. • While Council has stipulated conditions which seek to minimise the impacts of noise, dust, smoke, privacy, visual amenity etc, there is no certainty that proponents will make themselves aware of the conditions or comply with them. • How will council manage increased compliance or enforcement action for properties not complying with the rules. • It is suggested that Council limit the proposed increased number of sites to properties of a minimum 40 or 50ha, while retaining the existing number of sites for smaller properties. 	<p>It is acknowledged that there can be environmental, amenity, biosecurity and compliance issues in associated with development.</p> <p>The ADSR provisions included in the proposed amendment package proposes increased provisions to those included in the existing planning scheme to further manage impacts on and off site. It is also noted that the ADSR requirements are proposed to ensure development is not located in within environmentally sensitive areas as identified under the planning scheme or Temporary Local Planning Instrument for Biodiversity Protection. Where a tourist park is proposed within a locality subject to environmental overlay mapping, a development application will be required for assessment.</p>	<p>In response to a number of submissions raising concerns around off-site amenity impacts generated by an increase to the number of sites in a Tourist park, it is recommended council retain the maximum number of sites as four (4) for ADSR.</p>
9. Amenity	<p>This submission objects to the proposed changes to the Tourist park provisions included in Amendment Package</p>	<p>It is noted that the amendment package includes a number of newly introduced provisions to strengthen the protection of amenity, environmental</p>	<p>In response to a number of submissions raising concerns around off-site</p>

	<p>3 based on the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter does not support the proposed increase to eight (8) sites. The maximum number of campsites/caravans/cabins permissible without a DA in a Rural Zone should remain at four (4). • The minimum property size should remain at 10 hectares. • Council should consider a minimum property size of 40 hectares for more than 4 campsites/caravans/cabins in a Rural Zone. • The performance outcomes in the Rural Zone Code for Tourist Parks should apply to all properties hosting any number of campsites/caravans/cabins, and these should be actively enforced. • Council should consider a further amendment to the Rural Zone Code re Tourist Parks (of any capacity) stipulating that if any ancillary activities are proposed (dirt bikes, ATV's, shooting, flying drones etc.), a development application will be necessary. 	<p>health, and to reduce off site impacts potentially generated by Tourist parks.</p>	<p>amenity impacts generated by an increase to the number of sites in a Tourist park, it is recommended council retain the maximum number of sites as four (4) for ADSR.</p>
10. Road Standard	<p>This submission is in support of the proposed increase in the number of cabins as 'ADSR'. However, the submitter raises issue with the requirement that a lot be serviced by direct access to a sealed road that is constructed in accordance with Council's minimum standards detailed in Planning Scheme Policy 1.</p> <p>The submitter raises concern that the requirement for direct access to a sealed road is unnecessarily onerous given the prevalence of unsealed council-maintained roads. The submitter proposes that it be reasonable to amend the requirement to ensure a new Tourist park sites directly access a council maintained road, rather than a needing a sealed road constructed to full Council standards.</p>	<p>It is noted that the requirement for a site to access a sealed road is an existing planning scheme requirement for accepted development subject to requirements.</p> <p>In the context that the proposed amendment package considers an increase to the number of tourist park sites (and a potential increase of possible impacts), it is not considered appropriate to reduce the minim standard of road access for accepted development.</p> <p>An increase of cabins, tents or caravan sites will also potentially increase traffic to rural sites. If a road is constructed to the accepted Council standard, then there is not a need to assess the road capacity to accommodate development of this scale. However,</p>	<p>There is not yet a consistency in the standard of constructed rural roads across the region. Whilst some unsealed roads may accommodate the increased traffic generated by a Tourist park, there are many rural roads that would pose a safety or maintenance burden if additional traffic was to be generated.</p> <p>not recommended that the minimum road standard be altered for acceptable</p>

		where a site does not access a road constructed to Council standards, it is appropriate that Council assess the local road and access opportunities for safety and potential dust impact, as part of a development application for material change of use.	development subject to requirements.
11. Diversify property use	<p>This submission is in support of the proposed increase in the number of cabins as 'ADSR'. The submitter raises the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides landowners and farmers need to have an alternative source of income to survive, and stay on their land longer after they retire. Local tourism will bring people into the area where they spend money and in turn help the local economy. Farmers value their farms and the environment and would not tolerate campers who do not abide by the rules of leaving no trace. Nuisance campers have no place on a campsite, especially where a limit of 8 sites can be easily maintained and supervised. The reason people camp on farms is to enjoy nature and the peace and quiet. <p>Monitoring is assisted by booking agents who help regulate the activity through a reviews system. These booking sites also show the rules and regulations as set out by the owners of the campsite and provide insurance cover for those who book through their site.</p>	It is noted that the comments support council proposed changes to the planning scheme.	No change to the draft scheme amendment is required in response to this submission.
12. Amenity	<p>This submission objects to the proposed changes to the Tourist park provisions included in Amendment Package 3 based on the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Previously operated tourist parks in the local area have ceased operation due to difficulties managing the conduct of visitors on private properties and the negative impact it has had on neighbours including loud music, wandering 	It is noted that the amendment package includes a number of newly introduced provisions to strengthen the protection of amenity, environmental health, and to reduce off site impacts potentially generated by Tourist parks.	In response to a number of submissions raising concerns around off-site amenity impacts generated by an increase to the number of sites in a Tourist park, it is recommended council retain the maximum

	<p>dogs (resulting in harassment of livestock), and theft.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Camping close to waterways and within flood affected areas (as mapped by Council overlay maps) has been observed where the tourist park has been operated without a development permit (as would be required under the current planning scheme). • There is concern that ongoing compliance with 'conditions' and/or accepted development requirements would be problematic and difficult to monitor. Being accepted development, there is no record or clear guidance or understanding for neighbouring properties about where camping (etc.) should or shouldn't occur. • There should be a register of these uses to record property operations, visitor numbers and accountability for property damage or theft to other properties in the vicinity of the camp site. As part of this management system, regular inspections should be undertaken. • Increased use of local roads will negatively impact the wear and tear on rural roads and biosecurity through introduced weeds. • The likelihood of ancillary events or activities is undesirable. Motorbike or other motorized vehicle use, campfires and amplified music (including music events) are of concern. • The proposed is for a commercial use where Council is not proposing to recover costs through infrastructure charges. However, there will be impact on the infrastructure network. 		<p>number of sites as four (4) for ADSR.</p>
--	---	--	--