

Draft State Planning Policy

Properly made submission form

Have your say

This form is for submissions relating to the draft State Planning Policy.

All properly made submissions will be reviewed and considered by the project team when finalising the State Planning Policy. By submitting this form and accurately completing all questions marked as “required”, your submission is properly made.

Consultation on the draft State Planning Policy is now open and closes at 11.59pm on Monday 26 October 2026. Feedback is welcomed from local government, industry, community organisations and interested Queenslanders.

For more information about the draft State Planning Policy, please visit the website via www.planning.qld.gov.au/state-planning-policy.

Collection notice

As part of this consultation, we collect personal information such as your name, residential or business address, and email address. We handle personal information in accordance with the Information Privacy Act 2009 (Qld). For more information about how your personal information is collected, used, stored, and disclosed, please read the full Collection Notice (haveyoursay.statedevelopment.qld.gov.au/draft-state-planning-policy-2026) and the department’s Privacy Policy (<https://www.statedevelopment.qld.gov.au/about-us/help/privacy>).

About you

Which of the following best describes you or the organisation you represent? (required)

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ Community member | ☐ Peak body |
| ☐ Community organisation | ☐ Industry/developer |
| ☐ Consultancy | ☐ Planning practitioner |
| ☐ Environmental group | ☐ Academic |
| ☐ Local government | ☐ Infrastructure provider |
| ☐ State agency | ☐ First Nations organisation |
| ☐ Federal department | ☐ Other (please specify) |
| ☐ Industry group | |

Your details (required)

First name: _____ Last name: _____

Email address: _____

Residential / business address:

Unit number: _____

Street address: _____

Suburb: _____

State: _____

Postcode: _____

Which Queensland region do you primarily live or work in? (select one) (required)

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☐ Cape York | ☐ Maranoa-Balonne |
| ☐ Central Queensland | ☐ North Queensland |
| ☐ Central West | ☐ North West |
| ☐ Darling Downs | ☐ South East Queensland |
| ☐ Far North Queensland | ☐ South West |
| ☐ Gulf | ☐ Wide Bay Burnett |
| ☐ Mackay, Isaac and Whitsunday | ☐ I don't live and work in Queensland |

How easy was the draft State Planning Policy to understand? (required)

- ☐ Very easy
- ☐ Somewhat easy
- ☐ Neither easy nor difficult
- ☐ Somewhat difficult
- ☐ Very difficult

How familiar are you with Queensland's planning system? (required)

- ☐ Very familiar
- ☐ Somewhat familiar
- ☐ Limited familiarity
- ☐ Not familiar

Which changes are of interest to you? (select all that apply) (required)

- ☐ New state aspirations
- ☐ Updated scope of state interests
- ☐ Structure of the document
- ☐ Changes to the Natural Hazards and Resilience state interest
- ☐ The new Environment, Heritage and Efficient Growth state interest
- ☐ Alignment with the Planning Act 2016
- ☐ Changes to assessment benchmarks
- ☐ Minister's Guidelines and Rules
- ☐ Updated guidance materials
- ☐ Mapping
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

If you selected "Community member" to the first question, please answer the below questions.

For any organisations or other stakeholders, please progress on to the "Stakeholder questions" from page 5.

Community member questions

Which state interests do you think will be the most crucial to your community over the next 20 years?
(select up to three) (required)

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ Housing | ☐ Natural events and safety |
| ☐ Productive Employment Land | ☐ High impact and hazardous activities |
| ☐ Tourism | ☐ Infrastructure |
| ☐ Mining and extractive industries | ☐ Energy |
| ☐ Agriculture | ☐ Water |
| ☐ Environment, Heritage and Efficient Growth | ☐ Transport, aviation and ports infrastructure |

Which of the following would best demonstrate that the State Planning Policy has been successful?
(select up to five) (required)

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ More homes in appropriate locations | ☐ Better protection of agricultural land |
| ☐ Better protection from natural hazards | ☐ More jobs and economic opportunities |
| ☐ Better coordinated infrastructure and services | ☐ Well-planned communities that meet local needs |
| ☐ Stronger environmental outcomes | ☐ Other (please specify) |
| ☐ Faster and more efficient planning decisions | _____ |

Does the draft State Planning Policy address the issues most important for Queensland's future growth? (required)

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ Mostly
- ☐ No
- ☐ Unsure

What is missing from the State Planning Policy?

Do you have any other comments about the draft State Planning Policy?

For all community members, thank you for completing this survey!

Please return your completed survey by the consultation closing date by either:

- emailing planningforqueensland@dsdip.qld.gov.au; or
- posting your submission to PO Box 15009, City East QLD 4002.

Stakeholder questions

Which of the following best describes your role within your organisation? (select one) (required)

- ☐ Officer/employee
- ☐ Manager
- ☐ Senior manager
- ☐ Executive
- ☐ Head of organisation (e.g. CEO, Mayor)
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

To what extent do you expect the proposed changes in the draft State Planning Policy to impact your organisation? (select one) (required)

- ☐ Major impact
- ☐ Moderate impact
- ☐ Minor impact
- ☐ No impact
- ☐ Unsure

What changes, if any, would make the draft State Planning Policy easier for your organisation to implement?

What information, tools or guidance would help your organisation better understand or implement the proposed changes?

Do you have any other comments about the draft State Planning Policy?

If you have an interest in the changes to the natural hazards and resilience state interest, please continue onto the below **optional** questions.

If you do not wish to complete additional questions about the changes to the natural hazards and resilience state interest, please return your completed survey by the consultation closing date by either:

- emailing planningforqueensland@dsdip.qld.gov.au; or
- posting your submission to PO Box 15009, City East QLD 4002.

Natural hazards

Based on your experience, how well does the SPP 2017 natural hazard assessment benchmarks perform in the following areas? (select one for each)

	Very poorly	Poorly	Adequately	Well	Very well	Not applicable / no experience
Clarity and ease of interpretation						
Consistency of assessment outcomes						
Proportionality to the level of risk						
Ability to respond to local context						
Treatment of cumulative and future risk						
Clarity about acceptable mitigation and residual risk						
Efficiency of the assessment process						

How effective is the existing natural hazard planning guidance in each of the following areas?
(select one for each)

	Very ineffective	Ineffective	Neither	Effective	Very effective	Not applicable / no experience
Clarity of terminology and risk concepts						
Practical implementation steps						
Consistency across hazard types						
Use of examples, diagrams and case studies						
Guidance on mapping and data						
Guidance on development assessment and mitigation						
Accessibility and ease of use						

What are the highest priority opportunities for improvements and why?

To what extent do you support the proposed shift from an “avoid, then mitigate” approach to an approach that allows development where natural hazard risks can be appropriately managed?

- ☐ Strongly oppose
- ☐ Oppose
- ☐ Neither support nor oppose
- ☐ Support
- ☐ Strongly support
- ☐ Unsure / need more information

Please briefly explain your response to the previous question and/or identify any conditions required for this approach to work effectively?

(This may include considerations relating to legislation, planning frameworks, planning processes, planning practice, stakeholder engagement, and other relevant matters.)

How important should each of the following factors be when determining whether natural hazard risk is acceptable, tolerable or intolerable? (select one for each)

	Not important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Important	Very important	Unsure
Likelihood and severity of the hazard						
Risk to life, health and safety						
Ability to evacuate and provide emergency access						
Impacts on essential infrastructure and services						
Impacts on neighbouring land and the wider community						
Effectiveness and reliability of mitigation measures over time						
Residual risk after mitigation						

Are there any other factors or considerations that should be taken into account when determining natural hazard risk?

The following questions focus on emerging policy and technical matters associated with the future of natural hazards planning in Queensland, including potential framework, process and mapping improvements currently being explored.

*Please read through the **natural hazards planning policy discussion paper** available via www.planning.qld.gov.au/state-planning-policy before completing these questions.*

Looking ahead 20 to 30 years, what should be the primary objective of Queensland's natural hazards planning framework? (select up to 3)

- ☐ Protecting life and safety
- ☐ Increasing community resilience
- ☐ Enabling sustainable growth
- ☐ Supporting housing supply
- ☐ Improving certainty for investment
- ☐ Reducing disaster recovery costs
- ☐ Supporting climate adaptation
- ☐ Protecting critical infrastructure
- ☐ Other _____

For each function below, which level of government should have the primary responsibility? (select one for each)

	Queensland Government	Local government	Shared responsibility	Other	Unsure
Setting minimum state-wide risk-management standards					
Preparing and maintaining hazard mapping					
Reflecting hazard risk in planning schemes					
Assessing development applications					
Monitoring and updating hazard information					
Communicating risk to landowners and communities					

For each aspect of natural hazard mapping, indicate your preferred level of state direction.
(select one for each)

	Fully standardised state-wide	State minimum standard with local flexibility	Primarily local discretion	Unsure
Hazard definitions and terminology				
Data sources and modelling methods				
Likelihood, consequence and risk categories				
Mapping formats, metadata and accessibility				
Treatment of weather changes and uncertainty				
Ground-truthing and use of local knowledge				
Review and update frequency				
Processes for correcting or challenging mapping				

For which matters should state advice be mandatory rather than guidance for local government?
(select one for each)

	Mandatory state requirement	State minimum with local flexibility	Non- mandatory guidance	Locally determined	Unsure
Risk terminology and classification					
Minimum mapping standards and data quality					
Minimum risk thresholds					
Requirements for vulnerable or essential uses					
Evacuation and emergency-access outcomes					
Consideration of future weather and cumulative risk					
Review and update timeframes					
Community notification and engagement					

In which circumstances, if any, should state-wide limits on new development apply because of natural hazard risk? (select all that apply)

- ☐ Where there is an intolerable risk to life or safety
- ☐ Where safe evacuation or emergency access cannot be achieved
- ☐ Where essential infrastructure cannot remain functional
- ☐ Where development would materially increase risk to other properties or communities
- ☐ Where mitigation cannot reduce residual risk to an acceptable or tolerable level
- ☐ For specified development types or vulnerable uses
- ☐ State-wide limits should not apply; decisions should be locally determined

Other (please specify) _____

How should the boundary between acceptable and unacceptable natural hazard risk for new development be established?

- ☐ A single state-wide threshold
- ☐ State-wide minimum thresholds with local flexibility
- ☐ Hazard-specific state thresholds
- ☐ Development-type-specific thresholds
- ☐ Locally determined thresholds within state guidance
- ☐ Case-by-case assessment only
- ☐ No clear threshold should be established
- ☐ Unsure

In which circumstances should development in an area exposed to known natural hazard risk be supported? (select all that apply)

- ☐ The risk is assessed as acceptable
- ☐ The risk is tolerable and can be reduced as low as reasonably practicable
- ☐ Safe evacuation and emergency access can be maintained
- ☐ The development will not increase risk elsewhere
- ☐ Mitigation measures are effective, enforceable and maintained for the life of the development
- ☐ The development provides an overriding community benefit
- ☐ It should not be supported in known hazard areas
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

Which measures should be required of development in an area exposed to known natural hazards? (select all that apply)

- ☐ Siting or design controls
- ☐ Minimum floor or construction standards
- ☐ Evacuation and access requirements
- ☐ Infrastructure upgrades
- ☐ Land-use restrictions
- ☐ Ongoing monitoring and maintenance
- ☐ Financial or legal mechanisms
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

Which groups would benefit from additional natural hazard planning guidance, and on which topics?
(select all that apply)

- ☐ Local government officers and elected representatives
- ☐ Development applicants and consultants
- ☐ Businesses and infrastructure providers
- ☐ Landowners and prospective purchasers
- ☐ Community organisations and residents
- ☐ First Nations peoples and communities
- ☐ No additional guidance is required
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

What should additional guidance cover? (select all that apply)

- ☐ Understanding hazard maps
- ☐ Risk categories and thresholds
- ☐ Development requirements
- ☐ Mitigation options
- ☐ Responsibilities and decision pathways
- ☐ Updating and reviewing mapping
- ☐ Insurance or financial implications
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

How would you prefer to be informed or involved when natural hazard mapping affecting your property or community is proposed, updated, or amended? (select up to three)

- ☐ Direct email or letter to affected landowners
- ☐ Online interactive map with change alerts
- ☐ Local government website or newsletter
- ☐ Community information sessions or workshops
- ☐ Public notice and formal submission process
- ☐ Targeted engagement with community or industry groups
- ☐ One-on-one access to technical advice
- ☐ SMS notifications
- ☐ No preference
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

At what stage should engagement occur?

- ☐ Before technical work begins
- ☐ During preparation
- ☐ When draft mapping is released
- ☐ Before adoption
- ☐ After adoption
- ☐ At each stage

Is there any further feedback you would like to contribute for the state to consider regarding guidance and engagement?**Which actions would most improve the simplicity, timeliness and consistency of natural hazard mapping across Queensland? (select up to five)**

- ☐ Common state-wide methods and terminology
- ☐ A single data and mapping platform
- ☐ Minimum data-quality and metadata standards
- ☐ Standard map formats, scales and risk categories
- ☐ Clear roles for state and local government
- ☐ Faster access to new hazard datasets and modelling
- ☐ A clear process for corrections, appeals or local evidence
- ☐ Training, tools and technical support
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

Have you been involved in lodging, assessing, or deciding development applications in natural hazard risk areas?

- ☐ Yes – lodged or prepared applications
- ☐ Yes – assessed applications
- ☐ Yes – decided applications
- ☐ Yes – more than one of the above
- ☐ No

If yes, how significant are the following issues? (select one for each)

	Not an issue	Minor	Moderate	Major	Critical	Not applicable
Unclear or overlapping benchmarks						
Insufficient or inconsistent mapping and data						
Unclear evidence requirements						
Difficulty demonstrating acceptable residual risk						
Inconsistent interpretation between authorities						
Time, cost or specialist-resource requirements						
Conditions or mitigation that are difficult to implement or maintain						

Do you have any further feedback or suggestions for improvement that you would like the state to consider relating to lodging, assessing or deciding development applications in natural hazard risk areas?

Which engagement approaches would most improve meaningful community and stakeholder participation in planning changes relating to natural hazards? (select up to five)

- ☐ Earlier engagement before a preferred approach is developed
- ☐ Direct notification of affected landowners and businesses
- ☐ Plain-language summaries and visual explanations
- ☐ Interactive maps showing proposed changes and property impacts
- ☐ Community workshops, drop-in sessions or webinars
- ☐ Targeted engagement with vulnerable or hard-to-reach groups
- ☐ Longer or more flexible submission periods
- ☐ Access to technical experts and independent advice
- ☐ Publication of how feedback influenced the final decision
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

Which actions would help ensure new or updated hazard information is incorporated into planning controls more efficiently? (select up to five)

- ☐ Standard data formats and quality requirements
- ☐ A single process for validating and approving new information
- ☐ Mandatory notification when authoritative data changes
- ☐ Simplified or staged amendment pathways
- ☐ Temporary or interim planning responses
- ☐ Dedicated funding and technical resources
- ☐ Clearer state and local government responsibilities
- ☐ Earlier community and stakeholder engagement
- ☐ Shared state-wide mapping systems and templates
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

What are the main causes of delay? (select all that apply)

- ☐ Data availability or quality
- ☐ Technical validation
- ☐ Funding or staffing
- ☐ Statutory process
- ☐ State review or approval
- ☐ Consultation requirements
- ☐ Competing priorities
- ☐ System or interoperability issues
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

How effective do you think each of the following potential changes would be in improving the efficiency of natural hazard-related planning scheme amendments while maintaining transparency and community engagement? *(select one for each)*

	Not effective	Slightly effective	Moderately effective	Very effective	Extremely effective	Unsure
Standard amendment templates and evidence requirements						
Risk-based or proportionate amendment pathways						
Concurrent technical review and consultation						
Defined decision timeframes and escalation points						
Early agreement between state and local government on scope and evidence						
Digital mapping, notification and submission tools						
A transparent process for urgent or interim amendments						
Clear reporting on feedback and reasons for decisions						

Thank you for completing this survey.

Please return your completed survey by the consultation closing date by either:

- emailing planningforqueensland@dmdip.qld.gov.au; or
- posting your submission to PO Box 15009, City East QLD 4002.