



# **The new Whitsunday Regional Council Planning Scheme**

## **Submission Analysis Report**

**December 2015**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Version No.</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>	<b>Approved by</b>
Draft Report	0.1	3 December 2015	Dan Staley & Jenna Kljaic	Jamie Thorley	
Final Report					

## Table of Contents

<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1. Background .....	5
1.1.1. Sustainable Planning Act 2009 .....	5
<b>2. Consideration of Properly Made Submissions .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3. Consideration of State Interests .....</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1. Tourism .....	8
3.2. Coastal Environment.....	8
3.3. State Transport Infrastructure .....	8
<b>4. Consideration of “Significantly Different” .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Attachment 1 .....</b>	<b>10</b>

## 1. Introduction

The Submission Analysis Report aims to advance the purpose of the *Sustainable Planning Act 2009* by improving the understanding of the issues surrounding the future development of the Whitsunday local government area in order to:

- a) ensure decision-making processes—
  - (i) are accountable, coordinated, effective and efficient; and
  - (ii) take account of short and long-term effects of development at local, regional, State and wider levels; and
  - (iii) apply the precautionary principle; and
  - (iv) seek to provide for equity between present and future generations.
- b) provide opportunities for community involvement in decision making.

The objectives of the Submissions Analysis Report are to:

- a) Consider every properly made submission about the proposed planning scheme.
- b) Identify changes to the proposed planning scheme;
- c) Determine whether or not any changes to the proposed planning scheme continue to appropriately integrate the Mackay, Isaac and Whitsunday Regional Plan or State Planning Policy, including the state interests expressed in those instruments, as confirmed by the Minister during State Interest Review of the proposed planning scheme; and
- d) Determine whether or not the proposed planning scheme is significantly different from the version which has undertaken public consultation.

The results of this Submissions Analysis Report are intended to inform the Council's land use planning, infrastructure coordination and investment attraction for the Whitsunday local government area. The results of this study may also inform potential amendments to the proposed planning scheme (prior and post adoption) and are intended to provide information for the community regarding future development in the Whitsunday local government area.

It is also intended for this report to be used, in future, by Council to assist in determining whether or not change to a development approval is a permissible change, particularly in relation to determining whether or not it is likely to cause a person to make a properly made submission objecting to the proposed change, if the circumstances allowed.

The Submission Analysis Report analyses only submissions received during the public notification of the proposed planning scheme for the Whitsunday local government area from Friday 21 August to Friday 16 October 2015, including the extension of the public notification by 2 weeks from Friday 2 October to Friday 16 October 2015.

## **1.1. Background**

### **1.1.1. Sustainable Planning Act 2009**

#### ***Public Notification of the Proposed Planning Scheme***

Whitsunday Regional Council is required to publicly notify a proposed planning scheme under the *Sustainable Planning Act 2009*. The public notification is required to follow the process stated in Statutory Guideline 04/14: Making and amending local planning instruments (MALPI). MALPI requires:

- a) The Council to publish at least once in a newspaper circulating in the local government's area, notice about a proposal to make a planning scheme;
- b) The Council to carry out public consultation for a period (the consultation period) of at least 30 business days;
- c) If public consultation about a proposal must be carried out—
  - (i) the local government is to have available for inspection and purchase during all of the consultation period a copy of the proposed planning scheme; and
  - (ii) members of the public to make submissions to the local government about the proposed planning scheme; and
  - (iii) the local government to consider all properly made submissions about the proposed planning scheme or planning scheme policy; and
  - (iv) the local government to advise persons who make a properly made submission about how the local government has dealt with the submission; and
  - (v) the local government to give the Minister a notice containing a summary of matters raised in the properly made submissions and stating how the local government dealt with the matters.

Particularly, the local government must carry out public consultation about the proposed planning scheme, including in accordance with any proposed communication strategy submitted to the Minister, for a period (consultation period) of at least 30 business days. However, if a planning scheme is made in substantial compliance with the process stated in MALPI, the planning scheme is valid so long as any noncompliance has not—

- a) Adversely affected the awareness of the public of the existence and nature of the proposed planning scheme; or
- b) Restricted the opportunity of the public to make properly made submissions about the proposed planning scheme under the guideline; or
- c) Restricted the opportunity of the Minister to consider whether State interests would be adversely affected.

#### ***Ministerial Consideration of the Proposed Planning Scheme***

MALPI requires the Minister to make four considerations prior to allowing a local government to proceed to adoption, being the Minister must consider:

- a) If conditions imposed prior to public notification of the proposed planning scheme have been appropriately complied with, or

- b) If the version is being considered for adoption is significantly different to a version which has undertaken public consultation;
- c) If sufficient information has been provided for the Minister's consideration;
- d) If the proposed planning scheme achieves the purpose of the SPA, and addresses the key elements of a planning scheme mentioned in section 88 of the SPA, and is consistent with the State Planning Statutory Provisions (SPSP) (where relevant), and appropriately integrates any relevant regional plan or State Planning Policy (SPP), and does not adversely affect a state interest.

## **2. Consideration of Properly Made Submissions**

Council has publicly notified the proposed planning scheme in accordance with the *Sustainable Planning Act 2009* and MALPI with the public notification of the proposed planning scheme occurring from Friday 21 August to Friday 16 October 2015, including the extension of the public notification by 2 weeks from Friday 2 October to Friday 16 October 2015. Council undertook various additional engagement activities to inform and consult with stakeholders, including:

- Regular meetings with the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning;
- Convening of public workshops and telephone survey in 2014 at venues in Bowen, Collinsville, Proserpine and Airlie Beach to consult the development of the corporate plan and proposed planning scheme;
- Establishment of, and regular meetings with an Industry Reference Group, including representatives of key industry sectors, each major town as well as residents groups;
- Production and distribution of media releases and social media postings;
- Public release of key studies informing the planning scheme, including the proposed planning scheme lodged with the Queensland Government for state interest review as well as the Airlie Beach Structure Plan;
- Undertaking a telephone survey of 380 local residents to confirm community acceptance of key strategic outcomes in the draft planning scheme.
- Production and distribution of website and factsheets. With more than 26,000 visits to the website during the public notification period;
- Council planning officers staffing at customer service centres and libraries across the region during the public consultation period;
- Convening of stakeholder group briefings by senior Council planning officers with over 140 stakeholders;
- Convening of public forums in 2015 at venues in Bowen, Collinsville, Proserpine and Airlie Beach to inform the development of the proposed planning scheme.

Council received 693 submissions during the public notification period.

	Town of Whitsunday	Bowen	Collinsville	Proserpine & Surrounds	Outside of region/ Unknown	TOTAL
<b>Airlie Beach Built Form (incl. heights)</b>	393 (Airlie 156)	43	3	18	154	611
<b>Site Specific Zones</b>	16	11		11	2	40
<b>Bowen Marina</b>		9				9
<b>Rural Residential Lot sizes</b>				4		4
<b>Development Manual</b>		1		1		2
<b>Various (whole planning scheme)</b>	9	4	1	2	6	22
<b>Billboards</b>					2	2
<b>State Entities</b>					3	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	418	68	4	36	167	693

The local government must consider every properly made submission about the proposed planning scheme the *Sustainable Planning Act 2009* and MALPI. After considering the submissions, the local government:

- a) May make changes to the proposed planning scheme to:
  - (i) address issues raised in a properly made submission
  - (ii) amend a drafting error, or
  - (iii) address new or changed planning circumstances or information
- b) Must ensure any changes continue to appropriately integrate any relevant regional plan or SPP, including the state interests expressed in those instruments, as confirmed by the Minister at state interest review of the proposed planning scheme, and
- c) Must advise each person in writing who made a properly made submission about how the local government has dealt with their submission.

### **3. Consideration of State Interests**

The Minister must consider whether or not any changes to the proposed planning scheme continue to appropriately integrate the Mackay, Isaac and Whitsunday Regional Plan or the SPP, including the state interests expressed in those instruments, as confirmed by the Minister during State Interest Review of the proposed planning scheme.

In July 2015, the Minister considered the proposed planning scheme appropriately integrated the Mackay, Isaac and Whitsunday Regional Plan and the State Planning Policy, including the state interests expressed in those instruments subject to the conditions contained within correspondence from the Minister dated 17 July 2015.

#### **3.1. Tourism**

The proposed planning scheme seeks to reduce the built form within Airlie Beach in terms of scale, bulk and appearance. The reduction still enables the opportunity for the establishment of tourist accommodation and therefore still advances the following outcome stated in the State Planning Policy:

*“Tourism planning and development opportunities that are appropriate and sustainable are supported; and the social, cultural and natural values underpinning the tourism developments are protected to maximise economic growth.”*

#### **3.2. Coastal Environment**

The proposed planning scheme seeks to alter zones in response to landowner intentions within the Bowen Boat Harbour. The alteration still enables the opportunity for the establishment of coastal dependant uses and therefore still advances the following outcome stated in the State Planning Policy:

*“The coastal environment is protected and enhanced, while supporting opportunities for coastal-dependent development, compatible urban form, and safe public access along the coast.”*

#### **3.3. State Transport Infrastructure**

The proposed planning scheme seeks to delete the Airlie Beach Local Plan, including Plan ABLP-02 (Access and Movement). The establishment of public transport routes is outside of the jurisdiction of the planning scheme however the surrounding development would not be inconsistent with a public transport route as shown in Plan ABLP-02 (Access and Movement) and therefore still advances the following outcome stated in the State Planning Policy:

*“Planning enables the safe and efficient movement of people and goods across Queensland and encourages land use patterns that support sustainable transport.”*



## 4. Consideration of “Significantly Different”

The Minister must consider whether or not Council must re-notify the planning scheme or part thereof, if the planning scheme for adoption is “significantly different” to the planning scheme that was publicly notified.

MALPI defines that “significantly different” as:

*“for a proposed planning scheme:*

- a) does not include a change to a proposed planning scheme as a result of a new state planning instrument that has been introduced since the process started, or*
- b) being made by a continuing local government, does not include a change to the proposed planning scheme to include all or part of an IPA planning scheme for the part of the local government area that will become the new local government area on the changeover day”*

The aforementioned definition does not definitively exclude or include particular types of changes to the proposed planning scheme however MALPI does allow the local government to make changes to the proposed planning scheme following public notification if the changes:

- a) Address issues raised in a properly made submission; or
- b) Amend a drafting error, or
- c) Address new or changed planning circumstances or information.

The proposed planning scheme is different to the planning scheme that was publicly notified given that in response to submissions, changes to the proposed planning scheme:

- a) Reduce the built form within Airlie Beach in terms of scale, bulk and appearance;
- b) Simplify the parking requirements for food and drink outlets;
- c) Modify requirements which potentially could “prohibit” the establishment of advertising devices (billboards) within the Whitsundays; and
- d) Alter zones in response to landowner intentions which are consistent with the strategic framework of the proposed planning scheme.

Council is seeking to consult with the community on any amendments to the draft planning scheme. This will also remove any doubt over potential ambiguity in relation to whether or not the proposed planning scheme is ‘significantly different’.



## Attachment 1

## Appendix A – Abbot Point – Summary of Issues Raised in Submissions and Council's Response

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
<b>Abbot Point</b>							
1.	96, 413	Objects to supporting the expansion of the Abbot Point Coal Terminal on the grounds that it is a minor employer, the Carmichael Coal Mine and port expansion will not benefit local employment, there is movement away from fossil fuels to renewable energy, the Abbot Point/Carmichael Coal Mine is a direct threat to the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, the Abbot Point Coal Terminal is currently not operating at capacity; therefore, expansion is not justifiable, the project is not economically viable.	<b>Yes</b>	<p>The proposed planning scheme has been developed to support continued economic growth through all industries within the Whitsunday Local Government Area. A key area for economic growth has been identified within the resource sector, with major projects associated with the Abbot Point State Development Area. According to the <i>Mackay, Isaac and Whitsunday Regional Plan</i> growth in the Whitsunday Local Government Area will largely be attributed to the development of construction and mining activities which are in turn anticipated to be direct consequences of the infrastructure expansion and upgrades associated with the Abbot Point State Development Area.</p> <p>It is acknowledged by Council that the project to facilitate the expansion of the Port of Abbot Point will only provide short-term benefits however; the project is noted as unlocking the resources of the Galilee Basin. Thus, the Port of Abbot Point expansion project will indirectly facilitate significant employment opportunities through the Galilee Basin mining projects.</p> <p>The proposed planning scheme provides support for business innovation inclusive of renewable energy pursuits.</p> <p>The proposed planning scheme recognises the Outstanding Universal Value of the Great Barrier Reef. A key intent of the proposed planning scheme is to maintain the protection of key ecological values as development and environmental pressures increase. The expansion of the Port of Abbot Point is required to demonstrate the low-environmental risk of the project through supporting goals and actions of the <i>Reef 2050 Long-Term Sustainability Plan, Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> and associated principles of ecologically sustainable development.</p>	No	No	No
2.	619	Commends the decision to allocate industrial land surrounding Abbot Point. However, it is noted that Bowen cannot benefit from worker camps; therefore, providing transport as well as encouraging workforce integration into Bowen and Collinsville townships is recommended.	<b>Yes</b>	The proposed planning scheme does not provide support for 'workers camps' outside of the construction phase of a project. For the operational phase of a project Accommodation activities for an operational workforce are to be integrated into the existing urban area. Requiring operational workforces to reside within the existing urban areas ensures communities such as Bowen and Collinsville achieve workforce integration and sustainable growth.	No	No	No

## Appendix B – Advertising Devices – Summary of Issues Raised in Submissions and Council's Response

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
<b>Advertising Devices</b>							
3.	100	Objects to banning freestanding billboard signage as it will impact on the advertising sector. However, it is recommended that billboards are strictly regulated and assessed as an impact assessable application.	No	The proposed planning scheme will be amended to allow billboard signage a minimum of 3 kilometres distance from existing or approved billboard signage, where located in the Rural zone adjacent a State controlled road. Industry standard for the maximum billboard signage area will be maintained (i.e. 6m x 3m or 18m <sup>2</sup> ).	<b>Yes</b>	No	No
4.	100	Recommends the following amendment to the proposed planning scheme to ensure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New billboards can be developed in a major centre zone or industry zone only.</li> <li>New billboards do not exceed a maximum sign face of 18m<sup>2</sup> per face.</li> <li>Any new application is assessed as impact assessment.</li> </ul>	No	The proposed planning scheme will be amended to also allow billboard signage a minimum of 3 kilometres distance from existing or approved billboard signage, where located in the Rural zone adjacent a State controlled road. Industry standard for the maximum billboard signage area will be maintained (i.e. 6m x 3m or 18m <sup>2</sup> ).	<b>Yes</b>	No	No
5.	471	Recommends modification of the definition of 'Advertising Device Types' in Tables 9.4.1.3.1 and Table 9.4.1.4.2 so that there is no distinction between 'Freestanding Signs' for 'on premises' and 'third party' use. Currently table 9.4.1.4.2 does not permit any Freestanding Signs for 'third party' use within the planning scheme area.	No	The definition of a free standing sign includes a billboard on which the advertising may not directly relate to the business, activity or occupation carried on, in or upon the site on which the structure is located. Existing use rights will remain for approved third party advertising devices. It should also be noted that the Department of Transport and Main Roads has guidelines and restrictions relating to advertising devices visible from a State controlled road, pursuant to the Transport and Infrastructure Act.	No	No	No
6.	471	Include provision for the upgrading of existing signs to industry standards once existing signs have reached end of operational life within the planning scheme area.	No	This is considered to be outside the jurisdiction of a planning scheme. If a sign is not compliant with industry standards, it is a development compliance issue that can be addressed by Council.	No	No	No
7.	471	Provide specific guidance for the development of digital media signage within the planning scheme area.	No	Noted. Council will endeavour to investigate this recommendation over the next 12 months.	No	No	<b>Yes</b>

## Appendix C – Airport – Summary of Issues Raised in Submissions and Council’s Response

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
<b>Airport</b>							
8.	95, 413	Notes that there is confusion concerning the airport project. The following needs to be clarified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it be a 99 year lease or joint venture?</li> <li>Who will be funding this project?</li> <li>Are there any interested airlines?</li> </ul>	No	<p>This is considered to be outside the jurisdiction of a planning scheme. Enquires relating to the Development of the Whitsunday Coast Airport should be directed to <a href="mailto:airpoteoi@whitsundayrc.qld.gov.au">airpoteoi@whitsundayrc.qld.gov.au</a></p> <p>The proposed planning scheme identifies land that may be suitable to support airport expansion, should it occur.</p>	No	No	No

## Appendix D – Bowen Boat Harbour – Summary of Issues Raised in Submissions and Council's Response

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
<b>Bowen Boat Harbour</b>							
9.	39, 45, 64, 107, 153, 166, 170, 188, 213, 237, 341, 357, 358, 381, 384, 385, 386, 388, 389, 464, 465, 466, 467, 484, 507, 508, 509, 520, 662, 663, 664 684	Objects to the proposed Waterfront Marine Industry zone being applied to the Bowen Boat Harbour. Requests that the Mixed Use Zone is reflected as it is the most appropriate zone to allow for development of other uses such as cafes and retail shops. There is also concern for the adjoining mangroves and waterways.	No	<p>Council has since resolved to undertake the process of developing a local plan for Bowen. For the interim, the proposed zone for the Bowen Boat Harbour has been amended to provide a detailed zone map where existing uses are more closely reflected. Amendments are available for viewing on map ZM-10, ZM-10B and ZM-10E. A mix of zones has been identified, such as Mixed use, Community facilities and Waterfront marine industry. Council is committed to maintaining the integrity of regional ecosystems through the delivery of the proposed planning scheme and will continue to protect these environments as development and environmental pressures increase.</p> <p>Council looks forward to developing the local plan with community input in the near future.</p>	No	Yes	Yes
10.	237, 341, 357, 358, 381, 384, 385, 386, 388, 389, 464, 465, 466, 467, 484, 507, , 508, 509, 520, 662, 663, 664	Why were the local boating community excluded from consultation and who was contacted regarding the Bowen Boat Harbour? When would "stakeholders" be contacted?	No	<p>Council undertook stakeholder meetings with the leases of the Bowen Boat Harbour, the Receivers Appointed to the Port of Airlie, the Whitsunday Sailing Club and RPS Group on behalf of the owners of Abell Point Marina.</p> <p>Council considers that a high level of consultation has been undertaken with key representatives of the boating community.</p>	No	No	No

## Appendix E – Building Heights – Summary of Issues Raised in Submissions and Council’s Response

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
<b>Building Heights</b>							
11.	290	Takes a view that the town needs to plan for growth.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
12.	290	At present, the permanent population is insufficient to underpin the services the community needs into the future.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
13.	290	If additional education facilities are required, including primary and secondary schools, additional sporting facilities, additional health care and aged care services, leisure facilities such as cinemas, bowling alleys, retail and dining options, these can only come if the region has more permanent residents; similarly, the only way we will attract permanent residents is if they can find employment.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
14.	290	The proposed planning scheme needs to reflect a model which keeps the tourism industry and visitors well-served and this again underpins why the industry needs hotel/s, not necessarily more strata title apartments, which can ultimately become residential complexes with the needs and opinions of permanent residents being at odds with the long term needs of the industry.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
15.	290	All business sectors are better served by a vibrant and growing tourism industry. It is an identified “risk factor” for the accommodation sector and tourism industry in general that increasing demand for high end strata title apartments by owner occupiers changes the face of Airlie Beach away from a purely tourism base towards an upmarket retirement village. This trend is already apparent; it is diluting the value of management rights in a number of apartment complexes, and results in a shortage of accommodation during peak periods. More resort style self-contained apartment complexes will, as demonstrated, be a model attractive to investors, but not necessarily in the long term interests of the tourism industry. These property styles, already well provided in Airlie Beach, should be restricted to the periphery of the CBD area.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
16.	290	In no particular order, there have been objections and at times protest rallies about development in Airlie Beach, right back to the time Bob Porter built Whitsunday Terraces. There were protests about: Abell Point Marina, The Lagoon, Port Of Airlie Marina, Port of Airlie Boat House, the new beach, Whisper Bay, Coral Sea Resort, the high rises on Hermitage Drive, the rebuild of Airlie Beach Hotel, Peninsular, Marina Shore, every single one of the resort complexes on Golden Orchid Drive, even McDonalds. They were all going to “kill/ruin/spoil/destroy” Airlie Beach and yet, life goes on, visitor numbers are on a clear upswing and Airlie - far from being “killed/ruined etc.” - is a far more vibrant and job-creating place than ever before.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
17.	290	The case being put forward to reduce existing approvals has the impact of reducing the value of commercial property and would open council (and ratepayers) to compensation issues, thus suggestions of reducing areas of 3 storeys back to 2 storeys is not being considered.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
18.	290	The existing plan allows for 3 storeys on the foreshore with	No	Noted.	No	No	No



No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
		zero set-backs to boundaries. We could, under the existing plan, end up with another "Hastings Street, Noosa" outcome of side-by-side-by-side buildings, all to 3 storeys and with zero set-backs to boundaries, resulting in no viewing corridors through to the lagoon area and ocean.					
19.	290	If a developer can fit in 4 storeys with 25% open space, what he could fit into 3 storeys with zero open space, then this is a win for the visual amenity without commercially disadvantaging the land owner/developer.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
20.	290	The other major issue which is not generally known is, on our advice, the existing (historical and with no sunset clause) 8 storey approval which sits over the Whitsunday Wanderers land parcel. Again, any attempt within the town plan to reduce this approved level would have a very significant effect on the land value of this site and consequent compensation claim which would be against council and ultimately be at the expense of ratepayers.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
21.	290	The proposed planning scheme must also eventuate into a format which will, over time, actually attract development. It is irrelevant having a planning scheme which is ultimately so restrictive that it is never commercially viable to develop and, as such, we never get the growth in product, which feeds the growth in jobs and ultimately the growth in services the entire community wants; we are all linked.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
22.	290	Portside Whitsunday: This property will be adversely affected by the development of a multi-storey building on the Port of Airlie site. That said, this battle was lost the day the Port of Airlie development was approved which included reclaiming land and a DA to develop a multi-faceted, integrated resort community and marina, with 4 and 5 storey buildings on the master plan for the reclaimed land. Regardless of the eventual height of any major hotel development, it will have a significant negative impact on this property and any battle should have been fought at the time. The proposed planning scheme cannot solve this problem as the developers/owners already have the existing approvals to fall back on.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
23.	290	Hermitage Drive properties: The majority of these have a view corridor to the left of the 'Boathouse' and will not be significantly impacted by a development on the Port of Airlie site. The exception to this is Whitsunday Vista, which has some rooms which will look down the North facing viewing corridor and others which have a most westerly aspect across the Port of Airlie site. The impact of the existing 5 storey approval will be significant, particularly for their lower level apartments with the westerly aspect, but once again, this is an issue far more relevant to the existing approval than the proposed planning scheme. In general, the Hermitage Drive properties are winners in respect of the potential impacts of the Port of Airlie site as originally a number of up to 4 storey projects were proposed on the land now being developed as "The Cove", residential lots which sit directly in their viewing corridor. As these are developed and built on as residential lots the Hermitage Drive properties have almost 100% security of their long-term views.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
24.	290	Golden Orchid Drive: A number of these properties have	No	In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan	No	Yes	No



No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
		views over the existing Airlie Beach Hotel 4 storey site and others over the Port of Airlie site. Whitsunday Terraces has the most potential “loss of view” but this is dependent on the end height of the eventual Port of Airlie building. While it would take the technical skills of a surveyor to fully demonstrate the impact it would look, to a layman’s eye that a building of 6 storeys or less would, while having some impact, not block the ocean view of the Golden Orchid Drive properties that currently have a view over Port of Airlie. A 12 storey project would have significant negative impacts.		and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>			
25.	290	Airlie Beach Hotel/Coconut Grove: This area, consisting of potential hotel development site and restaurant/retail space will have its view blocked by the Port of Airlie development, but, as is the case with Portside, this was a battle lost the day the Port of Airlie development was approved.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
26.	290	The proposed planning scheme identifies additional residential areas in Cannon Valley and Jubilee Pocket area, including but not limited to, detached housing, additional commercial precincts and light industrial. We are in full agreement with this strategy. It further identifies some areas of medium and high density housing and we are generally supportive of this planning proposal and location(s).	No	Noted.	No	No	No
27.	290	A low-rise resort is generally far less viable and it will likely be far more difficult to find an investor willing to develop within the “low-rise” model. The area is already well-served by a series of “low-rise” developments, but these are, in the vast majority of cases, strata title, self-contained apartments, that do not offer full hotel service, and are built to a size, which conforms to the self-contained strata title format for investors, but are inefficient in terms of hotel-style operations.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
28.	290	Supports a general proposition of “boutique hotels” offering full hotel service, and one high end, full service hotel of at least 200 rooms including, but not limited to, conference/convention facilities, restaurant, retail and business centre.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
29.	290	Supports a mix of hotel sizes which can conceivably generate 400 additional rooms across the next 5 to 10 years would be sufficient to meet anticipated demand.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
30.	290	Supports the critical planning factor to facilitate the development of hotel rooms in the Airlie CBD, rather than replicate the existing strata title apartment model.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
31.	290	Supports the challenge faced by council in a planning scheme which facilitates the “hotel” style development, in preference to the far more usual development model, which sees a developer build strata title apartments, with a view to selling units to investors or owner occupiers, selling the management rights and then walking away with the profits; at times, with little or no consideration as to the longer terms impacts on the tourism industry.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
32.	290	Low rise (maximum 4 storeys along the foreshore) with a maximum coverage of 75 % of available space, for the footprint of the actual multi-level building. We do not see side-by-side-by-side buildings, all at 4 storeys and blocking	No	In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>	No

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
		access to the foreshore as being the best outcome. This "maximum coverage" would be brought about by various building set-backs from boundaries and street frontage, open space grounds and guest facilities all being designed to retain the village atmosphere of "front street". This 4 storey maximum and 75% maximum cover should be extended to the parcel of land known as the Airlie Beach Hotel "block", notwithstanding this is the existing 6 storey approval for the actual Airlie Beach Hotel stage 2 development. We do not believe this is suitable for 8 storeys as the impacts on the properties along Golden Orchid Drive would be too significant.		ZM-08D are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>			
33.	290	The submission suggests a trade- off requiring developers keep a 25% viewing corridor (to run at 90 degrees to Shute Harbour Road) of open space/ground level resort facilities in exchange for an additional storey. The property owners will not be financially disadvantaged and council not exposed as the extra storey, in exchange for 25% open space consideration can be seen as a balance between land owner values and maintaining the open space and viewing corridors required from the streetscape.	No	Council may consider this in future planning for the region.	No	No	Yes
34.	290	The proposed planning scheme, in respect of all building heights in the central tourism precinct, should be impact assessable as part of the approval process.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
35.	290	Supports increased building heights throughout the <b>CBD</b> on an incremental basis. This will encourage continuous small and mid-sized redevelopments and prevent one or two large developments absorbing all of the current demand, which would leave other lot owners unable to find interested investors.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
36.	290	Is generally supportive of 8 storeys in the valley area to the south of Shute Harbour road but needs a minimum setback so that these potential buildings do not "crowd" the streetscape. Likewise it is suggested that a "maximum coverage" level, be built into the proposed planning scheme so that the area does not become a "concrete jungle" at some stage in the future.	No	In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	No
37.	290	Is generally supportive of one major high rise hotel site, suitable for a 200+ room hotel located at the periphery of the CDB so as to be within easy walking distance of the CBD facilities without an actual domineering impact on the central "village" area. Believes the best location for this is the Port of Airlie site. While acknowledging this will be a very substantial and visually impacting building, the village is in need of a branded high-end, full service hotel which includes substantial conference/convention facilities and full integrated resort facilities.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
38.	290	While 12 storeys is suggested for the Port of Airlie, the height should reflect the height needed, based on the footprint of available land, to develop 200 rooms. This will in	No	In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building	Yes	Yes	No

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
		fact be significantly less than 12 storeys and still offer any developer a realistic expectation of commercial viability.		heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>			
39.	493	If growth is not consolidated by higher density development in urban centres (such as Airlie Beach), the negative effects of sprawl are exacerbated, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Walking, cycling and methods of transport other than by private vehicle are impractical;</li> <li>Agricultural (rural) land is converted to residential land to accommodate the growing population; and</li> <li>Residential subdivisions characterised by low density development cause impacts such as traffic and increasing expense of public transport etc.</li> </ul> It is therefore requested that Council does not allow the Whitsunday Region to become subject to continued urban sprawl and indirectly impose the array of negative consequences on its current and future population.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
40.	493	Smart Growth is the consolidation or concentration of urban growth in compact urban centres to avoid sprawl and reduce the impact of the many negative consequences that result from sprawl. The many benefits of Smart Growth most significantly include but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduction in reliance on the private motor vehicle leading to a reduction in traffic, emissions, traffic accidents and reliance on heavily polluted main roads;</li> <li>Less impact on water displacement (flooding) and water quality (pollution);</li> <li>Less encroachment on agricultural / rural land;</li> <li>Increased active and public transport, improving general health, wellbeing and quality of life.</li> </ul> It is therefore requested that Council promotes Smart Growth in Airlie Beach by adopting the proposed planning scheme in its current format in terms of the proposed building heights for 8 and 12 storeys, so as to minimise the expansion of Urban Sprawl and the many negative consequences associated therein.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
41.	493	To compare Airlie Beach to the Gold Coast and Surfer's Paradise is not reasonable. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Gold Coast City had a population of 527,828 and a density of 336.6 persons per square kilometre in 2010;</li> <li>The entire Whitsunday Region (which is far greater than the population of Airlie Beach) had a population of 34,765 and a density of 1.45 persons per square kilometre in 2010;</li> <li>The Whitsunday Region's population was approximately 6.6% the size of the Gold Coast City's population in 2010;</li> </ul>	No	Noted.	No	No	No

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Whitsunday Region's density was approximately 0.4% that of the Gold Coast City's density in to 2010;</li> <li>To be comparable to the Gold Coast City's density, the Whitsunday Region would need a population of just under 8.75 million people, which is approximately 38% of Australia's entire population or more than twice the population of Sydney; and</li> <li>The Gold Coast City and the Whitsunday Region are completely different places with completely different planning schemes and are not comparable in any way.</li> </ul> <p>It is therefore requested that any points raised in any opposing submission that are based on the perceived issue of Airlie Beach becoming the Gold Coast be dismissed as the two areas are not comparable in population or density and therefore subject to different levels of impact.</p>					
42.	493	<p><b>Chinese (Foreign) Investment</b></p> <p>This topic does not merit lengthy discussion. It is widely known throughout the Whitsunday Region's community that there is interest from Chinese developers in the construction of large projects in the Airlie Beach locality (e.g. Chinatown). It appears to be the opinion of some that the proposed building heights in the proposed planning scheme are a direct result of this interest, and that foreign development in Airlie Beach is not wanted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The origin of foreign investment is not a Town Planning consideration and should not be involved in the Local Government's decision making process.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, it is requested that any opposing submission lodged on the basis that building heights should not be increased because of the perceived negative stigmas associated with foreign (in this case, Chinese) investment be dismissed as irrelevant as it is not a Town Planning consideration, and as it is not up to a Local Government to allow or disallow foreign investment based on its Country of origin. Applications for development in Queensland are under a Performance Based planning system and should be assessed and considered on their merits.</p>	No	Noted.	No	No	No
43.	493	<p><b>Ocean Views</b></p> <p>It is likely that at least some of the opposing submission will be lodged by persons who are concerned about the loss or interruption of ocean views from their property, and the associated decrease in property value that may occur.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is a common misconception that if a person purchases a property with ocean views (or any other views for that matter) that they are indefinitely entitled to that view;</li> <li>Property with ocean views is in most cases more expensive than a nearby property of a similar size that does not have ocean views;</li> <li>It is not true that the 'view' is purchased along with the land;</li> <li>The ownership of a property stops at the property boundaries; and</li> <li>The loss of value to a property because of loss or interruption of certain (ocean) views is not</li> </ul>	No	Noted.	No	No	No

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
		measurable and is not a Town Planning consideration. It is therefore requested that any opposing submission relating to loss or interruption of ocean views as a result of increased building heights in Airlie Beach be dismissed as these views are not owned by the property owners, have an impact that cannot be measured or quantified, and are not a Town Planning consideration.					
44.	493	<b>Village Atmosphere</b> Probably the most common and repeated popular opinion in local media and among the portion of the community who oppose the proposed building heights of the proposed planning scheme is that by increasing building heights in Airlie Beach, the township will lose its village atmosphere. The first and probably most problematic issue with this opinion is forming a unanimously acceptable definition of what a 'village atmosphere' is. In terms of the village atmosphere exhibited by Airlie Beach, it is assumed that this is defined as being characterised by the existing community (quality of life) and environment (both built and natural).	No	Noted.	No	No	No
45.	493	<b>Community</b> The village atmosphere characterised by the community is one reflective of a small population, and the quality of life enjoyed by residents may be due to any combination of the following (in a very broad sense, for the sake of this submission): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Happiness;</li> <li>• Health;</li> <li>• Access to goods, services and infrastructure;</li> <li>• Cost of living; and</li> <li>• Household income.</li> </ul> As previously discussed, continued expansion of Urban Sprawl has a proven negative impact on happiness (isolation and less public places); health (increased pollution and less active transport); access to goods, services and infrastructure (displacement of residential areas from commercial and retail, reliance on private motor vehicles); cost of living and household income (household infrastructure services are more expensive, increased expenditure on transport). It can therefore be stated that the quality of life currently enjoyed by residents of the Whitsunday Region that characterises their view of a community that creates a 'village atmosphere' will actually deteriorate by a lack of Smart Growth and the continued expansion of Urban Sprawl.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
46.	493	An increase in building heights in Airlie Beach will have a perceived negative impact on the built environment that characterises the 'village atmosphere' of Airlie Beach by changing the existing building height and density of areas predominantly near the Main Street. However, the increase in building heights will promote Smart Growth and reduce the expansion of Urban Sprawl, which will have the following positive impacts on the built and natural environments that characterise the 'village atmosphere' of Airlie Beach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased development will draw more people to the Main Street to enjoy the beautiful and interactive scenic amenity provided by the open space and</li> </ul>	No	Noted.	No	No	No



No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
		<p>natural areas;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure services can be more efficiently and affordably provided; and</li> <li>The development potential of the Main Street will be increased, attracting redevelopment of dated structures and increasing the appeal of the built form to capture the attention of the pedestrian-oriented, upgraded Main Street.</li> </ul> <p>However, if Smart Growth was to be avoided, and Urban Sprawl continued to expand in an effort to preserve the 'village atmosphere' of Airlie Beach, the negative impacts would contribute to the deterioration of the 'village atmosphere'. This may be through the degradation of infrastructure services as more demand is inefficiently placed upon them; the scenic amenity of the Main Street cannot be enjoyed by more people in line with population growth, who are required to travel long distances reliant on private motor vehicles and find public parking spaces; and the existing dilapidation of some buildings will continue with less attraction for new development due to lower development potential.</p> <p>It is therefore requested that opposing submissions received by Council that cite degradation of the 'village atmosphere' be considered carefully for their overall impact, in terms of all aspects of the community's quality of life and the built and natural environments, and ensure the long term preservation of this 'village atmosphere' by avoiding the negative impacts of continued expansion of Urban Sprawl and promotion Smart Growth. It is not substantial for an opposing submission of this nature to cite only the impact of proposed building heights when there are many other contributing factors to consider.</p>					
47.	493	<p>Possibly the most deeply entrenched opinion is that the Whitsunday Region, and Airlie Beach in particular, has already undergone too much historical change from what used to be, and any further change is moving further away from what the community loves about living and working in the area.</p> <p>As the population grows, demand grows for places to live, work and play. This also increases demand on Council's infrastructure networks. If this demand is not curtailed through mechanisms such as Smart Growth, they will naturally expand as Urban Sprawl, and bring about the repeatedly mentioned negative consequences associated therein.</p> <p>It is therefore requested that any opposing submission lodged with Council that opposes the proposed building heights in Airlie Beach on the basis of too much historical change, or unacceptance of change be carefully considered, as this attitude may promote the expansion Urban Sprawl and the associated negative consequences that outweigh the perceived negative effects of the proposed building heights.</p>	No	Noted.	No	No	No
48.	493	<p>It is requested that if Council receives any opposing submission to the proposed building heights in Airlie Beach based on the perceived potential for large, bulky towers that will block views, breezes and access, it is to be carefully</p>	No	Noted.	No	No	No

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
		examined for its consideration of the extensive and intricate measures Council has made to protect and enhance these features in the relevant development codes.					
49.	493	The requirements of MALPI were complied with during Council's public notification period, which was extended from 4 weeks to 6 weeks after it became evident that a portion of the community did not believe there had been enough consultation time. It is therefore requested, that any opposing submission lodged against the proposed planning scheme in relation to proposed building heights on the basis of Council not properly undergoing the public notification process be considered against the abovementioned requirements.					
50.	214, 215, 216, 228, 239, 416, 417, 418, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 501, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657	Acknowledges the effort to reduce urban sprawl.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
51.	56, 60, 62, 65, 77, 183, 187, 195, 199, 200, 201, 211, 214, 215, 216, 220, 239, 416, 417, 418, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 499, 501, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652	Objects to building heights on the grounds that Council did not consider the community's historical opposition to building heights.	No	<p>In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, the proposed building heights are merely one tool to assist in the redevelopment of Airlie Beach to support future growth and are open to public consultation and feedback.</p> <p>The proposed planning scheme has been developed on the premise of creating economic diversity and growth within our region. As a whole our unique region has the benefit of three economic drivers being agriculture; resources and tourism. However, Airlie Beach does not have good agricultural land or room for mining resources and associated industries which leaves one</p>	Yes	Yes	No

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
				very important driver to maintain sustainable growth, tourism. In order to support this key driver of our economy, Council has undertaken population and economic forecasting studies to understand the future growth of the tourism industry and what is required to support this sustained growth. The proposed planning scheme implements a few key goals in which this may be achieved.			
52.	6, 15, 22, 26, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 43, 46, 47, 52, 54, 55, 57, 58, 59, 62, 63, 65, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73, 74, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 95, 98, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 110, 113, 114, 115, 116, 119, 120, 122, 124, 125, 126, 130, 132, 133, 134, 136, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 151, 152, 157, 167, 168, 173, 174, 175, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 187, 189, 196, 197, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 211, 214, 215, 216, 220, 221, 225, 229, 230, 233, 234, 236, 237, 239, 241, 243, 244, 246, 249, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 266, 276, 277, 278, 280, 281, 282, 284, 285, 287, 288, 289, 291, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 319, 320, 342, 345, 346, 347, 348, 351, 352, 359, 360, 361, 362, 364, 365, 366, 369, 370, 372, 374, 376, 378, 379, 380, 387, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 413, 414, 416, 417, 418, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 455, 456, 460, 461, 462, 492, 494, 495, 499, 501, 503, 504, 506, 511, 513, 514, 515, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 948, 968, 970, 982, 985	Objects to building heights on the grounds that the proposed planning scheme is not consistent with the intent of the area and does not enhance Airlie's natural beauty, coastal resources and areas of environmental significance. It will also remove the "village" feel.	No	<p>Airlie Beach is a constantly evolving area that is led by the tourism economy. In order to support Airlie Beach, planning provisions must allow for an appropriate amount of development to occur. Specific development requirements in the proposed planning scheme have been developed to address setbacks and other design requirements.</p> <p>Council are also undertaking a Scenic Amenity Study for the whole of the Whitsunday Region, to identify scenic and landscape values across the region along our key transport corridors. This will help inform any visual amenity issues resulting from future development. Council encourages the community to be involved in this future project.</p>	No	No	Yes
53.	22, 56, 60, 62, 63, 65, 74, 75, 93, 98, 102, 112, 114, 119, 122, 134, 136, 139, 141, 145, 173, 183, 184, 186, 201, 202, 209, 210, 214, 215, 216, 217, 220, 221, 228, 234, 235, 239, 241, 246, 344, 345, 363, 414, 416, 417, 418, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444,	Objects to building heights on the grounds that there is a potential loss of views that will negatively impact on existing tourist accommodation, businesses and private homes.	No	<p>In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	No



No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
	445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 453, 462, 463, 473, 499, 500, 501, 502, 505, 511, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul> <p>The amended building heights proposed are considered to minimise any conceived impacts to views from accommodation premises or homes.</p> <p>Airlie Beach is a constantly evolving area that is led by the tourism economy. In order to support Airlie Beach, planning provisions must allow for an appropriate amount of development to occur. Specific development requirements in the proposed planning scheme have been developed to address setbacks and other design requirements.</p> <p>Council are also undertaking a Scenic Amenity Study for the whole of the Whitsunday Region, to identify scenic and landscape values across the region along our key transport corridors. This will help inform any visual amenity issues resulting from future development. Council encourages the community to be involved in this future project.</p>			
54.	62, 65, 124, 144, 146, 182, 183, 185, 189, 214, 215, 216, 239, 277, 278, 319, 320, 344, 408, 409, 410, 413, 416, 417, 418, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 501, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658	Objects to building heights on the grounds that the scale and design is not compatible with the surrounding development and is unfair on adjoining neighbours who choose not to increase in height.	No	<p>In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul> <p>The purpose of the planning scheme is to set the parameters for development. It is up to individual landowners as to what is economically feasible to develop. Due to property sizes and design and environmental constraints and setbacks, not all sites will achieve maximum building heights.</p> <p>Airlie Beach is a constantly evolving area that is led by the tourism economy. In order to support Airlie Beach, planning provisions must allow for an appropriate amount of development to occur. Specific development requirements in the proposed planning scheme have been developed to address setbacks and other design requirements.</p> <p>Council are also undertaking a Scenic Amenity Study for the whole of the Whitsunday Region, to identify scenic and landscape values across the region along our key</p>	Yes	Yes	No

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
				transport corridors. This will help inform any visual amenity issues resulting from future development. Council encourages the community to be involved in both of these future projects.			
55.	15, 20, 25, 26, 65, 77, 81, 83, 112, 125, 144, 146, 173, 182, 184, 187, 197, 208, 210, 214, 215, 216, 217, 220, 225, 233, 234, 239, 281, 285, 286, 319, 320, 345, 354, 363, 364, 368, 374, 413, 416, 417, 418, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 452, 501, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657	Objects to building heights on the grounds that the proposed planning scheme does not address traffic or potential parking problems.	Yes	<p>The proposed planning scheme was submitted to the State Government for assessment by all relevant State Agencies. The Department of Transport and Main Roads has reviewed the proposed planning scheme and provided sign off for approval.</p> <p>All future development will be required to comply with Council's Car Parking and Transport Code and provide on-site car parking, as well as comply with any additional requirements from the State Department of Transport and Main Roads.</p>	No	No	No
56.	65, 122, 214, 215, 216, 231, 239, 285, 354, 363, 368, 413, 416, 417, 418, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 501, 511, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657	Objects to building heights on the grounds that Council water supply and sewerage infrastructure do not have the capacity to cater for high rise developments.	No	<p>Building heights are not the catalyst for increased impacts on Council's infrastructure networks. However, Council will ensure that all impacts on infrastructure from future development will be mitigated by the developer and not the community. Infrastructure demands will be enforced by Councils Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP) and Council's Adopted Infrastructure Charges Resolution.</p> <p>Council has undertaken a series of studies to inform the development of its LGIP, to enable Council to address shortfalls in infrastructure when development arises. The LGIP is envisaged to be finalised by late-2017.</p>	No	No	Yes
57.	65, 81, 98, 114, 119, 122, 127, 128, 139, 148, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 169, 171, 172, 179, 184, 191, 192, 193, 209, 210, 214, 215, 216, 217, 220, 234, 235, 236, 239, 251, 269, 270, 271, 272, 274, 318, 345, 363, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 413, 416, 417, 418, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 462, 501, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526,	Objects to building heights on the grounds that concentrated increases in accommodation will negatively impact on smaller existing operators and providers.	No	This is not considered to be a matter addressed by a planning scheme. Commercial competition and decisions therein, will be led by the market and for individual landowners to consider.	No	No	No

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
	527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657						
58.	119, 122, 187, 195, 199, 200, 201, 208, 211, 217, 220, 266, 282, 284, 287, 288, 289, 291, 296, 298, 299, 300, 301, 304, 305, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 313, 315, 316, 317, 342, 348, 352, 359, 360, 361, 362, 370, 372, 376, 378, 379, 380, 387, 402, 455, 456, 461, 492, 503, 504, 506, 513, 514, 515, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 948, 968, 970, 982, 985	Objects to building heights on the grounds that the Strategic framework identifies the Airlie Beach main street and esplanade to be a major regional function facility which does not appropriately reflect existing values and character.	No	<p>The Strategic framework of the proposed planning scheme sets the dreams and aspirations for the region heading towards the year 2036.</p> <p>It is a goal of the Council to diversify the tourism and accommodation market to be resilient to the highs and lows of the economy. To allow for a major regional function facility would positively impact on businesses in the Airlie Beach area as it provides an opportunity for Airlie Beach to become a holiday destination, as well as a destination to host functions and events in the tourism low season.</p>	No	No	No
59.	20, 26, 56, 119, 187, 195, 197, 200, 208, 211, 217, 220, 225, 233, 234, 266, 281, 282, 284, 287, 288, 289, 291, 296, 298, 299, 300, 301, 304, 305, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 313, 315, 316, 317, 342, 348, 352, 359, 360, 361, 362, 364, 370, 372, 374, 376, 378, 379, 380, 387, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 402, 450, 455, 456, 461, 463, 473, 492, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 506, 513, 514, 515, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 948, 968, 970, 982, 985	Objects to building heights on the grounds that increased building heights is not consistent with “small town scale” as outlined in the overall outcomes of the Airlie Beach Local Plan Code.	No	<p>In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>• Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>• Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>• Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>• Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>• Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>• Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul> <p>The amended building heights proposed are considered to appropriately allow for revitalisation of the Main Street without compromising the small town scale.</p>	Yes	Yes	No
60.	220, 266, 282, 284, 287, 288, 289, 291, 296, 298, 299, 300, 301, 304, 305, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 313, 315, 316, 317, 342, 348, 352, 359, 360, 361, 362, 370, 372, 376, 378, 379, 380, 387, 455, 456, 461, 503, 504, 506, 513, 514, 515, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 948, 968, 970, 982, 985	Requests that building heights are reduced.	No	<p>In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>• Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>• Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>• Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>• Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>• Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>• Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	Yes

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
				<p>The purpose of the planning scheme is to set the parameters for development. It is up to individual landowners to determine what is economically feasible to develop. Due to property sizes and design and environmental constraints and setbacks not all sites will achieve maximum building heights.</p> <p>Airlie Beach is a constantly evolving area that is led by the tourist economy. In order to support Airlie Beach, planning provisions must allow for an appropriate amount of development to occur. Specific development requirements in the proposed planning scheme have been developed to address setbacks and other design requirements.</p> <p>Council are also undertaking a Scenic Amenity Study for the whole of the Whitsunday Region, to identify scenic and landscape values across the region along our key transport corridors. This will help inform any visual amenity issues resulting from future development. Council encourages the community to be involved in both of these future projects.</p>			
61.	27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 43, 46, 47, 54, 57, 58, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73, 82, 83, 84, 86, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 99, 101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 110, 114, 127, 128, 130, 132, 133, 140, 143, 151, 152, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 167, 168, 169, 171, 172, 174, 175, 179, 181, 184, 186, 191, 192, 193, 196, 201, 204, 207, 234, 235, 236, 251, 269, 270, 271, 272, 274, 318, 344, 345, 346, 363, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 414, 511	Objects to building heights on the grounds that the proposed building heights will have adverse impacts on visual amenity. The skyline of potential buildings will not compliment the current terraced development. Thus impacting the tourist economy.	No	<p>In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>• Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>• Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>• Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>• Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>• Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>• Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul> <p>The purpose of the planning scheme is to set the parameters for development. It is up to individual landowners to determine what is economically feasible to develop. Due to property sizes and design and environmental constraints and setbacks not all sites will achieve maximum building heights.</p> <p>Airlie Beach is a constantly evolving area that is led by the tourist economy. In order to support Airlie Beach, planning provisions must allow for an appropriate amount of development to occur. Specific development requirements in the proposed planning scheme have been developed to address setbacks and other design requirements.</p> <p>Council are also undertaking a Scenic Amenity Study for the whole of the Whitsunday Region, to identify scenic and landscape values across the region along our key transport corridors. This will help inform any visual amenity issues resulting from future development. Council encourages the community to be involved in</p>	Yes	Yes	Yes



No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
				both of these future projects.			
62.	27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 43, 46, 47, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 65, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73, 75, 77, 79, 82, 84, 86, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 98, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 110, 112, 114, 117, 127, 128, 130, 132, 136, 139, 140, 143, 151, 152, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 167, 168, 169, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 179, 181, 187, 191, 192, 193, 196, 200, 201, 204, 207, 217, 220, 229, 230, 234, 235, 236, 237, 242, 244, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 269, 270, 271, 272, 274, 276, 280, 297, 306, 312, 314, 318, 346, 351, 363, 365, 366, 369, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 412, 413, 414, 450, 451, 460, 499, 505	Recommends that Council applies Byron Bay, Noosa, Palm Cove and Bangalow as a case study when planning for Airlie Beach. Other examples: Daintree, Cairns, Cooktown, Frazer Island, Port Douglas, Bodrum (Turkey).	No	<p>In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul> <p>As a result of undertaking public consultation, Council has been able to consider the suggested case studies to understand how the community envisages Airlie Beach to develop. These case studies have been considered in conjunction with other economic feasibility studies which have informed the development of the proposed Planning Scheme.</p> <p>This has resulted in the amendment of the ABLP – 01 Airlie Beach Local Plan: Heights plan which will provide Airlie Beach with a unique opportunity to develop.</p> <p>Council are also undertaking a Scenic Amenity Study for the whole of the Whitsunday Region, to identify scenic and landscape values across the region along our key transport corridors. This will help inform any visual amenity issues resulting from future development. Council encourages the community to be involved in both of these future projects.</p>	Yes	Yes	Yes
63.	15, 20, 56, 227 228, 243, 286, 363,390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 450, 492	Objects to building heights on the grounds that wind tunnels will be created, ultimately impacting on tourism.	No	<p>Council considers that this perceived issue relates to large scale high-rise development and not the scale of buildings proposed within the Airlie Beach area that is afforded the natural protection of Mount Whitsunday.</p> <p>Specific development requirements in the proposed planning scheme have been developed to address setbacks and other design requirements that provide a solution to potential wind tunnel issues.</p>	No	No	No
64.	20, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400	Concerned that it will give grounds to developers to appeal to the State Government to have heights raised further for areas behind the main street in Precinct C.	No	Building heights proposed within a Local Government planning scheme are not considered to be a State Interest and therefore the State Government cannot request Council to increase building heights based on lobbying from developers.	No	No	No
65.	354, 368, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400	Objects to “blanket” building height limits as this does not allow for a terraced approach where there are opportunities for everyone to have a view.	No	<p>In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	Yes

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul> <p>The purpose of the planning scheme is to set the parameters for development. It is up to individual landowners as to what is economically feasible to develop. Due to property sizes and design and environmental setbacks, not all sites will achieve maximum building heights.</p> <p>Airlie Beach is a constantly evolving area that is led by the tourist economy. In order to revitalise Airlie Beach planning provisions must allow for an appropriate amount of development to occur. Specific development requirements in the proposed planning scheme have been developed to address setbacks and other design requirements.</p> <p>Council are also undertaking a Scenic Amenity Study for the whole of the Whitsunday Region, to identify scenic and landscape values across the region along our key transport corridors. This will help inform any visual amenity issues resulting from future development.</p> <p>Council encourages the community to be involved in both of these future projects.</p>			
66.	98, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 505	Recommends that each application must be assessed on its merits.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
67.	237, 239, 341, 357, 358, 381, 384, 385, 386, 388, 389, 464, 465, 466, 467, 484, 507, 508, 509, 520, 662, 663, 664	Objects building heights on the grounds that the proposed Airlie Beach building heights impacts on sensitive land uses and cultural identity.	No	<p>The proposed planning scheme has been developed on the premise of creating economic diversity and growth within our region. Our unique region has the benefit of being blessed with four economic drivers being; agriculture, resources, tourism and construction.</p> <p>However, Airlie Beach is not blessed with good agricultural land, resources from mining or room for construction and manufacturing, which leaves it with one very important driver for our region to maintain sustainable growth, and this is tourism. In order to support this key driver of our economy, Council has undertaken population and economic forecasting studies to understand the future growth of the tourism industry and what is required to support this sustained growth.</p> <p>The proposed building heights are merely one tool to assist in the redevelopment of Airlie Beach to support this future growth and are open to public consultation and feedback.</p> <p>Council are undertaking a Scenic Amenity Study for the whole of the Whitsunday Region, to identify scenic and landscape values across the region along our key transport corridors. This will help inform any visual amenity issues resulting from future development.</p>	No	No	Yes

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
				Council encourages the community to be involved in both of these future projects.			
68.	237, 239,341, 357, 358, 381, 384, 385, 386, 388, 389, 464, 465, 466, 467, 484, 507, 508, 509, 520, 662, 663, 664	Has concerns regarding the lack of scenic amenity study.	No	Protection of our key scenic values is important to Council, as such Council are currently undertaking a region-wide scenic amenity study, to identify and protect our scenic values along key transport corridors and our urban centres. In the near future, Council will be undertaking public consultation with the community to understand the scenic qualities that need to be protected. This study is due for completion in the first quarter of 2016 and will be included as a policy in the first amendment package of the proposed planning scheme.	No	No	Yes
69.	237, 239, ,341, 357, 358, 381, 384, 385, 386, 388, 389, 464, 465, 466, 467, 484, 507, 508, 509, 520, 662, 663, 664	Why was the consultation with the Airlie Beach change in building heights not fully discussed with local residents at the time of the release of the Airlie Structure Plan, and left to the Tourism and Real Estate Agents to be consulted in this plan?	No	Ratepayers within the relevant precinct for the Airlie Structure Plan were consulted. Other local residents and ratepayers now have the opportunity to comment on the content of the proposed planning scheme. Council has undertaken an extensive public consultation process, over and above the requirements of the State Government. The proposed planning scheme has been on public display on Councils, website since November 2014. Nonetheless, feedback about the consultation process and improving this process is welcome by Council.	No	No	No
70.	146, 180, 234,277, 278, 408, 409, 410, 658	Recommends that the maximum building height for Port of Airlie remains at 5 storeys and all other building heights are maintained as per the <i>Whitsunday Shire Planning Scheme 2009</i> .	No	In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	No
71.	146, 182,277, 278, 408, 409, 410, 505, 658	Recommends that should the existing building heights not be maintained then a maximum building height of 6 storeys is proposed.	No	In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	No
72.	26, 144, 182, 187, 195, 233, 255,277, 278, 281, 374, 408, 409, 410, 658	Recommends that avoidance of a block wall streetscape is to be enforced along Shute Harbour Road and Airlie Esplanade.	No	Specific development requirements in the proposed planning scheme have been developed to address setbacks and other design requirements.	No	No	No
73.	19, 26, 187, 199, 200, 208, 211, 217, 220, 225,233, 265, 281, 351, 364, 374,	Objects to building heights on the grounds that the proposed planning scheme does not protect and enhance the natural	No	Full consideration of the geographical surrounds of Airlie Beach must be considered. Airlie Beach is bound by	No	No	No

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
	501	environment nor conform to Council's own 2014 Structure Plan, which says:  <i>"Building heights are not seen to improve return on costs, in the market conditions of Airlie Beach. As such it is not considered a driver for development profit, and in fact scenarios that vary <u>only</u> height are seen to perform worse."</i>		the hills, forming a natural amphitheatre. As a result of the geographical layout, development is restricted and cannot "spread out". Should development continue to be restricted, growth and development will be stunted and in return negatively impact on the key economic driver for Airlie Beach: tourism. In light of projected increases in tourism visitation and local population., it is critical that Council appropriately plan for development to support the key economic driver in this region, which is tourism			
74.	124, 144, 146, 182, 184, 185, 189, 195, 208, 225, 233, 234, 281, 345, 374	Recommends that the maximum building height be limited to below the height of existing tree canopy and not exceed the existing building height on surrounding allotments.	No	In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	No
75.	15, 20, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 43, 46, 47, 54, 57, 58, 63, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73, 82, 84, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 99, 101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 110, 114, 124, 130, 132, 140, 143, 144, 146, 151, 152, 157, 158, 167, 168, 174, 175, 180, 181, 182, 189, 190, 195, 196, 197, 200, 203, 204, 207, 220, 226, 234, 243, 285, 286, 363, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 412, 452, 492	Recommends that all building heights are maintained as per the <i>Whitsunday Shire Planning Scheme 2009</i> .	No	In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	No
76.	20, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 43, 46, 47, 54, 57, 58, 63, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73, 82, 84, 86, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 98, 99, 101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 110, 112, 113, 114, 124, 130, 132, 140, 143, 144, 145, 146, 151, 152, 157, 158, 167, 168, 174, 175, 181, 182, 189, 190, 195, 196, 197, 200, 201, 204, 207, 208, 245, 265, 346, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 414, 459, 501, 659	Recommends that the proposed planning scheme proposes not more than a maximum building height of 4 storeys.	No	In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	No
77.	15, 19, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 43, 46, 47, 52, 54, 57, 58, 59, 63, 65, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 81, 82, 83, 84, 86, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 98, 99, 101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 110, 112, 114, 117, 121, 125, 130, 132, 133, 134, 139, 140, 143, 151, 152, 155, 157, 167, 168, 174, 175, 181, 184, 196, 200, 201, 204, 205,	Objects to building heights on the grounds that Airlie will be "another Gold Coast high rise concrete jungle" or "high rise town".	No	Due to the geographical surrounds of Airlie Beach being bound by the hills, forming a natural amphitheatre, it is not possible for density to increase significantly to become a 'concrete jungle'.  Council are undertaking a Scenic Amenity Study for the whole of the Whitsunday Region, to identify scenic and	No	No	Yes



No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
	206, 207, 209, 210, 228, 234, 235, 241, 242, 243, 245, 246, 285, 286, 344, 345, 346, 347, 351, 356, 363, 368, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 412, 414, 415, 429, 450, 453, 462, 469, 476, 499			landscape values across the region, within major Towns and along key transport corridors. The study will direct Council in managing the unique beauty of Airlie Beach to ensure that future growth is designed in a manner to reduce the impacts on areas of scenic value. Council encourages the community to be involved in this future project.			
78.	27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 43, 46, 47, 53, 54, 57, 58, 63, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73, 82, 84, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 98, 99, 101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 110, 114, 119, 122, 130, 132, 140, 143, 151, 152, 157, 167, 168, 174, 175, 181, 196, 201, 204, 206, 207, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406	Objects to building heights on the grounds that there is too many unit developments which real estate cannot sell as the market is flat.	No	The proposed planning scheme is a tool to set the parameters for development, and as such it cannot determine financial feasibility. The planning horizon of the scheme is to 2036, and as such the market will likely fluctuate over this time period.	No	No	No
79.	15, 56, 209, 217, 220, 228, 229, 230, 234, 236, 237, 243, 244, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 276, 280, 285, 286, 297, 306, 312, 314, 344, 363, 365, 366, 369, 407, 429, 450, 451, 460, 462, 492, 499	Objects to building heights on the grounds that 12, 8 and 4 storeys will cast long shadows over commonly used public areas for long periods of time each day as well as blocking breezes.	No	In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul> Specific development requirements in the proposed planning scheme have been developed to address setbacks and other design requirements that provide a solution to potential shadow and breeze issues.	Yes	Yes	No
80.	15, 63, 65, 76, 91, 98, 114, 117, 141, 145, 187, 200, 209, 220, 229, 230, 236, 237, 243, 244, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 276, 280, 286, 297, 306, 312, 314, 346, 356, 365, 366, 369, 407, 450, 451, 460, 469, 499, 501	Objects on the grounds that developers should not continue to drive the planning agenda. Example: China Town development, Port of Airlie.	No	The key economic driver in the Airlie Beach area has been identified as tourism, and as such, it is Council's intention to plan for and support its sustained growth and development. Council has undertaken population and economic forecasting studies to understand the future growth of the tourism industry and what is required to support this sustained growth. The proposed planning scheme implements a few key goals in which this may be achieved.	No	No	No
81.	136	Objects to building heights on the grounds that 12 storeys is not defined by a measurement (i.e. existing planning scheme prescribes by X metres high).	No	Noted. The proposed planning scheme will be amended to include a height in meters and storeys.	Yes	Yes	No
82.	136	Objects to building heights on the grounds of not wanting a population of 55,000 that may cause the character of Airlie to change.	No	Council cannot cap population growth in the region but is able to plan for increased development requirements which will result.	No	No	No
83.	19, 59, 65, 85, 98, 112, 139, 206, 209, 210, 217, 220, 234, 245, 286, 413, 463, 469, 473, 500, 502	Objects to building heights on the grounds that loss of views will lower property values.	No	In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	Yes

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul> <p>Council are also undertaking a Scenic Amenity Study for the whole of the Whitsunday Region, to identify scenic and landscape values across the region along our key transport corridors. This will help inform any visual amenity issues resulting from future development.</p> <p>Council encourages the community to be involved in this future project.</p>			
84.	217, 220	Objects to building heights on the grounds that infrastructure development and upgrades will not be paid by the developer and that ratepayers will be burdened with these costs.	No	<p>Building heights are not the catalyst for increased impacts on Council's infrastructure networks. However, Council will ensure that all impacts on infrastructure from future development will be mitigated by the developer and not the community.</p> <p>This will be enforced through Council's Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP) and the Adopted Infrastructure Charges Resolution. Council have undertaken a series of studies to inform the development of its LGIP, to enable Council to address shortfalls in infrastructure when development arises. The LGIP is envisaged to be finalised by late 2017.</p>	No	No	Yes
85.	96, 217, 220	Recommends that building heights along the main street are adopted reflecting the existing buildings of 1 or 2 storeys.	No	<p>In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	No
86.	217, 220, 234	Recommends that Council enters a joint venture with higher education institutions to establish a branch campus in the region.	No	Noted. Council may consider this in future planning for the region.	No	No	Yes
87.	217, 220, 234	Objects to 12 storey building heights on the grounds that planning for a 0.8m sea level rise may be inadequate. It is recommended that Council consider the Climate Change Adaptive Program.	No	The proposed planning scheme was submitted to the State Government for assessment by all relevant State Agencies. The relevant departments have reviewed the proposed planning scheme and provided sign off for approval. The proposed planning scheme addresses the State Planning Policy interest relating to climate change.	No	No	No
88.	113	Recommends that the proposed building heights are amended to reduced 12 storeys to 8 storeys and 8 storeys to 6 storeys.	No	<p>In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	No

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>			
89.	65	Increased building heights at Port of Airlie will destroy the Mangrove Community in Muddy Bay.	No	All proposed development applications will need to address any off-site impacts before gaining approval.	No	No	No
90.	124, 144, 146, 182, 185, 189, 195, 197, 450	Objects to building heights and the lack of planning provisions to address interface with adjoining property.	No	<p>In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul> <p>The purpose of the planning scheme is to set the parameters for development. It is up to individual landowners as to what is economically feasible to develop. Due to property sizes and design and environmental setbacks, not all sites will achieve maximum building heights.</p> <p>In order to revitalise Airlie Beach planning provisions must allow for an appropriate amount of development to occur. Specific development requirements in the proposed planning scheme have been developed to address setbacks and other design requirements.</p> <p>Council are also undertaking a Scenic Amenity Study for the whole of the Whitsunday Region, to identify scenic and landscape values across the region along our key transport corridors. This will help inform any visual amenity issues resulting from future development.</p> <p>Council encourages the community to be involved in both of these future projects.</p>	Yes	Yes	Yes
91.	195	Objects to building heights as they conflict with the proposed planning scheme provisions that state development must be financially viable and market supportable. New development will drive out existing budget accommodation options.	No	The Planning Scheme is a tool to set the parameters for development, and as such it cannot determine financial feasibility. The planning horizon of the scheme is to 2036, and as such the market will likely fluctuate over this time period.	No	No	No
92.	180	Supports 8 storeys in Waterson Way “D”.	No	Noted	No	No	No
93.	121, 142, 148, 149, 155, 219	Objects to building heights.	No	<p>In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	No

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
94.	60, 102, 112, 119, 210, 286	Recommends that Funnel Bay is the most appropriate location for development to have increased building heights.	No	One of the defining reasons for increasing building heights within the Airlie Beach was to restrict the need for further urban encroachment on the regions environmentally significant areas. To allow further development within Funnel Bay is considered to be detrimental achieving this outcome to protect this environmentally significant area.	No	No	No
95.	112	Recommends that the land proposed to contain 12 storeys should be turned into swimming enclosure or green space.	No	Council currently maintains a large portion of open space along the Airlie Beach foreshore, including the Lagoon. This maintenance program is partly funded by the ratepayers of Whitsunday. Furthermore, these lots are under private ownership and are considered to be prime real estate land, which would cost ratepayers a substantial amount to purchase.	No	No	No
96.	74, 201	Notes that Council may have legal action against them for devaluing properties.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
97.	63, 228	Acknowledges the need for employment opportunities to avoid population relocation.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
98.	77, 228	Although the population may increase it is questioned whether locals will benefit from employment opportunities.  For example: <i>"From the Japanese experience, a Japanese airliner would be met by Japanese national guides and operators, ushered onto a Japanese owned bus and taken into a Japanese owned hotel or resort. Employment for Australians was limited to local tour and activity markets and a share of hospitality. Employment grew – for Japanese nations but fell for Australians."</i>	No	The nature of submission is considered to be outside of Council's jurisdiction.	No	No	No
99.	227, 228	Recommends that building heights within Precinct E (main street & foreshore) seaside of the main street should be maintained at 3 storeys.	No	In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Precinct A – 14 meters</li><li>• Precinct B – 14 meters</li><li>• Precinct C – 21 meters</li><li>• Precinct D – 18 meters</li><li>• Precinct E – 14 meters</li><li>• Precinct F – 18 meters</li><li>• Precinct G – 14 meters.</li></ul>	Yes	Yes	No
100.	231, 267	Recommends that building heights within Precinct E (main street & foreshore) seaside of the main street should be maintained at 2 storeys.	No	In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Precinct A – 14 meters</li><li>• Precinct B – 14 meters</li><li>• Precinct C – 21 meters</li><li>• Precinct D – 18 meters</li><li>• Precinct E – 14 meters</li><li>• Precinct F – 18 meters</li><li>• Precinct G – 14 meters.</li></ul>	Yes	Yes	No
101.	180	Recommends that building heights within Precinct E (main street and foreshore) landward of the main street should be	No	In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the	Yes	Yes	No

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
		maintained at 5 storeys.		proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>			
102.	227, 228	Recommends the inclusion of a specific “village” planning overlay to ensure that “village” ambience is maintained.	No	Council considers that the Strategic framework sets policy direction for the planning scheme, to guide and inform appropriate development. This part of the planning scheme will aid in guiding planning for the desired vision of region.	No	No	No
103.	96, 227, 228	Recommends that all buildings in the “D” of Waterson way have a maximum building height of 4 storeys with compulsory car park buildings.	No	In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul> Car parking and traffic movements are considered for any development application and are assessed against the Transport and Parking Code.	Yes	Yes	No
104.	227, 228	Recommends that all buildings on Waterson way should have minimum setbacks of 30m to assist with environmentally friendly areas and car parking.	No	All development is required to be setback from environmentally significant areas by 50m, specifically in the area of Waterson Way; Airlie Creek will require a 50m buffer from any future buildings.	No	No	No
105.	227, 228	Notes that Waterson Way pavement surface, street lighting and road markings are poor.	No	Noted. This issue has been passed on to Council's Engineering Services Department.	No	No	No
106.	227, 228	Recommends that multi-storey hotel to accommodate FIFO tourism should be located in Precinct F and G (Port of Airlie). This is the most suitable location for a casino to be located – with “6 storeys at the bottom end of main street with its own underground parking, which would allow visitors and residents the choice of village in main street or casino high roller excitement in precinct F and G.”	No	Noted.	No	No	No
107.	96, 227, 228	Recommends building height in Precinct F and G (Port of Airlie) is limited to 6 storeys.	No	In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	No



No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
108.	227, 228	Recommends that the Esplanade/Shute Harbour Road triangle (precinct 1) is redeveloped <i>"into a more contiguous (and reinforced) planning overlay rather than just raising the height – which should be 4 or 5 levels as it grades up to the 6 storey hotel."</i>	No	In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	No
109.	227, 228	Recommends that <i>"the first 50 metres from the esplanade should be 4 levels to protect the beach from shading."</i>	No	In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	No
110.	227, 228	Recommends that Precinct C (Waterson Way) retains the current planning principles in line with the village feel and that the hotel site is kept to 5 or 6 storeys. Car parking plus 'surface buildings' should be kept at 2 storeys above Waterson Way.	No	In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	No
111.	19	<i>"My involvement with Airlie Beach stretches back 35 years, first a visitor and more recently over the past 15 years an owner, resident and tourism operator. Over the course of this time, I have observed some excellent planning decisions undertaken by various councils, including the significant Port of Airlie development, the improvements to the foreshore and most recently the upgrade of the main street. These changes have made Airlie Beach a more attractive destination for visitors and as an accommodation provider myself, have seen over the past year a steady improvement in the volume and length of visitor stays."</i>	No	Noted.	No	No	No
112.	463, 473, 500, 502	Objects to building heights on the grounds that views from the Airlie Beach lookout will be negatively impacted.	No	In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	Yes

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul> <p>Council are also undertaking a Scenic Amenity Study for the whole of the Whitsunday Region, to identify scenic and landscape values across the region along our key transport corridors. This will help inform any visual amenity issues resulting from future development. Council encourages the community to be involved in this future project.</p>			
113.	242, 363, 463, 473, 500, 502	Objects to building heights on the grounds that the current view will be lost when driving over the hill and into Airlie Beach.	No	<p>In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul> <p>Council are also undertaking a Scenic Amenity Study for the whole of the Whitsunday Region, to identify scenic and landscape values across the region along our key transport corridors. This will help inform any visual amenity issues resulting from future development. Council encourages the community to be involved in this future project.</p>	Yes	Yes	Yes
114.	413	Recommends that the land identified to contain 12 storey buildings is developed to contain a single storey art and culture precinct that encompasses an indigenous cultural information centre, interactive museum, roof top café, ground floor conference centre and exhibition space and an outdoor amphitheatre.	No	These lots are under private ownership and Council can work with individual applicants to encourage them to provide additional cultural benefits for the community on a case-by-case basis.	No	No	No
115.	415	Supports 5-6 storeys in the “D” bound by Waterson Way as development will be less visible and have less impact in the area.	No	<p>In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	No
116.	265, 351, 501	<p>Notes that overall outcome (h) in the Mixed use zone code contradicts the proposed building heights in ABLP – 01 Airlie Beach Local Plan: Heights plan.</p> <p><i>“Development has a low to medium-rise built form that is compatible with the intended scale and character of the streetscape and surrounding area, with a maximum building</i></p>	No	<p>In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	No

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
		<i>height of 12.0m above ground level."</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>			
117.	285	Recommends that should the proposed planning scheme be submitted to the State Government for consideration, there is a maximum of 6 storeys.	No	<p>In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	No
118.	231, 267	Precinct 1 (main street & foreshore) – Recommends that buildings on the south side of the main street between the starfish roundabout and the Coconut Grove roundabout be restricted to 4 storeys.	No	<p>In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	No
119.	267	Precinct 1(main street & foreshore) – Recommends that the area bound by the main street, esplanade and Coconut grove is restricted to 4 storeys.	No	<p>In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	No
120.	267	Precinct C (Waterson Way) – Recommends that buildings within the area bound by Waterson Way to increase in height as development progresses further inland. Buildings on the immediate south of the main street to be restricted to 4 storeys, increasing to 8 storeys further inland.	No	<p>In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	No
121.	267	Precinct A (Abell Point Marina) – Recommends that	No	In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan	Yes	Yes	No



No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
		buildings backing onto Shute Harbour Road and the western side of the headland to be restricted to 3 storeys.		and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>			
122.	267	Precinct F and G (Port of Airlie) – Recommends that all buildings within the Port of Airlie be restricted to 4 storeys.	No	In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	No
123.	267	Precinct B (Airlie Hill) – Recommends that the immediate area just outside of Waterson Way and inland of Shute Harbour Road through to just short of Plantation Drive be restricted to 8 storeys. Inland from Waterson Way, following the Airlie Creek valley, building heights increase from 8 storeys up to 16+ storeys	No	In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	No
124.	452	Recommends that a 'vision' for the future is developed so that development can conform to the "Vision of Airlie".	No	Council considers that the Strategic framework sets policy direction for the planning scheme, to guide and inform appropriate development. This part of the planning scheme will aid in guiding planning for the desired vision of region.	No	No	No
125.	85	Objects to building heights on the grounds that <i>"there is plenty of land...spread it out."</i>	No	Full consideration of the geographical surrounds of Airlie Beach must be considered. Airlie Beach is bound by the hills, forming a natural amphitheatre. As a result of the geographical layout, development is restricted and cannot "spread out".  Council is aware of the concern for the development of Airlie Beach. In light of projected increases in population and tourism visitation, it is critical that Council appropriately plan for development to support the key economic driver in this region, which is tourism.	No	No	No
126.	463, 473, 500,502,	Objects to building heights within Precinct B (Airlie Hill) being raised to 4 storeys, specifically in relation to existing approval 20090357. Two submissions were lodged against this proposal, building height and form and traffic and noise. Should the proposed building heights succeed, this may	No	The <i>Whitsunday Shire Planning Scheme 2009</i> and Port of Airlie approval was developed to allow for development appropriate at the time of planning. Since the establishment of the 2009 planning scheme and Port of Airlie approval, somewhat 6 years ago,	No	No	No

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
		result in proposals with increased building heights succeed.		development and demand has evolved rendering both documents outdated. The proposed planning scheme provides for growth for the next 20 years and therefore consideration has been given to all land within the Airlie Beach area for possible future growth and job creation.  The applicant of approval 20090357 may still undertake development as per approval. Should there be any request to change the existing approval (i.e. increase in height) it would require reassessment by Council's Planning Department.			
127.	249	Recommends that the two storey building height limit in Airlie Beach is 'heritage listed' to avoid future changes to building heights.	No	In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>• Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>• Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>• Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>• Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>• Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>• Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	No
128.	285	Objects to building heights of 4 and 8 storeys within the Airlie Hill 'amphitheatre' on the grounds that town and traffic noise will travel.	Yes	The proposed planning scheme was submitted to the State Government for assessment by all relevant State Agencies. The Department of Transport and Main Roads has reviewed the proposed planning scheme and provided sign off for approval.  All future development will be required to comply with Council's Car Parking and Transport Code within the proposed planning scheme and provide on-site car parking, as well as comply with any additional requirements from the State Department of Transport and Main Roads.	No	No	No
129.	351, 501	Objects to building heights on the grounds that the Port of Airlie development undertook an extensive EIS program and was approved for 5 storeys; thus the proposed building heights conflict with existing Port of Airlie approvals.	Yes	The <i>Whitsunday Shire Planning Scheme 2009</i> and Port of Airlie approval was developed to allow for development appropriate at the time of planning. Since the establishment of the 2009 planning scheme and Port of Airlie approval, somewhat 6 years ago, development and demand has evolved rendering both documents outdated.	No	No	No
130.	265, 450, 499, 501	Objects to building heights on the grounds that Council's informative reports, plans and studies do not fully justify or support an increase in building heights. These reports include: The Whitsunday Region Economic Analysis, Economic and Population Study (Norling 2013), Urban Growth Study and the Airlie Beach Structure Plan.	No	In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>• Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>• Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>• Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>• Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>• Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>• Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> <li>• Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>	Yes	Yes	No

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
131.	450, 499	Objects to building heights on the grounds that it will further alienate the main street from the Port of Airlie. The 12 storey building will dominate and separate the existing tenuous connection between the main street and the Port of Airlie.	No	Development at the Port of Airlie aims to provide further connectivity and completion of Airlie Beach as a whole. New infrastructure, particularly pedestrian paths will connect the Port of Airlie to the main street.	No	No	No
132.	15, 243, 363	Objects to building heights on the ground that no environmental impact study and/or social impact study has been completed on the community or sea life.	Yes	<p>The proposed planning scheme addresses the State Planning Policy interest relating to climate change. Depending on future funding Council may undertake specific studies in the future.</p> <p>The proposed planning scheme may also require information regarding environmental features and growth management as per schedule 6 "Planning Scheme Policies" to inform the assessment of development applications.</p> <p>Council are also undertaking a Scenic Amenity Study for the whole of the Whitsunday Region, to identify scenic and landscape values across the region along our key transport corridors. This will help inform any visual amenity issues resulting from future development. Council encourages the community to be involved in this future project.</p>	No	No	Yes
133.	15, 243, 363	Objects to building heights on the grounds that no study has been completed to understand the effects the increase in building heights will have on tourism numbers or what perceptions of Airlie Beach are from world-wide sources.	No	Existing buildings are constructed at 60+ meters to 80+ meters above sea level (AHD) within Airlie Beach. The potential height of the "worst case scenario" buildings suggested under the proposed planning scheme is 46m to 48m AHD. As such the potential impacts from buildings on the tourism industry is considered low and the requirement for further investigation into this matter, may be undertaken as part of any future local plan.	No	No	Yes
134.	201	Recommends that 8 and 12 storey buildings are photoshopped on the proposed sites and made public.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
135.	113	Recommends that Council undertake a risk assessment for storm surge.	Yes	<p>The proposed planning scheme was submitted to the State Government for assessment by all relevant State Agencies. The relevant departments have reviewed the proposed planning scheme and provided sign off for approval.</p> <p>The proposed planning scheme addresses the State Planning Policy interest relating to climate change. Depending on future funding Council may undertake specific studies in the future.</p>	No	No	Yes
136.	511	Concerns that building heights in Airlie Beach will increase tourist population and make flood evacuation unsafe.	Yes	All new development in Airlie Beach will need to meet minimum flood safety standards or will be assessed to determine impact on a case-by-case basis.	No	No	No

## Appendix F – Car Parking, Traffic & Access – Summary of Issues Raised in Submissions and Council’s Response

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
<b>Car Parking, Traffic and Access</b>							
137.	113, 124, 144, 146, 182, 185, 189	Minimal mention within scheme on how car parking and traffic movement in Airlie Beach is being addressed.	Yes	The proposed planning scheme was submitted to the State Government for assessment by all relevant State Agencies. The Department of Transport and Main Roads has reviewed the proposed planning scheme and acknowledges that it addresses the State interest. Car parking and traffic movements are considered for any development application and are assessed against the Transport and Parking Code. It is considered that the proposed planning scheme adequately addresses this issue.	No	No	No
138.	20, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400	Recommends the foreshore carpark is landscaped and returned to its original purpose.	No	The foreshore car park is currently owned by the State Government in trust to Council for the purposes as a temporary car park. Matters to the revegetation of this area are outside the jurisdiction of a planning scheme and will be considered separately by Council.	No	No	No
139.	113, 203	Requests that the main street of Airlie Beach be focused on pedestrians, not vehicles.	No	This is considered to be outside the jurisdiction of a planning scheme. This issue has been forwarded to Council's Engineering Department for consideration.	No	No	No
140.	286	Objects to the proposed planning scheme on the grounds that it does not adequately address vehicle traffic issues caused by the major redevelopments on Day Dream Island and Lindeman Island. Questions what road system is being planned as the foreseeable traffic issues cannot be addressed with traffic lights or round-a-bouts, will compulsory land acquisition occur?	Yes	The proposed planning scheme was submitted to the State Government for assessment by all relevant State Agencies. The Department of Transport and Main Roads has reviewed the proposed planning scheme and acknowledges that it addresses the State interest. Car parking and traffic movements are considered for any development application and are assessed against the Transport and Parking Code. It is considered that the proposed planning scheme adequately addresses this issue.	No	No	No
141.	267	Notes that alternate access to Shute Harbour Road is required. It is suggested access from Jubilee Pocket through to the Whitsunday Transit Bus Depot, with connecting feeders down into Cannonvale and Airlie Beach.	No	This is considered to be outside the jurisdiction of a planning scheme. This has been forwarded to Council's Engineering Department for consideration.	No	No	No
142.	415, 501	Notes that there is no bike or pedestrian pathway on Paluma Road.	No	This is considered to be outside the jurisdiction of a planning scheme. This has been forwarded to Council's Engineering Department for consideration.	No	No	No
143.	501	On-road cycle lanes are too narrow and disappear in several places.	No	This is considered to be outside the jurisdiction of a planning scheme. This has been forwarded to Council's Engineering Department for consideration.	No	No	No
144.	113	Recommends alternative opportunities for the main street and Waterson Way in regards to closing off the main street and opening it up to Waterson Way.	No	This is considered to be outside the jurisdiction of a planning scheme. This has been forwarded to Council's Engineering Department for consideration.	No	No	No
145.	217, 220	Concerns regarding contributions from developments for parking yet it cannot be seen “where these paid-for spaces have been allocated.”	No	This submission is considered to be outside the jurisdiction of a planning scheme.	No	No	No
146.	217, 220	Concerns regarding the reduced car parking requirements a minimal fee for the Heart Hotel on the Airlie Beach main street.	No	This submission is considered to be outside the jurisdiction of a planning scheme.	No	No	No
147.	20, 227, 228	Recommends altering traffic flows and pedestrian crossings to be pedestrian friendly. Consider heavy traffic access restrictions after 8am.	No	Noted. This issue has been referred to Council's Engineering Services Department.	No	No	No
148.	227, 228	Recommends that all structures with amplified music must face the sea.	No	Council will assess all applications for uses containing amplified music in accordance with the requirements of the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1994</i> .	No	No	No

## Appendix G – Consultation – Summary of Issues Raised in Submissions and Council’s Response

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
<b>Consultation</b>							
149.	15, 18, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 43, 46, 47, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 65, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 82, 83, 84, 88, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 98, 99, 101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 110, 112, 114, 130, 132, 140, 143, 149, 151, 152, 157, 167, 168, 174, 175, 181, 195, 196, 199, 200, 204, 207, 211, 214, 215, 216, 220, 221, 239, 241, 243, 246, 346, 363, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 414, 416, 417, 418, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 499, 501, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657	Notes that the public consultation process undertaken was inadequate.	No	<p>As Council endeavours to implement best practices when consulting with the community, it is understood that feedback and comments from the community are critical in improving these processes.</p> <p>Council undertook consultation as per the requirements under the <i>Sustainable Planning Act 2009</i>, and Making or Amending a Local Planning Instrument State Statutory Guideline. In order to encourage public input, Council extended this period and the consultation activities beyond the statutory requirements. Information regarding the activities undertaken are further detailed in this report.</p> <p>It should also be noted that a second round of consultation is being undertaken in relation to amendments to the draft planning scheme.</p>	No	No	No
150.	52, 55	Raises concerns over perceived lack of consultation with the public over the proposed building heights and general “smoke and mirrors” approach of Council.	No	<p>As Council endeavours to implement best practices when consulting with the community, it is understood that feedback and comments from the community are critical in improving these processes.</p> <p>Council undertook consultation as per the requirements under the <i>Sustainable Planning Act 2009</i>, and Making or Amending a Local Planning Instrument State Statutory Guideline. In order to encourage public input, Council extended this period and the consultation activities beyond the statutory requirements. Information regarding the activities undertaken are further detailed in this report.</p> <p>It should also be noted that a second round of consultation is being undertaken in relation to amendments to the draft planning scheme.</p>	No	No	No
151.	102, 173, 186, 187, 200, 228	Lack of consultation, timeframe too short and two week extension is not enough for such a policy change.	No	<p>As Council endeavours to implement best practices when consulting with the community, it is understood that feedback and comments from the community are critical in improving these processes.</p> <p>Council undertook consultation as per the requirements under the <i>Sustainable Planning Act 2009</i>, and Making or Amending a Local Planning Instrument State Statutory Guideline. In order to encourage public input, Council extended this period and the consultation activities beyond the statutory requirements. Information regarding the activities undertaken are</p>	No	No	No



No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
				further detailed in this report.  It should also be noted that a second round of consultation is being undertaken in relation to amendments to the draft planning scheme.			
152.	59, 102, 210	Landowners should have been notified by post or in the rates notice.	No	As Council endeavours to implement best practices when consulting with the community, it is understood that feedback and comments from the community are critical in improving these processes.  Council undertook consultation as per the requirements under the <i>Sustainable Planning Act 2009</i> , and Making or Amending a Local Planning Instrument State Statutory Guideline. In order to encourage public input, Council extended this period and the consultation activities beyond the statutory requirements. Information regarding the activities undertaken are further detailed in this report.  It should also be noted that a second round of consultation is being undertaken in relation to amendments to the draft planning scheme.	No	No	No
153.	102, 117	Public Consultation seems rushed and suggests a hidden agenda.	No	As Council endeavours to implement best practices when consulting with the community, it is understood that feedback and comments from the community are critical in improving these processes.  Council undertook consultation as per the requirements under the <i>Sustainable Planning Act 2009</i> , and Making or Amending a Local Planning Instrument State Statutory Guideline. In order to encourage public input, Council extended this period and the consultation activities beyond the statutory requirements. Information regarding the activities undertaken are further detailed in this report.  It should also be noted that a second round of consultation is being undertaken in relation to amendments to the draft planning scheme.	No	No	No
154.	74	Believes a judicial review should take place to investigate the lack of public consultation.	No	As Council endeavours to implement best practices when consulting with the community, it is understood that feedback and comments from the community are critical in improving these processes.  Council undertook consultation as per the requirements under the <i>Sustainable Planning Act 2009</i> , and Making or Amending a Local Planning Instrument State Statutory Guideline. In order to encourage public input, Council extended this period and the consultation activities beyond the statutory requirements. Information regarding the activities undertaken are further detailed in this report.  It should also be noted that a second round of consultation is being undertaken in relation to amendments to the draft planning scheme.	No	No	No
155.	228	Believes that uploading the proposed planning	No	As Council endeavours to implement best practices	No	No	No

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
		scheme to the Council website and “slipping” the advertising into Public Notices was a “ <i>deliberate method to comply with ‘exposure’ requirements in the sneakiest way.</i> ”		<p>when consulting with the community, it is understood that feedback and comments from the community are critical in improving these processes.</p> <p>Council undertook consultation as per the requirements under the <i>Sustainable Planning Act 2009</i>, and Making or Amending a Local Planning Instrument State Statutory Guideline. In order to encourage public input, Council extended this period and the consultation activities beyond the statutory requirements. Information regarding the activities undertaken are further detailed in this report.</p> <p>It should also be noted that a second round of consultation is being undertaken in relation to amendments to the draft planning scheme.</p>			
156.	228	Questioned why the public were not notified about the proposed planning scheme by sending flyers with rates notices.	No	<p>As Council endeavours to implement best practices when consulting with the community, it is understood that feedback and comments from the community are critical in improving these processes.</p> <p>Council undertook consultation as per the requirements under the <i>Sustainable Planning Act 2009</i>, and Making or Amending a Local Planning Instrument State Statutory Guideline. In order to encourage public input, Council extended this period and the consultation activities beyond the statutory requirements. Information regarding the activities undertaken are further detailed in this report.</p> <p>It should also be noted that a second round of consultation is being undertaken in relation to amendments to the draft planning scheme.</p>	No	No	No
157.	228	<i>“The investors who have been looking at advertising overseas have seen artist impressions of the concept before the ratepayers even knew about it. Why hasn’t the Council provided ratepayers with an artist’s impression? This demonstrates the one-sided closed mind approach being taken by Council.”</i>	No	<p>Council have not received a copy of any artist impressions of development within Airlie Beach at this stage. As such, it is difficult for Council to assess the likely impacts or benefits of development that has not been through the assessment process.</p> <p>Council endeavours to implement best practices when consulting the community. This statement will inform future consultation programs to achieve a positive outcome. Council has undertaken Public Consultation over and above the requirements of the <i>Sustainable Planning Act 2009</i> and the Making or Amending a Local Planning Instrument State Statutory Guideline.</p>	No	No	No
158.	511	Commends the proposed planning scheme on being well organised and allows everyone with the opportunity to understand the intention for development.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
159.	113	Commends Council on the distribution and information contained within the factsheets.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
160.	113	Commends Council on the handling of the Airlie Beach community consultation at the PCYC. Notes the disappointment at comments and lack of knowledge of some participants.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
161.	56, 77, 113	Recommends that Council liaise with voluntary	No	Council endeavours to implement best practices when	No	No	No

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
		organisations that have contact with many tourists to obtain feedback regarding the region.		<p>consulting the community. This statement will inform future consultation programs to achieve a positive outcome. Council has undertaken Public Consultation over and above the requirements of the <i>Sustainable Planning Act 2009</i> and the Making or Amending a Local Planning Instrument State Statutory Guideline.</p> <p>Further detailed information regarding the consultation process undertaken through the development of the proposed planning scheme is provided in the body of this report.</p>			
162.	496	Believes that there is mistrust in the community due to poor consultation practices across Council as an organisation. Draws links to previous poor experience with the water rates scheme.	No	<p>Council endeavours to implement best practices when consulting the community. This statement will inform future consultation programs to achieve a positive outcome. Council has undertaken Public Consultation over and above the requirements of the <i>Sustainable Planning Act 2009</i> and the Making or Amending a Local Planning Instrument State Statutory Guideline.</p> <p>Further detailed information regarding the consultation process undertaken through the development of the proposed planning scheme is provided in the body of this report.</p>	No	No	No
163.	237, 239, , 341, 357, 358, 381, 384, 385, 386, 388, 389, 464, 465, 466, 467, 484, 507, 508, 509, 520, 662, 663, 664	Comments that consultation meetings were “presentations” and did not provide satisfactory answers for many of the questions asked in the Bowen PCYC consultation.	No	<p>Consultation meetings were presentations to give the community an overview of the proposed planning scheme and inform them on the process of making a formal submission on the planning scheme. These sessions were coupled with one-on-one question time with Council planners. Further information sessions were undertaken with key stakeholders across the region as well as appointments with community members as requested.</p> <p>Council endeavours to implement best practices when consulting the community. This statement will inform future consultation programs to achieve a positive outcome. Council has undertaken Public Consultation over and above the requirements of the <i>Sustainable Planning Act 2009</i> and the Making or Amending a Local Planning Instrument State Statutory Guideline.</p> <p>Further detailed information regarding the consultation process undertaken through the development of the proposed planning scheme is provided in the body of this report.</p>	No	No	No



## Appendix H – Development Manual – Summary of Issues Raised in Submissions and Council's Response

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
<b>Development Manual</b>							
164.	510	AP1.03-2 and AP1.06: Notes that there is duplication of the approval process.	No	These are two different steps of the process, one to review the drawings and the second to check that the infrastructure was built in accordance with the drawings.	No	No	No
165.	510	AP1.08-1: Concerned about the timing of the QLeave, levy should be required at pre-start.	No	The timing of the QLeave payment is prescribed in the <i>Building and Construction Industry (Portable Long Service Leave) Act 1991</i> and the <i>Building and Construction Industry (Portable Long Service Leave) Regulation 2013</i> .	No	No	No
166.	510	AP1.08-10: Concerned that the level of information in the Design Report is excessive and costly.	No	Council requires a particular level of information to ensure the quality and safety of works.	No	No	No
167.	510	CP1.06: Recommends investigation of the 5% security bond.	No	The security bond is applied at the discretion of Council on a case-by-case basis.	No	No	No
168.	510	CP1.11: Recommends that the requirement for notices or signage should be removed due to cost.	No	Council will consider this request in future amendments of the proposed planning scheme once further investigations have been conducted.	No	No	Yes
169.	490, 510	CP1.26-3: Notes that sewer main CCTV is costly compared to other checks.	No	Council will remove all reference to CCTV checks.	Yes	No	No
170.	490, 510	CP1.26-3: Stormwater CCTV is costly compared to other checks.	No	Council will remove all reference to CCTV checks.	Yes	No	No
171.	490, 510	CP Appendixes: Recommends further consideration of Inspection Test Requirements.	No	Noted. The requirement to advertise the development in the newspaper has been removed.	Yes	No	No
172.	510	Recommends further consideration of presentation of as constructed drawings.	No	Council will consider this request in future amendments of the proposed planning scheme once further investigations have been conducted.	No	No	Yes
173.	510	Notes that Carriageway widths are excessive.	No	The proposed carriageway widths meet the current industry standards and will not be reduced.	No	No	No
174.	510	D1.14: Notes that the kerb radii at cul-de-sacs is too prescriptive.	No	The minimum standards provided are prescriptive, however alternate solutions will be accepted and assessed on a case-by-case basis.	No	No	No
175.	510	D1.21 Recommends reduction of kerb grades to 0.3%.	No	Council will consider this request in future amendments of the proposed planning scheme once further investigations have been conducted.	No	No	Yes
176.	510	D1.4: Recommends review of pavement widths due to practicality.	No	The pavements width standards have generally not changed from the previous development manual and reflects industry standards.	No	No	No
177.	510	D3.06-6: Recommends to add Civil Engineer to existing Geotechnical Engineer.	No	The Development Manual has been amended to include "and/or Civil Engineer".	Yes	No	No
178.	510	Table 3.2: Collector Road thickness and subbase is considered to be excessive.	No	Council will consider this request in future amendments of the proposed planning scheme once further investigations have been conducted.	No	No	Yes
179.	510	D4.13: Recommends that stormwater drainage provision is reviewed.	No	The stormwater drainage provisions have been amended to be generally in accordance with the current Development Manual standards.	Yes	No	No
180.	510	D4.19-1: Recommends that easement width basis is too prescriptive and excessive.	No	Council will consider this request in future amendments of the proposed planning scheme once further investigations have been conducted.	No	No	Yes
181.	510	Table 7.6: Recommends that side boundary alignment width of 0.8m for sewer pipes is inadequate.	No	A 0.8m side boundary sewer pipe alignment is the current industry standard.	No	No	No
182.	510	D7.10: Recommends that alternative pits should be considered as end of line access.	No	Council will consider this request in future amendments of the proposed planning scheme once further investigations have been conducted.	No	No	Yes
183.	510	Table 2.1: Recommends that CBR base and subbase requirements should be reviewed.	No	Council has investigated the request and made appropriate amendments to Table 2.1, particularly 'Type 2.2' will be amended to 'Type 2.1'.	Yes	No	No
184.	510	S4.03 Recommends that rubber ring jointed stormwater pipes should not be precluded in some applications.	No	Council has reviewed the request and has amended S4.03-2 and S4.03-3 has been deleted.	Yes	No	No
185.	490, 510	S4 – Appendix A: Recommends that CCTV inspections are costly and unnecessary.	No	Council will remove all reference to CCTV checks.	Yes	No	No
186.	490, 510	S6.3: Recommends that CCTV inspections are costly and unnecessary.	No	Council will remove all reference to CCTV checks.	Yes	No	No
187.	490	Recommends that QUDM ARI levels should be	No	ARI 5 levels meet the current industry standards and will be maintained to ensure	No	No	No

		reduced to ARI 5 from ARI 2 to save on costs.		a minimal impacts from overflow flooding.			
188.	490	Recommends that ADAC data is not useful and increases cost of development per lot.	No	Council will consider this request in future amendments of the proposed planning scheme once further investigations have been conducted.	No	No	<b>Yes</b>
189.	490	Recommends that increase in width of road pavement requirements add additional cost to development.	No	The pavement widths in the Development Manual meet the current industry standards.	No	No	No
190.	490	Recommends that Council should use Development Manual as a standard of construction, reiterated from point one above.	No	Council will review its internal process, to ensure that the Development Manual is being applied.	No	No	<b>Yes</b>
191.	490	Recommends that review of standard drawings and highlights a missing drawing.	No	Council will consider this request in future amendments of the proposed planning scheme once further investigations have been conducted and immediately add any 'missing drawings'.	<b>Yes</b>	No	<b>Yes</b>

## Appendix I – Environment – Summary of Issues Raised in Submissions and Council's Response

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
<b>Environment</b>							
192.	454	Objects on the grounds that the proposed planning scheme has no mention of "Advancing the purpose of the <i>Sustainable Planning Act 2009</i> "(SPA) and that Ecological Sustainable Development the main purpose of SPA does not get a mention.	No	The proposed planning scheme advances the purpose of the SPA and Ecological Sustainable Development through the implementation of various State planning instruments such as the Queensland Planning Provisions (QPP) and the State Planning Policy (SPP).	No	No	No
193.	454	Objects on the grounds that the proposed planning scheme does not mention climate change and the need to consider the impact of planning and development assessment on climate change.	No	<p>Council understands the concern regarding these issues, however it is satisfied that elements of the Planning Scheme will address these.</p> <p>The proposed planning scheme has developed a Coastal protection overlay code. The purpose of the code as stated in Section 8.2.5 of the proposed planning scheme is to ensure development is designed, constructed and operated to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Protect, conserve, rehabilitate, and manage the coast, including its resources and biological diversity;</li> <li>b) Avoid the social, financial and environmental costs arising from adverse impacts of coastal hazards, taking into account the predicted effects of climate change;</li> <li>c) Preferentially use land on the coast for coastal-dependent development; and</li> <li>d) Ensure development maintains the safety of people and property.</li> </ul> <p>The proposed planning scheme also identifies areas of temporary inundation (Map CP1) and Permanent inundation (Map CP2) with the proposed planning scheme managing any intensification in relation to development in these locations.</p>	No	No	No
194.	454	Objects on the grounds that the proposed planning scheme is misleading when it states it is advancing the purpose of the SPA.	No	The proposed planning scheme advances the purpose of the SPA and Ecological Sustainable Development through the implementation of various state planning instruments such as the Queensland Planning Provisions (QPP) and the Sustainable Planning Policy (SPP).	No	No	No
195.	184, 345, 454	Objects on the grounds that the proposed planning scheme does not reflect the regions Mackay Isaac Whitsunday Regional Plan as required by the SPA.	No	The proposed planning scheme has undertaken a State Interest Review where the Minister of Planning, supported by the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning considers State Interests. As a result of the review the Minister was satisfied the relevant State interests have been integrated, and Council may consult on this version of the proposed planning scheme.	No	No	No
196.	454	Objects on the grounds that the proposed planning scheme requires adaptations to manage the risk from climate variability and extremes to address; water resources, ecosystems and their services, coastal zones, human settlements, insurance implications and human health.	No	<p>Council understands the concern regarding these issues, however it is satisfied that elements of the Planning Scheme will address these.</p> <p>The proposed planning scheme has developed a Coastal protection overlay code. The purpose of the code as stated in Section 8.2.5 of the proposed planning scheme is to ensure development is designed, constructed and operated to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Protect, conserve, rehabilitate, and manage the coast, including its resources and biological diversity;</li> <li>b) Avoid the social, financial and environmental costs arising from adverse impacts of coastal hazards, taking into account the predicted effects of climate change</li> <li>c) Preferentially use land on the coast for coastal-dependent development; and</li> <li>d) Ensure development maintains the safety of people and property.</li> </ul> <p>The proposed planning scheme also identifies areas of temporary inundation (Map CP1) and Permanent inundation (Map CP2) with the</p>	No	No	No

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
				<p>proposed planning scheme managing any intensification in relation to development in these locations.</p> <p>Whitsunday Regional Council is a member of the Coastal Councils Adaptation Taskforce. Through this membership Council will progress its understanding, knowledge and action on coastal climate change adaptation matters including the continual development of governance and policies.</p>			
197.	454	Objects on the grounds that the proposed planning scheme claims to preserve all matters of ecological environmental scenic value while promoting developments such as the Multi Cargo Port Facility at the Port of Abbot Point and Urannah Dam.	No	<p>The proposed planning scheme needs to balance the outcomes of the Strategic framework. The proposed planning scheme looks to ensure the Whitsundays is a prosperous, liveable and sustainable region where people live work play and invest. The scheme does this through the following five themes that collectively represent the policy intent of the proposed planning scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liveable communities and housing;</li> <li>• Economic growth;</li> <li>• Environment and heritage</li> <li>• Hazards and safety; and</li> <li>• Transport and infrastructure.</li> </ul>	No	No	No
198.	454	Objects on the grounds that the proposed planning scheme promotes a water pipeline from Bowen River Catchment to the Galilee Basin when the Galilee Water Infrastructure Project that will supply water to the basin is already at an EIS stage of approval.	No	<p>Matters stated in the Strategic framework are an expression of aspiration to be met by 2036. These aspirations are designed to support the Strategic framework and policy intent of the proposed planning scheme relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liveable communities and housing;</li> <li>• Economic growth;</li> <li>• Environment and heritage</li> <li>• Hazards and safety; and</li> <li>• Transport and infrastructure.</li> </ul>	No	No	No
199.	454	Objects on the grounds that the proposed planning scheme promotes Urannah Dam when the Connors Dam has already been approved.	No	Noted. The Connors' River Dam Project is wholly contained within the Isaac region and does not provide any benefits to the Whitsunday Region.	No	No	No
200.	454	Objects on the grounds that the proposed planning scheme promotes the transmission corridor from Collinsville to the Galilee Basin when a power station is proposed by Adani for its mines and neighbouring mines in the Galilee Basin. The project would be a waste of resources and that it will pose unacceptable biodiversity outcomes.	No	<p>Matters stated in the Strategic framework are an expression of aspiration to be met by 2036. These aspirations are designed to support the Strategic framework and policy intent of the proposed planning scheme relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liveable communities and housing;</li> <li>• Economic growth;</li> <li>• Environment and heritage</li> <li>• Hazards and safety; and</li> <li>• Transport and infrastructure.</li> </ul>	No	No	No
201.	454	Objects on the grounds that the proposed planning scheme does not mention how to deal with waste. Recommends that a futuristic waste management policy to deliver Green House Gas abatement, recycling, production of biogas and renewable energy.	No	The management of waste is not within the jurisdiction of a planning scheme. Waste is managed through Whitsunday Regional Council's Waste Management Plan. The Waste Management Plan is written in accordance with the <i>Waste Reduction and Recycling Act 2011</i> and is currently under review to include provisions to assess aspects such as Green House Gas abatement and recycling.	No	No	No

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
202.	231, 454, 496	Objects on the grounds that the proposed planning scheme does not mention protecting nationally protected wetlands or Great Barrier Reef Protected Wetlands.	No	The proposed planning scheme recognises all matter of state environmental significance (MSES) including wetlands. Both nationally significant wetlands and wetland protection areas within the Great Barrier Reef Catchments are identified in the proposed planning scheme Waterways and wetlands overly mapping (Map WW1). Outlined in Section 8.2.12. The purpose of the Waterways and Wetlands overlay code is to ensure that: a) Matters of environmental significance are protected; b) Ecological connectivity and habitat extent are maintained or enhanced; c) Wetland and waterways are protected, maintained or enhanced; and d) Development in or adjacent to wetlands in the Great Barrier Reef catchments is planned, designed, constructed and operated to prevent the loss or degradation of the wetlands and their environmental values.	No	No	No
203.	53, 454	Objects on the grounds that increased growth will destroy habitat and development should be contained to existing areas.	No	Council is considered to be protecting the environment through a number of provisions of the proposed planning scheme, namely that only existing approved developments and zoning is reflected in the proposed planning scheme and new urban areas are identified where it is demonstrated that there is a need.  Council believe there is sufficient land for residential purposes to 2036 within the identified zoned areas. The exception to this rule is the shortfall with industrial zoned land in our region. Council has zoned additional industrial land in areas that are already considered urban in nature, free of environmental features and close to existing transport corridors.	No	No	No
204.	124, 144, 146, 182, 185,189, 454	Objects on the grounds that the proposed planning scheme does not protect the natural environment.	Yes	Council have addressed the natural environment throughout all aspects of the proposed planning scheme and has achieved substantial compliance with the State Planning Policy.  Council are always looking to improve its protection of the natural environment and have begun work in protecting our regions waterways through development of a water quality strategy; protection of our natural scenic values through the development of a scenic amenity study; protecting encroachment from development on our key ecological areas by refusing any additional land for rural residential purposes in all areas other than Bowen and Collinsville.	No	No	Yes
205.	454, 511	Concerns regarding that an increase in tourism in the area will damage the environment.	Yes	All new tourist activities in the area will be assessed against the State and local interests to ensure that no unreasonable impact on the environment will occur.	No	No	No
206.	237, 239, , 341, 357, 358, 381, 384, 385, 386, 388, 389, 454, 464, 465, 466, 467, 484, 507, 508, 509, 520, 662, 663, 664	Questions who is to be responsible for the maintenance and costs of wildlife corridors?	No	This is considered to be outside the jurisdiction of a planning scheme. The maintenance of Environmental Corridors is a partnership between the State Government, Council, Landowners and Not for Profit Organisations.	No	No	No



## Appendix J – Extractive Industry – Summary of Issues Raised in Submissions and Council’s Response

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
<b>Extractive Industry</b>							
207.	150	<p>Of particular importance to Boral is the appropriate integration of the State Planning Policy’s (SPP) Development and Constructions, Mining and Extractive Resources; and Emissions and Hazardous Activities sectors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recommendation 1:</b> Review the proposed planning scheme on an ‘across the board’ basis to ensure it appropriately reflects and incorporates the principles of the SPP.</li> <li>▪ <b>Recommendation 2:</b> Review and adopt the recommendations regarding specific Boral sites as set out in this submission.</li> </ul>	<b>Yes</b>	The proposed planning scheme has undertaken a State Interest Review where the Minister of Planning, supported by the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning considers State Interests. As a result of the review the Minister was satisfied the relevant State interests have been integrated, and Council may consult on this version of the proposed planning scheme.	No	No	No
208.	150	<p>The proposed planning scheme Codes relevant to Extractive industry are ambiguous and contrary to industry standards that would advance the State’s interest in extractive resources.</p> <p>Boral has been actively involved with Cement Concrete Aggregates Australia (CCAA) and the State Government in developing specific standard planning scheme provisions that will provide consistency and certainty for both the community and the industry. These new provisions, referred to as the Extractive Industry Model Codes (version 1.0), include the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extractive Industry Zone Code; and</li> <li>• Extractive Industry Use Code.</li> </ul> <p>More recently the State government has prepared a Model extractive resources overlay code, which forms part of the SPP Mining and extractive resources state interest guideline. Boral endorses the model extractive resources overlay code as a very good solution to provide the necessary protection for Key Resource Areas (KRA) from encroachment by incompatible and sensitive development (including non-residential activities).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recommendation 1:</b> Review and incorporate the following CCAA and State Government Model Codes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CCAA Extractive Industry Zone Code;</li> <li>• CCAA Extractive Industry Use Code; and</li> <li>• SPP Model extractive resources overlay code.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<b>Yes</b>	The proposed planning scheme has undertaken a State Interest Review where the Minister of Planning, supported by the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning considers State Interests. As a result of the review the Minister was satisfied the relevant State interests have been integrated, and Council may consult on this version of the proposed planning scheme.	No	No	No
209.	150	<p>The proposed planning scheme does not adopt an Extractive industry zone.</p> <p>Extractive industry uses are therefore subject to unreasonable and unnecessary assessment provisions, including Impact assessment.</p> <p>This is of particular concern to Boral who operate the Gregory River Quarry which is a designated KRA (KRA No. 27).</p> <p>Implementation of the Rural zone as an assessment mechanism for Extractive industry gives rise to potential encroachment by incompatible and sensitive development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recommendation 1:</b> Adopt an Extractive Industry zone and apply to Key Resource Areas within the Whitsunday Regional Council area; and</li> <li>▪ <b>Recommendation 2:</b> Apply Code Assessment provisions to Extractive Industry in the Extractive Industry zone.</li> </ul> <p>In the instance that an Extractive Industry zone is not adopted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recommendation 1:</b> Enable Extractive Industry to be Code assessable development within the Rural zone, where contained within the Extractive resources overlay.</li> </ul>	<b>Yes</b>	An Extractive industry zone and provisions will not be developed at this point in time for the proposed planning scheme. Adequate provisions are in place to address potential issues such as encroachment of incompatible and sensitive development. In particular, the Gregory River Quarry is a protected resource as per the Extractive resources overlay. This site is identified as a Key Resource Area/Processing area. It is also surrounded by a 1km Extractive resource separation area buffer.	No	No	No



No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
210.	150	<p>Extractive Industry uses require support from auxiliary uses, including Caretaker's Accommodation, Research and Technology Industry (on-site test labs) and Office.</p> <p>It is common for extractive industry uses to form part of an integrated network with associated industrial uses such as concrete batching plants and other medium or high impact industrial uses.</p> <p>As the draft scheme does not propose an extractive industry zone, Extractive Industry is required to conform to the provisions of the specified zone, generally the Rural zone.</p> <p>Under the proposed Planning Scheme, High impact industry defaults to Impact assessment in the Rural zone.</p> <p><b>If Extractive Industry Zone is adopted, apply level of assessment tables to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recommendation 1:</b> Provide for auxiliary uses (Caretaker's Accommodation, Office, and Research and Technology Industry (on- site test lab)) as Exempt development; and</li> <li>▪ <b>Recommendation 2:</b> Extend support for the co-location of synergistic uses to Concrete batching plants and other medium and high impact industry uses to assist in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• promoting efficient business operations;</li> <li>• reducing trips and impacts associated with multiple haul routes; and</li> <li>• containing and minimising potential adverse impacts.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	No	<p>Due to the potential amenity and environmental issues, a full assessment of any extractive industry proposals will be required to be undertaken. The scope of rural activities in comparison to that of extractive industry is vastly different and therefore requires thorough assessment.</p> <p>It should be noted that Caretaker's accommodation, Dwelling house and Home based business are all self-assessable and Rural workers accommodation is code assessable. The Extractive resources overlay does not increase the level of assessment.</p>	No	No	No
211.	150	<p>The proposed hours of operation do not fully align with the CCAA Extractive Industry Model Codes, which is intended for state-wide adoption in all new planning schemes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recommendation 1:</b> Amend Extractive industry code to support the following hours of operation for Extractive Industry: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9am to 5pm Monday to Friday for blasting operations;</li> <li>• 6am to 6pm Monday to Saturday for other operations; and</li> <li>• 6am to 10pm Monday to Saturday for maintenance of equipment and vehicles.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ <b>Recommendation 2:</b> Where sufficient evidence can be provided that the use will not result in disturbance at surrounding uses, extended hours of operation should be supported.</li> </ul>	Yes	<p>The proposed planning scheme has undertaken a State Interest Review where the Minister of Planning, supported by the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning considers State Interests. As a result of the review the Minister was satisfied the relevant State interests have been integrated, and Council may consult on this version of the proposed planning scheme.</p> <p>Extended operational hours are not supported as a full assessment of potential impacts is required.</p>	No	No	No
212.	150	<p>The Queensland Planning Provisions do not mandate level of assessment of particular land uses within particular land use zones.</p> <p>Nonetheless, the proposed planning scheme defaults High impact industry to Impact assessment in all industry zones except the High impact industry zone and Special industry zone.</p> <p>Whilst the High impact industry land use definition, by name has associations with a high level of impact, it is appropriate for concrete batching and possibly other specific types of High impact industry uses to remain Code assessable uses within the Medium impact precinct, where suitable assessment measures are put in place.</p> <p>Various local governments, including Brisbane City Council, are acknowledging that concrete batching plant in most instances do not generate the level of impact aligned with 'high impact industry', and are subsequently reviewing industry thresholds and levels of assessment to facilitate code assessable provisions for concrete batching plants in the medium impact industry zone/precinct.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recommendation 1:</b> Amend the proposed planning scheme to enable certain High</li> </ul>	Yes	<p>Council acknowledges this recommendation; however, High impact industry uses should be located in the High impact industry one, where this does not occur, further assessment of the potential impact is required.</p> <p>Council acknowledges this recommendation; however, existing concrete batching plants will have existing use rights and not require assessment. Any intensification of the use would require further assessment of the potential impact.</p>	No	No	No

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
		<p>impact industry land uses (i.e. concrete batching plants) to be code assessable development within the Medium Impact Industry Zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Recommendation 2:</b> Include performance-based solutions / acceptable outcomes in the Medium impact industry zone code, to provide the supporting framework to enable existing concrete batching plants to be Code assessable development in the Medium impact industry zone.</li> </ul>					
213.	150	<p>Land suitable for High impact industry uses are a limited resource and the unfettered allowance of certain lower order or potentially incompatible uses within these areas has the potential to erode the available land supply for high impact industries across the Whitsunday Regional Council Local Government Area.</p> <p>It is important to ensure the ongoing operation of high impact industrial uses is not compromised through the introduction of incompatible or inappropriate land uses.</p> <p>High impact industry areas are a limited resource and the unfettered allowance of certain lower order or potentially incompatible uses within these areas has the potential to erode the available land supply for high impact industries across the regional government area.</p> <p>It is important to ensure the ongoing operation of high impact industrial uses within the High impact industry zone is not compromised through the introduction of incompatible or inappropriate land uses.</p> <p>Where Low impact industry, Service industry and Warehouse uses are included, they can potentially undermine the development, expansion, or operation of High impact industry uses on the basis of reverse amenity impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Recommendation 1:</b> Maintain the proposed High impact industry provisions including zone code, assessment criteria and level of assessment table.</li> </ul>	No	Noted.	No	No	No
214.	150	<p>The proposed planning scheme does not sufficiently provide for the protection of key industrial activities and industrial zoned land from incompatible land uses.</p> <p>An important principle of the Emissions and Hazardous Activities sector of the SPP is "preventing the unreasonable encroachment and unnecessary restriction of industrial development by incompatible development."</p> <p>Whilst the High impact industry zone code seeks to address certain interface issues, it is considered that these provisions do not satisfactorily restrict encroachment by incompatible and sensitive development on key industrial activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Recommendation 1:</b> Council introduce an industrial amenity overlay (similar to that adopted by Brisbane City Council's City Plan 2014) which identifies and restricts sensitive development within proximity of key industrial land.</li> <li><b>Recommendation 2:</b> Council apply Impact assessment provisions to sensitive and incompatible development within the buffer or separation areas.</li> </ul>	No	<p>Council acknowledges this recommendation; however, adequate provisions are in place to address potential issues such as encroachment of incompatible and sensitive development. The Extractive resources overlay identifies Key Resource Area/Processing area(s) and defines Extractive resource separation area buffers.</p> <p>Council will further investigate assessment provision for the development of sensitive and incompatible development within the separation areas identified on the Extractive resources overlay.</p>	No	No	Yes
215.	150	<p>Mobile and temporary facilities are critical to the delivery of Boral's services as they provide additional capacity to the fixed plant network, dedicated capability to large projects and capability in areas not normally serviced by the market.</p> <p>Mobile and temporary facilities are not clearly dealt with in the proposed planning scheme and are therefore likely to predominantly default to Impact assessment, which is inconsistent with the way they are dealt with in the <i>Sustainable Planning Act 2009</i> (SPA) when for the purpose of Community Infrastructure.</p> <p>The proposed planning scheme definitions include Temporary use as an administrative definition; however inadequate clarification is applied. This is inconsistent with Drafting</p>	No	<p>Council acknowledges this recommendation and will further investigate the level of assessment of high impact industrial uses (where a use is temporary), which are ancillary to existing/approved high impact industrial uses.</p> <p>Council acknowledges this recommendation and will further investigate the clarification of mobile and temporary crushing and screening and concrete batching as an example of a</p>	No	No	Yes

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
		<p>Principle 2 of the QPP, which seeks to ensure that “users readily understand how to apply and interpret the planning scheme”.</p> <p>It is therefore unclear as to whether they would then fall within the more regular land use definition for the specific nature of the use (e.g. High impact industry, of which concrete batching is an example) or if they would be regarded strictly as Impact assessable as would “any use not defined in Schedule 1 (Definitions).”</p> <p>It is appropriate that these uses be exempt development regardless of the applicable zone. This is consistent with the way in which they are dealt with when associated with community infrastructure, but also is reflective of the nature of the land use, being innocuous due to their temporary and necessary nature.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recommendation 1: Amend the Level of Assessment Table for industrial and rural zones to include High impact industry (where a Temporary use) as Exempt development.</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Recommendation 2: Amend the QPP recommended Section 1.7 – ‘Local Government Administrative Matters’, and through specific mention, clarify that Mobile and Temporary crushing and screening, concrete batching and asphalt manufacturing is an example of a Temporary Use.</b></li> </ul>		Temporary use.			
216.	150	<p>While building height is included in the Administrative definitions, the application of this is somewhat inconsistent with buildings or structures common to industrial land uses. As there is no reference to building height as it applies to structures, it is assumed that control of building height would be applied to all structures on Boral sites (e.g. silos).</p> <p>The Acceptable Outcomes of the applicable Zone codes do not stipulate a maximum building height for extractive industry or industry activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recommendation 1: Boral support these provisions.</b></li> </ul>	No	Noted.	No	No	No
<b>Cannonvale Concrete Plant</b>							
217.	150	<p>The site is located within a pre-existing industrial locality that supports industrial activities, including high impact industry.</p> <p>The Strategic framework mapping appropriately acknowledge Boral’s Cannonvale Concrete Plant as within one of the region’s significant existing industrial areas intended to support industry activities.</p> <p>The proposed planning scheme inappropriately includes the site within the Low impact industry zone.</p> <p>The Low impact industry zoning fails to lend any support or protection to High impact industry.</p> <p><b>Subject Site</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recommendation 1: Transition the site to the High impact industry zone;</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Recommendation 2: Maintain Code assessable provisions for High impact industry in the High impact industry zone.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>OR in the event High impact industry zone is not applied to the subject site:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Recommendation 1: Transition the site and surrounding area to the Medium impact industry zone;</b></li> <li>▪ <b>Recommendation 2: Amended the Medium impact industry zone code to support High impact industry (i.e. concrete batching) and amend the corresponding Table of Assessment to provide Code assessment for certain High impact industry where achieving performance-based solutions.</b></li> </ul>	No	Council acknowledges this recommendation; however, the site has existing use rights and the intent of the area is to maintain low impact industrial uses. High impact industry and medium impact industry uses are a major intensification of the site when compared to Low impact industry uses. As a result, any future development of this site for purposes other than Low impact industry, will be subject to impact assessment to enable the community and Council to determine the level of impacts associated with the proposal.	No	No	No

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
Gregory River Quarry							
218.		<p>The site is afforded protection under the SPP and designed as a Key Resource Area (KRA No. 27).</p> <p>The proposed planning scheme fails to adopt an Extractive industry zone, inappropriately relying on the Rural zone as part of the assessment mechanism to protect and support Extractive industry.</p> <p>The Rural zone does not lend sufficient support or protection to Extractive resources, including the application of Impact assessable provisions.</p> <p>The proposed planning scheme appropriately applies the Extractive resources overlay to the subject site, in accordance with the KRA Resource/Processing Areas, Separation Areas and Transport Routes.</p> <p>However, the Rural zone and Extractive resources and minerals overlay Codes and associated Tables of assessment do not afford appropriate protection from incompatible or sensitive land uses.</p> <p>The proposed planning scheme needs to be amended to ensure the outcomes of the SPP are integrated to afford appropriate protection of state significant extractive industry resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b><u>Recommendation 1:</u> Adopt the Extractive industry zone and apply to the subject site.</b></li> <li>▪ <b><u>Recommendation 2:</u> Apply Code Assessment provisions to Extractive industry uses where located in the Extractive industry zone.</b></li> </ul> <p>OR, if the event an Extractive industry zone is not adopted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b><u>Recommendation 1:</u> Maintain the site within the Rural zone and provide greater support through the Zone code and corresponding Material Change of Use Tables of Assessment to facilitate Extractive industry as Code assessable development where within the Extractive resources overlay.</b></li> </ul> <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b><u>Recommendation 1:</u> Include and update the Extractive Industry Code and Extractive Resources Overlay Code to reflect the CCAA Extractive Industry Model Codes and SPP Model extractive resources overlay code.</b></li> <li>▪ <b><u>Recommendation 2:</u> Amend the Extractive resources overlay Table of assessment to ensure incompatible and sensitive development occurring within the Extractive resources overlay trigger Impact assessment.</b></li> </ul>	No	Council acknowledges this recommendation; however, the site has been included in the Key Resource Area on the Extractive resources overlay, this also provides a buffer against the encroachment of sensitive and inappropriate uses. Council considers that this provides adequate protection for the on-going use of the site.	No	No	No



## Appendix K – Growth – Summary of Issues Raised in Submissions and Council's Response

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
<b>Growth</b>							
219.	53	Norling Report suggests increased growth. This will result in loss of amenity for existing and future residents.	No	Council is unable to cap population growth, but endeavours to plan appropriately for development through the planning scheme in a manner that minimises the impact on the valued amenity of the region. .	No	No	No
220.	217, 220	Objects to Norling Report and Population Projections and Planning Assumptions stating there will be growth. Council should advertise as a “no growth town” like Noosa.	No	Council is unable to cap population growth, but endeavours to plan appropriately for development through the planning scheme.	No	No	No
221.	619	Raises concerns about the growth assumptions for Proserpine, Bowen and Collinsville and recommends that planning initiatives are adopted to encourage employment and ultimately growth. Also recommends policies surrounding industrial development and decentralisation are reviewed.	No	The growth assumptions made for Proserpine, Bowen and Collinsville have been made by a reputable consulting firm using the best available data to provide a series of growth projections. The Strategic intent of the proposed planning scheme is to encourage employment opportunities within the Whitsunday Local Government Area which will help maintain growth within all sectors.	No	No	No
222.	413	No additional residential land should be allocated in Bowen due to declining house prices and vacant rental properties. The release of additional residential land will encourage more financial pressure.	No	The Norling Report has identified a series of growth projections for the Bowen region. Based on the future demand for housing based a number of factors it has been recommend that further land be zoned to accommodate for this growth. This land is to be located to the south of Bowen, removed from known constraints.	No	No	No
223.	453	Supports development and growth. Examples provided: China Town.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
224.	15, 243	<i>“There is no imperative to necessitate a change in zoning or increase in building height restrictions. There is plenty of land available for the projected new residents in the next 20 years, and to accommodate the Council's assumed increase of 6,000-10,000 additional residents over the next 10 years.”</i>	No	The Norling Report has identified a series of growth projections for the Whitsunday Local Government Area. Based on the future demand for housing based a number of factors it has been recommend that further land be zoned to accommodate for this growth. To assist in accommodating for this future growth restrictions to building heights have been listed to consolidate growth around established urban areas. This decision has been made to prevent uncontrolled urban sprawl, which is an undesirable outcome to deal with future growth.	No	No	No
225.	35, 53	Objects to development that will allow for population growth on the grounds that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• traffic is increasing</li> <li>• infrastructure upgrades are required (i.e. sewage treatment plants); and</li> <li>• increases in population will impact on local businesses as it will encourage more new businesses and larger corporations to enter the area.</li> </ul>	<b>Yes</b>	The proposed planning scheme was submitted to the State Government for assessment by all relevant State Agencies. The Department of Transport and Main Roads has reviewed the proposed planning scheme and acknowledges that it addresses the State interest. Car parking and traffic movements are considered for any development application and are assessed against the Transport and Parking Code. It is considered that the proposed planning scheme adequately addresses this issue.	No	No	No
226.	134	Objects to building heights on the grounds that developers are not held accountable for a maintenance period to address issues such as water leakages.	No	This is considered to be outside the jurisdiction of a planning scheme. However, it is noted that new developments go on a period of ‘on-maintenance’ where the developer is responsible for any faults.	No	No	No
227.	619	Objects on the grounds that density is being concentrated in Airlie Beach which has restricted space at the expense of places like Bowen (where there is space for density increase).	No	The proposed planning scheme has identified a number of areas for residential population in all four major centres of the region. It must be noted that each centre has a different focal point that will boost population growth. For instance, residential land has been identified to the south of Bowen and there is a focus on fostering both the agricultural and resource sectors in the proposed planning scheme.	No	No	No

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
228.	511	Concerns that the automation of the existing workforce has not been considered in the growth figures used by Council.	No	The Norling Report and subsequently the UGS takes into account many factors when modelling population and job projections, one of those factors is advancements in technology.	No	No	No
229.	228	Recognises the need for development to cater for growth. Notes that not all buildings will “happen at once” as it is being planned for the next 10-20 years.	No	Noted.	No	No	No



## Appendix L – Heritage – Summary of Issues Raised in Submissions and Council's Response

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
<b>Heritage</b>							
230.	496	Raises concerns regarding the local heritage register providing no protection and that it has not fully captured all heritage buildings.	<b>Yes</b>	In accordance with State legislative requirements, Council undertook a comprehensive review, with the assistance of specialists, to establish the Local Heritage Register. Maintenance of these important places of significance is identified on the Heritage overlay to be adopted. Council acknowledges that these assets are vital to the cultural and historical makeup of the community and as such no changes are proposed to the current procedure for management of these assets.	No	No	No
231.	496	Concerned that there is no continuity and quality in the administration of heritage and character in this Council.	<b>Yes</b>	In accordance with State legislative requirements, Council undertook a comprehensive review, with the assistance of specialists, to establish the Local Heritage Register. Maintenance of these important places of significance is identified on the Heritage overlay to be adopted. Council acknowledges that these assets are vital to the cultural and historical makeup of the community and as such no changes are proposed to the current procedure for management of these assets.	No	No	No
232.	21, 135.	Recommends that the Normanby Goldfields Cemetery is recognised as a local heritage place in the Heritage overlay map and is included in the Whitsunday Regional Council Local Heritage Register.	<b>Yes</b>	This matter is currently being investigated. There are issues with gaining access to the site to undertake a full investigation. Once these issues have been addressed the Normanby Goldfields Cemetery will be included in the Local Heritage Register.	No	No	<b>Yes</b>

## Appendix M – Infrastructure – Summary of Issues Raised in Submissions and Council's Response

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
<b>Infrastructure</b>							
233.	124, 144, 146, 182, 185, 189, 197, 285, 364	Identified that there is no Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP) in the proposed planning scheme.	No	Council are currently undertaking development of the LGIP, with adoption date expected in mid-2016. Council will include the LGIP as part of a planning scheme amendment which requires public consultation at a later date. This document will inform the future direction of infrastructure planning within our region.	No	No	<b>Yes</b>
234.	79	Notes that there is no pump out facilities to remove sewerage from all the tourism passenger vessels.	No	This is considered to be outside the jurisdiction of a planning scheme.	No	No	No
235.	24	Ergon notes that Council adopted some recommendations Ergon Energy made in November 2014 (as part of the first State interest review) and has provided additional feedback regarding the Strategic framework, Tables of assessment, Infrastructure overlay map, Infrastructure overlay code and Zone maps.	No	Noted. Council acknowledges this additional information; however, the proposed planning scheme adequately addresses the State interest for infrastructure as per the State interest review.	No	No	No
236.	156	Powerlink notes that Council adopted some recommendations Powerlink made in November 2014 (as part of the first State interest review) and has provided additional feedback regarding the Tables of assessment and Zone maps.	No	Noted. Council acknowledges this additional information; however, the proposed planning scheme adequately addresses the State interest for infrastructure as per the State interest review.	No	No	No
237.	26, 81, 187, 208, 225, 228, 233, 237, 239, , 277, 278, 281, 341, 357, 358, 374, 381, 384, 385, 386, 388, 389, 408, 409, 410, 464, 465, 466, 467, 484, 507, 508, 509, 520, 658, 662, 663, 664	Concerns regarding the lack of infrastructure planning.	No	Council is presently undertaking the development of the LGIP, which will involve its own consultation processes. Working on the development of this plan has undertaken significant time for the large region. The LGIP will eventually be included as a part of the planning scheme as an amendment. This document will inform the future direction of infrastructure planning within our region.	No	No	<b>Yes</b>

## Appendix N – Land Valuations – Summary of Issues Raised in Submissions and Council's Response

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
<b>Land valuations</b>							
238.	53	Stopping growth and maintaining existing developed areas, will increase property prices, which is great for existing landowners.	No	This is considered to be outside the jurisdiction of a planning scheme. Furthermore, to reduce the opportunity to provide housing diversity and affordability within the proposed planning scheme would be contradicting the requirements of the State Planning Policy.	No	No	No
239.	97	Supports the proposed zone of Low impact industry; however, the interested party is concerned about how this change will affect the amount of rates payed. At present, the property is zoned rural and is used as cane land; however, the proposed zone of Low impact industry may increase the rates payed when the actual use of the land has not changed.	No	Council acknowledges this concern; however, this information is best obtained from the Department of Natural Resources and Mines as this is the entity responsible for defining land values.	No	No	No

## Appendix O – Minimum Lot Sizes – Summary of Issues Raised in Submissions and Council's Response

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
<b>Minimum Lot Sizes</b>							
240.	35, 53, 116	Recommends that a minimum of 10,000m <sup>2</sup> lot sizes within the rural residential zone are maintained as per the <i>Whitsunday Shire Planning Scheme 2009</i> .	No	<p>The objective of the proposed planning scheme was to create one policy framework for the whole of the region. In doing so, the proposed planning scheme takes existing elements from both the Bowen and Whitsunday Shire Planning Schemes. The proposed lot sizes are consistent with the current <i>Bowen Shire Planning Scheme 2006</i> requirements.</p> <p>There are additional benefits to reducing the lots sizes and constraining additional rural residential lots to the existing rural residential zoned land. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduced urban sprawl, impacting on the significant environmental and agricultural areas;</li> <li>• Introduction of more manageable lot sizes to reduce introduction of pests; and</li> <li>• Offering housing diversity options for future residents.</li> </ul> <p>It is important to note, the proposed lots sizes are a “minimum” and it is up to individual landowners to address environmental and design constraints to propose additional rural residential lots.</p>	No	No	No
241.	116	Recommends that the prescribed minimum lot size is 5 acres (~20,000m <sup>2</sup> ) in the rural residential zone.	No	<p>The objective of the proposed planning scheme was to create one policy framework for the whole of the region. In doing so, the proposed planning scheme takes existing elements from both the Bowen and Whitsunday Shire Planning Schemes. The proposed lot sizes are consistent with the current Bowen Shire Planning Scheme 2006 requirements.</p> <p>There are additional benefits to reducing the lots sizes and constraining additional rural residential lots to the existing rural residential zoned land. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduced urban sprawl, impacting on the significant environmental and agricultural areas;</li> <li>• Introduction of more manageable lot sizes to reduce introduction of pests; and</li> <li>• Offering housing diversity options for future residents.</li> </ul> <p>It is important to note, the proposed lots sizes are a “minimum” and it is up to individual landowners to address environmental and design constraints to propose additional rural residential lots.</p>	No	No	No
242.	35, 53, 77, 116	Notes the potential threat to local fauna and native habitat, in particular the Proserpine Rock Wallaby, due to decreased minimum lot sizes within the Rural residential zone.	No	<p>The proposed planning scheme was submitted to the State Government for assessment by all relevant State Agencies. The relevant department has reviewed the proposed planning scheme and acknowledges that it addresses the State interest.</p> <p>Council considers areas of environmental significance of utmost importance and have adopted the Environmental management and conservation zone code to regulate development in these areas. Land identified to be of environmental significance, whether it be flora or fauna, are regulated accordingly, irrespective of lot size. These areas are protected by appropriate state covenants where necessary in accordance with the <i>Land Title Act</i>.</p>	No	No	No
243.	18, 116, 177	Notes the potential threat to the water table in terms of depletion and contamination as a result of decreased minimum lot sizes within the rural residential zone.	No	The extraction of valuable assets such as water is a matter of State concern; however, each application for future residential subdivision will be required to address the potential impacts on issues such as water quality, stormwater and effluent discharge and will be required to meet the applicable environmental standards to avoid negative impacts on the natural environment.	No	No	No
244.	18, 35, 53, 56, 77, 116, 177, 178, 501	Objects to the proposed 4,000m <sup>2</sup> minimum lot sizes in the Rural residential zone as it impacts on amenity, lifestyle and privacy.	No	Council appreciates the fact that there may be perceived impacts on the amenity of adjoining property owners if lots are subdivided to 4,000m <sup>2</sup> lots. The proposed planning scheme will adequately assess future location of dwellings in accordance with the Queensland Development Code and prescribing separation distances from adjoining dwellings.	No	No	No
245.	177	Objects to the proposed 4,000m <sup>2</sup> minimum lot sizes in the rural residential zone as it will result in increased traffic flows.	Yes	The proposed planning scheme was submitted to the State Government for assessment by all relevant State Agencies. The Department of Transport and Main Roads has reviewed the proposed planning scheme and acknowledges that it addresses the State interest.	No	No	No

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
				Car parking and traffic movements are considered for any development application and are assessed against the Transport and Parking Code. It is considered that the proposed planning scheme adequately addresses this issue.			
246.	18, 177	Notes the lack of access to Council water and sewage infrastructure in rural residential areas.	No	The purpose of rural residential areas is that it comprises of low density residential style developments (i.e. dwelling house) that have limited provision of infrastructure and services. Council does not service rural residential areas with town water or sewer services. Each proposed rural residential lot, must demonstrate the ability to provide future on-site water and wastewater facilities to gain approval at subdivision stage.	No	No	No
247.	18	Recommends that the proposed planning scheme requires future rural residential properties to have access to bore water or town water for drinking.	No	The purpose of rural residential areas is that it comprises of low density residential style developments (i.e. dwelling house) that have limited provision of infrastructure and services. Council does not service rural residential areas with town water or sewer services. Each proposed rural residential lot, must demonstrate the ability to provide future on-site water and wastewater facilities to gain approval at subdivision stage.	No	No	No
248.	18	Recommends that only division of 5 acre (~20,000m <sup>2</sup> ) lots into two lots with a minimum size of 2 acres (~8,000m <sup>2</sup> ) to maintain the rural lifestyle.	Yes	<p>The objective of the proposed planning scheme was to create one policy framework for the whole of the region. In doing so, the proposed planning scheme takes existing elements from both the Bowen and Whitsunday Shire Planning Schemes. The proposed lot sizes are consistent with the current <i>Bowen Shire Planning Scheme 2006</i> requirements.</p> <p>There are additional benefits to reducing the lots sizes and constraining additional rural residential lots to the existing rural residential zoned land. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduced urban sprawl, impacting on the significant environmental and agricultural areas;</li> <li>• Introduction of more manageable lot sizes to reduce introduction of pests; and</li> <li>• Offering housing diversity options for future residents.</li> </ul> <p>It is important to note, the proposed lots sizes are a “minimum” and it is up to individual landowners to address environmental and design constraints to propose additional rural residential lots.</p>	No	No	No
249.	18, 501	Notes that the increase in population in rural residential areas will result in the contamination of ground water by sewage.	No	All on-site effluent disposal systems will be assessed by Council in accordance with the provisions stated in the <i>Plumbing and Drainage Act 2002</i> .	No	No	No
250.	56, 77	Objects to rural residential minimum lot sizes on the grounds that it will increase the impact of land clearing and weed invasion on local vegetation communities.	Yes	<p>The proposed planning scheme was submitted to the State Government for assessment by all relevant State Agencies. The relevant department has reviewed the proposed planning scheme and acknowledges that it addresses the State interest.</p> <p>Council considers areas of environmental significance of utmost importance and have adopted the Environmental management and conservation zone code to regulate development in these areas. Land identified to be of environmental significance, whether it be flora or fauna, are regulated accordingly, irrespective of lot size. These areas are protected by appropriate State covenants where necessary in accordance with the <i>Land Title Act 1994</i>.</p>	No	No	No
251.	363	Objects to Rural residential minimum lot size on the grounds that it produces overcrowding and social implications such as crime and domestic violence.	No	Council appreciates the fact that there may be perceived impacts on the amenity of adjoining property owners if lots are subdivided to 4,000m <sup>2</sup> lots. The proposed planning scheme will adequately assess future location of dwellings in accordance with the Queensland Development Code and prescribing separation distances from adjoining dwellings, in order to maintain privacy and utilising landscaping, lighting and other measures to address potential for crime.	No	No	No

## Appendix P – Other – Summary of Issues Raised in Submissions and Council's Response

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
<b>Other</b>							
252.	113	Notes that there is no support for volunteer groups in terms of funding. Suggests Council liaises with Chambers of Commerce and other groups to help support volunteer groups.	No	This is considered to be outside the jurisdiction of a planning scheme.	No	No	No
253.	41	Recommends a walking track around Collinsville to enhance connectivity.	No	This is considered to be outside of the jurisdiction of the proposed planning scheme. This has been referred to Council's Engineering Department for further consideration for the 2016/2017 budget.	No	No	No
254.	41	Questions the factors responsible for Collinsville not retaining a population or high income wage earners. Discusses reports produced by Adani addressing air quality.	No	The Adani project is a significant project under a State Development Area which is regulated under the Coordinator General. In summary, this is outside of the jurisdiction of the proposed planning scheme. However, it should be noted that additional industrial land has been allocated in Collinsville to support the resource sector.	No	No	No
255.	77	Recommends that Council separates the proposed planning scheme so that Airlie Beach (including Cannonvale and Jubilee Pocket) is considered completely separately from the other towns.	No	The proposed planning scheme is a whole of region document and is intended to provide the same rules with the exception of those contained within Local Plans across the region. The separation of Airlie Beach from the remainder of the document will provide the same rules across the region and will not resolve the current issues associated with two planning schemes.	No	No	No
256.	56, 77	Notes that the proposed planning scheme does not prioritise the use of local native plant species in landscaping and rehabilitation.	No	The proposed planning scheme does prioritise the use of plant species suitable to withstand the tropical environment within the Whitsunday region. Further details can be found in section 9.4.5 Landscaping code and Planning Scheme Policy SC6.4 (Landscaping).	No	No	No
257.	56, 77	Notes that development along the foreshore in the Whitsunday region needs to cater for the needs of sea turtles.	<b>Yes</b>	The proposed planning scheme recognises all matter of state environmental significance (MSES) including environment and heritage.	No	No	No
258.	19	Notes concerns regarding Council's choice of partner to develop the proposed planning scheme. Believes Place Design Group and Jonas Lange Lasalle are biased towards development.	No	Noted. These consultants were engaged in accordance with Council's Policy on Procurement.	No	No	No
259.	496	Notes concerns regarding the disposal of the 1990s Carpet Snake Creek Landcare Group sign.	No	This is considered to be outside the jurisdiction of a planning scheme.	No	No	No
260.	137	Notes concerns regarding the Cannonvale/Airlie Beach "goat track" as it is an unfinished and dangerous pathway that attracts a lot of pedestrian traffic.	No	This matter has been referred to Council's Parks and Gardens Department for consideration.	No	No	No
261.	222	Recommends that Airlie Beach is designated as a Special Entertainment Precinct.	No	Council will endeavour to investigate this recommendation over the next 12 months.	No	No	<b>Yes</b>
262.	519	The Department of Natural Resources and Mines has provided additional feedback regarding the Strategic framework, Strategic framework map and Zone maps.	<b>Yes</b>	Council acknowledges this additional information; however, the proposed planning scheme adequately addresses the State interest for infrastructure as per the State interest review.	No	No	No
263.	237, 239, , 341, 357, 358, 381, 384, 385, 386, 388, 389, 464, 465, 466, 467, 484, 487, 507, 508, 509, 520, 662, 663, 664	Recommends that Council amend 3.2.2.2 point 4 of the Strategic framework to include Merinda when identifying appropriate places for industrial development to occur.	No	Noted. Council has amended the Strategic framework to reflect this.	<b>Yes</b>	No	No
264.	511	Notes concerns regarding FIFO workers in the region.	No	The proposed planning scheme cannot prescribe which people work for each use; however, each non-resident workforce accommodation use will be assessed on its individual merits.	No	No	No



No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
265.	237, 239, , 341, 357, 358, 381, 384, 385, 386, 388, 389, 464, 465, 466, 467, 484, 507, 508, 509, 520, 662, 663, 664	Concerns regarding what will happen to existing "operational" non-resident workers accommodation in local communities. This is in relation to operational phase workforce being accommodated by non-resident accommodation and operation workforce being integrated into the existing urban areas.	No	All existing approved workers accommodation premises will be able to continue to operate. The Strategic framework of the proposed planning scheme sets a clear intent that Council will strongly oppose any further workers accommodation to be approved within the Whitsunday Local Government Area.	No	No	No
266.	237, 239, , 341, 357, 358, 381, 384, 385, 386, 388, 389, 464, 465, 466, 467, 484, 507, 508, 509, 520, 662, 663, 664	Why the statement "operational workforce in town and construction workforce" was not discussed with the concerned communities and is this in place to balance the upgrade of the airport and FIFO, which impacts on small communities?	No	Council have set a policy direction of no further approvals of workers accommodation premises within the Whitsunday region, on a permanent basis. Council are protecting the Whitsunday region from a "boom and bust" scenario as witnessed in a number of our adjoining regions. Council are fully supportive of the operational workforce being placed within our urban centres, and strongly oppose the construction workforce being located within our towns.	No	No	No
267.	23, 25, 30, 44, 48, 56, 61, 65, 114, 129, 154, 205, 214, 215, 216, 217, 220, 227, 235, 239, 248, 296, 303, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 363, 412, 415, 416, 417, 418, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 501, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657	Requests that further consultation is conducted prior to allowing self-assessment requirements for extending business into residential zones and allowing building up to 50m².	No	The allowance for self-assessable home based businesses within the proposed planning scheme, is seen as a positive step for the wider community to broaden the Whitsunday Region's economic base. All home based businesses will need to comply with the self-assessable provisions of the proposed planning scheme, which limit scale, hours of operation, parking and noise impacts. The increase in self-assessable land uses within the whole of the proposed planning scheme is seen to achieve the intent of the State Government to reduce red tape for minor development.	No	No	No
268.	217, 220	Objects to "adding 200 residential lots to Bowen and Collinsville" as this "will not help the local real estate market."	No	During the development of the proposed planning scheme mapping, all existing and operating approvals and land uses were reflected. Any additional residential land has been identified for potential development over the next 20 years, should the market demand increase. The proposed planning scheme is a tool that provides opportunities for development to occur; however, it does not influence the market.	No	No	No
269.	81, 113, 619	Recommends that a retirement village/aged care accommodation is the most appropriate form of development that will supply work and be invested in by locals.	No	Noted.	No	No	No

## Appendix Q – Overlays – Summary of Issues Raised in Submissions and Council's Response

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
<b>Overlays – Flood</b>							
270.	619	Notes concerns regarding flood levels in Bowen being a requirement of the State Government. Notes that current Council position is detrimental to development in Bowen. Recommends that Council negotiate with the State Government to compromise an outcome that will not impact on future development.	No	<p>When development applications in the local area are being considered, Council must have regard to both State mapping and local planning scheme overlays which indicate whether a site is affected by potential flooding. Council will continue to work with State Government to ensure that people and property in these areas is protected against the impacts of flood inundation.</p> <p>To further inform the planning process within the Whitsunday Region, Council will apply for funding to undertake studies that are specific to parts of the Region. This allows the proposed planning scheme to be well informed and specific regarding potential impacts from flood and storm tide inundation.</p>	No	No	Yes
271.	26, 237, 239, , 341, 357, 358, 381, 384, 385, 386, 388, 389, 464, 465, 466, 467, 484, 507, 508, 509, 520, 662, 663, 664	Concerns regarding the impact of environmental overlays on agricultural uses.	Yes	<p>The proposed planning scheme has a number of overlay maps that will impact on agricultural uses. These overlay maps are a State Interest and are a requirement for the proposed planning scheme to be consistent with the State Planning Policy.</p> <p>The proposed planning scheme will not trigger a Development Application for these overlays on their own, only in the circumstance that a development application cannot comply with the self-assessable provisions.</p>	No	No	No

## Appendix R – WRC Proposed Planning Scheme – Summary of Issues Raised in Submissions and Council's Response

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
<b>1.1 Introduction</b>							
272.	212, 483.	It is important that the proposed planning scheme does not increase the already onerous State Government requirements, especially in regards to vegetation management and natural hazards.	No	Council remains committed to upholding and advancing the State Government requirements and applying these requirements in a localised context by the creation of integrated local plans and providing localised responses.	No	No	No
273.	212, 483.	Requests that consequential amendments are undertaken to reflect approvals when issued. Numerous applications have been submitted on behalf of clients where subdivision or change of use approvals have not been carried through in the zoning of the Proposed Scheme.	No	Council considers that its ability to amend the proposed planning scheme as a result of each approval would be curtailed by time and budgetary constraints. However, Council will be undertaking regular maintenance of the planning scheme via annual amendments. Changes to uses or lot configuration will be reflected during these scheduled processes.	No	No	Yes
<b>1.2 Planning Scheme Components</b>							
274.	212, 483.	1.2.1 Zone & Zone Precincts Supports the increase in the variety of zones to facilitate a reduction in the levels of assessment and provide clearer outcomes for each zone.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
275.	212, 483.	1.2.2 Local Plan Supports local plans as a tool for more detailed planning criteria. We encourage Council to develop Local Plans for other areas.	No	Noted. Council has resolved to develop a local plan for Bowen. Other local plans will be developed upon further investigation.	No	No	Yes
276.	212, 483.	1.2.3 Overlays Encourages Council to ensure that Overlays are used as a guide only. The level of detail in these Overlays is often lacking and inaccurate. Numerous Overlays appear rushed and should be left out of the proposed planning scheme until they are revised (or replaced). The Council should have delegation to waive requirements for development applications triggered by Overlays when it is obvious the mapping is incorrect. The Overlay Codes should not increase the already onerous requirements of the State Government.	No	Noted. Council is committed to continually reviewing the data sources formulating the Overlays and acknowledge that there are overlays that contain inaccuracies. Council will address the validity of the effects of all Overlays on applications on an individual basis.	No	No	No
277.	212, 483.	1.2.4 Development Codes In general, the increase in the number of codes is supported, on the basis that the development assessment process is streamlined due to clarity in planning criteria.  Council is strongly encouraged to assess development against these codes as performance based, not prescriptive as has been experienced in the past in some instances.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
278.	212, 483.	1.2.5 Planning Scheme Policies Encourages Council to ensure that proposed Planning Scheme Policies are relevant and reasonable, and do not create onerous development requirements.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
<b>2.1 State Planning Policy</b>							
279.	212, 483.	Are Council expecting to have any aspects of the State Planning Policy reflected in the Scheme?	Yes	The proposed planning scheme has undertaken a State Interest Review where the Minister of Planning, supported by the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and	No	No	No

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
				Planning considers State Interests. As a result of the review the Minister was satisfied the relevant State interests have been integrated, and Council may consult on this version of the proposed planning scheme.			
<b>2.2 Regional Plan</b>							
280.	212, 483.	Are Council expecting to have the Scheme signed off as advancing the Regional Plan?	<b>Yes</b>	The proposed planning scheme has undertaken a State Interest Review where the Minister of Planning, supported by the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning considers State Interests. As a result of the review the Minister was satisfied the relevant State interests have been integrated, and Council may consult on this version of the proposed planning scheme.	No	No	No
<b>2.3 Referral Agency Delegations</b>							
281.	212, 483.	Are Council expecting to have any referral agency delegations?	<b>Yes</b>	Council's referral agency delegations will be limited to those stated in accordance with the Planning Act.	No	No	No
<b>3.1 Preliminary</b>							
282.	212, 483.	(3)(b) Council is requested to clarify which theme has highest priority?	No	No one singular theme has priority. Council is committed to upholding and balancing the consistent application of the themes as and where required.	No	No	No
<b>3.2 Strategic Intent</b>							
283.	212, 483.	Generally supports the Strategic Intent comments, but again question which intent has highest priority for Council in the case of a conflict.	No	No one singular theme has priority. Council is committed to upholding and balancing the consistent application of the themes as and where required.	No	No	No
284.	212, 483.	3.2.1 Liveable Communities 3.2.1.2 Land Use Strategies Generally supports the Land Use Strategies comments. (2) The phrase 'Limited Accommodation activities' seems to prevent any form of low scale tourism development which may be appropriate to areas such as Dingo Beach and Shute Harbour. (8) This comment seems to prohibit workers' camps. Any such development should be assessed on its merits taking into consideration the specifics of each project.	No	(2) The land use strategies are to act as a guide as to Council's intentions for scale and intensity of development in small settlements throughout the region. The phrase 'Limited Accommodation Activities' does not prevent low scale tourism development, but merely serves to indicate that the intensity of the use should be limited and in keeping with the environmental, cultural and community constraints of the surrounding locality.  (8) It is the intention to treat any application for workers accommodation on its merits with respect to the particulars of the associated project; however Council confirms its position that accommodation activities for operational workforces are to be integrated into existing urban areas.	No	No	No
285.	212, 483.	3.2.2 Economic Growth We generally support the Land Use Strategies comments. (1) Diversifying rural activities needs to be taken into consideration when assessing subdivisions in the Rural Zone. There are numerous rural activities that do not need 100 hectares of land to operate feasibly. Council's current approach prevents potential diversifications from occurring. The 4,000m <sup>2</sup> lot size in the Rural residential zone now creates a need for smaller rural blocks that allow other rural pursuits to occur. (4) Strongly supports Council's intent for industrial expansion at the Whitsunday Coast Airport. (5) Strongly supports Council's position on multi-commodity facilities at Abbot Point. (6) The opportunity for a Marine Industry	No	(1) Council have been guided by the Rural Land Strategy in determining the location and extent of Rural activities. Council must also balance the importance of rural activities and their benefits to our region with the diversification of the nature of those activities and the subsequent impacts of diversification upon the economy.  (4-7) Noted.	No	No	No

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
		precinct at Shute Harbour should not be excluded. (7) Woodwark should be included in this comment (Freedom Shores site).					
286.	212, 483.	3.2.3 Environment & Heritage 3.2.3.2 Land Use Strategies Generally supports the Land Use Strategies comments.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
287.	212, 483.	3.2.4 Hazards & Safety 3.2.4.2 Land Use Strategies Generally supports the Land Use Strategies comments.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
288.	212, 483.	3.2.5 Infrastructure & Transport 3.2.5.2 Land Use Strategies Generally supports the Land Use Strategies comments. (1) Strongly supports an international airport. (2) Strongly supports new rail connections between Abbot Point and the coal basins. (3) Strongly supports establishment and expansion of power generation facilities near Collinsville.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
<b>Part 4 – Local government infrastructure plan</b>							
289.	212, 483.	Encourages Council to reduce infrastructure charges to encourage development. We look forward to reviewing the LGIP.	No	Noted. Council are in the process of developing a LGIP.	No	No	Yes
<b>Part 5 – Tables of assessment</b>							
290.	212, 483.	Generally supports Council's lowering of assessment for consistent uses. Questions Council's ability to compliance the high level of Self Assessable uses. We also question Council's ability to appropriately secure infrastructure charges for these Self Assessable uses.  Instead of Self Assessable uses, a better outcome would be to adopt a simpler method of assessment, such as Risk-Smart and accrediting consultants to sign off on low risk uses. This would ensure development is undertaken appropriately and allow Council to issue infrastructure charges notices at the time of approval, rather than when a use is complied (if at all).  Questions the format of the Tables of Assessment. The Tables are not user friendly and could be much more efficient. The Tables of Assessment in the current Mackay Regional Council Planning Scheme are highlighted as an efficient method of determining levels of assessment.	No	Council has a system in place to manage and audit self-assessable uses under the proposed planning scheme.  This system includes the issuing of an Adopted Infrastructure Charges Notice where applicable.  Council has previously investigated the option of risk smart and accrediting consultants and are yet to determine implementation and viability. The purpose of the lowering of assessment to was to reduce the need for another application and therefore reducing additional assessments or applications.  The question of format of the tables of assessment has been noted.	No	No	No
<b>Part 6 – Zones</b>							
291.	212, 483.	6.1 Preliminary Generally supports the increase in the number of Zones and the detail provided within the Zone Codes. We note that Council's intent is to	No	Noted.	No	No	No



No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
		streamline the development process in this regard.					
292.	212, 483.	6.2 Zone Codes 6.2.1 Community Facilities Zone Code Generally supports application, purpose and overall outcomes.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
293.	212, 483.	6.2.2 District Centre Zone Code Generally supports, application, purpose and overall outcomes. Questions the need to provide an Economic Impact Assessment, if the use is consistent with the Zone and the Whitsunday hierarchy of centres. This footnote (page 6:7) should be clarified or deleted.	No	The purpose of the Economic Impact Assessment within the District Centre zone was to enable a report to be requested should the development exceed any of the overall outcomes within the zone code.	No	No	No
294.	212, 483.	6.2.3 Emerging Communities Zone Code Generally supports, application, purpose and overall outcomes. Questions the need to provide a Development Needs Assessment. If an area is zoned Emerging Communities, Council has already identified a need. This footnote (page 6:10) should be deleted.	No	The purpose of the Development Needs Assessment is to ensure the development is necessary and not premature.	No	No	No
295.	212, 483.	6.2.4 Environmental Management & Conservation Zone Code Generally support application, purpose and overall outcomes. 6.2.4.2 (2) – why is it necessary to mention community wellbeing in the purpose?	No	Community wellbeing is an important aspect of the proposed planning scheme particularly given the areas which are zoned Environmental Management & Conservation back onto the urban areas and therefore the interaction between conservation and community needs to be balanced, particularly in regard to natural hazards.	No	No	No
296.	212, 483.	6.2.5 High Impact Industry Zone Code Generally support, application, purpose and overall outcomes. We question the need to provide an Economic Impact Assessment, if the use is consistent with the Zone. This footnote (page 6:15) should be clarified or deleted. 6.2.5.2 (3)(g) – requiring high impact industries to have a high quality built form introduces unnecessary cost implications. The community does not expect industrial uses within a High Impact Industry zone to be pretty. 6.2.5.2 (3)(h) – the reference to the location of the uses should be deleted. The land zoned High Impact Industry has been identified by Council and this statement contradicts Council's decision. 6.2.5.2 (3)(j) – industrial development within an industrial zone should not be burdened with the requirement to provide public transport. It is highly likely members of the public would be catching a bus or walking to a high impact industry zone. Heavy vehicles and activities that produce emissions conflict with pedestrians and public transport. 6.2.5.2 (3)(l) – encouraging parks within a high impact industry area is poor planning. 6.2.5.2 (3)(n) – the requirement to protect amenity of high impact industrial uses is questioned?	No	6.2.5.2 (3)(g) The purpose of the Economic Impact Assessment within the High Impact zone was to enable a report to be requested should the development exceed any of the overall outcomes within the zone code. This requirement is an important aspect of the assessment of the application, particularly given the locations are close to townships or entrances to townships. Council are also undertaking a Scenic Amenity Study for the whole of the Whitsunday Region, to identify scenic and landscape values across the region along our key transport corridors. This will help inform any visual amenity issues resulting from future development. Council encourages the community to be involved in this future project. 6.2.5.2 (3)(h) The intent of this section is to provide consideration and mitigation measures for adjoining properties. This is also required for areas designated Industrial investigation for consideration. 6.2.5.2 (3)(j) Access to employment by modes other than car is supporting equity and diversity. 6.2.5.2 (3)(l) The reference to parks will be deleted. 6.2.5.2 (3)(n) Amenity needs to be considered, particularly where these uses are being conducted. Existing uses are being conducted in sensitive areas and therefore this needs to be considered and addressed.	<b>Yes</b> to 6.2.5.2(3)(l)	No	<b>Yes</b>
297.	212, 483.	6.2.6 Industry Investigation Zone Code	No	6.2.6 Industry Investigation Zone Code	<b>Yes</b> to	No	No



No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
		Generally supports application, purpose and overall outcomes. Questions the need to provide a Development Needs Assessment. If an area is zoned Industry Investigation, Council has already identified a need. This footnote (page 6:17) should be deleted. 6.2.6.2 (3)(b)(vii)(b) – industrial development within an industrial zone should not be burdened with the requirement to provide public transport. It is highly unlikely members of the public would be catching a bus or walking to a high impact industry zone. Heavy vehicles and activities that produce emissions conflict with pedestrians and public transport. 6.2.6.2 (3)(b)(xvi) – encouraging parks within a high impact industry area is poor planning. 6.2.6.2 (3)(b)(xvii) – the requirement to protect amenity of high impact industrial uses is questioned?		The purpose of the Development Impact Assessment within the Industry investigation zone was to enable a report to be requested should the development exceed any of the overall outcomes within the zone code. The zone is 'investigation' for a purpose and therefore additional reports and assessments are required. 6.2.6.2 (3)(b)(vii)(b) Access to employment by modes other than car is supporting equity and diversity. 6.2.6.2 (3)(b)(xvi) The reference to parks will be deleted. 6.2.6.2 (3)(b)(xvii) Amenity needs to be considered, particularly where these uses are being conducted. Existing uses are being conducted in sensitive areas and therefore this needs to be considered and addressed.	6.2.6.2(3)(b)(xvi)		
298.	212, 483.	6.2.7 Local Centre Zone Code Generally supports application, purpose and overall outcomes. Questions the need to provide an Economic Impact Assessment, if the use is consistent with the Zone. This footnote (page 6:20) should be clarified or deleted.	No	The purpose of the Economic Impact Assessment within the Local centre zone was to enable a report to be requested should the development exceed any of the overall outcomes within the zone code.	No	No	No
299.	212, 483.	6.2.8 Low Density Residential Zone Code Generally supports application, purpose and overall outcomes. 6.2.8.2(2) – allowing small-scale services and facilities that caters for local residents seems to undermine the intent of the Local Centre Zone. 6.2.8.2(3)(d) – this seems to undermine the intent of the Local Centre Zone. 6.2.8.2 (3)(g) – where are 'specified locations'? This should be clarified.	No	The purpose of allowing small scale services and facilities is to cater for the home based businesses. This is to allow for 'start up' and then once they develop these businesses can relocate to commercial premises.	No	No	No
300.	212, 483.	6.2.9 Low Impact Industry Zone Code Generally supports application, purpose and overall outcomes. We question the need to provide an Economic Impact Assessment, if the use is consistent with the Zone. This footnote (page 6:25) should be clarified or deleted.	No	The purpose of the Economic Impact Assessment within the Low impact industry zone was to enable a report to be requested should the development exceed any of the overall outcomes within the zone code.	No	No	No
301.	212, 483.	6.2.10 Low-medium Density Residential Zone Code Generally supports application, purpose and overall outcomes.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
302.	212, 483.	6.2.11 Major Centre Zone Code Generally supports application, purpose and overall outcomes. Development in this zone especially should not need to provide an Economic Impact Assessment, if the use is consistent with the Zone. This footnote (page 6:30) should be clarified or deleted. Table 6.2.11.2.1 –Questions the need to limit	No	The purpose of the Economic Impact Assessment within the Major centre zone was to enable a report to be requested should the development exceed any of the overall outcomes within the zone code.  The height limits within the Major centre zone have been amended to 12 meters across the region to maintain consistency.	Yes	No	No

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
		Proserpine and Cannonvale to 8.5 metres. Each application should be assessed on its own merits. This also conflicts with consistent uses, for example, a cinema.					
303.	212, 483.	6.2.12 Medium Impact Industry Zone Code Generally supports application, purpose and overall outcomes. Questions the need to provide an Economic Impact Assessment, if the use is consistent with the Zone. This footnote (page 6:33) should be clarified or deleted.	No	The purpose of the Economic Impact Assessment within the Medium impact industry zone was to enable a report to be requested should the development exceed any of the overall outcomes within the zone code.	No	No	No
304.	212, 483.	6.2.13 Mixed Use Zone Code Generally supports application, purpose and overall outcomes. Questionsthe need to provide an Economic Impact Assessment, if the use is consistent with the Zone. This footnote (page 6:35) should be clarified or deleted.	No	The purpose of the Economic Impact Assessment within the Mixed use zone was to enable a report to be requested should the development exceed any of the overall outcomes within the zone code.	No	No	No
305.	212, 483.	6.2.14 Neighbourhood Centre Zone Code Generally supports application, purpose and overall outcomes. Questionsthe need to provide an Economic Impact Assessment, if the use is consistent with the Zone. This footnote (page 6:37) should be clarified or deleted.	No	The purpose of the Economic Impact Assessment within the Neighbourhood centre zone was to enable a report to be requested should the development exceed any of the overall outcomes within the zone code.	No	No	No
306.	212, 483.	6.2.15 Recreation & Open Space Zone Code Generally supports application, purpose and overall outcomes.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
307.	212, 483.	6.2.16 Rural Zone Code Generally supports application, purpose and overall outcomes.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
308.	212, 483.	6.2.17 Rural Residential Zone Code Generally supports application, purpose and overall outcomes.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
309.	212, 483.	6.2.18 Special Industry Zone Code Generally supports application, purpose and overall outcomes. 6.2.18.2(3)(d) – why limit height when consistent uses include telecommunication towers? Questionsthe need to provide an Economic Impact Assessment, if the use is consistent with the Zone. This footnote (page 6:45) should be clarified or deleted.	No	6.2.18.2(3)(d) A height limit is required to consider all impacts, especially telecommunication towers.  6.2.18.2(3)(d) The purpose of the Economic Impact Assessment within the Special Industry zone was to enable a report to be requested should the development exceed any of the overall outcomes within the zone code.	No	No	No
310.	212, 483.	6.2.19 Tourist Accommodation Zone Code Generally supports application, purpose and overall outcomes.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
311.	212, 483.	6.2.20 Waterfront & Marine Industry Zone Code Generally supports application, purpose and overall outcomes. 6.2.20.2(3) – this level of detail is unusual for the purpose and overall outcomes of this Zone Code.	No	6.2.20 Noted.  6.2.20.2(3) This zone is intended to provide for a wide range of Waterfront and Marine Industry uses, hence the different overall outcomes.	No	No	No
<b>Part 7 – Local Plan Codes</b>							
312.	212, 483.	Generally supports local plans as a tool for more detailed planning criteria. We encourage Council to develop Local Plans for other areas.	No	Noted. Council has resolved to develop a local plan for Bowen. Other local plans will be developed upon further investigation.	No	No	<b>Yes</b>
313.	212, 483.	7.2.1 – Airlie Beach Local Plan Code	No	Noted. However, in response to submitters comments, Council	No	No	<b>Yes</b>

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
		Commends Council for undertaking this local plan. We strongly support the use mix and building heights. We encourage Council to investigate increased building heights in other areas of the Local Plan, such as Shingley Beach, Cannonvale Beach and allotments fronting the western side of Waterson Way.		has decided to revoke the Airlie Beach Local Plan. Council will continue to work on future local plans for the Bowen and Airlie Beach areas.			
314.	212, 483.	7.2.2 – Hamilton Island Local Plan Code We have no objection to this Code.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
<b>Part 8 – Overlay Codes</b>							
315.	212, 483.	Strongly encourages Council to ensure that Overlays are used as a guide only. The level of detail in these Overlays is often lacking and inaccurate. Numerous Overlays appear rushed and should be left out of the proposed planning scheme until they are revised (or replaced). The Council should have delegation to waive requirements for development applications triggered by Overlays when it is obvious the mapping is incorrect. The Overlay Codes should not increase the already onerous requirements of the State Government.	No	Noted. The overlay codes are included within the proposed planning scheme to ensure Council not only carries out its State obligations but its local interests.  The overlays have also been written to provide for self assessable provisions therefore reducing the domestic scale 'jump ups' for applications.	No	No	No
316.	212, 483.	8.2.1 – Acid Sulfate Soils Overlay Code Generally support application, purpose and overall outcomes.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
317.	212, 483.	8.2.2 – Agricultural Land Overlay Code The Overlay Map associated with this code is beyond belief when it comes to inaccuracies. Remnant Vegetation is mapped as State Important Agricultural Areas. The mapping also conflicts with the Environmental Significance Overlay Map.  State Important Agricultural Areas are defined as "land that has all of the requirements for agriculture to be successful and sustainable, is part of a critical mass of land with similar characteristics and, is strategically significant to the region or the state". Please explain how remnant vegetation meets this criterion. Class A land is defined as "Crop land that is suitable for a wide range of current and potential crops with nil to moderate limitations to production." Class B land is defined as "Limited crop land that is suitable for a narrow range of current and potential crops. Land that is marginal for current and potential crops due to severe limitations but is highly suitable for pastures. Land may be suitable for cropping with engineering or agronomic improvements."  It is clear that no consideration of the land attributes to fit within these definitions has been taken into consideration when the mapping has been created. No consideration has been given to existing uses, existing approvals, topography or constraints. It is obvious no ground truthing	Yes	Both the Agriculture land overlay and Environmental significance overlay map data has been sourced from the State Government; therefore, any issues regarding the quality and accuracy of the data should be referred to the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning. The only exception is to the Locally important agricultural areas identified within the Agriculture land overlay that was developed by Council where ground truthing exercises took place.  The purpose of public consultation is to receive feedback on any errors that may be evident in the proposed planning scheme and associated mapping. Should there be any inconsistencies, for example, residential land that contains the Environmental significance overlay it is recommended that the interested party contact the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Council immediately so that this error can be addressed in the first amendment of the planning scheme. The overlay maps are a State Interest and are a requirement for the proposed planning scheme to be consistent with the State Planning Policy; therefore, it will not be removed.	No	No	No

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
		<p>has occurred, and very little effort has been put into forming this overlay and it appears rushed. The mapping also covers rural residential zoned land.</p> <p>On closer investigation, it is obvious this mapping has been copied and pasted from the old GQAL maps, which is commonly known to contain massive inaccuracies. Council should remove this Overlay from the proposed planning scheme as a matter of urgency.</p>					
318.	212, 483.	8.2.3 – Airport Environs Overlay Code Generally supports this code and trust that the performance criteria will not contradict what Council is trying to achieve at the Whitsunday Coast airport.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
319.	212, 483.	8.2.4 – Bushfire Hazard Overlay Code Notes that this Overlay is grossly inaccurate but a vast improvement on the current mapping. We have discovered numerous cases where grass used for cattle grazing is mapped as High risk. The land in the middle of Waterson Way is also mapped as High risk. Numerous cleared residential properties in Cannonvale are also mapped as Medium or High risk. 8.2.4.3 AO1.1 We strongly insist this is changed to promote a site inspection.	No	The Environmental significance overlay map data has been sourced from the State Government; therefore, any issues regarding the quality and accuracy of the data should be referred to the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning.	No	No	No
320.	212, 483.	8.2.5 – Coastal Protection Overlay Code Strongly encourages Council to ensure the State Government's already onerous coastal protection measures are not amplified through this code.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
321.	212, 483.	8.2.6 – Environmental Significance Overlay Code Concerns that Council's requirements exceed the State's treatment of vegetation. The Overlay Maps have identified remnant vegetation and regrowth vegetation as having an identical environmental value. Remnant Vegetation and Regrowth Vegetation do not have the same environmental value. Both are State Interests and are protected according to their environmental value through referral triggers under the Sustainable Planning Regulation, and the State Planning Policy. The Overlay Code does not acknowledge the difference in these two types of vegetation and should be amended to do so; alternatively remove regrowth vegetation from the 'regulated vegetation' mapped areas. The Wildlife Habitat component of the Overlay Codes is also questioned. There are numerous properties with this mapped that are clearly not habitat. For example 10 of the 46 lots within Botanica Estate are marked as Wildlife Habitat, while adjacent lots are left clear. There are also lots within the centre of Cannonvale in a similar	Yes	<p>The Environmental significance overlay map data has been sourced from the State Government; therefore, any issues regarding the quality and accuracy of the data should be referred to the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning. The overlay maps are a State Interest and are a requirement for the proposed planning scheme to be consistent with the State Planning Policy; therefore, it will not be removed.</p> <p>The Environmental significance overlay code does not differentiate between Remnant Vegetation and Regrowth Vegetation as the associated mapping does not differentiate between the two.</p> <p>The purpose of public consultation is to receive feedback on any errors that may be evident in the proposed planning scheme and associated mapping. Should there be any inconsistencies, for example, residential land that contains the Environmental significance overlay it is recommended that the interested party contact the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Council immediately so that this error can be addressed in the first amendment of the planning scheme.</p>	No	No	No



No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
		scenario. The Overlay Code should encourage site inspections where there are obvious mapping anomalies.					
322.	212, 483.	8.2.7 – Extractive Resources Overlay Code Generally supports application, purpose and overall outcomes.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
323.	212, 483.	8.2.8 – Flood Hazard Overlay Code 8.2.8.3 AO2.1 The 50 metre setback conflicts with the setbacks in the Environmental Significance Overlay Code. The Codes should be consistent to avoid conflict.	No	The setback referred to in the Flood Hazard Overlay makes reference to 'non-urban' areas whereas the Environmental significance overlay deals within 'urban' areas.	No	No	No
324.	212, 483.	8.2.9 – Heritage Overlay Code Generally supports application, purpose and overall outcomes.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
325.	212, 483.	8.2.10 – Infrastructure Overlay Code Generally supports the application and purpose of this code, we question Council's jurisdiction to assess things like railway corridors, power infrastructure and the like. These items are assessed during the Referral process of a development application. We are concerned this code is duplicating assessment which is unnecessary. 8.2.10.3 AO10.1 20 metre setbacks to water supply pipelines are onerous and should be assessed on a case by case basis.	No	8.2.10 The purpose of this requirement is to restrict and protect these corridors.  The proposed planning scheme has undertaken a State Interest Review where the Minister of Planning, supported by the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning considers State Interests. As a result of the review the Minister was satisfied the relevant State interests have been integrated, and Council may consult on this version of the proposed planning scheme. 8.2.10.3 AO10.1 Noted, all applications will considered on merit.	No	No	No
326.	212, 483.	8.2.11 – Landslide Hazard Overlay Code Generally support application, purpose and overall outcomes.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
327.	212, 483.	8.2.12 – Waterways & Wetlands Overlay Code Generally support application, purpose and overall outcomes, however the accuracy of this mapping is questioned. We have identified examples where gullies devoid of vegetation in cane fields are identified as Stream Order 1. 8.2.12.3 AO18.1 100 metre setbacks to wetlands are onerous and should be assessed on a case by case basis. Table 8.12.12.3.4 This refers to protection zone buffers in SDAP Module 8. The Code is not clear on whether alternative buffers widths will be acceptable if an alternate outcome is proposed, which is allowed under SDAP Module 8. This should be clear.	No	The overlay maps are a State Interest and are a requirement for the proposed planning scheme to be consistent with the State Planning Policy; therefore, it will not be removed.  In relation to buffers, all distances have been provided in accordance with the requirements of the State. The proposed planning scheme has undertaken a State Interest Review where the Minister of Planning, supported by the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning considers State Interests. As a result of the review the Minister was satisfied the relevant State interests have been integrated, and Council may consult on this version of the proposed planning scheme.	No	No	No
<b>Part 9 – Development Codes</b>							
328.	212, 483.	9.1 – Preliminary In general, the increase in the number of development codes is supported, on the basis that the development assessment process is streamlined due to clarity in planning criteria. Council is strongly encouraged to assess development against these codes as performance based, not prescriptive as has been experienced in the past in some instances.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
329.	212, 483.	9.2 – Statewide Codes 9.2.1 – Community Residence Code	No	Noted.	No	No	No

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
		Generally support application, purpose and overall outcomes.					
330.	212, 483.	9.2.2 – Forestry for Wood Production Code Generally support application, purpose and overall outcomes.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
331.	212, 483.	9.2.3 – Reconfiguring a lot (subdividing one lot into two lots) and associated operational works code Generally support application, purpose and overall outcomes. We note there is limited opportunity for this to occur.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
332.	212, 483.	9.3 – Use Codes 9.3.1 – Business Activities Code Generally support assessment criteria.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
333.	212, 483.	9.3.2 – Caretaker's Accommodation Generally support assessment criteria.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
334.	212, 483.	9.3.3 – Child Care Centre Code Generally support assessment criteria.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
335.	212, 483.	9.3.4 – Dual Occupancy Code Constant reference to the QDC provisions is not user friendly. PO5 – Does this conflict with the Planning Scheme?	No	Noted. The use of the Queensland Development Code ensures all development is consistent and a separate set of rules is not developed to create confusion.	No	No	No
336.	212, 483.	9.3.5 – Dwelling House Code Constant reference to the QDC provisions is not user friendly. AO9.2 – this is regulated at Building Approval stage and has the potential for conflict.	No	Noted. The use of the Queensland Development Code ensures all development is consistent and a separate set of rules is not developed to create confusion. This also assists with self assessable provisions.	No	No	No
337.	212, 483.	9.3.6 – Extractive Industry Code AO3.2 – The requirement to seal access/driveways to extractive industry operations is ridiculous, considering the location of most extractive industries (e.g. in the Don River). AO3.3 – Site distances and driveway access grades are determined by the location of the resource itself, which is restricted by the natural processes that formed the resource. The resource is limited and finite in a certain location. PO4 – Council should recognise that the extractive resource is limited to specific locations and is finite. PO6 – Council should recognise that these aspects of development are regulated by DEHP under an Environmental Authority. Table 9.3.6.3.2 – Operating hours are governed by an Environmental Authority under separate legislation.	No	Noted. The assessment of extractive industries will be considered on each of their merits, however there are a large number of extractive industries which all access onto a sealed road in close proximity to urban areas. The impacts of dust and noise need to be considered and assessed to mitigate impacts against existing surrounding urban uses.	No	No	No
338.	212, 483.	9.3.7 – Home Based Business Code Generally support assessment criteria.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
339.	212, 483.	9.3.8 – Industry Activities Code AO1.1 – Site cover should not be prescribed. Appropriate setbacks and on-site requirements for each specific circumstance should be the deciding factor. AO7.1 – Why are 50 metre setbacks required?	No	Site cover is essential, particularly for industrial uses to ensure appropriate controls and use of the site is managed. The 50 metre setback is required for industrial uses within the rural zone to ensure the building and use is not located directly on the frontage of the site for amenity purposes.	No	No	No
340.	212, 483.	9.3.9 – Market Code	No	Noted.	No	No	No



No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
		Generally supports assessment criteria.					
341.	212, 483.	9.3.10 – Multi-Unit Uses Code Generally support assessment criteria.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
342.	212, 483.	9.3.11 – Relocatable Home & Tourist Park Code Generally supports assessment criteria.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
343.	212, 483.	9.3.12 – Residential Care Facility & Retirement Facility Code Generally supports assessment criteria.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
344.	212, 483	9.3.13 – Rural Activities Code AO3.1 – Where can you undertake intensive rural activities if not on Agricultural Land, given that Council's Overlay Map AL29 identifies all non-residential land as Agricultural. This is another example of why the Overlay Map should be removed from the Scheme urgently. Table 9.2.13.3.3 – This table confirms that viable alternative agricultural uses can occur on land less than 100 hectares (e.g. 4 ha, 5 ha, 20 ha, 50 ha, and 1 ha for rural industry). This conflicts with the ROL code.	No	9.3.1.3 – Rural activities code Intensive rural activities are intended to occur on rural/agricultural land as it is generally a consistent use. For example, Intensive animal industry is code assessable in the Rural zone, where consistent with the Rural activities code and Rural zone code. If it is triggered by the Agricultural land overlay map there is no change in the level of assessment; however it is required that the Agricultural land overlay is addressed. The Agricultural land overlay map will not be removed as it does not seem to have any issues.  Table 9.3.13.3.3 Firstly, it is assumed that Table 9.2.13.3.3 was a typing error as this table does not exist within the proposed planning scheme. This table does identify that a number of rural activities can occur on land less than 100 hectares as not all properties that are zoned rural are a minimum of 100 hectares due to historical planning approvals. The siting and setback requirements in Table 9.3.13.3.3 are to ensure that the land use has an appropriate amount of space to operate as well as allowing for setbacks away from sensitive uses.	No	No	No
345.	212, 483.	9.3.14 – Sales Office Code Generally supports assessment criteria.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
346.	212, 483.	9.3.15 – Service Station Code Generally supports assessment criteria.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
347.	212, 483.	9.3.16 – Telecommunications Facility Code Generally supports assessment criteria.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
348.	212, 483.	9.4 – Other Development Codes 9.4.1 – Advertising Devices Code Generally supports assessment criteria.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
349.	212, 483.	9.4.2 – Construction Management Code Generally supports assessment criteria.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
350.	212, 483.	9.4.3 – Excavation & Filling Code Generally supports assessment criteria.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
351.	212, 483.	9.4.4 – Infrastructure Code AO2.1 & 2.2 – When will the Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP) be made available? Reference should not be made to a document that is not finalised and not available for public comment.	No	The LGIP is currently in progress and will be available for public comment mid-2016.	No	No	<b>Yes</b>
352.	212, 483.	9.4.5 – Landscaping Code Generally support assessment criteria.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
353.	212, 483.	9.4.6 – Reconfiguring a Lot Code AO8.1 – The width of the vegetation buffer should be assessed on a case by case basis. The requirement for a 40 metre buffer to all Rural zoned land is onerous and unnecessary in all scenarios. For example, a Rural Residential block adjoining a large Rural zoned parcel used	No	AO8.1 The requirement for a buffer is consistent with the requirement to reduce land use conflicts and the use of the adjoining agricultural land cannot be guaranteed, it may change to an alternative rural activity which may increase the impacts. The reverse of this example is also addressed within the proposed planning scheme. AO10.1 Noted.	<b>Yes</b> to Table 9.4.6.3.2	No	No

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
		for cattle grazing; or adjoining a large Rural zoned parcel of land that contains vegetation. AO10.1 – Reference to the LGIP should not be included until it is a public document. Table 9.4.6.3.2 – The reference to the 4: 1 ratio is not clear and should be further explained.		Table 9.4.6.3.2 This will be clarified by including text in that confirms the 4:1 ration is to be read depth: width.			
354.	212, 483.	9.4.7 – Transport & Parking Code Acknowledges the wording in the Performance Outcomes allows for a merit based assessment of each development application, which is very positive as car parking is a major issue in areas such as Airlie Beach. Strongly supports PO2. Notes the car parking ratios and also note that a Traffic Impact Assessment will be considered by Council when determining required car spaces.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
<b>Schedule 1 – Definitions</b>							
355.	212, 483.	Generally supportive of the definitions.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
<b>Schedule 2 – Mapping</b>							
356.	212, 483.	Zone Maps –Numerous back zoning circumstances have been identified and strongly disagree with this.	No	Noted, can be reviewed when details of ‘back zoned’ sites have been identified.	No	No	No
357.	212, 483.	Overlay Maps – Again we highlight major concerns with the Agricultural Land Overlay Map and the Environmental Significance Overlay Map. Refer to previous sections of this submission. We also question the accuracy of the Bushfire Risk Overlay Map.	No	Noted	No	No	No
<b>Schedule 3 – Local Government Infrastructure Plan (LGIP)</b>							
358.	212, 483.	No comment can be made until a draft LGIP is made public. We do not support the reference to the LGIP in the proposed planning scheme until such time it is a public document.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
<b>Schedule 4 – Notations Required Under SPA</b>							
359.	212, 483.	No comment.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
<b>Schedule 5</b>							
360.	212, 483.	No comment.	No	Noted.	No	No	No
<b>Schedule 6 – Planning Scheme Policies.</b>							
361.	212, 483.	We are Supportive of Council formalising the policy position on a number of matters as part of the planning scheme. The content of the policies will no doubt be subject to further debate.	No	Noted.	No	No	No

## Appendix S – Zone – Summary of Issues Raised in Submissions and Council's Response

No.	Submission Reference	Point of Submission	State Interest Matter?	Council Response	Plan Change?	Mapping Change?	Deferred for Future Action?
<b>Zone</b>							
1.	113	Understands that there is to be a change of use to the land currently used by backpackers for camping (illegally) adjacent to the market and Sailing Club car park and that the old bus terminal is to be removed.  If this occurs, what alternative has been considered to remain at the forefront of the Cruise ship industry?	No	This area is and continues to remain zoned for recreation and outdoor space. There are no plans to relocate the bus terminal at this time. No changes are proposed.	No	No	No
2.	619	Notes that the proposed planning scheme must ensure that adequate and quality industrial land is available now and in the future for Bowen, Collinsville and Proserpine.	No	It should be noted that additional industrial land has been allocated in Bowen, Collinsville and Proserpine to support the resource sector. Council has zoned additional industrial land in areas that are already considered urban in nature, free of environmental features and close to existing transport corridors.	<b>Yes</b>	No	No
3.	619	Recommends that the proposed planning scheme allows for more medium density development as single dwelling home ownership is becoming less financially viable for first home owners.	No	Council cannot control affordability or market conditions; however provision has been made for land to be designated as Emerging Community, indicating Council's intention to cater for the expansion of the area and to make land available for development in the future. Rural residential lot sizes have also been reduced to aid future growth in these areas.	No	No	No
4.	218	Recommends that additional Rural residential land is zoned on the outer fringe of Collinsville and Scottville.	No	Council will consider this request in future amendments of the proposed planning scheme once further investigations have been conducted.	No	No	<b>Yes</b>
5.	237, 239, , 341, 357, 358, 381, 384, 385, 386, 388, 389, 464, 465, 466, 467, 484, 507, 508, 509, 520, 662, 663, 664	Concerns regarding Low impact industry and Industry Investigation in Bowen and Merinda, particularly in relation to overall outcome 6.2.6.2 (3)(b)(xvi).  <i>"Development is provided with the full range of urban services, including parks, reticulated water, sewerage, stormwater drainage, sealed roads, pathways, electricity and telecommunications infrastructure."</i>	No	Council applies reasonable and relevant conditions to each proposed development in these areas to ensure adequate infrastructure and urban services are provided or contributions toward the cost are paid by the developer in lieu. Planning for future growth and development of Industrial areas is undertaken at every stage of the application process to bring those areas currently below standard into line with current community expectations.	No	No	No
6.	237, 239, , 341, 357, 358, 381, 384, 385, 386, 388, 389, 464, 465, 466, 467, 484, 507, 508, 509, 520, 662, 663, 664	Objects to the proposed zone based on approvals and sale of Council land that are within a Recreation and open space zone and/or Coastal erosion zone along Horseshoe Bay Road.	No	The proposed planning scheme cannot regulate matters such as Council's decision to sell land. The Recreation and open space zone is a direct translation of the current <i>Bowen Planning Scheme 2006</i> .	No	No	No

## Appendix T – Summary of Site Specific Zone & Overlay Changes

Revised Whitsunday Regional Council Planning Scheme: Summary of Zone & Overlay Changes					
Submission Reference	Street Address & Lot & Plan	Suburb	Draft WRCPS public consultation zone/overlay	Revised WRCPS zone/overlay	Reason
2	461 Sugarloaf Road 1, 18 & 99 SP241792	Riordanvale	Rural residential	No change	These properties were publicly notified as Rural residential, not Rural. In the <i>Whitsunday Shire Planning Scheme 2009</i> these properties were Rural. The change from the 2009 Planning Scheme to the proposed planning scheme was due to an existing Court Order and Council resolution at the time to undertake a consequential amendment to change the zoning. This amendment never occurred as part of the 2009 Planning Scheme amendments. The zone in the proposed planning scheme is correct and therefore no changes are required.
4	2667 Shute Harbour Road 1-2SP230520	Mandalay	Rural	No change	The Decision Notice Approval to establish nineteen (19) low density residential lots was granted in September, 2011 and was granted a two (2) year extension to the relevant period on 21 August, 2015, therefore valid to 17 September, 2017. No related approvals have been granted to date. Future amendment can be considered once the development has commenced.
6	Gregory Cannon Valley Road 21SP270170	Strathdickie	Rural residential	No change	The proposed planning scheme does not encourage expansion of rural residential land to protect valuable agricultural land, hence the decision to consolidate existing rural residential areas and reduce the minimum lot size. There is no proven need for additional rural residential land within the region. According to Council's Urban Growth Studies there is a surplus of rural residential land.
7	Gillies Road 2-8SP274029	Strathdickie	Rural	<b>Amend</b> Lots 2-7 (as per registered survey plan 274029) to reflect rural residential. No change to Lot 8.	The survey plan has been sealed for lots 2-7; whereas further development of Lot 8 has not yet commenced. Accordingly the zoning change will only reflect the stage of the development which has commenced being Lots 2-7 SP274029 and the balance to remain as rural. Future amendments can be considered once the development undertakes the next stage.
8	Scully Street 43SP113319	Bowen	Rural	<b>Amend</b> to Low impact industry No change to Acid sulfate soil overlay <b>Amend</b> Agriculture land overlay	<p>The site contains an existing approval including related approvals for Operational Works. Significant infrastructure works have been completed on site connecting to Council's infrastructure. Due to an increasing need for industrial land in the Whitsunday region, Council has given favourable consideration to including the property in the Low impact industry zone.</p> <p>The Acid sulfate soil overlay will remain as per State Government mapping. It is recommended that any supporting documentation that addresses acid sulfate soils is maintained as a record for future reference. The Acid sulfate soil overlay can be reconsidered at time of sealing the survey plan when all the necessary engineering reports and 'as constructed' data has been received and reviewed verifying the changes. Based on this information, a future amendment may be considered at a later date.</p> <p>The Agriculture land overlay has been removed from the site due to the proposed amended Low impact industry zone being applied to this site.</p>
9	17 Harrison Court 90SP253581	Bowen	Recreation and open space	<b>Amend</b> to Rural	Stage 3 of the development does not contain any low density residential use rights or approvals, therefore until such time as an approval has been sought, the proposed zone will be amended to reflect Council's policy position in the current <i>Bowen Shire Planning Scheme 2006</i> of which is Rural.
10	Paluma Road 55HR99	Woodwark	Emerging communities	No change to zone <b>Amend</b> Agriculture land overlay No change to Environmental significance overlay and Infrastructure overlay	<p>Supports proposed zone.</p> <p>The Agriculture land overlay has been removed from the site due to the proposed Emerging community zone being applied to this site.</p> <p>The Environmental significance overlay will remain as per State Government mapping. It should be noted that any future applications should identify the exemption as per the <i>Sustainable Planning Regulations 2009</i> and that the Environmental significance overlay also identifies and protects wildlife habitat; therefore, removal of this overlay is not supported. In addition, where a PMAV has been obtained and not reflected in the State Government mapping, it is suggested that proponents liaise with the State Government to amend the mapping.</p> <p>Further support is required to qualify the statement that "it is not envisioned that noise associated with the waste management facility will have any detrimental amenity impacts on the site". Information addressing Section 15.1(b) of the proposed planning scheme will qualify this statement.</p>
11	2 Hinschen Street 1SP265771	Proserpine	Community facilities	<b>Amend</b> to Low impact industry	Due to an increasing need for industrial land in the Whitsunday region, Council has given favourable consideration to including the property in the Low impact industry zone. A Decision Notice Approval has been granted including the related approval. Based on the existing uses on site, Proposed Lot 1 will be included in the Low impact industry zone and the existing residential uses within Proposed Lot 2 will be included in the Low density residential zone.



Revised Whitsunday Regional Council Planning Scheme: Summary of Zone & Overlay Changes					
Submission Reference	Street Address & Lot & Plan	Suburb	Draft WRCPS public consultation zone/overlay	Revised WRCPS zone/overlay	Reason
13	Horseshoe Bay Road 2SP245743	Bowen	Recreation and open space	No change	Property owners may continue using the property under existing use rights and may act upon the associated approval once determined. This zone is consistent with Council's policy position in the current <i>Bowen Shire Planning Scheme 2006</i> and remains unchanged.
14	122 Patullo Road 298RP2846453	Gregory River	Rural	No change	No survey plan has been registered confirming the use has commenced. Until such time the existing approval has been commenced the proposed zone will be maintained. The site is in keeping with the Rural zone. Existing approved activities may still be undertaken and Council may consider this request in future amendments of the proposed planning scheme.
16	Allan Road 5RP738979	Conway	Rural	No change	The proposed planning scheme does not encourage expansion of rural residential land to protect valuable agricultural land, hence the decision to consolidate existing rural residential areas and reduce the minimum lot size. There is no proven need for additional rural residential land within the region. According to Council's Urban Growth Studies there is a surplus of rural residential land.  No survey plan has been registered confirming the use has commenced. Until such time the existing approval has been approved the proposed zone will be maintained.
97	Bruce Highway 17RP739261	Proserpine	Low impact industry	No change	Supports proposed zone.
118	Main Street 3SP264124	Proserpine	Rural	<b>Amend</b> to Low impact industry	Due to an increasing need for industrial land in the Whitsunday region, Council has given favourable consideration to including the property in the Low impact industry zone. The site contains existing approvals for Industrial purposes and these uses have commenced on site.
138	Bruce Highway 7SP112928	Myrtlevale	Rural	No change	The proposed planning scheme does not encourage expansion of rural residential land to protect valuable agricultural land, hence the decision to consolidate existing rural residential areas and reduce the minimum lot size. There is no proven need for additional rural residential land within the region. According to Council's Urban Growth Studies there is a surplus of rural residential land.
176	385 Sugarloaf Road 40HR110	Riordanvale	Agricultural land overlay Bushfire hazard overlay	No change	Requests that the boundary of the State important agriculture is realigned to the boundary of the existing <i>Whitsunday Shire Planning Scheme 2009</i> Conservation overlay map. Data used for the Agricultural land overlay is as per State Government mapping. Consideration of exclusion should be discussed with the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning.  Requests that the bushfire category is downgraded from medium bushfire hazard to low bushfire hazard. Data used for the Bushfire hazard overlay is as per State Government mapping. Consideration of exclusion should be discussed with the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning.
194	2-6 Banksia Court 51RP864671	Cannonvale	Low-medium density residential	No change	This site is within close proximity to sensitive uses and receiving environments, such as residential development. The Low impact industry zone is incompatible with the surrounding uses and therefore is not supported.
198	12 Waterson Way 3RP734156	Airlie Beach	Low-medium density residential Maximum building height of 4 storeys	No change	The site was zoned Commercial under the 1985 and 2000 <i>Whitsunday Shire Planning Scheme</i> and changed under the <i>Whitsunday Shire Planning Scheme 2009</i> . Council will consider this request in future amendments of the proposed planning scheme once further investigations have been conducted to ascertain the background behind the zoning change. Amendments to the maximum building height will be investigated further for future amendments.
218	Scottville Road & 1A Fairway Street 32SP200134 & 35SP220391	Collinsville	Rural	<b>Amend</b> Lot 32 and Lot 35 to Low-medium density residential	The subject site was identified as part of the Collinsville /Scottsville Local Area Plan conducted in 2012. The subject sites were recommended for Attached Residential Investigation Areas and included on the Local Area Map. The sites were identified for Residential Precinct 2. Based on the findings of this report, the zones will be changed to reflect the equivalent of Residential Precinct 2, being Low Medium Residential. The request for additional Rural Residential land on the outer fringe of the Collinsville and Scottsville will be further investigated for future amendments.
238	11 Waite Street 2 & 4 RP706112	Proserpine	Low density residential	<b>Amend</b> to Major centre zone	The site contains existing approvals and existing use rights for commercial purposes. Council has given favourable consideration to including the property in the Major centre zone consistent with the adjoining property and uses operating on site.
240	Whitsunday Aviation Village Estate (WAVE) Air Whitsunday Road 400SP220005, 1- 3SP201433, 34- 40SP220006	Flametree	Community facilities	No change	Consistency of zoning will be applied to the Whitsunday Coast Airport, Bowen Airport and WAVE. Existing approved activities may still be undertaken and Council may consider this request in future amendments of the proposed planning scheme.
247	Cutuli Road 75SP164939 &	Riordanvale	Emerging community (Lot 75)	<b>Amend</b> Lot 75 to Emerging community	The subject site is surrounded by Emerging Community Zoned land and the request to change is considered logical. Furthermore, proposed master plans have included development over Lot 5. The Agriculture land

Revised Whitsunday Regional Council Planning Scheme: Summary of Zone & Overlay Changes					
Submission Reference	Street Address & Lot & Plan	Suburb	Draft WRCPS public consultation zone/overlay	Revised WRCPS zone/overlay	Reason
	5RP869340		Rural residential (Lot 5) Agricultural land overlay (Lot 75) Environmental significance overlay (Lot 75 & Lot 5)	<b>Amend</b> Agriculture land overlay on Lot 75 No change to Environmental significance overlay on Lots 75 & 5	overlay has been removed from Lot 75 due to the proposed Emerging community zone being applied to this site. The Environmental significance overlay will remain as per State Government mapping. It should be noted that any future applications should identify the exemption as per the <i>Sustainable Planning Regulations 2009</i> and that the Environmental significance overlay also identifies and protects wildlife habitat; therefore, removal of this overlay is not supported. In addition, where a PMAV has been obtained and not reflected in the State Government mapping, it is suggested that proponents liaise with the State Government to amend the mapping.
268	Plantation Drive 101-102 SP218221	Jubilee Pocket	Low density residential (Lot 101) Low-medium residential (Lot 102)	No change	Supports proposed zone.
279	Dudley Road 200SP260203, 201SP265297 203SP201439	Proserpine	Emerging community (Lot 200 & Lot 201) Rural (Lot 203) Agricultural land overlay Flood hazard overlay	<b>Amend</b> Lot 200 and Lot 201 to Low density residential No change to zone on Lot 203 <b>Amend</b> Agricultural land overlay on Lot 200 and Lot 201 No change to Flood hazard overlay on Lot 203	The survey plan has been sealed for Lot 200 and Lot 201; whereas further development of Lot 203 has not yet commenced or obtained an approval for the proposed reconfiguration of a lot. Accordingly the zoning change should only reflect the stage of the development which has commenced being Lot 200 and Lot 201 and the balance to remain as Rural. Future amendments can be considered once the development undertakes the next stage. The Agriculture land overlay has been removed from Lot 200 and Lot 201 due to the proposed Low density residential zone being applied to this site. The Flood hazard overlay will not be removed from the site until such time as constructed designs have been submitted to Council for consideration.
283	Bruce Highway 232SP250546	Bowen	Rural	<b>Amend</b> to Emerging community	The subject site is located in close proximity to the proposed future urban expansion of the Mt Gordon area. This site is considered essential to facilitate future connection to the Mt Bramston urban area and existing urban area of Scully Street. Council has given favourable consideration to including the property in the Emerging community zone.
292	23 Ocean View Avenue 0 & 6-9SP121140 and 19SP124856	Airlie Beach	Low-medium density residential Building height (3 storeys)	No change to zone No change to proposed building height	Supports proposed zone. The existing approval is acknowledged, where an approval has not lapsed existing approved activities may still be undertaken. The request to increase the maximum building height to 8 storeys will result in intensification of the property. Council do not support further intensification of the site as the site is in keeping with the Low-medium density residential. Amendments to the maximum building height will be investigated further for future amendments of the proposed planning scheme.
294	125 & 131 Shingley Drive 268HR1060 & 95HR1223	Airlie Beach	Low-medium density residential	No change	The existing approval is acknowledged. Existing approved activities may still be undertaken and Council may consider this request in future amendments of the proposed planning scheme. Council do not support further intensification of the site. Until such time the existing approval has been commenced the proposed zone will be maintained.
295	119B Botanica Drive 62SP211518	Woodwark	Rural residential	No change	The existing approval is acknowledged. Existing approved activities may still be undertaken and Council may consider this request in future amendments of the proposed planning scheme. Council do not support further intensification of the site. Until such time the existing approval has been commenced the proposed zone will be maintained.
297	Lodge Road 1SP277858 & 73HR180	Bowen	Rural residential	<b>Amend</b> to Emerging community	The subject site is located in close proximity to the proposed future urban expansion of the Mt Gordon area. This site is considered essential to facilitate future connection to the Mt Bramston urban area. Council has given favourable consideration to including the property in the Emerging community zone.
321	8 Waterson Way 10RP719827	Airlie Beach	Low-medium density residential Building height (4 storeys)	No change	Council will consider this request in future amendments of the proposed planning scheme once further investigations have been conducted.
323	10 Waterson Way 4RP734156	Airlie Beach	Low-medium density residential Building height (4 storeys)	No change	Council will consider this request in future amendments of the proposed planning scheme once further investigations have been conducted.
322	16 Waterson Way 1RP734156	Airlie Beach	Low-medium density residential Building height (4 storeys)	No change	Council will consider this request in future amendments of the proposed planning scheme once further investigations have been conducted.
339	Bruce Highway 7 & 8 RP731253	Bowen	Rural residential	<b>Amend</b> to Emerging community	The subject site is located in close proximity to the proposed future urban expansion of the Mt Gordon area. This site is considered essential to facilitate future connection to the Mt Bramston urban area and existing urban area of Scully Street. Council has given favourable consideration to including the property in the Emerging community zone.
343	47-49 Queens Road 4RP741865	Bowen	Low density residential	No change	Council will consider this request in future amendments of the proposed planning scheme once further investigations have been conducted.
458	Langford Road 150HR1308 & 300HR1583	Flametree	Tourist accommodation	No change	Due to the complexity of requested changes further investigation is required once the use has been commenced as per existing approval. Council will consider this request in future amendments of the proposed



Revised Whitsunday Regional Council Planning Scheme: Summary of Zone & Overlay Changes					
Submission Reference	Street Address & Lot & Plan	Suburb	Draft WRCPS public consultation zone/overlay	Revised WRCPS zone/overlay	Reason
					planning scheme once further investigations have been conducted.
474	12 Pandanus Street 3RP738821	Cannonvale	Low-medium density residential	No change	This site is within close proximity to sensitive uses and receiving environments, such as residential development. The Low impact industry zone is incompatible with the surrounding uses and therefore is not supported.
475	37 Cumberland Court, Seaview Drive and Kara Crescent 44 & 101 SP167803 and 100SP268394	Airlie Beach	Low density residential	No change	Until such time the existing approval has been fully commenced the proposed zone will be maintained. Existing approved activities may still be undertaken and Council may consider this request in future amendments of the proposed planning scheme.
477	45 Saltwater Creek Road 2RP733744	Palm Grove	Rural	No change	The proposed planning scheme does not encourage expansion of rural residential land to protect valuable agricultural land, hence the decision to consolidate existing rural residential areas and reduce the minimum lot size. There is no proven need for additional rural residential land within the region. According to Council's Urban Growth Studies there is a surplus of rural residential land.
478	50 Livingstone Street 6RP712807	Bowen	Low density residential	<b>Amend</b> to Low impact industry	Due to existing use rights, Council has given favourable consideration to including the property in the Low impact industry zone.
479	Bruce Highway 2, 3 & 4RP910221, 121HR325, 84USL44998 & 151HR325	Bowen	Rural	<b>Amend</b> to Emerging community	The subject site is located in close proximity to the proposed future urban expansion of the Mt Gordon area. This site is considered essential to facilitate future connection to the Mt Bramston urban area and existing urban area of Scully Street. Council has given favourable consideration to including the property in the Emerging community zone.
486	97 Ecker Road 10 & 11 SP248739	Preston	Rural	No change	The proposed planning scheme does not encourage expansion of rural residential land to protect valuable agricultural land, hence the decision to consolidate existing rural residential areas and reduce the minimum lot size. There is no proven need for additional rural residential land within the region. According to Council's Urban Growth Studies there is a surplus of rural residential land. No survey plan has been registered confirming the use has commenced. Until such time the existing approval has been approved the proposed zone will be maintained.
487	Champion Street 110HR1989	Merinda	Industrial investigation	No change	Supports proposed zone.
488	77 Warwick Road 2RP728311	Delta	Rural	No change	This site currently has use rights associated with the Rural zone under the proposed planning scheme. The zone therefore appropriately reflects the uses on the site and will remain unchanged.
489	249, 251, 253 & 255 Shute Harbour Road 9-10A8599 24, 26 & 28 Broadwater Avenue 406-408 & 411-412A8593	Airlie Beach	Mixed use Building heights (4 storeys)	No change	Supports proposed zone and maximum building height.
620	Parkwood Terrace 1RP858362	Cannonvale	Rural residential	No change	The site does not contain any existing use rights or approvals which allow for additional intensification at this stage. The site zone will remain unchanged at this time.
628	Entire block bound by: Myles, Champion, Crompton and Lynley Streets 902-908M4881 & 10 & 11RP724068	Merinda	902M488 – Neighbourhood centre 903-908M488 – Low density residential 10 & 11RP724068 – Low- medium density residential	<b>Amend</b> Lot 902, Lot 10 and Lot 11 to Neighbourhood centre <b>Amend</b> Lots 903-908 – Low medium density residential	The site contains existing uses on Lots 902 and Lot 10 and 11 which are consistent with approvals and uses within the Neighbourhood centre zone. This change is supported. The site contains existing uses and approved uses for motel and accommodation on Lots 903-908, part of the use has commenced and therefore these lots will be changed to reflect the approved uses.

## Appendix U – Summary of Complex Site Specific Changes

Revised Proposed Whitsunday Regional Council Planning Scheme: Summary of Zone & Overlay Changes					
Submission Reference	Street Address & Lot & Plan	Suburb	Point of Submission	Revised WRCPs	Reason
<b>ABELL POINT MARINA</b>					
472	102SP225395, 3SP265779 & 290CP866394	Airlie Beach	Supports building heights proposed in Airlie Beach.	No change	Supports proposed building heights.
472	102SP225395, 3SP265779 & 290CP866394	Airlie Beach	Supports proposed zone for Abell Point.	No change	Supports proposed zone.
<b>Mapping</b>					
472	102SP225395 & 3SP265779	Airlie Beach	Lot 102 and Lot 3 are not included in the zoning map.	<b>Amend</b>	Updated mapping data will be applied to the revised version of the proposed planning scheme prior to the next review by the State Government. As a result, Lot 102 & Lot 3 will take on the land zoning of the adjoining land.
<b>Building Height</b>					
472	102SP225395, 3SP265779 & 290CP866394	Airlie Beach	Objects to the proposed 3 storey building height restriction.	Noted	N/A
472	102SP225395	Airlie Beach	<p><u>Site 1</u> Recommends that this site is suitable for 6 storey building height limits as the building will not fully obstruct the outlook from surrounding allotments.</p> <p><u>Site 2</u> Recommends that this site is suitable for 5 storey building height limits as the building will not fully obstruct the outlook from surrounding allotments, pending appropriate design, and is a more economically feasible option than 3 or 4 storeys.</p>	No change	Further detail cannot be included in the mapping as the cadastre and land tenure are yet to be finalised. All mapping data in the proposed planning scheme will be updated in an administrative amendment. Council will consider this request in future amendments of the proposed planning scheme once further investigations have been conducted.
472	3SP265779	Airlie Beach	Recommends that this site is suitable for 6 storey building height limits as the building will not fully obstruct the outlook from surrounding allotments.	No change	Further detail cannot be included in the mapping as the cadastre and land tenure are yet to be finalised. All mapping data in the proposed planning scheme will be updated in an administrative amendment. Council will consider this request in future amendments of the proposed planning scheme once further investigations have been conducted.
472	290CP866394	Airlie Beach	Recommends that this site is suitable for 4 and 5 storey building height limits as the building will not fully obstruct the outlook from surrounding allotments.	No change	Further detail cannot be included in the mapping as the cadastre and land tenure are yet to be finalised. All mapping data in the proposed planning scheme will be updated in an administrative amendment. Council will consider this request in future amendments of the proposed planning scheme once further investigations have been conducted.
<b>FUNNEL BAY</b>					
458	Langford Road 150HR1308	Flametree	Requests that the proposed planning scheme is amended to allow for a number of changes that are tailored to the intended use under an existing approval, in regards to the table of assessment and establishing a "Funnel Bay Precinct".	No change	Due to the complexity of requested changes further investigation is required once the use has been commenced as per existing approval. Council will consider this request in future amendments of the proposed planning scheme once further investigations have been conducted.
<b>HAMILTON ISLAND</b>					
<b>Schedule 1 Definitions</b>					
480	Hamilton Island	Hamilton Island	HIE submit the Hamilton Island and Dent Island tourist resort facilities and uses are more accurately and appropriately defined as the 'Resort complex' use definition proposed in the proposed planning scheme. HIE request that the Council confirm and agree with this point of submission and will interpret all uses and activities associated with the operation of the tourist resorts on the islands as the 'Resort complex' use definition after the adoption of the proposed planning scheme.	<b>Amend</b> definition to Resort Complex	Hamilton Island is more closely aligned to the definition of Resort Complex and therefore support is given for this change.
<b>Mapping</b>					
480	Hamilton Island	Hamilton Island	Strategic Framework Map	<b>Amend</b> Strategic framework	This was an administrative error. HIE Airport is an essential airport for the

Revised Proposed Whitsunday Regional Council Planning Scheme: Summary of Zone & Overlay Changes					
Submission Reference	Street Address & Lot & Plan	Suburb	Point of Submission	Revised WRCPS	Reason
			HIE submit that the Strategic framework Map – SRM -01 must be amended to include Contextual information of an ‘Airport’ and ‘Port to recognize the established and operating Hamilton Island Airport and Hamilton Island Marina.	Map – SRM-01 to include HIE Airport	growth of our region and will be reflected appropriately.
480	Hamilton Island	Hamilton Island	HIE submit that the Strategic framework Map – SRM – 01 be amended to include minor changes to reflect the correct Settlement pattern as shown in Appendix U.1.	<b>Amend</b> Strategic framework Map – SRM-01 to reflect the correct settlement patterns.	This was an administrative error and will be reflected appropriately. Hamilton Island is a key stakeholder and provides important economic benefits to our region.
480	Hamilton Island	Hamilton Island	<u>Zone Map</u> HIE submit that the tourist resort facilities on Hamilton Island and Dent Island are more closely aligned and reflected by the purpose and overall outcomes of the Tourist accommodation zone category rather than the proposed five separate zone categories as identified and drawn on Zoning Map – ZM – 04. HIE request that Council amend the draft Zoning Map – ZM -04 to include the tourist resort areas within the Tourist accommodation zone category. The balance of the islands will remain in the Recreation and open space zone category. It is also submitted that the Hamilton Island Marina also be included in the Tourist accommodation zone as has the Hayman Island Marina and the Daydream Island Marina areas.	<b>Amend</b> the zoning map to reflect the developed area as per the submission to Tourist Accommodation Zone and Open Space Zone.	The changing of the zoning more accurately reflects the uses which are consistent in the Resort Complex definition. This allows for a more consistent approach to uses on the island.
480	Hamilton Island	Hamilton Island	<u>Building Height Map</u>  HIE submit and request some minor amendments to the maximum heights and the height precincts currently mapped on Local plan – HILP – 01 to be in accordance with Appendix U.1.	<b>Amend</b> the building height map as per submission.	The amendment of the building height map more accurately reflects the approved and developed building heights on the island.
<b>Hamilton Island Local Plan Level of Assessment</b>					
480	Hamilton Island	Hamilton Island	This submission has requested Council include the tourist resort areas of the two islands into the Tourist Accommodation zone category which, if supported will reduce in the number of Hamilton Island local plan levels of assessment tables down to two (2) only, i.e. Hamilton Island local plan Tourist Accommodation zone and Hamilton Island local plan Recreation and open space code.  It is submitted that Table 5.9.2 – Hamilton island local plan levels of assessment be amended by the deletion of the following Tables: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Table 5.9.2.1 Hamilton island local plan – Community facilities zone;</li> <li>• Table 5.9.2.2 Hamilton island local plan – Low density residential zone;</li> <li>• Table 5.9.2.3 Hamilton island local plan – Low impact industry code;</li> <li>• Table 5.9.2.4 Hamilton island local plan – Low medium density residential zone; and</li> <li>• Table 5.9.2.5 Hamilton island local plan – Mixed use zone.</li> </ul> It is further submitted that Table 5.9.2 – Hamilton island local plan levels of assessment be amended to include a new Table – Hamilton island local plan – Tourist accommodation zone.	<b>Amend</b> the tables of assessment to reflect suggested changes.	The Community facilities, Recreation and open space and Tourist accommodation zone codes will remain and be included within the Hamilton Island Local Plan.
<b>Hamilton Island Local Plan Code</b>					
480	Hamilton Island	Hamilton Island	A revised Hamilton island local plan code has been prepared which adopts recommended changes as per the Hamilton Island Building Design and Siting Guidelines.	<b>Amend</b> sections: 7.2.1.2(g), 7.2.1.2 (m), 7.2.1.2.1A01.1, 7.2.1.2.1A03.1, 7.2.1.2.1A03.2, 7.2.1.2.1A04.1, 7.2.1.2.1A07.1,	No amendments are proposed to – Advisory note – There is no need for Council to reiterate the requirements under legislation, particularly when legislation changes over time. Council is bound by these provisions and will continue to operate in accordance with these requirements. No amendment to 7.1.1.3.1 A08.3, 7.1.1.3.1 A010.5 and 7.1.1.3.1 A010.6 will be made. The suggested change is a building assessment provisions

Revised Proposed Whitsunday Regional Council Planning Scheme: Summary of Zone & Overlay Changes					
Submission Reference	Street Address & Lot & Plan	Suburb	Point of Submission	Revised WRCPS	Reason
				7.2.1.2.1A013.1, 7.2.1.2.1A013.2.	matter and is therefore not supported.
<b>Development Code</b>					
<b>480</b>	Hamilton Island	Hamilton Island	<p>Part 9 of the proposed planning scheme contains the codes for selected development uses as well as other development codes to address design and construction requirements for development in the Region.</p> <p>These development codes include Performance Outcomes and Acceptable Outcomes which encapsulate many of the building design and siting requirements of the Hamilton Island BDSG which have not been transposed into the HILP code.</p> <p>This submission has included a request that the Council include all of the resort facility use areas within the one zone – Tourist accommodation zone. This submission also includes a request that the HILP levels of assessment be amended to include a new Table – Hamilton island local plan – Tourist accommodation zone. This Table includes each of the relevant use codes, zone codes and development codes within the Assessment Criteria for each specific use.</p>	<b>Amend</b> the definition and uses as per submission	The Hamilton Island Local Plan has been amended to include a Tourist accommodation zone code and Table of assessment reflecting some of the requests of the submission.
<b>JOU3 (WOOLWORTHS AIRLIE BEACH)</b>					
491	81-97 Waterson Way 53SP248501	Airlie Beach	Delete from the draft Local Plan Map the notation of “existing/future public car parking” on the JOU3 land.	<b>Amend</b>	The Airlie Beach Local Plan has been deleted from the proposed planning scheme; therefore, this issue is resolved.
491	81-97 Waterson Way 53SP248501	Airlie Beach	Delete any other reference to the JOU3 Land as an existing or future “public” car park in the balance of the proposed planning scheme.	<b>Amend</b>	The Airlie Beach Local Plan has been deleted from the proposed planning scheme; therefore, this issue is resolved.
491	81-97 Waterson Way 53SP248501	Airlie Beach	Include clear, detailed provisions in the proposed planning scheme that require any development of the Council land to provide car parking, including public car parking (consistent with the ABAM Plan), which is within the boundaries of the Council land and accommodates the form of development that could be achieved on the land under the provisions of the proposed planning scheme. Further, the proposed planning scheme, should require impact assessment for development applications in respect of the Council land where those car parking requirements are not achieved. For example, a development application should be impact assessable where not complying with the minimum on-site parking requirements set out in Table 9.4.7.3.3 of the Transport and parking code.	No change	Until such time a development application is lodged to Council, the proposed provisions will remain. Council will consider this request in future amendments of the proposed planning scheme once further investigations have been conducted. It should be noted that all proposals will be assessed on its merits.
491	81-97 Waterson Way 53SP248501	Airlie Beach	Specifically include in the proposed planning scheme a requirement that all access and egress for any development on the Council land is to be obtained from the Waterson way/Raintree Place roundabout. By way of example, we suggest that the purpose and overall outcomes for Precinct C: Waterson Way and the performance criteria for Precinct C: Waterson Way (both of which are contained in the Airlie Beach Local Plan Code), are amended in this regard, together with any consequential amendments to ensure that the provision is not inconsistent with any other provision of the proposed planning scheme. Further, the proposed planning scheme should require impact assessment for a development application in respect of the Council land which proposes access and egress other than in accordance with the above requirements (i.e. other than from the Waterson Way/Raintree Place roundabout).	<b>Amend</b>	The Airlie Beach Local Plan has been deleted from the proposed planning scheme; therefore, this issue is resolved.
491	81-97 Waterson Way	Airlie Beach	Consider any issues in relation to overshadowing of development so that they are properly taken into consideration.	No change	Until such time a development application is lodged to Council, the proposed provisions will remain. Council will consider this request in future



Revised Proposed Whitsunday Regional Council Planning Scheme: Summary of Zone & Overlay Changes					
Submission Reference	Street Address & Lot & Plan	Suburb	Point of Submission	Revised WRCPS	Reason
	53SP248501				assessment of potential development applications, once further investigations have been conducted. It should be noted that all proposals will be assessed on its merits.
491	81-97 Waterson Way 53SP248501	Airlie Beach	Remove the JOU3 land from the Acid sulfate soil overlay and the Flood hazard overlay.	No change	Data used for the Bushfire hazard overlay is as per State Government mapping. Consideration of exclusion should be discussed with the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning.
491	81-97 Waterson Way 53SP248501	Airlie Beach	JOU3 is supportive of the designation of the JOU3 land within the Mixed use zone and the 8 storey area on the Airlie Beach Local Plan: Heights Plan.	No change	Supportive of proposed zone and maximum building height.
<b>LAGOON GARDENS</b>					
279	Dudley Road 200SP260203, 201SP256297 & 203SP201439	Proserpine	Requests that the proposed zone for Lot 203 is amended to reflect the existing approval. It is recommended that it is changed to Emerging communities.	No change	Until such time a survey plan is lodged to Council, the proposed zone will remain. Council will consider this request in future amendments of the proposed planning scheme once further investigations have been conducted.
279	Dudley Road 200SP260203, 201SP256297 & 203SP201439	Proserpine	Raises concerns regarding why so much land has been zoned as Emerging communities on the northern side of Proserpine when there is very little demand for land.	No change	Each community within the region has been allocated land to cater for growth over the medium and long term period.
279	Dudley Road 200SP260203, 201SP256297 & 203SP201439	Proserpine	Notes that part of the site that is identified as flood prone has been filled above the Q100 line. It is recommended that the proposed zone is changed over approximately half of the site; however, to avoid split zoning the submitter will lodge a Reconfiguration of a lot development application to formally separate the northern portion of Lot 203 (Stage 4) from the southern portion (Stage 5).	No change	Until such time a survey plan is lodged to Council, the proposed zone and Flood hazard overlay will remain. Council will consider this request in future amendments of the proposed planning scheme once further investigations have been conducted.
279	Dudley Road 200SP260203, 201SP256297 & 203SP201439	Proserpine	Notes that if any of the sites are amended to reflect the Low-density residential and Emerging communities zone, the Agricultural land overlay.	<b>Amend</b>	The proposed zone for Lot 200 and Lot 201 have been changed to reflect Low density residential; therefore, the Agricultural land overlay has been removed from this site.
279	Dudley Road 200SP260203, 201SP256297 & 203SP201439	Proserpine	Requests that the Flood hazard overlay is removed from a portion of Stage 4 as informed by and Engineering assessment completed for the site.	No change	Until such time a survey plan provides the finished ground levels and is lodged to Council, the Flood hazard overlay will remain. This is generally taken at the time of sealing the survey plan.
279	Dudley Road 200SP260203, 201SP256297 & 203SP201439	Proserpine	Requests that proposed planning scheme mapping is updated to show the twenty (20) lots recently endorsed as part of Stage 3B(i).	<b>Amend</b>	All mapping data in the proposed planning scheme will be updated in an administrative amendment.
<b>PORT OF AIRLIE</b>					
17			The cadastre for Council's draft mapping will need to be updated to reflect the changes to the cadastral boundaries for the precinct that are currently being made. This should be done before the mapping is finalised and the proposed planning scheme commences.	<b>Amend</b>	All mapping data in the proposed planning scheme will be updated in an administrative amendment.
<b>Strategic Framework</b>					
17			The Strategic framework does not specifically recognise the residential, retail and commercial potential with the Port of Airlie (as a precinct within Airlie Beach) and we would recommend that Council expand the Strategic framework to recognise this potential. In this regard, the framework should recognise the unique opportunity presented by Port of Airlie to provide absolute waterfront residential product, and marina-related residential product, both of which add significant scope, value and attraction to the Whitsunday residential	No change	The Strategic framework does not recognise specific commercial operations within the region, this would be inconsistent with the drafting principles.

Revised Proposed Whitsunday Regional Council Planning Scheme: Summary of Zone & Overlay Changes					
Submission Reference	Street Address & Lot & Plan	Suburb	Point of Submission	Revised WRCPS	Reason
			market. Equally, Port of Airlie presents wide opportunities for high-end, speciality and marine-related retail and commercial activities that cannot necessarily be offered in, for example, the Airlie Beach Town Centre, Cannonvale or Proserpine. Overall, the Port of Airlie has significant potential to contribute to the economic growth of the Whitsundays and this should be recognised at the highest level of the proposed planning scheme.		
17	Precincts D, K, O and P (Lot 112 on SP232106, Lot 116 on SP260211, Lot 104 on SP232115 and Lot 108 on SP232115)		The inclusion of Precincts D, K, O and P within the rural area under the Strategic framework is completely inconsistent with the provisions of the proposed planning scheme, which supports development of various types through the relevant zoning and local plan provisions. Additionally, the Strategic framework does not recognise the current and intended urban uses of Precincts D, K, O and P, as well as the urban nature of these areas, considering their location and surrounding land uses. The Strategic framework mapping should be amended to identify Precincts D, K, O and P as urban areas within the settlement pattern, in alignment with the rest of the proposed planning scheme.	Amend	These areas will be identified as urban uses.
<b>Levels of Assessment</b>					
17			<p>Under the previous version of the proposed scheme, and in the specific context of the Port of Airlie, hotels were made code assessable land uses in the Mixed Use Zone. This has been changed to impact assessable under the newly amended version of the proposed planning scheme.</p> <p>Hotels are consistent with the intended development of land in the Mixed Use Zone within the Port of Airlie precinct and the overall outcomes identified for this area in the Airlie Beach Local Plan. Hotels should therefore be made code assessable in the Mixed Use Zone, where undertaken in the Port of Airlie precinct. It is recommended that Council amend the tables of assessment for the Mixed Use Zone within the Airlie Beach Local Plan to state that hotels are code assessable.</p>	Amend	The Airlie Beach local plan Table of assessment has been removed and will now refer to the Mixed use zone.
17			<p>Within the tables of assessment for the Mixed Use Zone, dual occupancies and health care services are both made either self or code assessable. Within the tables of assessment for development in the Mixed Use Zone under the Airlie Beach Local Plan, these land uses are made impact assessable, by being included in the 'other' category for each of the activity groups.</p> <p>Although the Mixed Use Zone land in the Port of Airlie may not currently be intended to be developed for these purposes, it is inconsistent for the local plan to make these land uses impact assessable by default, when there is no significant reason why these land uses should be made impact assessable in the Mixed Use Zone in the Port of Airlie specifically. It is recommended that the tables of assessment for the Mixed Use Zone under the Airlie Beach Local Plan be amended to note that the levels of assessment for dual occupancies and health care services remain unchanged from those identified in the tables of assessment for the Mixed Use Zone.</p>	Amend	The Airlie Beach local plan Table of assessment has been removed and will now refer to the Mixed use zone.
17			Within the tables of assessment for the Low Medium Density Residential Zone, a shop is made code assessable, where a corner store and complying with the acceptable outcomes of the relevant codes. Within the tables of assessment for development in the Low Medium Density Residential Zone under the Airlie Beach Local Plan, a shop is made impact assessable, by being included in the 'other'	Amend	The Airlie Beach local plan Table of assessment has been removed and will now refer to the Low Medium Density zone.



Revised Proposed Whitsunday Regional Council Planning Scheme: Summary of Zone & Overlay Changes					
Submission Reference	Street Address & Lot & Plan	Suburb	Point of Submission	Revised WRCPS	Reason
			<p>category for the business activities group.</p> <p>It is inconsistent for the local plan to make a shop impact assessable by default in the Low Medium Density Residential Zone, when there is no significant reason why a shop should be made impact assessable in this zone in the Port of Airlie specifically. It is recommended that the tables of assessment for the Low Medium Density Residential Zone under the Airlie Beach Local Plan be amended to note that the level of assessment for a shop is to remain unchanged from that identified in the tables of assessment for the Low Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>		
17			<p>Within the tables of assessment for the Community Facilities Zone, caretaker's accommodation, community residence and health care services are made self or code assessable (in certain circumstances). Within the tables of assessment for development in the Community Facilities Zone under the Airlie Beach Local Plan, these land uses are made impact assessable, by being included in the 'other' category for each of the activity groups.</p> <p>Although the Community Facilities Zone land in the Port of Airlie may not currently be intended to be developed for these purposes, it is inconsistent for the local plan to make these land uses impact assessable by default, when there is no significant reason why these land uses should be made impact assessable in the Community Facilities Zone in the Port of Airlie specifically. It is recommended that the tables of assessment for the Community Facilities Zone under the Airlie Beach Local Plan be amended to note that the levels of assessment for caretaker's accommodation, community residence and health care services remain unchanged from those identified in the tables of assessment for the Community Facilities Zone.</p>	<b>Amend</b>	The Airlie Beach local plan Table of assessment has been removed and will now refer to the Community Facilities zone.
17			<p>Community uses and utility installations in the Mixed Use Zone, Community Facilities Zone and Low-Medium Density Residential Zone are made exempt development, where undertaken by or on behalf of Council. In any other circumstances, they are impact assessable development. This is inequitable, as development undertaken by the private sector would result in the same use ultimately. We therefore believe that utility installations should be made exempt development in the Mixed Use Zone, Community Facilities Zone and Low-Medium Density Residential Zone, where undertaken within the Port of Airlie precinct. Community uses should also be exempt development where undertaken within the Mixed Use Zone and the Community Facilities Zone in the Port of Airlie precinct, and not more than code assessable where within the Low-Medium Density Residential Zone in the Port of Airlie precinct.</p> <p>We therefore recommend that the tables of assessment for the Mixed Use Zone, Community Facilities Zone and Low-Medium Density Residential Zone within the Airlie Beach Local Plan be amended to reflect these reduced levels of assessment for community uses and utility installations. Please note, under the current planning scheme, utility installations are made exempt development for all parties.</p> <p>We appreciate that the proposed planning scheme does not include a specific code for the assessment of community uses. In the absence of a specific use code in this instance, we have recommended that the level of assessment for community uses only be amended where</p>	<p>No change</p> <p><b>Amend</b></p>	<p>The purpose for community uses being exempt when being carried out on or behalf of Council is due to these uses being essential services and not for profit. Furthermore State agencies currently have exemptions under the <i>Sustainable Planning Regulations</i>.</p> <p>The Airlie Beach Table of assessment has been removed and will now refer to the Low Medium Density Residential zone.</p>

Revised Proposed Whitsunday Regional Council Planning Scheme: Summary of Zone & Overlay Changes					
Submission Reference	Street Address & Lot & Plan	Suburb	Point of Submission	Revised WRCPS	Reason
			<p>undertaken within the Port of Airlie precinct. To further support the assessment of community uses in the Port of Airlie, we also recommend that additional provisions could be included in the Airlie Beach Local Plan Code for the assessment of community uses in the Port of Airlie Precinct.</p> <p>Please note, where the levels of assessment for 'other activities' is identified in the tables of assessment for development in the Low-Medium Density Residential Zone, the table of assessment states 'all other rural activities' and should be amended to state 'all other activities.' This appears to be an error in drafting and will need to be rectified for completeness.</p>		
17			<p>We believe that parking stations established within the Community Facilities Zone and the Mixed Use Zone of the Port of Airlie Precinct under the Airlie Beach Local Plan should be code assessable, irrespective of whether they are undertaken by or on behalf of Council or by a private entity. Under the proposed planning scheme, they are made impact assessable. The requirement for a car parking station within either of these zones within the Port of Airlie Precinct to be subject to impact assessment is particularly onerous and the proposed planning scheme should instead be seeking to facilitate the provision of additional public car parking within the Port of Airlie.</p> <p>This is particularly relevant to the potential future expansion of the existing public car park located on Lot 114 on SP260211 (Precinct J2) in the Mixed Use Zone, which is leased by Council and was established for Council by the proponents for the Port of Airlie. There is no need to bring in the statutory section of the proposed planning scheme for the assessment of an application for the future expansion of an existing car parking station.</p> <p>We therefore recommend that parking stations within the Community Facilities Zone or Mixed Use Zone of the Port of Airlie Precinct should be subject to code assessment and that the relevant tables of assessment within the Airlie Beach Local Plan should be amended to reflect this.</p>	<b>Amend</b>	The Airlie Beach Local Plan has been removed from the proposed planning scheme, and as a result, will defer to the zone code for levels of assessment.
17			<p>We believe the levels of assessment specified for OW developments are appropriate and are therefore supported.</p> <p>It is important to note that the proposed planning scheme cannot regulate any development in an area that is not part of a zone. We believe that the open ocean is not defined as a waterway and therefore does not assume any zoning of adjacent land. As such, the levels of assessment for operational work for tidal work can only relate to that component of a development that is landward of high water mark.</p>	No change	Support the level of assessment for Operational works.
17			We note that a minimum lot size is not specified for sites included in the Community Facilities Zone. This is an anomaly in the proposed planning scheme and causes confusion when trying to determine the level of assessment for ROL applications in this zone. In practice, all ROLs in this zone would trigger impact assessment, as no minimum lot size is specified in the relevant table. After discussing this matter with Council, we have been informed that not specifying a minimum lot size for land in the Community Facilities Zone does not automatically trigger impact assessment for ROL applications, as there is no minimum lot size to comply with. Council stated that they	<b>Amend</b>	The Reconfiguration of a lot table has been amended to provide clarity regarding the level of assessment for Community facilities, Environmental management and Recreation and open space zones. Impact assessment will be triggered as it is not the intent for these areas to be reconfigured.

Revised Proposed Whitsunday Regional Council Planning Scheme: Summary of Zone & Overlay Changes					
Submission Reference	Street Address & Lot & Plan	Suburb	Point of Submission	Revised WRCPS	Reason
			<p>would include a note to explain that were no minimum lot size is provided, ROL applications remain code assessable. We support this as a suitable way to clarify the determination of levels of assessment.</p> <p>Generally speaking, we believe that all reconfiguration of a lot applications should be subject to code assessment and that minimum lot size should not be used as a trigger for impact assessment (when a subdivision doesn't comply). Instead, minimum lot sizes should just be identified as an acceptable outcome within the Subdivision Code and impact assessment should be reserved for specific circumstances when a reconfiguration of a lot will have strategic implications.</p> <p>We therefore recommend that the level of assessment for reconfiguration of a lot applications within the entire proposed planning scheme area be code assessable at most and that at the very least, this position be adopted for all reconfiguration of a lot applications within the Port of Airlie Precinct.</p>		
<b>Overlays</b>					
17	Precincts G, H, L and M (Lot 106 on SP172255, Lot 105 on SP232115, Lot 103 on SP232115 and Lot 102 on SP232115)		<p>Parts of Precincts G, H, L and M (Lot 106 on SP172255, Lot 105 on SP232115, Lot 103 on SP232115 and Lot 102 on SP232115) are included in the Acid Sulfate Soils Overlay.</p> <p>As the entire Port of Airlie Area is reclaimed land and was subject to extensive EIS investigations and an environmental management plan (which was provided to Council), we consider the inclusion of these sites in the Acid Sulfate Soils Overlay to be unnecessary and inappropriate. The mapping should therefore be amended to remove Port of Airlie from this overlay.</p>	No change	Data used for the Acid sulfate soils overlay is as per State Government mapping. Consideration of exclusion should be discussed with the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning.
17	Precinct R (Lot 117 on SP232115)		<p>It would appear as though Council have largely adopted the State mapping for coastal erosion and inundation for the site (current at the time of drafting), which does not reflect the reclamation of the site or existing development within the area.</p> <p>We believe coastal erosion mapping should be removed from the precinct for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The entire precinct is surrounded by either rock revetment walls or sheet pile walls, which protect the site from coastal erosion.</li> <li>The Cove, The Point and the ferry terminal include provision for land side access corridors to the revetment walls for maintenance purposes, as a result of negotiations with DEHP.</li> <li>The same arrangements are being made for The Landing and will be provided for future developments on Lot 109 and Lot 115.</li> </ul> <p>The precinct is clearly well protected against coastal erosion.</p> <p>We also believe that TSTI and permanent inundation mapping should be removed from the precinct for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development was originally a State significant project and has been completed in accordance with a comprehensive EIS process and approvals by both the federal environmental department and the Queensland Co-Ordinator-General.</li> <li>The reclamation of the land for the precinct was undertaken in accordance with the operational work permit approved by DEHP/EPA, in accordance with the EIS response to coastal hazards for the area.</li> </ul>	Amend	Data used for the Coastal hazard overlay mapping will be amended to exclude this site from the overlay as per advice from State Government entities.

Revised Proposed Whitsunday Regional Council Planning Scheme: Summary of Zone & Overlay Changes					
Submission Reference	Street Address & Lot & Plan	Suburb	Point of Submission	Revised WRCPS	Reason
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The operational works approval was conditioned to the effect that the minimum finished level of the reclaimed land should be 3.7 metres AHD. This requirement was echoed in the Port of Airlie Infrastructure Agreement, to which Council is a signatory. All works have been completed and signed off as being consistent with this requirement. Please see <b>Appendix A</b> of this submission for a copy of the RPEQ signed letters confirming compliance with the minimum finished floor level requirements. It is therefore unreasonable and extremely onerous for the proposed planning scheme to come over the top of these existing approvals and impose additional requirements for dealing with potential coastal hazards.</li> </ul> <p>We have received further advice from Council relating to the DSTE levels, under which the DSTE for the Port of Airlie site would be taken to be HAT level plus an additional two metres. With a HAT level of 2.19m AHD, DSTE levels for the Port of Airlie site are 4.19m AHD. As such, there is a difference of nearly 0.5m between the DSTE level for the site and the previously approved level of 3.7 metres AHD (as detailed above).</p> <p>The effect of the inclusion of Port of Airlie within the Coastal Hazard Overlay is that the levels of all or most of the remaining development sites would have to be filled further to comply with the DSTE and minimum habitable floor level arising from the overlay provisions. The imposition of such a requirement would be unreasonable and extremely onerous and would cut across the existing approvals and impose substantial and unsustainable cost implications. Such additional filling would also result in inconsistent levels between existing and future development sites.</p> <p>In addition to the above, we advise that the approved minimum level of 3.7m AHD provides suitable immunity against storm tide inundation, including having regard to anticipated sea level rise. This is demonstrated below (all levels to AHD):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highest Astronomical Tide (HAT) level: 2.2m</li> <li>Q<sub>100</sub> storm tide level: 3.3m</li> <li>Sea level rise over 50 year asset life: 0.4m (based on 0.8m/100 years)</li> <li>Minimum site level: 3.7m</li> </ul> <p>As such, the as-constructed site levels provide suitable storm tide immunity.</p> <p>Furthermore, in early 2014, the DEHP notified the Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning (DSDIP) that, as a result of the approval of the reclamation of land for the Port of Airlie, future development in the area will not require further assessment against the <i>Coastal Protection and Management Act 1995</i>. DEHP also stated that as the Port of Airlie has already been subjected to rigorous coastal management assessment processes, at both the environmental impact assessment and reclamation works stages, no further technical advice is required in relation to the future development of the Port of Airlie. Please see <b>Appendix B</b> of this submission for a copy of this correspondence.</p>		

Revised Proposed Whitsunday Regional Council Planning Scheme: Summary of Zone & Overlay Changes					
Submission Reference	Street Address & Lot & Plan	Suburb	Point of Submission	Revised WRCPS	Reason
			<p>In late 2014, the State Government coastal management district (CMD) mapping was also amended to remove a number of marina areas and developed sites with lowered environmental value. Previously, the entire Port of Airlie area (excluding Precinct N, The Beacons) was included in the CMD. According to the new mapping (current as of August 2015), all of precincts A, B, C, D, H, J1, J2, J3, K, O, P, Q and R and the majority of Precinct F are excluded from the CMD. The proposed planning scheme mapping for the Coastal Protection Overlay should reflect these changes.</p> <p>As the as-constructed site levels provide suitable storm tide immunity for the precinct and the site is clearly well protected against coastal erosion, all Coastal Protection Overlay mapping should be removed from the entire Port of Airlie Precinct, in accordance with the recommendations of DEHP.</p>		
17			<p>The entire Port of Airlie precinct is identified as an MDA. The site is also included within the Mixed Use, Low-Medium Density Residential, Community Facilities and Recreation and Open Space zones. In combination with the existing and approved development for the precinct, the zoning suggests that although the Port of Airlie will include some maritime related development, a significant portion of the precinct has and will continue to be developed for residential and other non-maritime development (including commercial and retail) to fulfil the intended mixed use nature of the area as intended by the proposed planning scheme.</p> <p>The MDA concept was established under the former Coastal Plan, which was repealed when the single State Planning Policy (SPP) was brought in, and was not carried through under the current SPP. Although a new Coastal Management Plan for Queensland was released in March 2014, this document does not seek to identify MDAs either. We would therefore question why the proposed planning scheme seeks to define MDAs when they are no longer referenced in the SPP.</p> <p>We also believe that it is contradictory and particularly onerous for the proposed planning scheme to restrict the future development of the Port of Airlie to being less than a quarter for accommodation activities and less than half for other non-maritime development, particularly considering the extent of approved development for the precinct and clearly articulated intended future development of the area (which has been the subject of numerous previous discussions with Council).</p> <p>We therefore recommend that the entire MDA concept be removed from the proposed planning scheme, or at the very least, from the Port of Airlie precinct, as it is onerous, restrictive and contradictory to the planning intent for the area.</p>	No change	The Maritime Development Areas will not be removed from the proposed planning scheme mapping; however, it may be reviewed in an administrative amendment in the future and after consultation with the State Government.
17	Precincts F and G (Various lots on SP201449 and Lot 106 on SP172255)		<p>Precincts F and G (Various lots on SP201449 and Lot 106 on SP172255) are mapped as being marginally affected by the Landslide Hazard Overlay (including areas with a slope of 15% or greater).</p> <p>The inclusion of a site in the Landslide Hazard Overlay has the potential to make development that would otherwise be self-assessable, code assessable. This would apply to development that</p>	No change	Council are aware of the data issues surrounding the Landslide hazard overlay and will continue to refine this overlay where possible.



Revised Proposed Whitsunday Regional Council Planning Scheme: Summary of Zone & Overlay Changes					
Submission Reference	Street Address & Lot & Plan	Suburb	Point of Submission	Revised WRCPS	Reason
			<p>is not wholly contained within an existing building, involving building work greater than 50m<sup>2</sup>, a change in site level greater than 0.5 metres of any part of the site or greater than 50m<sup>3</sup> of material is imported or removed from the site.</p> <p>This mapping is incorrect, as no areas of the site have a slope of 15% or more. We recommend that the Landslide Hazard Overlay mapping be deleted from the site.</p>		
	Precincts D, J and J3 (Lot 112 on SP232106, Lot 111 on SP260215 and Lot 115 on SP260215)		<p>The Infrastructure Overlay identifies Precincts D, J and J3 (Lot 112 on SP232106, Lot 111 on SP260215 and Lot 115 on SP260215) as public passenger transport facility sites, whilst a buffer for these facilities extends across nearly the entire precinct.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Overlay will affect existing, approved and future development within a significant proportion of the precinct. The Infrastructure Overlay Code does not include different criteria for sites that are identified as public passenger transport facilities compared to those that are included in the buffer area and instead, identifies the same provisions for sites included in both areas. Council have confirmed that the requirements for both facilities and buffer areas are intended to be the same and that the intent of the Infrastructure Overlay Code is to ensure maximum connectivity and accessibility throughout the site. We are satisfied that the Port of Airlie achieves this outcome and do not recommend any further actions in this regard.</p> <p>Additionally, Lot 115 on SP260215 (Precinct J3) is expected to be developed for a boat storage facility in the future. It is not a public transport site and will not be developed for public transport purposes. We recommended to Council that they amend the mapping for the Infrastructure Overlay by removing Precinct J3 (Lot 115 on SP260215) from the public passenger transport facility site category. Council have informed us that once the cadastral boundaries for the Port of Airlie precinct are updated (during the finalising of the mapping for the proposed planning scheme), Precinct J3 will be identified as a separate lot to the bus terminal and will no longer be identified as a public passenger transport facility site under the Infrastructure Overlay. We are satisfied that this will resolve this matter and no further action is required.</p>	Amend	All mapping data in the proposed planning scheme will be updated in an administrative amendment.
17	Precincts F, G and H (various lots on SP201449, Lot 106 on SP172255 and Lot 105 on SP232115)		<p>The as constructed development plans for Precincts F, G and H demonstrate that all electricity infrastructure is located below ground and within the boundaries of the road reserve for Port Drive, Shute Harbour Road and Coconut Grove. Furthermore, none of these precincts currently include any easements for electricity infrastructure. The Infrastructure Overlay mapping is therefore incorrect and it is recommended that Council amend the mapping for the Infrastructure Overlay to ensure that Precincts F, G and H are not identified as being affected by major electricity infrastructure.</p> <p>Council have confirmed that the Infrastructure Overlay Code will also be amended to include separate provisions and requirements for above ground electricity infrastructure and below ground infrastructure, as it currently lacks this distinction. This is supported.</p>	No change	The mapping in question is a buffer area, it identifies infrastructure is within the vicinity of these areas. It does not identify the specific route and location of infrastructure. Data used for the Infrastructure overlay will remain as per State Government mapping. Consideration of exclusion should be discussed with the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning.
<b>Airlie Beach Local Plan</b>					
17			The identified role of Airlie Beach as a key mainland tourism centre is supported. The Port of Airlie plays a key part in cementing this role of	No change	The Strategic framework does not recognise specific commercial operations within the region, this would be inconsistent with the drafting

Revised Proposed Whitsunday Regional Council Planning Scheme: Summary of Zone & Overlay Changes					
Submission Reference	Street Address & Lot & Plan	Suburb	Point of Submission	Revised WRCPS	Reason
			<p>Airlie Beach within the Whitsunday region and we would therefore recommend that Council amend the overall outcomes to make specific reference to the important way that the Port of Airlie contributes to the significance of Airlie Beach as a tourism centre.</p> <p>As with the Strategic framework, the overall outcomes of the Airlie Beach Local Plan Code should be amended to recognise the unique opportunity presented by Port of Airlie to provide absolute waterfront residential product, and marina-related residential product, both of which add significant scope, value and attraction to the Whitsunday residential market. Equally, Port of Airlie presents wide opportunities for high-end, speciality and marine-related retail and commercial activities that cannot necessarily be offered in, for example, the Airlie Beach Town Centre, Cannonvale or Proserpine. Overall, the Port of Airlie has significant potential to contribute to the economic growth of the Whitsundays and this should be recognised at the both the highest level of the proposed planning scheme (Strategic framework) and most importantly, within the specific provisions that relate to the Port of Airlie precinct.</p>		principles.
17			<p>The specific purpose and overall outcomes for the Port of Airlie Precinct under the Airlie Beach Local Plan Code recognise the role of the Port of Airlie in supporting a mix of activities that support marina and visitor functions and promoting access to the Whitsunday Islands and the Great Barrier Reef. However, the overall outcomes for this precinct also state that the development of business, entertainment and recreation activities are supported where they enhance the waterfront aspects of the precinct or provide services to boats and boat users. Council have confirmed that the intent of this statement is simply to support development that captures ocean views and maximises streetscape activation. Development that does not have waterfront aspects will still be supported if it achieves this purpose and Council will look to amend the overall outcomes for the Port of Airlie Precinct to more clearly articulate their desire for streetscape activation, even in those areas with no waterfront aspects. We are satisfied that this will resolve this matter.</p> <p>The overall outcomes for this precinct also state that development provides for a range and mix of accommodation activities and dwelling types in a low to low-medium rise format for visitors and resident. This is inconsistent with the building height plan for the Port of Airlie Precinct under the Airlie Beach Local Plan, which identifies a desired building height of up to 8 and 12 storeys. We recommend that this overall outcome be amended to state that medium to high rise development is also supported, where consistent with the building height plan for the Airlie Beach Local Plan.</p>	No change	The proposed planning scheme does not recognise specific commercial operations within the region, this would be inconsistent with the drafting principles.
17	Precincts L and M (Lots 102 and 103 on SP232115)		The walkway extends into Precincts L and M (Lots 102 and 103 on SP232115), The Point, where no provision has been made (or has been required to be made) for a public walkway along the waterfront. The walkway is also shown as extending along the eastern side of Port Drive, where only a partial walkway has been provided (with a full length walkway actually having been provided on the western side of Port Drive). The local plan requires development to physically provide this walkway, with overall outcome (h) for the Port of Airlie stating that development should support the continuation and upgrading of the Bicentennial walkway. Acceptable Outcome AO6.2 also states that development should not interfere with the connectivity	Amend	In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. This is no longer a requirement.

Revised Proposed Whitsunday Regional Council Planning Scheme: Summary of Zone & Overlay Changes					
Submission Reference	Street Address & Lot & Plan	Suburb	Point of Submission	Revised WRCPS	Reason
			<p>of the Bicentennial Walkway. The associated performance outcome asks that the walkway be enhanced to fully connect the length of the coastline as a safe and highly functional asset.</p> <p>To ensure consistency with the relevant assessment criteria and intent for development within the Port of Airlie, we recommend that the mapping be amended to correctly reflect the location of walkways as already provided, and to delete the walkway shown over The Point. Council have confirmed that the mapping for the Bicentennial walkway is indicative only and will be amended to remove it from Precincts L and M entirely.</p> <p>We would also like to note our support for that part of the mapped walkway that extends through the proposed easement that will be located along the shared boundary of Lot 108 on SP232115 (Precinct P) and Lot 109 on SP232115 (Precinct B). This will provide the public with suitable access to the waterfront and the recreational, retail and dining opportunities that will be available to them along the foreshore and within Port of Airlie generally. However, we would also note that the constructed walkway is in fact located within Lot 109 and not Lot 108 as shown on the proposed planning scheme mapping.</p>		
<b>Zone</b>					
17			<p>The overall outcomes of the Low-Medium Density Residential Zone Code state that development is to have a low to medium-rise built form, with a maximum building height of 12 metres above ground level. Whilst this provision is consistent with the building height plan for the Port of Airlie Precinct under the Airlie Beach Local Plan, which identifies land within the Low-Medium Density Residential Zone as having a desired building height of three storeys, this is not consistent with good planning principles. More specifically, we do not believe that the inclusion of prescriptive provisions regarding building height in the overall outcomes of a zone code is in accordance with planning scheme drafting principles. As such, we recommend that the reference to a specific building height be removed from the Low-Medium Density Residential Zone Code. Alternatively, at a minimum, a note should be included in the overall outcomes stating that any building height plan for a local plan area takes precedence over any maximum building heights identified in a zone code.</p>	<b>Amend</b>	<p>In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>• Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>• Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>• Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>• Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>• Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>• Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>
17			<p>The overall outcomes of the Community Facilities Zone Code state that development is to have a low rise built form, with a maximum building height of 8.5 metres above ground level or 10 metres where located on slopes exceeding 15%. Whilst we recognise that the provisions of a local plan code take precedence over and prevail in the event of a conflict with any zone code, this overall outcome is not consistent with the building height plan for the Port of Airlie Precinct under the Airlie Beach Local Plan, which identifies land within the Community Facilities Zone as having a desired building height of up to 8 storeys. Additionally, we do not believe that the inclusion of prescriptive provisions regarding building height in the overall outcomes of a zone code is in accordance with planning scheme drafting principles.</p> <p>We recommend that the reference to a specific building height be removed from the Community Facilities Zone Code. Alternatively, at a minimum, a note should be included in the overall outcomes stating that any building height plan for a local plan area takes precedence</p>	<b>Amend</b>	<p>In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>• Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>• Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>• Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>• Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>• Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>• Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>

Revised Proposed Whitsunday Regional Council Planning Scheme: Summary of Zone & Overlay Changes					
Submission Reference	Street Address & Lot & Plan	Suburb	Point of Submission	Revised WRCPS	Reason
			over any maximum building heights identified in a zone code.		
17			<p>The overall outcomes of the Mixed Use Zone Code state that development is to have a low to medium-rise built form, with a maximum building height of 12 metres above ground level. Whilst we recognise that the provisions of a local plan code take precedence over and prevail in the event of a conflict with any zone code, this overall outcome is not consistent with the building height plan for the Port of Airlie Precinct under the Airlie Beach Local Plan, which identifies land within the Mixed Use Zone as having a desired building height of up to 12 storeys. Additionally, we do not believe that the inclusion of prescriptive provisions regarding building height in the overall outcomes of a zone code is in accordance with planning scheme drafting principles.</p> <p>We recommend that the reference to a specific building height be removed from the Mixed Use Zone Code. Alternatively, at a minimum, a note should be included in the overall outcomes stating that any building height plan for a local plan area takes precedence over any maximum building heights identified in a zone code.</p>	<b>Amend</b>	<p>In response to submissions, the Airlie Beach Local Plan and associated maps have been removed from the proposed planning scheme. The maximum building heights in the Airlie Beach area, identified on zone map ZM-08D are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Precinct A – 14 meters</li> <li>• Precinct B – 14 meters</li> <li>• Precinct C – 21 meters</li> <li>• Precinct D – 18 meters</li> <li>• Precinct E – 14 meters</li> <li>• Precinct F – 18 meters</li> <li>• Precinct G – 14 meters.</li> </ul>
17	Precinct P, Lot 108 on SP232115, Lot 114 on SP260211, Lot 108 on SP232115		<p>The marina car park (Precinct P, Lot 108 on SP232115) is included within the Community Facilities Zone.</p> <p>The marina car park is not available for public use and is not a public facility. It provides an ancillary service for users of the marina only and is, and will remain, a privately owned site. Furthermore, the marina car park is not included in the proposed planning scheme's community activities defined activity group. Instead, it is ancillary to the existing marina and included in the land use definition of port services. As a private facility and an ancillary component of a marina, this car park does not fall within the definition of a community facility and it should be removed from the Community Facilities Zone and instead included in the Mixed-Use Zone.</p> <p>Please note, Precinct J2 (Lot 114 on SP260211), the public car park, is included in the Mixed Use Zone. By including this site within the Mixed Use Zone, Council have acknowledged that, although the car park does provide a service for the general public, the site is privately owned and leased to Council (as provided for in the infrastructure agreement between the owners of the Port of Airlie and Council). The inclusion of this site in the Mixed Use Zone also recognises that the site may be suitable for other development in the future and that Mixed Use Zone is best placed to facilitate this.</p> <p>We therefore recommend that Precinct P (Lot 108 on SP232115) be included in the Mixed Use Zone, to more appropriately reflect the currently use of the site and any future potential uses.</p>	No change	All mapping data in the proposed planning scheme will be updated in an administrative amendment.
17	Precinct C Lot 122 on SP260214		<p>Precinct C (Lot 122 on SP260214) is largely included in the Low Medium Density Residential Zone, where business and entertainment activities are impact assessable. As the cadastral boundaries do not reflect the true layout of the site, Precinct C is also partly within the Mixed Use Zone.</p> <p>Although this site has a preliminary approval over it for a short term accommodation/multiple dwelling development only, we believe that it should be fully included in the Mixed Use Zone, to allow for other potential land use outcomes. We recommended that Council amend</p>	<b>Amend</b>	All mapping data in the proposed planning scheme will be updated in an administrative amendment.



Revised Proposed Whitsunday Regional Council Planning Scheme: Summary of Zone & Overlay Changes					
Submission Reference	Street Address & Lot & Plan	Suburb	Point of Submission	Revised WRCPS	Reason
			<p>the zoning maps to include Precinct C entirely in the Mixed Use Zone.</p> <p>Council have informed us that once the cadastral boundaries for the Port of Airlie precinct are updated (during the finalising of the mapping for the proposed planning scheme), the boundaries of Precinct C will be correctly identified and this site will be included in the Mixed Use Zone. We are satisfied that this will resolve this matter and no further action is required.</p>		
17	Precincts L and M (Lots 102 and 103 on SP232115)		<p>Precincts L and M (Lots 102 and 103 on SP232115) are included in the Low Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>Under the current planning scheme, Precinct L is identified as having a maximum preferred building height of five metres. As detailed below, we have requested that both Precincts L and M be shown as having a maximum building height of five storeys under the proposed planning scheme, to reflect the scale of development anticipated for these sites under the existing planning scheme.</p> <p>Precincts L and M are also identified under the current planning scheme as a preferred development site for multiple dwellings, accommodation units and the like. Considering the preferred land use outcome and building height for the precincts under the current planning scheme, we believe that Precincts L and M should be included in the Mixed Use Zone, rather than the Low Medium Density Residential Zone. This would be consistent with zoning of Precinct C (Lot 122 on SP260214), The Landing (to be amended by Council as discussed above), which will be developed for similar purposes.</p> <p>We therefore recommend that Precincts L and M be included in the Mixed Use Zone, to more appropriately reflect the intended development of these precincts under the current planning scheme and show consistency in the draft zoning, considering the similarities of these sites to Precinct C.</p>	No change	The intended development is acknowledged. Existing approved activities may still be undertaken and Council may consider this request in future amendments of the proposed planning scheme. Until such time the existing approval has been commenced the proposed zone will be maintained.
17	Precinct O (Lot 104 on SP232115)		<p>Precinct O (Lot 104 on SP232115) is included in the Community Facilities Zone.</p> <p>It is intended that Precinct O be developed in the future for the purposes of an educational establishment, in the form of a maritime academy. An educational establishment is included in the defined list of community activities and is made code assessable under the tables of assessment for development in the Community Facilities Zone, under the Airlie Beach Local Plan. The inclusion of Precinct O within the Community Facilities Zone is therefore supported.</p>	No change	Supports proposed zone.
17	Precincts A and N (various lots on SP260220, Lots 1 to 13 on SP172252 and Lot 14 on SP253594)		<p>Inclusion of Precincts A and N (various lots on SP260220, Lots 1 to 13 on SP172252 and Lot 14 on SP253594) in the Low Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>Precincts A and N have either already been developed for residential purposes, or are intended to be under existing approvals or future approvals to be obtained. The inclusion of these precincts within the Low Medium Density Residential Zone is therefore supported.</p>	No change	Supports proposed zone.
17	Precincts B, F, G, H, J, J2, J3, Q and R (Lot 109 on SP232115,		<p>Inclusion of Precincts B, F, G, H, J, J2, J3, Q and R (Lot 109 on SP232115, various lots on SP201449, Lot 106 on SP172255, Lot 105 on SP232115, Lot 111 on SP260215, Lot 114 on SP260211, Lot 115 on SP260215, Lot 113 on SP260211 and Lot 117 on SP232115) in the Mixed Use Zone.</p>	No change	Supports proposed zone.



Revised Proposed Whitsunday Regional Council Planning Scheme: Summary of Zone & Overlay Changes					
Submission Reference	Street Address & Lot & Plan	Suburb	Point of Submission	Revised WRCPS	Reason
	various lots on SP201449, Lot 106 on SP172255, Lot 105 on SP232115, Lot 111 on SP260215, Lot 114 on SP260211, Lot 115 on SP260215, Lot 113 on SP260211 and Lot 117 on SP232115)		Precincts B, F, G, H, J, J2, J3, Q and R have already been developed for mixed use purposes, land uses that service a range of other land uses and are therefore considered to service a mixed use function or will be developed for mixed use purposes in the future. The inclusion of these precincts in the Mixed Use Zone is therefore supported.		
17	Precincts D and K (Lot 112 on SP232106 and Lot 116 on SP260211)		Inclusion of Precincts D and K (Lot 112 on SP232106 and Lot 116 on SP260211) in the Community Facilities Zone.  Precincts D and K have already been developed for the purposes of a public transit terminal and a public boat ramp car park. These land uses are quite clearly public facilities and the inclusion of Precincts D and K in the Community Facilities Zone is therefore supported.	No change	Supports proposed zone.
17	Precinct U (Lot 100 on SP218220)		Inclusion of Precinct U (Lot 100 on SP218220) in the Recreation and Open Space Zone.  Precinct U encompasses the public beach and park that adjoins the residential development within Precinct N (The Beacons). The inclusion of Precinct U in the Recreation and Open Space Zone is therefore supported.	No change	Supports proposed zone.
<b>Building Heights</b>					
17	Precincts G and H (Lot 106 on SP172255 and Lot 105 on SP232115)		A maximum building height of 12 storeys for Precincts G and H (Lot 106 on SP172255 and Lot 105 on SP232115) has been proposed under the proposed planning scheme.  The proposed maximum building height for Precincts G and H will facilitate the future development of these key sub-precincts and is therefore supported. We support this recognition of the significance of these two sites in the wider context, and the catalytic role they will play in the evolution of Airlie Beach.	No change	Supports proposed building heights.
17	Precincts B, F and P (Lot 109 on SP232115, various lots on SP201449 and Lot 108 on SP232115)		A maximum building height of 8 storeys for Precincts B, F and P (Lot 109 on SP232115, various lots on SP201449 and Lot 108 on SP232115 respectively) has been adopted under the proposed planning scheme.  The proposed maximum building height for Precincts B, F and P supports the development potential of these sites and is therefore supported.	No change	Supports proposed building heights.
17	Precinct J3 (Lot 115 on SP260215)		Precinct J3 (Lot 115 on SP260215) is included in the Mixed Use zone and has a maximum building height of three storeys under the local plan heights plan. The local plan also states that a marine industry use (which includes a boat storage building) in the mixed use zone can go up to 15 metres.  It is intended that Precinct J3 be developed for a boat storage facility in the future. The maximum building height of 15 metres for this type	No change	Supports proposed building heights.

Revised Proposed Whitsunday Regional Council Planning Scheme: Summary of Zone & Overlay Changes					
Submission Reference	Street Address & Lot & Plan	Suburb	Point of Submission	Revised WRCPS	Reason
			of development within the Mixed Use Zone under the Airlie Beach Local Plan is considered sufficient for the intended future development of the site and is therefore supported.		
17	Precincts D, J, J2, K and N (Lot 112 on SP232106, Lot 111 on SP260215, Lot 114 on SP260211, Lot 116 on SP260211, Lots 1 to 13 on SP172252 and Lot 14 on SP253594)		<p>A maximum building height of three storeys has been identified for Precincts D, J, J2, K and N (Lot 112 on SP232106, Lot 111 on SP260215, Lot 114 on SP260211, Lot 116 on SP260211, Lots 1 to 13 on SP172252 and Lot 14 on SP253594 respectively).</p> <p>These sites have been the subject of approvals, being the public transit terminal, passenger terminal, public car park, boat ramp car park and The Beacons residential development respectively, which have subsequently been established. A maximum building height of three storeys on each of these sites is supported, as it either reflects or exceeds the height of existing buildings and structures located on the sites.</p>	No change	Supports proposed building heights.
17	Precinct A (various lots on SP260220)		<p>A maximum building height of three storeys has been identified for Precinct A (various lots on SP260220).</p> <p>Precinct A has been the subject of an approval for The Cove, a residential development. A maximum building height of three metres on this site is supported, as it either reflects or exceeds the height of buildings and structures to be established on the site.</p>	No change	Supports proposed building heights.
17	Precincts L and M (Lots 102 and 103 on SP232115)		<p>A maximum building height of three storeys has been identified for Precincts L and M (Lots 102 and 103 on SP232115).</p> <p>Precincts L and M have been the subject of an approval for The Point, a residential development. Although a maximum building height of three storeys on each of these sites either reflects or exceeds the height of buildings and structures to be established on the site, under the proposed planning scheme, a maximum building height of five storeys is identified for Precinct L. We request that the maximum building height for Precincts L and M be increased to five storeys, to reflect the scale of development anticipated for the site under the existing planning scheme.</p>	No change	A maximum building height will be maintained at 3 storeys to maintain the existing level of visual prominence commensurate to the surrounding area.
17	Precincts O and Q (Lot 104 on SP232115 and Lot 113 on SP260211)		<p>A maximum building height of three storeys has been identified for Precincts O and Q (Lot 104 on SP232115 and Lot 113 on SP260211 respectively).</p> <p>It is intended that Precinct O be developed in the future for the purposes of an educational establishment, in the form of a maritime academy, whilst it is expected that Precinct Q will be the subject of a retail/commercial or mixed use development. It is expected that a maximum building height of three storeys will be suitable for the intended scale of development on these sites and is therefore supported.</p>	No change	Supports proposed building heights.
17	Precinct R (Lot 117 on SP232115)		<p>A maximum building height of three storeys has been identified for Precinct R (Lot 117 on SP232115).</p> <p>Precinct R has been developed for a dredge spoil pond. Under the conditions of the head lease for the Port of Airlie, this site must continue to be used for this purpose only. A maximum building height limit of three storeys is therefore considered appropriate for the site.</p>	No change	Supports proposed building heights.
17	Precinct C (Lot 122 on SP260214)		A maximum building height of three storeys has been identified for Precinct C (Lot 122 on SP260214).	No change	Supports proposed building heights.

Revised Proposed Whitsunday Regional Council Planning Scheme: Summary of Zone & Overlay Changes					
Submission Reference	Street Address & Lot & Plan	Suburb	Point of Submission	Revised WRCPS	Reason
	SP260214)		As mentioned above, Precinct C has a preliminary approval over it for a short term accommodation/multiple dwelling development (being The Landing), allowing a maximum height of three storeys. The maximum building height of three storeys under the building height plan reflects the maximum building height under the preliminary approval and is therefore supported.		
<b>Car Parking Requirements</b>					
17			<p>Car parking requirements for the entire range of land uses have been reviewed as part of the proposed planning scheme preparation process.</p> <p>Please see Appendix U.2 for comments and recommendations regarding the proposed car parking rates for the range of future potential land uses to be established within the Port of Airlie.</p> <p>We understand that Council is currently in the process of preparing a car parking strategy for Airlie Beach and that the recommendations of this strategy are likely to be reflected in the first set of amendments to the proposed planning scheme, due to the anticipated timing for its commencement. We hope that our recommendations will be useful and will inform the recommendations of the strategy and following amendments to the proposed planning scheme.</p>	No change	Council will review recommendations to inform the car parking strategy in the future planning of the region.

