

# Development application—decision under delegated authority

Reconfiguring a Lot at 959 Twin Creeks Road, Yarrol and 271 McLaughlans Road, Ventnor on land described as Lots 9 and 133 on SP289940—Code assessable development application under the *Planning Act 2016*

Application reference: DA220017

## 1 Proposal summary

- (1) The applicant seeks a Development Permit for Reconfiguring a Lot at 959 Twin Creeks Road, Yarrol and 271 McLaughlans Road, Ventnor (described as Lot 9 and 133 on SP289940).
- (2) The stated objective of the application is to realign the boundary between the two parcels along an existing fence line.
- (3) The site is used for the residential activity of Dwelling house as well as for grazing. The site accommodates a dwelling and other ancillary structures. All residential improvements would be fully contained within the relevant approved Lot.
- (4) Proposed lots 9 and 133 will have an area of 2,367ha and 808ha respectively. All proposed lots meet the minimum area and road frontage requirements in the planning scheme.
- (5) The Council must assess the application against the assessment benchmarks, having regard to those matters set out in the *Planning Act 2016* and *Planning Regulation 2017*, and decide the application in accordance with the decision rules in s60(2) and s60(5). The attached Statement of reasons sets out the rationale for deciding to approve the application.

## 2 Recommendations

- (1) That the Council or its delegate, having regard to the matters set out in the Statement of reasons, decide the application under s60(2) of the *Planning Act 2016* by approving all of it subject to conditions.
- (2) That the Council notify the applicant of its decision in accordance with the attached Decision Notice.
- (3) That the Council publish the Decision Notice, including the Statement of reasons, on its website.
- (4) Council can no longer issue a charges notice in accordance with its Charges Resolution (No. 2) 2015 as it did not make a Local Government Infrastructure Plan by 1 July 2018.

## 3 Decision

I concur with the above recommendations—please issue the Decision Notice as recommended.



Lyn McLeod  
Development Officer  
(Delegate of North Burnett Regional Council)

29 March 2022

Date

## 4 Statement of reasons

This statement explains the reasons for the assessment manager's decision in relation to a development application for Reconfiguring a Lot at 959 Twin Creeks Road, Yarrol and 271 McLaughlans Road, Ventnor (described as Lot 9 and 133 on SP289940). The statement is required under **section 63 Notice of decision** of the *Planning Act 2016*.

### 4.1 Facts and circumstances

- (1) The application was deemed properly made on 28 March 2022.
- (2) Council did not issue a Confirmation notice as it was not required under s2.2 of the Development Assessment Rules.
- (3) The application does not trigger any referrals.
- (4) The application included sufficient information and it was not necessary to issue an information request.
- (5) The following matters have been key considerations for the assessment manager—
  - (a) material about the application, including the proposal plans and the applicant's report;
  - (b) the North Burnett Regional Planning Scheme 2014 v1.4 (amendments commenced 17 August 2020), to the extent relevant; and
  - (c) the extent of remnant vegetation;
  - (d) bushfire & flood hazard
  - (e) the SPP, to the extent that it is not appropriately integrated in the planning scheme.

### 4.2 Category of assessment

- (1) The site is in the Rural zone (Intensive Agricultural Precinct) and is surrounded by other Rural lots.
- (2) The proposal is identified as Code assessable against the Reconfiguring a lot (Boundary realignment) and associated operational work code,
- (3) The proposed also requires assessment against the following overlay codes—
  - (a) *Bushfire hazard overlay code;*
  - (b) *Flood hazard overlay code;*
  - (c) *Natural features or resources overlays code*
- (4) In accordance with s60(2) of the *Planning Act 2016*, to the extent the application involves development that requires code assessment, the Council—
  - (a) must decide to approve the application to the extent the development complies with all of the assessment benchmarks;
  - (b) may decide to approve the application even if the development does not comply with some of the assessment benchmarks; and
  - (c) may, to the extent the development does not comply with some or all the assessment benchmarks, decide to refuse the application only if compliance cannot be achieved by imposing development conditions.

## 4.3 Assessment benchmarks

- (1) A basic assessment against the assessment benchmarks is provided in the report and associated documentation submitted with the application. Such assessment confirms that the matter is relatively straightforward, and it is not necessary to carry out a more detailed assessment for compliance.

### 4.3.2 State planning instruments

- (1) *Regional plan*—the Wide Bay Burnett Regional Plan is appropriately integrated in the planning scheme and does not require further or separate consideration for Council to decide the application.
- (2) *State planning policy*—there are no State interest statements, policies or benchmarks relevant to this application.

### 4.3.3 Reconfiguring a lot (Boundary realignment) and associated operational work code

- (1) The proposal complies with the Reconfiguring a lot (Boundary realignment) and associated operational work code —
  - (a) it achieves the purpose and overall outcomes of the code;
  - (b) it complies with the performance outcomes of the code, specifically—
  - (c) the lots would be regularly configured with both proposed lots exceed the minimum 1.0 ha area;
  - (d) Both lots have a suitable building area free from any site constraints including most natural hazards (with both lots already built upon);
  - (e) Both lots are suitably sized to provide adequate non-trunk infrastructure connections;
  - (f) a safe, lawful and practical access to Twin Creeks Road and McLaughlans Road is available to Lot 9 and 133 (with a suitable access existing to both lots).
  - (g) new boundaries would not affect identified MSES areas or infrastructure.

### 4.3.4 Overlay codes

- (1) The proposal complies with the *Flood Hazard overlay code* as—
  - (a) it achieves the purpose and overall outcomes of the code;
  - (b) it complies with the performance outcomes of the code;
  - (c) the realignment would not compromise the stock route with no additional lots or material change of use proposed.
- (2) The proposal complies with the *Bushfire hazard overlay code* as—
  - (a) it achieves the purpose and overall outcomes of the code;
  - (b) it complies with the performance outcomes of the code;
  - (c) the proposed realignment would not compromise site access and does not involve building work or material change of use.
- (3) The proposal complies with the *Natural features or resources overlays code* as—
  - (a) it achieves the purpose and overall outcomes of the code;
  - (b) it complies with the performance outcomes of the code, specifically—
  - (c) significant impacts on environmental values would be avoided with new boundaries distant from significant MSES areas.

## 4.4 Consultation

### 4.4.1 Internal stakeholder comments

- (1) Technical Services advised they have no concerns for the development and subsequently did not provide further comment on the development.

### 4.4.2 External stakeholder comments

- (1) The application did not require referral to DSDMIP under Schedule 10 of the *Planning Regulation 2017*.

### 4.4.3 Public consultation

- (1) The application did not require public notification.

## 4.5 Key issues for this application

- (1) The assessment manager considers that the following matters have been instrumental in its decision—
  - (a) *Compliance with the assessment benchmarks*—the proposal is fully compliant with the relevant assessment benchmarks;
  - (b) *Lot configuration*—both lots would be regular in shape and be compatible with other development in the locality considering the area, orientation and constraints;
  - (c) *Infrastructure*—both lots have access to a constructed road and;
  - (d) *Hazards*—the realignment would not alter existing hazards with all structures located to mitigate associated risks.

## 4.6 Decision rules under the *Planning Act 2016*

- (1) The assessment manager—
  - (a) must approve if the proposal complies with all the assessment benchmarks;
  - (b) may approve if the proposal does not comply with some assessment benchmarks;
  - (c) may impose conditions;
  - (d) may refuse the application only if the proposal does not comply with some of the benchmarks and conditions cannot achieve compliance;
  - (e) may give a preliminary approval for all or part of the proposal.

*Section 60(2) of the Planning Act 2016 sets out the decision rules for code assessment.*
- (2) Development conditions must—
  - (a) be relevant to but not an unreasonable imposition; and
  - (b) be reasonably required as a consequence of the development.

*Section 65 of the Planning Act 2016 limits the nature of approval conditions.*
- (3) Having regard to the above matters and after assessing the application against the assessment benchmarks, the assessment manager decides to approve the application and impose conditions in accordance with the decision rules.