

# HOUSING AND LOT DIVERSITY AMENDMENT

SUBMISSION ANALYSIS & RESPONSE REPORT

LOGAN PLANNING SCHEME 2015

**SEPTEMBER 2022**



# Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Consultation on the Amendment</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Consultation activities	3
2.2	Submissions	4
2.3	Proposed changes	4
<b>3</b>	<b>Key matters</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Summary and Responses to Matters Raised in Submissions</b>	<b>5</b>
	<b>Appendix 1</b>	<b>6</b>

# 1 Introduction

This report summarises the feedback Council received on the proposed Housing and Lot Diversity Amendment (the Amendment) and provides Council's response to the feedback.

The consultation process undertaken for the Amendment is detailed in Section 2. Key issues raised by the community, Council's response to these issues and recommended actions are provided in Sections 3 and 4.

The community's feedback has helped Council to finalise the Amendment. This report is intended to be read in conjunction with the Amendment which can be accessed on Council's website at [www.logan.qld.gov.au/planning](http://www.logan.qld.gov.au/planning).

For further information regarding the Amendment, please contact Council on (07) 3412 4247.

## 2 Consultation on the Amendment

Public consultation on the Amendment was undertaken between 7 February 2022 and 11 March 2022.

### 2.1 Consultation activities

Council undertook the following community engagement activities:

Date	Community Engagement Activity
3 February 2022	Letters advising of the Amendment and the associated public consultation were mailed to landowners and residents affected by proposed rezonings.
7 February 2022 and 9 February 2022	Public notices were published in the following newspapers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Courier Mail (7 February 2022)</li><li>• Jimboomba Times (9 February 2022)</li></ul>
7 February 2022 – 11 March 2022	<p>The Amendment was published on Council's website with hard copies also available at Council's customer service counters. A copy of the notice was also on display at Council's administration centres.</p> <p>The "Have Your Say" online engagement portal was active, allowing the community to provide feedback.</p> <p>A staffed telephone enquiry line was available.</p> <p>Council hosted 12 online 'Talk to a Planner' sessions, allowing for one-on-one discussion with registered community members.</p> <p>Council hosted seven online 'Drop-In' sessions, whereby Council officers explained the background to the Amendment and responded to questions.</p> <p>Posts were made on several social media platforms, directing the community to the "Have Your Say" online engagement portal.</p> <p>Meetings were available to enquirers upon request.</p> <p>Council corresponded with peak industry bodies (Urban Development Institute of Australia, Housing Industry Association and Property Council of Australia), inviting feedback on the proposed Amendment.</p> <p>Council invited representatives of the Logan Disability Coalition network to provide feedback on the proposed Amendment.</p> <p>Council invited representatives of the Danggan Balun People, Yuggera Ugarapul People and Jabree and Gold Coast Native Title Group to provide feedback on the proposed Amendment.</p>
11 March 2022	Consultation period closed.

## 2.2 Submissions

Council received 53 submissions on the Amendment, five of which were not properly made. All submissions were considered in the refinement of the Amendment.

Council processed and considered submissions in the following way:

- The details of each submission received were entered into a database;
- Submitters were emailed or mailed an acknowledgement to confirm receipt of their submission;
- Submissions were summarised and categorised to identify key matters;
- Each matter in each submission was considered to determine if changes were warranted to the Amendment;
- Responses to each matter were formulated; and
- The proposed responses to submissions and associated revisions to the Amendment were considered by Council's delegates for endorsement.

## 2.3 Proposed changes

A number of minor changes are proposed in response to the issues raised during public consultation. The changes are not considered to represent a significant change, with alterations predominantly occurring to refine policy, provide clarity and consistency to the intended application of the amendment provisions, or to rectify typographical/administrative errors which occurred during the drafting process. The Amendment has been refined in the following ways:

- Table 9.4.6.3.5 - Frontage Requirements in the Reconfiguring a Lot Code has been revised to set out two categories of frontage width, rather than three as formerly proposed. The first category outlines a frontage range for "Maximum 70% of total lots created" rather than the 60% of total lots as formerly proposed, while the second category identifies a range for "Minimum 30% of total lots created". The formerly-proposed third category outlining the frontage requirement for a minimum 10% of lots created has been removed. This refinement greatly simplifies the frontage diversity requirements while still ensuring the original intent of the Amendment is maintained.
- The citing of the minimum lot sizes for the Small Lot, Suburban and Village precincts of the Low Density Residential Zone in the Low Density Residential Zone Code overall outcomes has been accompanied by character statements that articulate the qualitative characteristics of these precincts.
- Section 3.4.3.1(3)(a) of the Strategic Framework has been amended to make clear that reconfiguring a lot is to complement the intended character of an area. A note has also been inserted in both this section and section 3.4.1 advising that the overall outcomes of the Low Density Residential Zone Code outline the intended character of the Small Lot, Suburban and Village precincts. Similarly, this note has also been included in the Reconfiguring a Lot Code to aid readers.
- The distinction in the minimum lot size permitted for attached and detached Dual Occupancies has been removed. Acknowledging the contribution that this housing typology makes to the city's diversity of housing choice, this refinement ensures that detached forms are not discouraged. Furthermore, the removal of this distinction also mitigates ambiguity that may arise from the previously-proposed use of the term "common wall".
- The minimum lot size of 800m<sup>2</sup> prescribed for a Dual Occupancy in the Suburban Residential precinct of the Loganholme Local Plan area has been carried across to the Tables of Assessment. Formerly, the Amendment cited this minimum lot size for a Dual Occupancy only in the local plan code but without any qualification in the Tables of Assessment. This anomaly has accordingly been corrected.

- The 'note' proposed for the Reconfiguring a Lot Tables of Assessment highlighting that the minimum rear lot area is to exclude the access strip has been relocated to sit within the category of development and assessment provisions for greater visibility.
- Various miscellaneous typographical corrections.

Section 4 of this report provides further detail on these changes.

### **3 Key matters**

The key matters raised during public consultation are categorised under the following headings:

- Lot size
- Frontage
- Dual occupancies
- Multiple dwellings
- Infrastructure
- Technical drafting
- Request for zoning change
- Other matters

A summary of the matters raised in the submissions, the responses to the matters raised and recommended changes are provided in Section 4.

### **4 Summary and Responses to Matters Raised in Submissions**

Refer to Appendix 1 overleaf.

## Appendix 1

Submission	Matter	Council s response
<b>Lot Size</b>		
82	The existing minimum lot sizes ought to be retained.	The planning scheme currently allows for development to establish an 'average lot size' where creating new lots. This mechanism of 'average lot size' allows for the area of an entire development site to be divided by the number of lots proposed when calculating the 'average lot size'. As a result, where development creates infrastructure such as roads, parks or stormwater detention basins, the resulting 'average lot size' is skewed and lots may be smaller than anticipated by the community. To address this issue, the mechanism of 'average lot size' is proposed to be removed. The removal of this mechanism in isolation, however, would have undesirable implications as the existing minimum lot sizes are not considered to be appropriate (for example, the Small Lot precinct does not presently prescribe any minimum lot size). Accordingly, new minimum lot sizes are required that align with community expectations.
15, 24, 40, 41, 50, 93	Minimum lot sizes ought to be larger.	The amendment proposes a range of minimum lot sizes for different precincts across the city, with a minimum lot size proposed of 400m <sup>2</sup> for the Suburban precinct, the most common urban residential zoning in the city. This minimum of 400m <sup>2</sup> conforms with the character of many existing residential areas, will allow Logan to continue to achieve the dwelling targets prescribed by the Queensland Government's South East Queensland Regional Plan and aligns with the requirements of a number of South East Queensland local governments.
39, 135	The minimum lot size ought to be at least 400m <sup>2</sup> .	The amendment proposes to introduce a minimum lot size of 400m <sup>2</sup> for the Suburban precinct of the Low Density Residential Zone. This precinct applies to the majority of the city's urban residential areas.
27, 31, 48, 115, 128, 136	The minimum lot size ought to be at least 450m <sup>2</sup> .	The amendment proposes to introduce a minimum lot size of 400m <sup>2</sup> for the Suburban precinct of the Low Density Residential Zone. This precinct applies to the majority of the city's urban residential areas. The proposed 400m <sup>2</sup> minimum has been guided by the standards of adjoining local governments, the intent of the South East Queensland Regional Plan, development industry standards and the prevailing character of areas affected by the proposed change.

Submission	Matter	Council's response
23, 25, 26, 28, 133	The minimum lot size ought to be at least 500m <sup>2</sup> .	A minimum lot size of 500m <sup>2</sup> is proposed for the Village precinct of the Low Density Residential Zone. A minimum lot size of 400m <sup>2</sup> , however, is proposed for the Suburban precinct, being the precinct that applies to the majority of the city's urban residential areas. The proposed 400m <sup>2</sup> minimum has been guided by the standards of adjoining local governments, the intent of the South East Queensland Regional Plan, development industry standards and the prevailing character of areas affected by the proposed change.
77, 117	The 350m <sup>2</sup> minimum lot size in the Suburban precinct ought to be maintained.	The minimum lot size of 350m <sup>2</sup> for the Suburban precinct is proposed to be raised to 400m <sup>2</sup> as the existing mechanism of 'average lot size' is being removed. The current planning scheme requires development in the Suburban precinct to achieve an 'average lot size' of 500m <sup>2</sup> , however, in the absence of this requirement, the existing minimum of 350m <sup>2</sup> is not considered to align with either community expectations or the prevailing character of this precinct.
79	Minimum lot sizes ought to be 250m <sup>2</sup> in the Small Lot precinct, 350m <sup>2</sup> in the Suburban precinct and 500m <sup>2</sup> in the Village precinct.	The minimum lot sizes suggested for the Small Lot and Suburban precincts are not considered to align with either community expectations or the prevailing character of these precincts. For these reasons, the amendment proposes larger lot sizes.
126	Minimum lot sizes ought to be 'no minimum' in the Small Lot precinct, 300m <sup>2</sup> in the Suburban precinct and 450m <sup>2</sup> in the Village precinct.	The minimum lot sizes suggested are not considered to align with either community expectations or the prevailing character of the subject precincts. For these reasons, the amendment proposes larger lot sizes.
77, 117, 121	The introduction of a minimum lot size for the Small Lot precinct removes the ability to provide terrace style or other more affordable dwelling types.	The introduction of a minimum lot size of 300m <sup>2</sup> for the Small Lot precinct seeks to ensure new lots in this precinct primarily support detached dwellings, reinforcing the existing character of these areas. It is acknowledged, however, that terrace-style housing is not contemplated by the precinct.  Support for terrace-style housing in well-serviced areas will be considered in the development of the new planning scheme, anticipated to commence in 2025. To learn more about the new planning scheme and how to contribute to its development, visit <a href="http://loganplan2025.com.au">loganplan2025.com.au</a> .
105, 125	The intent of 'average lot size' was to allow for a site constrained by overlays to achieve the same yield. The removal of this principle will	While the intent of 'average lot size' was partially to allow for constrained lots to achieve a greater density of development, it has

Submission	Matter	Council s response
	negatively affect yield, which is furthered by the proposal to require variation in frontages.	<p>inherently resulted in the creation of lots below the 'average lot size'. As such, the lot sizes anticipated by the community have not been achieved. For this reason, this mechanism is proposed to be removed from the planning scheme and new minimum lot sizes instated.</p> <p>The amendment also proposes to introduce the requirement for variation in frontage where producing 10 or more lots to better facilitate variation in housing forms. It is noted, however, that the amendment has been revised. Table 9.4.6.3.5 - Frontage Requirements has been amended to only set out two categories of frontage width. The first column outlines a range for "Maximum 70% of total lots created", while the second column identifies a range for "Minimum 30% of total lots created". This refinement greatly simplifies the frontage diversity requirements while still ensuring the original intent of the amendment is maintained.</p>
120	The scheme ought to provide flexibility in the Suburban precinct for lots smaller than 400m <sup>2</sup> and frontages less than 12.5m where this is compatible with surrounding established lots.	The amendment proposes that subdivision in the Suburban precinct be impact assessable where lots are proposed below 400m <sup>2</sup> . As such, applications will be assessed on their merits against the entire planning scheme. Given the nature of the performance-based planning system, where proposed development aligns with the intent and character of its locale, it may be supported.
53, 73, 81, 132	Support the removal of average lot size.	Council notes your expressed support.
77, 121, 123	Do not support the elevation of the minimum lot size to the overall outcomes of the Low Density Residential Zone code.	The Low Density Residential Zone Code is proposed to cite the minimum lot sizes for the Small Lot, Suburban and Village precincts in an effort to strengthen the planning scheme's ability to achieve the prescribed minimums. Acknowledging the nature of performance-based planning, the code has since been revised to also provide character statements for these precincts to articulate their qualitative characteristics.
77, 123, 126	The Park Residential precinct of the Rural Residential Zone ought to support a minimum lot size of 3,000m <sup>2</sup> , with references to the minimum lot sizes within the overall outcomes of the zone code removed.	The Park Residential precinct of the Rural Residential Zone is characterised by large rural residential lots often in a bushland setting. The amendment does not seek to change this character, but rather, maintain the prevailing character while removing a technical provision within the planning scheme (being the mechanism of 'average lot size'). Further, supporting a minimum lot size of 3,000m <sup>2</sup> would result in allowing a lot size smaller than that permitted in portions of the Low



Submission	Matter	Council s response
49, 66, 121	Oppose the proposal to change the minimum lot size of the Park Residential precinct from 4,000m <sup>2</sup> to 5,000m <sup>2</sup> .	<p>Density Residential Zone, a zone applied to more urban settings.</p> <p>The Park Residential precinct of the Rural Residential Zone currently permits a minimum lot size of 4,000m<sup>2</sup>, however, requires a minimum average lot size of 5,000m<sup>2</sup> to be achieved. The mechanism of 'average lot size' is proposed to be removed as it allows for development creating infrastructure such as roads, parks and stormwater detention basins to achieve reduced lot sizes. In instances where such infrastructure is not created (as would typically be the case in the Park Residential precinct) lot sizes are currently required to achieve the minimum average of 5,000m<sup>2</sup>. Accordingly, the proposed change will generally have little bearing on the development outcomes that can presently be achieved in this precinct.</p>
19	The proposed changes to the minimum lot size in the Park Residential precinct need further justification. They do not appear to be supported by the <i>Logan Housing Study 2020</i> .	<p>The amendment proposes to remove the planning scheme's mechanism of 'average lot size'. This mechanism allows for the area of an entire development site to be divided by the number of lots proposed when calculating the 'average lot size'. As a result, where development creates infrastructure such as roads, parks or stormwater detention basins, the resulting 'average lot size' is skewed and lots may be smaller than anticipated by the community. To address this issue, the mechanism of 'average lot size' is proposed to be removed.</p> <p>Exclusively removing the Park Residential precinct's 'average lot size' of 5,000m<sup>2</sup> would allow development to default to the existing minimum lot size of 4,000m<sup>2</sup>. However, as development in this precinct is at present typically required to achieve a minimum lot size of 5,000m<sup>2</sup>, the minimum lot size is proposed to be elevated to align with that presently required to be achieved, maintaining the prevailing character of the precinct.</p>
53	Request that the minimum lot size for a large suburban lot be changed from 1,000m <sup>2</sup> to 600m <sup>2</sup> if there is already a detached secondary dwelling (specifically an auxiliary unit) on the property built prior to the current date. This would allow owners to utilise the subdivision option without increasing density limits on the area as the dwelling already exists as well as most of the operational works.	The requested change is beyond the scope of the proposed amendment. Further, it is noted that Secondary Dwellings are intended to accommodate members of the same household as that of the primary dwelling, typically family. For this reason, they are limited in scale and function and are not intended to be granted a freehold lot.
82	The rear lot minimum lot size should not be a distinct trigger for impact	The minimum lot size for rear lots is proposed to be introduced as a trigger for impact assessment as a measure to ensure rear lots

	assessment.	maintain residential amenity. The reduction in the supported rear lot minimum size in the Suburban precinct from 600m <sup>2</sup> to 500m <sup>2</sup> recognises that rear lots of this size are capable of suitably accommodating dwelling houses, however, below this size, the likelihood of generating amenity concerns (noise, car parking, etc.) increases. Accordingly, the minimum lot size is proposed to be retained as a trigger for impact assessment.
132	Support the reduction in the minimum lot size of rear lots from 600m <sup>2</sup> to 500m <sup>2</sup> .	Council notes your expressed support.
82	The Village precinct ought to permit rear lots at a minimum size of 500m <sup>2</sup> (rather than the proposed 600m <sup>2</sup> ), consistent with the Suburban precinct, as there is no discernible difference.	Rear lots in the Village precinct are proposed to continue to require a minimum lot size of 600m <sup>2</sup> . The Village precinct has been applied relatively sparingly across the city, recognising areas of slightly larger lots than the Suburban precinct. Acknowledging the different character of these areas, it is proposed that a larger rear lot size be maintained.
132	The minimum lot size in the Low-Medium Density Residential Zone (Townhouse precinct) should be 400m <sup>2</sup> (instead of 500m <sup>2</sup> ) to allow removal of net density and equivalent dwellings completely.	The minimum lot size in the Low-Medium Density Residential Zone is proposed to remain unchanged. This zone seeks to support higher density residential development in the form of Multiple Dwellings (townhouses, apartments) and as such, in an effort to avoid the fragmentation of land that may reduce the ability to deliver these housing forms, the minimum lot size is not proposed to be reduced.

## Frontage

121, 125, 132	The minimum frontage requirements should be revised to align with industry standard lot widths and housing products.	The minimum frontage widths proposed (10m in Small Lot precinct, 12.5m in Suburban precinct and 15m in Village precinct) align with the housing products offered by a range of preeminent home builders.
121, 123	The minimum frontage requirements should allow flexibility for constrained sites.	The proposed minimum frontage widths are set out as an acceptable outcome in the Reconfiguring a Lot Code. Where these widths are not achieved, an application must demonstrate compliance with the corresponding performance outcome (which predominantly regulates consistency with surrounding character and safety). This allows for the development assessment process to consider the merits of an application with respect to the values sought by the performance outcome.
82	Request the Small Lot precinct permit a minimum frontage of 7.5m and	The proposed minimum frontage widths of 10m for the Small Lot

	the Suburban precinct permit a minimum frontage of 10m to allow development to better respond to site constraints.	precinct and 12.5m for the Suburban precinct have been maintained. To reduce the frontage requirements for these precincts as suggested would permit development inconsistent with the existing character of these precincts.
117	The minimum frontage for the Village precinct should be reduced from 15.5m to 14.5m to reflect market trends and improve housing choice by providing a frontage that is suitable for a broader range of dwelling types.	The amendment proposes a minimum frontage width of 15m for the Village precinct. This requirement is considered to allow for a broad range of housing products while maintaining the established character of the Village precinct.
77, 82	Variation in lot frontage ought to be solely governed through the provisions of Planning Scheme Policy 8.	The amendment seeks to encourage frontage diversity in larger developments to facilitate a broader range of housing forms in emerging neighbourhoods. In order to achieve this, the relevant provisions are required in the Reconfiguring a Lot Code. To locate them entirely within a planning scheme policy would erode their ability to achieve meaningful outcomes. As such, the frontage diversity requirements are proposed within the Reconfiguring a Lot Code, with additional guidance material located within Planning Scheme Policy 8 - Urban Design.
89	Amend Table 9.4.6.3.5 – Frontage requirements to amend the middle column to “Minimum 30% of total lots created”, consistent with the explanatory notes.	Table 9.4.6.3.5 - Frontage Requirements has been revised to only set out two categories of frontage width. The first column outlines a range for “Maximum 70% of total lots created”, while the second column identifies a range for “Minimum 30% of total lots created”. This refinement greatly simplifies the frontage diversity requirements while still ensuring the original intent of the amendment is maintained.

## Dual Occupancies

63	Dual occupancies should not be permitted on lots less than 1,000m <sup>2</sup> in size.	The amendment proposes to support Dual Occupancies on lots of 700m <sup>2</sup> in size in the Suburban precinct (the most common precinct in the city’s urban residential areas). This lot size is considered suitable to accommodate this form of housing while maintaining the character of the city’s residential areas. It should be noted that Dual Occupancies are required to comply with a range of siting and design requirements to ensure adjoining amenity is considered and maintained.
82, 117	The removal of the corner lot density concession for Dual Occupancies will result in the need for considerably larger lots. Rather, Council ought to introduce design provisions to ensure the preferred design	The amendment proposes to support Dual Occupancies on lots of 700m <sup>2</sup> in size in the Suburban precinct (the most common precinct in the city’s urban residential areas). This lot size is considered

Submission	Matter	Council s response
	outcome is achieved (for example, dwellings fronting separate streets).	<p>reasonable for accommodating a Dual Occupancy.</p> <p>The introduction of additional design criteria for Dual Occupancies will be considered in the development of the new planning scheme, anticipated to commence in 2025. To learn more about the new planning scheme and how to contribute to its development, visit <a href="http://loganplan2025.com.au">loganplan2025.com.au</a>.</p>
105	The proposed Dual Occupancy changes will lead to the delivery of no one or two bedroom dwellings.	It is acknowledged that the removal of the ‘equivalent dwellings’ mechanism for Dual Occupancies will likely result in fewer one and two bedroom dwellings, however, it should be noted that the planning scheme continues to make provision for Auxiliary Units, a two bedroom form of Dual Occupancy that can be undertaken without the need for development approval. This form of land use will ensure that two bedroom dwellings continue to be delivered in existing residential areas, supporting the city’s diverse housing needs.
105	The allowance of a smaller lot size for attached Dual Occupancies will discourage detached forms.	The amendment has been revised to no longer make a distinction in the minimum lot size permitted for attached and detached Dual Occupancies. Acknowledging the contribution that this housing typology makes to the city’s diversity of housing choice, this refinement will ensure that detached forms are not discouraged.
132	The minimum lot area for attached dual occupancies should be 75% of the equivalent lot size for detached dwellings to encourage diversity.	The minimum lot size required for a Dual Occupancy is proposed at 87.5% of the starting minimum lot size required for a two lot subdivision. This size seeks to incentivise this form of housing. It should be noted that the amendment has been revised so that the Dual Occupancy minimum lot size requirements to longer differentiate between attached and detached forms.
109	The proposed amendment introduces new minimum lot sizes to replace the previously used equivalent dwellings for a Dual Occupancy. Within the Table of Assessment for the Loganholme Local Plan, the minimum area requirements have not been included for a Dual Occupancy. The Table of Assessment is to be amended to align with the Dual Occupancy minimum lot size requirements under the Table of Assessment for Material Change of Use.	The current planning scheme only makes provision for a Dual Occupancy to be accepted development (subject to requirements) in the Residential Choice precinct and Residential Frame precinct of the Loganholme Local Plan where located on a corner lot or dual road lot. The amendment does not propose to vary this position. Furthermore, given the large size of the existing corner lots / dual road lots in these precincts, it is not considered necessary to replace the former density limitation with a minimum lot size. A refinement is proposed, however, to cite a minimum lot size of 800m <sup>2</sup> for a Dual Occupancy in the Tables of Assessment for the Suburban Residential precinct. Formerly, the amendment cited this minimum lot size for a Dual Occupancy only in the local plan code but without any qualification in

		the Tables of Assessment. This anomaly has accordingly been corrected.
77	The removal of the overall net density provisions for the Low Density Residential Zone, combined with the maximum density limits for Dual Occupancy and Multiple Dwellings, that are consistent with that of detached dwellings, makes them unviable development options, and thus only detached dwellings are likely to be developed.	In order to continue to facilitate diversity of housing choice by way of Dual Occupancies, the amendment proposes to offer a minimum lot size concession for this land use. For instance, the minimum lot size required for a Dual Occupancy is proposed at 87.5% of the starting minimum lot size required for a two lot subdivision. This concession seeks to incentivise this form of housing. With respect to Multiple Dwellings, the amendment proposes to continue the planning scheme's current position of supporting development at an equivalent density to that permissible by way of subdivision. It is noted, however, that Multiple Dwellings are primarily supported in zonings that support higher density residential development, such as the Low-Medium Density Residential Zone.
82	The term 'common wall' ought to be defined.	Acknowledging the ambiguity that the term 'common wall' may introduce, the amendment has been refined to no longer make a distinction in the minimum lot size permitted for attached and detached Dual Occupancies. This refinement will also ensure that detached forms are not discouraged.

## Multiple Dwellings

82	The proposed amendments seek to increase the permitted density of Multiple Dwellings in the Low Density Residential Zone. However, the proposed increase falls short of encouraging attached or semi-detached products as a greater or consistent density is still possible via a freehold subdivision.	The proposed amendment does not seek to directly facilitate more intense attached housing products (such as terrace housing). Diverse housing forms such as this, however, will be considered in the development of the new planning scheme, anticipated to commence in 2025. To learn more about the new planning scheme and how to contribute to its development, visit <a href="http://loganplan2025.com.au">loganplan2025.com.au</a> .
89	Retain the current allowable densities with no increase, or if Council does continue to desire an increase in townhouse densities, consider including a minimum site area for townhouses (eg. 1,000m <sup>2</sup> ) to reduce the number of townhouse developments that can occur on any given suburban street.	The density allowable for Multiple Dwellings in the Suburban precinct (the most common precinct in the city's urban residential areas) is proposed to increase from 20 dwellings per hectare to 25 dwellings per hectare. This increase is commensurate with the proposed change in minimum lot size permitted (from an average of 500m <sup>2</sup> to a minimum of 400m <sup>2</sup> ). Where units with three or more bedrooms are proposed, this would result in the need for 400m <sup>2</sup> of site area per dwelling, therefore compatible in intensity with that permitted for detached dwellings.

Submission	Matter	Council s response
132	References to equivalent dwellings for multiple dwellings should be removed.	The mechanism of 'equivalent dwellings' is proposed to be retained for Multiple Dwellings. This mechanism encourages the provision of one and two bedroom dwellings which are important in ensuring that the city offers diversity of housing choice.
115	Townhouse and unit development should not be supported in suburban areas.	The planning scheme currently supports townhouse and unit development in the Low Density Residential Zone where limited in scale and density. These land uses are presently typically limited to 8.5m in building height (consistent with limitations for Dwelling Houses) and are proposed to be permitted at a density of 25 equivalent dwellings per hectare in the Suburban precinct (the most common precinct in the city's urban residential areas). This equates to one equivalent dwelling per 400m <sup>2</sup> of site area, therefore compatible in intensity with detached dwellings while still offering a variety of housing choices for the city's diverse needs.

## Infrastructure

13, 24, 27, 59, 128, 135	Minimum road widths in new residential developments ought to be increased.	The Logan Planning Scheme 2015 outlines requirements for development, including road widths. Residential streets (classified as 'urban access streets') are required to have a minimum carriageway width of 7.5m and a minimum reserve width of 15.5m (to accommodate services, footpaths, street trees, etc.). This 7.5m carriageway width is considered suitable to allow for the safe two-way movement of vehicles.
15, 118	Infrastructure (such as roads) should be constructed prior to new estates being built.	The Logan Planning Scheme 2015 outlines requirements for development. The planning scheme required that infrastructure such as roads, water, sewer, stormwater, electrical services and telecommunication services are established in a housing estate prior to the development of dwelling houses.
66	Increased development leads to increased traffic and congestion.	All subdivision development and multi-unit development requires the lodgement of a development application and assessment against the Logan Planning Scheme 2015. Through the development assessment process, Council ensures that development thoroughly considers its traffic implications and appropriately mitigates any impacts.
15, 61	Public transport services ought to be improved.	Translink, as the state government public transport operator, is

Submission	Matter	Council s response
		responsible for the planning and delivery of public transport.
<b>Technical Drafting</b>		
89	<p>There are significant concerns with the proposed wording of 3a within the Strategic Framework. This wording would likely allow for lots which conflict with the zoning provided they're complementary to the pattern of development in the surrounding area – even if the surrounding area is intentionally in a different zone. It is also a fairly easy test to meet for lots to be “of an appropriate size and dimension to suit their intended use”, even if the lot size is completely in conflict with the minimum lot sizes intended for the zone. It is requested the provision is amended to focus on how the proposed lot size and dimensions reinforce the intended character of the relevant zone. Suggest revision to:</p> <p><i>lots that are of an appropriate size and dimension to suit their intended use and that are in accordance with the intended character of the relevant zone;</i></p>	<p>The Strategic Framework has been amended to include a cross-reference to the Low Density Residential Zone Code to better guide the reader as to the character of this zone. Further, the Low Density Residential Zone Code has been revised to also provide character statements for the Small Lot, Suburban and Village precincts that articulate the qualitative characteristics of these precincts.</p>
89	<p>It is recommended that the definition for ‘Rear lots’ is amended to make reference to Vehicular access, or an editor’s note is included to this effect so all lots in a given subdivision which seek to utilise a shared driveway crossover will be definitively considered rear lots.</p>	<p>The requested change is beyond the scope of the proposed amendment, however, Council is in the early stages of preparing a new planning scheme, anticipated to commence in 2025. Additional clarity for which lots in a development are considered rear lots will be considered in the preparation of the new planning scheme.</p> <p>To learn more about the new planning scheme and how to contribute to its development, visit <a href="https://loganplan2025.logan.qld.gov.au">loganplan2025.logan.qld.gov.au</a>.</p>
89	<p>Amend Tables 5.6.1 – Reconfiguring a lot to make reference to “clear of access” in the Low density residential level of assessment criteria instead of referencing it as a footnote.</p>	<p>The proposed note highlighting that the minimum rear lot area is to exclude the access strip has been relocated to sit within the category of development and assessment provisions so as to be more visible.</p>
109	<p>The Tables of Assessment propose to introduce new minimum lot sizes across a number of precincts. An additional note has also been provided which defines how the minimum lot size is to be calculated. It is recommended that this note is relocated to the sit within the “Category of development and assessment” section of the table for improved visibility.</p>	<p>The proposed note highlighting that the minimum rear lot area is to exclude the access strip has been relocated to sit within the category of development and assessment provisions so as to be more visible.</p>
89	<p>Amend the minimum frontage width for the Village precinct in Table 9.4.6.3.2 – Reconfiguring a lot or Table 9.4.6.3.5 – Frontage requirements to be consistent.</p>	<p>The Village precinct’s frontage range for “maximum 70% of total lots created” set out in Table 9.4.6.3.5 – Frontage Requirements has been amended to “15m - 17.99m” to ensure consistency with the minimum</p>

Submission	Matter	Council s response
		frontage permitted in this precinct (being 15m).
109	The proposed amendment provides additional diagrams within Planning Scheme Policy 8 – Urban Design. Proposed Figure 2.3.3.2 has been provided to assist in the calculation of the frontage for corner lots. It is recommended that the diagram be renamed to clarify that the measurement is for the primary frontage only. In some cases the secondary frontage may also be applicable and as such the current title could be misleading.	It is proposed that the figure’s existing wording be maintained. The purpose of the figure is not to identify which frontage on a corner site is the primary frontage, but rather, how the frontage is to be measured. The existing definition of ‘primary street frontage’ provides guidance for determining which frontage on a corner site is the primary frontage.
109	Figure 2.3.3.3. does not clearly show that lots are different sizes and as such does not have much benefit. It is recommended that the image is replaced with a scaled diagram.	Figure 2.3.3.3 - Example of Diverse Frontage Sizes Facilitating a Range of Housing Types is considered a suitable figure for demonstrating the noticeable difference in a variety of frontage widths. Importantly, this figure guides PO9 of the Reconfiguring a Lot Code which requires that “reconfiguring a lot achieves a diverse lot mix and high quality streetscape by... providing lots with <u>noticeable frontage variation when observed from the street.</u> ”

## Request for Zoning Change

64, 65, 69	Request that residential development be permitted in a portion of Priestdale to ease the housing affordability crisis.	The area requested to be rezoned is located outside the Urban Footprint of the South East Queensland Regional Plan 2017 (regional plan). The regional plan has been developed by the Queensland Government in an effort to manage the region’s growth and ensure efficient delivery of infrastructure. Importantly, Council is unable to apply a zoning to an area inconsistent with the intent of the regional plan.
113	Request for change of zoning of property in Jimboomba to allow for subdivision.	The area requested to be rezoned is located outside the Urban Footprint of the South East Queensland Regional Plan 2017 (regional plan). The regional plan has been developed by the Queensland Government in an effort to manage the region’s growth and ensure efficient delivery of infrastructure. Importantly, Council is unable to apply a zoning to an area inconsistent with the intent of the regional plan.
14	The Large Suburban precinct area in Shailer Park ought to be changed to allow large residential properties to be subdivided to lots of 500m <sup>2</sup> . This would not have any detrimental impacts but would allow for the provision of more housing. I also don’t think this would have negative impacts on parking, waste collection, resources, traffic or schools as	The requested change is beyond the scope of the proposed amendment, however, Council is in the early stages of preparing a new planning scheme, anticipated to commence in 2025. The development of the new planning scheme will involve a citywide review of zonings and allowable lot sizes. During this stage the



Submission	Matter	Council s response
	Shailer Park is a large, spacious suburb with wide roads, parks and access. I would not support lots of units to be developed though, but small scale subdivision of existing large residential properties seems appropriate and productive.	zoning and lot sizes permitted in Shailer Park will be considered. To learn more about the new planning scheme and how to contribute to its development, visit <a href="http://loganplan2025.com.au">loganplan2025.com.au</a> .
47	The Large Suburban precinct in Daisy Hill ought to allow smaller lot sizes than the 1,000m <sup>2</sup> permitted under the current planning scheme.	The requested change is beyond the scope of the proposed amendment, however, Council is in the early stages of preparing a new planning scheme, anticipated to commence in 2025. The development of the new planning scheme will involve a citywide review of zonings and allowable lot sizes. During this stage the zoning and lot sizes permitted in Daisy Hill will be considered. To learn more about the new planning scheme and how to contribute to its development, visit <a href="http://loganplan2025.com.au">loganplan2025.com.au</a> .
30	Buccan ought to be considered for development of smaller residential lots.	The area requested to be rezoned is located outside the Urban Footprint of the South East Queensland Regional Plan 2017 (regional plan). The regional plan has been developed by the Queensland Government in an effort to manage the region's growth and ensure efficient delivery of infrastructure. Importantly, Council is unable to apply a zoning to an area inconsistent with the intent of the regional plan.

## Other Matters

35, 99	Support the proposed amendment.	Council notes your expressed support.
134	The removal of the depth to width ratio should be undertaken for more zones, specifically, the LDR Large Suburban and Acreage precincts.	The requested change is beyond the scope of the proposed amendment, however, Council is in the early stages of preparing a new planning scheme, anticipated to commence in 2025. Development parameters within the Low Density Residential Zone will be considered in the preparation of the new planning scheme. To learn more about the new planning scheme and how to contribute to its development, visit <a href="http://loganplan2025.logan.qld.gov.au">loganplan2025.logan.qld.gov.au</a> .
134	Depth to width ratio should not apply to infill development (where no new road is proposed) and only be applicable for larger new estates. Currently the depth to width ratio limits the ability for small subdivisions (such as 1 into 2 lots) due to limitations of the parent lots.	The amendment proposes to remove the depth to width requirements for the Small Lot, Suburban and Village precincts of the Low Density Residential Zone.
135	The Small Lot Precinct and Suburban Precinct should be removed	The requested change is beyond the scope of the proposed amendment, however, Council is in the early stages of preparing a

Submission	Matter	Council s response
	from the Low Density Residential Zone.	<p>new planning scheme, anticipated to commence in 2025. The development of the new planning scheme will involve a review of the Low Density Residential Zone and its precincts. During this stage the mix of precincts, their character statements and allowable lot sizes will be considered.</p> <p>To learn more about the new planning scheme and how to contribute to its development, visit <a href="http://loganplan2025.com.au">loganplan2025.com.au</a>.</p>
61	Logan needs more affordable land / property. With the current housing affordability crisis, it is extremely difficult for first home buyers to enter the market or for investors to further expand their property portfolio. We need more land to be rezoned to be residential.	<p>Council is in the early stages of preparing a new planning scheme, anticipated to commence in 2025. The development of the new planning scheme will involve a review of residential land across the city. During this stage, zoning changes will be considered.</p> <p>To learn more about the new planning scheme and how to contribute to its development, visit <a href="http://loganplan2025.com.au">loganplan2025.com.au</a>.</p>
58	My concern is around residential areas, zoned for medium density, but which presently accommodate single residences. These designated zones are concentrated in particular areas which means that there is a consequential concentration of traffic, foot & vehicular, when those areas are developed into medium density. On the boundaries, one side of a street may be zoned for medium density and the other side not. There is no logical reason for this disparity. I assume land values, at sale, are generally higher for medium density blocks than simple residential. I would like Council to review this & consider it on a larger scale, so that there would be less concentration in one area, but a similar population density across that larger area. We could benefit from medium density, but does it have to be in such concentration?	Areas of higher density residential zonings are generally located in close proximity to features such as centres, public transport, schools, parks, etc. These higher density zoned areas transition to lower density areas, typified by detached dwellings. These boundaries generally utilise the road network as a natural, defined break in intensity of development.
28, 135	Dwelling size should be proportionate to the lot size, otherwise people purchase a small block of land and put the biggest house they can on it which then defeats the purpose of having lot sizes.	The Queensland Development Code (developed by the Queensland Government) establishes the site cover (the area of a site covered by buildings) limitations for dwelling houses. Site cover requirements are expressed as a percentage, meaning that development is permitted as a fixed proportion of the site area.
39	Mandate rainwater tanks on all new builds.	The requested change is beyond the scope of the proposed amendment and is regulated by state government building codes. As such, Council cannot mandate the installation of rainwater tanks.
50	Existing trees should be retained when new housing estates are developed.	Council is in the early stages of preparing a new planning scheme, anticipated to commence in 2025. The development of the new

Submission	Matter	Council's response
		<p>planning scheme will involve the development of an urban greening strategy. Council will explore ways to better facilitate the retention of existing trees in new development as part of this project.</p> <p>To learn more about the new planning scheme and how to contribute to its development, visit <a href="http://loganplan2025.com.au">loganplan2025.com.au</a>.</p>
115	New housing estates should be tree-lined.	The Planning Regulation 2017 requires that new housing estates incorporate street trees every 15m.
39	Reduce the amount of green corridors being destroyed and pledge to offset any habitat destruction with an equivalent amount of re-planting or buying back sites and putting them back into public hands to offset the loss of public green spaces.	<p>Council is in the early stages of preparing a new planning scheme, anticipated to commence in 2025. The development of the new planning scheme will involve a review of green corridors. Council will explore ways to enhance biodiversity values across the city as part of this project.</p> <p>To learn more about the new planning scheme and how to contribute to its development, visit <a href="http://loganplan2025.com.au">loganplan2025.com.au</a>.</p>
115, 128	Development should not occur in flood-affected areas.	The planning scheme regulates development in flood-affected areas through the Flood Hazard Overlay. This overlay limits development in such areas to mitigate injury, loss of life, damage to premises and the burden on the emergency management system.
50	Higher density development should be focused around train lines.	The planning scheme's existing zoning strategy applies higher density zonings in well-serviced areas. This generally means that areas in and surrounding centres and high frequency public transport are afforded greater development rights.
53, 73	Request subdivision be permitted within close proximity of the Centre Zone.	The planning scheme's existing zoning strategy applies higher density zonings in well-serviced areas. This generally means that areas in and surrounding centres and high frequency public transport are afforded greater development rights.
115, 128	All development in or adjoining residential areas ought to be impact assessable.	Community input on development is critical to ensuring development reflects the community's expectations for our city. Nonetheless, it is not practical for all development applications to be impact assessable as this would significantly burden both the community and Council's development assessment services. Furthermore, the Queensland Government's State Planning Policy requires that a planning scheme only regulates development to the extent necessary to address potential impacts. As such, where development is consistent and in

Submission	Matter	Council s response
		accordance with the broad intent of a zone and able to be assessed against assessment benchmarks, it should be identified as code assessable.
39	Improve the consultation process and transparency regarding development applications.	Where development is impact assessable (that is, it is generally inconsistent with the intent of an area) it must undergo public notification as required by the <i>Planning Act 2016</i> . Not all development, however, can be made impact assessable due to the significant burden it would impose on both the community and Council's development assessment service due to financial and resourcing implications.
121	Request transitional arrangements to allow the development industry time to lodge development applications under the current provisions.	Upon commencement of the amendments to the planning scheme, the <i>Planning Act 2016</i> affords applicants the ability to seek to apply the superseded planning scheme for a period of 12 months.
121	Council ought to pursue compliance action against certifiers and builders who approve/undertake development beyond that permitted by the planning scheme.	Council notes your feedback.
121, 123	The proposed minimum lot sizes will impact overall density and result in development not able to achieve the desired outcomes of the South East Queensland Regional Plan in regard to residential density.	The proposed changes to reconfiguring a lot will not diminish the city's ability to achieve the dwelling targets set out by the South East Queensland Regional Plan.
132	All references to net density and equivalent dwellings should be replaced with gross residential density, net residential density, and site density as defined by Shaping SEQ.	Council is in the early stages of preparing a new planning scheme, anticipated to commence in 2025. The development of the new planning scheme will involve a review of the means by which density is applied through the planning scheme. During this stage, Council will explore ways to regulate the density of development.  To learn more about the new planning scheme and how to contribute to its development, visit <a href="http://loganplan2025.com.au">loganplan2025.com.au</a> .
63	The purpose of the amendment as stated in supporting material, "to better preserve the character of our residential areas" is the reverse of what has happened.	At its heart, the amendment seeks to better regulate subdivision to ensure lot configuration aligns with community expectations. This in turn will better preserve the character of the city's residential areas.
105	Amend the 'bedroom' definition within the planning scheme to remove the ambiguity as to what is or can be considered a bedroom.	The planning scheme defines 'bedroom' as "any enclosed, habitable room in a dwelling that is capable of being used for sleeping accommodation." This definition is not considered to be ambiguous.
43	Housing should be affordable.	The planning scheme amendment seeks to ensure Logan can

Submission	Matter	Council s response
		continue to provide a range of diverse and affordable housing types.