
**CALL IN NOTICE FOR A DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION UNDER
THE SUSTAINABLE PLANNING ACT 2009**

**111 BOUNDARY STREET, 26 and 26A LITTLE JANE STREET, 19 and 23 MOLLISON
STREET, WEST END AND 37 MOLLISON STREET, SOUTH BRISBANE,
BRISBANE CITY COUNCIL**

Pursuant to section 425 of the *Sustainable Planning Act 2009* (SPA), I hereby call in to reassess and re-decide a development application by Uniacke Pty Ltd c/- Landpartners Limited for the West Village mixed use development including multiple dwelling units and centre activities over the Absoe site ("development application").

The site is located at 111 Boundary Street, 26 and 26A Little Jane Street, 19 and 23 Mollison Street, West End and 37 Mollison Street, South Brisbane.

The development application is for a preliminary approval under section 242 of SPA for material change of use, reconfiguration of a lot, carry out building work and carry out operational work to vary the effect of the *Brisbane City Plan 2014* (City Plan).

The documentation for the development application can be accessed through Brisbane City Council's website at:

<https://pdonline.brisbane.qld.gov.au/MasterViewUI/Modules/applicationmaster/default.aspx?page=wrapper&key=A004115562>.

On 18 May 2016, Brisbane City Council (Council) approved the development application, subject to conditions. Council issued its decision notice on 19 May 2016.

On 21 June 2016, the West End Community Association Inc. filed a submitter appeal in the Planning and Environment Court (P&E Court) against Council's decision to approve the development application (Ref: 2407/16).

On 27 June 2016, Councillor Sri wrote to me requesting me to exercise my ministerial call in powers for the abovementioned development application (the request).

By Notice dated 26 July 2016, I gave written notice of the proposed call in of the development application, pursuant to section 424A of SPA. A total of 736 representations were received in response to the proposed call in notice.

Reasons for the call in

State interests

Under Section 424 of SPA, I may call in a development application only if the development involves a state interest. A state interest is defined in Schedule 3 of SPA as:

- (a) *an interest that the Minister considers affects an economic or environmental interest of the State or a part of the State, including sustainable development; or*
- (b) *an interest that the Minister considers affects the interest of ensuring there is an efficient, effective and accountable planning and development assessment system.*

A State Planning Policy (SPP) advances the purpose of SPA by stating the state's policy about a matter of state interest (section 22(b) of SPA). A designated region's regional plan is taken to be a state interest under section 35 of SPA.

I consider the proposed development involves the following state interests:

1. The development affects an economic and environmental interest of the State or a part of the State as:

a. The development represents a substantial economic investment in the area, with:

- i. the applicant's Economic Impact Assessment prepared by Macroplan Dimasi, dated April 2015, stating that:
 - *"The non-residential component of the proposed West Village mixed-use development is proposed to contain a total floorspace of 11,500sq.m, including a 4,500sq.m GFA supermarket"* (at page i)
 - *"The proposed development, which in addition to the proposed retail and non-residential uses has a total of 1,350 units proposed or approximately 2,970 persons on development completion"* (at page iii)
 - *"We have estimated that the proposed 4,500 sq.m GFA supermarket will generate sales in the order of \$45.0 million (\$10,000 per sq.m) in its first full year"* (at page viii).
- ii. The request purports that the proposal is an \$800 million development (at page 8).

b. The State Planning Policy April 2016 (the SPP) identifies the state interest of Development and construction (Economic growth), and states at page 22:

- i. that development and construction is of interest to the state as *"Planning for development and construction supports a thriving industry that is both a major employer, delivers the housing we need and is a prerequisite for other economic activities."*
- ii. *"Planning supports employment needs and economic growth by facilitating a range of residential, commercial, retail and industrial development opportunities, and by supporting a strong development and construction sector."*

The applicant's Economic Impact Assessment prepared by Macroplan Dimasi, dated April 2015, purports that:

- i. *"estimated employment resulting from the construction of the proposed development is 447 jobs per year, including 172 created directly and a further 275 resulting from multiplier induced effects"* (at page vii)
- ii. *"net employment on-site and ongoing resulting from the retail is expected to be 368 net jobs"* (at page 42).

c. The SPP identifies the state interests of Liveable communities and Housing supply and diversity and states that:

- i. housing supply and diversity is of interest to the state as *"Housing is required to cater for different lifestyles, incomes, ages, household and family types, and community needs."* (at page 16)
- ii. liveable communities are of interest to the state as *"The liveability of communities is of fundamental concern to all levels of government as it*

directly influences our quality of life and wellbeing. As the population of our cities and towns grow, and socioeconomic and demographic profiles change, the importance of attractive, healthy, safe, accessible and inclusive places and spaces increases.” (at page 18)

The proposed development occupies a significant site identified as a ‘Key development site’ in the South Brisbane Riverside Neighbourhood Plan. The site comprises a total area of approximately 2.6 hectares in a brownfield inner-city location. This site provides a significant opportunity for infill development. The development of this site is of a significant scale and provides an opportunity to independently contribute to these state interests by:

- *“facilitating a diverse and comprehensive range of housing options”* (at page 17)
- *“providing for best-practice, innovative and adaptable housing design”* (at page 17)
- *delivering “liveable, well designed and serviced communities that support wellbeing and enhance quality of life”* (at page 17)
- *“planning for public open space that : (i) is functional, accessible and connected”* (at page 19)
- *“facilitating vibrant places and spaces, diverse communities, and good neighbourhood planning and centres design that meets lifestyle needs by: (a) providing a mix of land uses to meet the diverse demographic, social, cultural, economic and lifestyle needs of the community...”* (at page 19).

2. The South East Queensland Regional Plan 2009 – 2031 includes the following:

- a. *“The regional vision for SEQ is a future that is sustainable, affordable, prosperous, liveable and resilient to climate change, where...”*
 - *communities are safe, healthy, accessible and inclusive ...*
 - *development is sustainable and well designed ...*
 - *the community has access to a range of quality, open space recreational opportunities.”* (at page 10).
- b. The strategic direction ‘Accommodating future residential and employment growth’ in ‘Part B Regional vision and strategic directions’ states at page 11 that:
 - *“Residential and employment growth is distributed across the region to facilitate access and choice, assist housing affordability and sub-regional self-containment...”*
 - *“Future residential growth will be accommodated through a combination of redevelopment and use of: •underutilised land within the broader urban framework and established urban areas.”* (at page 11)
- c. The ‘Sub-Regional Narratives’ of Brisbane in ‘Part C – Regional land use pattern’ of the Regional plan states that *“Under the SEQ Regional Plan, an additional 156 000 dwellings will be required to house Brisbane’s expected regional growth and demographic change. Most will be delivered in existing urban areas. Redevelopment and infill will need to deliver at least 138 000 of these additional dwellings”* (at page 17)

The sub-regional narratives for Brisbane identify South Brisbane and West End as ‘Existing urban areas.’

The residential component of the development is purported by the applicant to contribute up to 1,350 infill dwellings in the Brisbane CBD frame area, contributing to these dwelling targets.

3. Ensuring there is an efficient, effective and accountable planning and development assessment system.

The application seeks to have the effect of varying certain levels of assessment, from impact assessable to code assessable, for future applications within the South Brisbane Riverside Neighbourhood Plan, the District centre zone, the Heritage overlay and the High density residential zone of the City Plan including for the following:

- a supermarket tenancy of a maximum GFA of 4,500m² (as opposed to 1,500m²) within the Boundary Rd Vulture Precinct (NPP- 003)
- on Lot 21 on RP10790 from those of the High Density Residential zone to those of the District Centre zone
- a site cover of a maximum of 95% (as opposed to 80%)
- development within and adjoining the Heritage Curtilage Area shown on the West Village Master Plan (as opposed to the Heritage Overlay).

The application also seeks to vary the Heritage overlay code to the applicant prepared West Village Preliminary Approval Heritage overlay code.

Varying the level of assessment from impact to code assessable development will remove the public's appeal rights following lodgement of a submission for future code assessable applications.

This development has attracted significant community interest as evidenced by the lodgement of 115 submissions and the filing of a submitter appeal. Resolution of this appeal is likely to take considerable time, delaying a clear decision on the development prospects of this decision for this site.

Representations

I have considered the 736 representations received in response to the proposed call in notice. I am not persuaded by these representations that I should decide not to call in the development application. Having considered the representations, I have decided to call in this development application for the following reasons.

Reasons

- I consider that the proposed development involves the state interests set out above.
- The potential impact of the development on the economy is substantial, with the proposal purported to be an \$800million development, generating 447 jobs per year during construction with a net employment on-site and ongoing resulting from the retail expected to be 368 net jobs.
- The contribution the development makes towards meeting the dwelling targets of 156,000 dwellings identified in the Brisbane sub-narrative of the regional plan, of which 138,000 need to be delivered through redevelopment and infill, with the development purported to be contributing up to 1,350 infill dwellings in the Brisbane CBD frame area.
- This significant site, being identified as a 'Key development site' in the South Brisbane Riverside Neighbourhood Plan, provides an opportunity to contribute to the state interests of Liveable communities and Housing supply and diversity.
- This is a significant development on a key development site and requires detailed consideration and assessment, based on sufficient information and on giving

appropriate weight to community concerns, to ensure an efficient, effective and accountable development decision is made.

- The economic and social significance of this development and the strong community interest warrants a timely consideration and resolution of this complex application in the interests of ensuring an effective, efficient and accountable development assessment system.

Merit assessment or state interest assessment

Section 425 of SPA provides that if I decide to call in the development application, I may reassess and re-decide the application having regard to the relevant assessment and decision provisions under SPA. This option allows me to reassess the development application on its merits against, amongst other things, all relevant planning instruments.

I intend to reassess and re-decide the development application under the normal assessment and decision provisions of SPA. My reason for this is that a merit assessment would allow me to address key issues. I consider these matters are best dealt with through a merit assessment, rather than a state interest assessment.

Integrated Development Assessment System

I propose to restart the Integrated Development Assessment System (IDAS) process for the development application at the start of the decision stage, as significant information has been provided about the development, it has been publically notified and submissions received. I may also ask any person for advice or comments about the application during the decision stage under section 256 of SPA.

Planning and Environment Court Appeals

On 21 June 2016, the West End Community Association Inc. filed a submitter appeal in the P&E Court against council's decision to approve the development application (Ref: 2407/16).

As a result of my decision to call in the development application, this appeal and any further P&E Court appeal made before the application was called in will be of no further effect, as provided for in section 427(6) of SPA.

My decision on the development application is taken to be the original assessment manager's decision although, pursuant to section 427(5) of SPA, my decision as the assessment manager cannot be appealed in the P&E Court.

Findings on material questions of fact and evidence or other material on which findings of material questions of fact were based

Prior to making my decision to call in the application I was re-briefed with a preliminary assessment report prepared by officers of the Department of Infrastructure, Local Planning and Planning (the department), dated July 2016, which included the following information:

Site and development application details:

Name of Applicant	Uniacke Pty Ltd c/- Landpartners Limited
Date application properly made to the council	14 May 2015
Date of decision notice issued by the council	19 May 2016
Development approval sought	Preliminary approval under section 242 of the <i>Sustainable Planning Act 2009</i> for material change of use, reconfiguration of a lot, carry out building work and carry out operational work to vary the effect of the <i>Brisbane City Plan 2014</i> for a mixed use development
Applicable planning scheme	<i>Brisbane City Plan 2014</i>
Land zoning	High density residential zone and district centre zone
Level of assessment	Impact assessable
Real property description	Lot 4 RP10876, Lot 21 RP10790, Lot 2 RP52220, Lot 1 RP95337, Lot 2 RP95337 and Lot 2 RP151557
Site address	19 and 23 Mollison Street, West End QLD 4101, 37 Mollison Street, South Brisbane QLD 4101, 111 Boundary Street, West End QLD 4101, 26 and 26A Little Jane Street, West End QLD 4101.
Referral agencies	Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning (State Assessment and Referral Agency)
Submissions received by Council	The application was publicly notified from 5 January 2016 to 19 February 2016 and 115 valid submissions and 29 invalid submissions were received by council about the application.
Appeal	On 21 June 2016, the West End Community Association Inc. filed a submitter appeal in the P&E Court against council's decision to approve the development application (Ref: 2407/16).

Request to call in the development application:

A request to call in the development application was received by an email from Councillor Sri dated 27 June 2016.

The request raises a number of issues including matters which are potentially relevant to whether this development involves matters of state interest in particular interests addressed in the SPP and the state interest of an effective, efficient and accountable development assessment system.

Prior to making my decision to call in the application I was re-briefed with a preliminary assessment report dated July 2016, prepared by officers of the department. This included a summary of the key issues raised in the request.

Council's decision

Prior to making my decision to call in the application I was re-briefed with a preliminary assessment report dated July 2016, prepared by officers of the department, which includes the following information:

- The development was made by Uniacke Pty Ltd c/o Landpartners Limited, for a mixed use development at 111 Boundary Street, 26 and 26A Little Jane Street, 19 and 23 Mollison Street, West End and 37 Mollison Street, South Brisbane. The development application is for a preliminary approval under section 242 of SPA for material change of use, reconfiguration of a lot, carry out building work and carry out operational work to vary the effect of the City Plan.
- The development application triggered impact assessment requiring assessment against the relevant parts of City Plan including the strategic framework, priority infrastructure plan, relevant zoning provisions, overlay codes, other applicable codes, the relevant provisions of the South Brisbane Riverside Neighbourhood Plan and relevant policies.
- The decision notice issued by council on 19 May 2016 following its approval of the development application on 18 May 2016, included conditions of approval. The decision notice includes council's Grounds for Approval in the decision notice which states that "*Council notes that under Section s329 and s335 of the Sustainable Planning Act 2009 the decision does not conflict with any matters stated in the relevant planning instrument.*" Variations approved by council include varying the levels of assessment for:
 - "*Building work where on land within the Heritage Curtilage Area shown on the West Village Master Plan (including heritage curtilage area) ... shall be subject to Code assessment against all outcomes in sections A and C of the Heritage overlay code*" (Condition 1)
 - "*material change of use for centre activities in the District centre zone ... where that development is ...- compliant with the conditions of this preliminary approval; ... - no greater than the site cover specified in the conditions of this preliminary approval, shall be subject to Code assessment against the South Brisbane riverside neighbourhood plan code, the District centre zone code, the Centre or mixed use code, the Prescribed secondary codes and any relevant planning scheme policy.*" (Condition 5)

- *"material change of use for centre activities in the High density residential zone where on land described as Lot 21 on RP10790; and .. - no greater than the site cover specified in the conditions of this preliminary approval, shall be subject to Code assessment against the South Brisbane riverside neighbourhood plan code, the District centre zone code, the Centre or mixed use code, the Prescribed secondary codes and any relevant planning scheme policy" (Condition 7)*
- *"The maximum site cover for the total (cumulative) West Village development site shall not exceed 95%" (Condition 10)*
- *"A maximum of one (1) individual tenancy greater than 1,500m² and where no greater than 4,500m² for a Shop or Shop component of a Shopping Centre shall be permitted" (Condition 11)*
- *"Reconfiguring a lot where on land within the Heritage Curtilage Area shown on the West Village Master Plan (including heritage curtilage area) ... shall be subject to Code assessment against all outcomes in sections A and C of the Heritage overlay code" (Condition 21)*
- *"Operational work where on land within the Heritage Curtilage Area shown on the West Village Master Plan (including heritage curtilage area) ... shall be subject to Code assessment against all outcomes in sections A and C of the Heritage overlay code" (Condition 25).*

Submissions

Prior to making my decision to call in the application I was re-briefed with a preliminary assessment report dated July 2016, prepared by officers of the department. This included council's summary of the issues raised in submissions.

Appeal

Appeal no. BD 2407 of 2016, a submitter appeal, was filed in the P&E Court on 21 June 2016.

The appeal raises a number of issues including matters which are potentially relevant to whether this development involves matters of state interest.

Prior to making my decision to call in the application I was re-briefed with a preliminary assessment report dated July 2016, prepared by officers of the department. This included a summary of the key grounds in the Notice of Appeal. I was also provided with a copy of the Notice of Appeal for this appeal.

State matters

Referral

On 4 June 2015, the development application was referred to the department, in capacity as the State Assessment and Referral Agency (SARA), as a concurrence agency, to assess the potential impacts of the development on state transport infrastructure.

On 9 July 2015, the department provided its concurrence agency response stating that *"it has no requirements relating to the application"*. Notably, in accordance with SPA, the department's concurrence agency response could only address the subject matter for which the application was referred to the department, namely state transport infrastructure, and could not address any other state interests that the development may involve.

State interests:

Under section 424 of SPA, I may call in a development application only if the development involves a state interest. A state interest is defined in Schedule 3 of SPA as:

- (a) *an interest that the Minister considers affects an economic or environmental interest of the State or a part of the State, including sustainable development; or*
- (b) *an interest that the Minister considers affects the interest of ensuring there is an efficient, effective and accountable planning and development assessment system.*

A State Planning Policy advances the purpose of SPA by stating the state's policy about a matter of state interest (section 22(b) of SPA). For SPA, a designated region's regional plan is also a state interest (section 35 of SPA).

The City Plan commenced on 30 June 2014 and is identified as appropriately reflecting all aspects of the SPP December 2013.

The development application was deemed properly made on 14 May 2015, after the commencement of the SPP July 2014 and before the commencement of the SPP April 2016. I consider the current SPP April 2016 can be taken into account in determining whether or not the development involves a state interest for the purpose of section 424 of SPA.

Prior to making my decision to call in the application I was re-briefed with a preliminary assessment report dated July 2016, prepared by officers of the department. This included a summary of the potential state interests that this development may involve. The summary stated that:

1. *Economic and environmental interest of the State or a part of the State*
 - a. The development represents a substantial economic investment in the area:
 - i. the applicant's Economic Impact Assessment prepared by Macroplan Dimasi, dated April 2015, stating that:
 - *"The non-residential component of the proposed West Village mixed-use development is proposed to contain a total floorspace of 11,500sq.m, including a 4,500sq.m GFA supermarket" (at page i)*
 - *"The proposed development, which in addition to the proposed retail and non-residential uses has a total of 1,350 units proposed or approximately 2,970 persons on development completion" (at page iii)*
 - *"We have estimated that the proposed 4,500 sq.m GFA supermarket will generate sales in the order of \$45.0 million (\$10,000 per sq.m) in its first full year" (at page vii).*
 - ii. The Request purports that the proposal is an \$800 million development.
 - b. The SPP April 2016 (the SPP) identifies the state interest of Development and construction (Economic growth), and states at page 3:
 - i. that development and construction is of interest to the state as *"Planning for development and construction supports a thriving industry that is both a major employer, delivers the housing we need and is a prerequisite for other economic activities."*

- ii. *“Planning supports employment needs and economic growth by facilitating a range of residential, commercial, retail and industrial development opportunities, and by supporting a strong development and construction sector.”*

The applicant's Economic Impact Assessment prepared by Macroplan Dimasi, dated April 2015, purports that:

- i. *“estimated employment resulting from the construction of the proposed development is 447 jobs per year, including 172 created directly and a further 275 resulting from multiplier induced effects”* (at page 42)
 - ii. *“net employment on-site and ongoing resulting from the retail is expected to be 368 net jobs”* (at page 42).
- c. The SPP identifies the state interests of Liveable communities and Housing supply and diversity and states that:
- i. housing supply and diversity is of interest to the state as *“Housing is required to cater for different lifestyles, incomes, ages, household and family types, and community needs.”* (at page 16)
 - ii. the state interest of housing supply and diversity seeks to facilitate *“ a diverse and comprehensive range of housing options”* whilst *“providing for best-practice, innovative and adaptable housing design”* (at page 17)
 - iii. liveable communities are of interest to the state as *“The liveability of communities is of fundamental concern to all levels of government as it directly influences our quality of life and wellbeing. As the population of our cities and towns grow, and socioeconomic and demographic profiles change, the importance of attractive, healthy, safe, accessible and inclusive places and spaces increases.”* (at page 18)
 - iv. the state interest of liveable communities seeks to:
 - deliver *“liveable, well designed and serviced communities that support well-being and enhance quality of life”* (at page 19)
 - plan *“for public open space that : (i) is functional, accessible and connected”* (at page 19)
 - facilitate *“vibrant places and spaces, diverse communities, and good neighbourhood planning and centres design that meets lifestyle needs by: (a) providing a mix of land uses to meet the diverse demographic, social, cultural, economic and lifestyle needs of the community...”* (at page 19).

The proposed development site is identified as a 'Key development site' in the South Brisbane Riverside Neighbourhood Plan.

The site comprises a total area of approximately 2.6 hectares in a brownfield inner-city location.

2. *The South East Queensland Regional Plan 2009–2031*

The regional plan states the following:

- a. *"The regional vision for SEQ is a future that is sustainable, affordable, prosperous, liveable and resilient to climate change, where...*
 - *communities are safe, healthy, accessible and inclusive ...*
 - *development is sustainable and well designed ...*
 - *the community has access to a range of quality, open space recreational opportunities."* (at page 10).
- b. The strategic direction 'Accommodating future residential and employment growth' in 'Part B Regional vision and strategic directions' states at page 11 that:
 - *"Residential and employment growth is distributed across the region to facilitate access and choice, assist housing affordability and sub-regional self-containment..."*
 - *"Future residential growth will be accommodated through a combination of redevelopment and use of: •underutilised land within the broader urban framework and established urban areas."*
- c. The 'Sub-Regional Narratives' of Brisbane in 'Part C – Regional land use pattern' of the Regional plan states that *"Under the SEQ Regional Plan, an additional 156 000 dwellings will be required to house Brisbane's expected regional growth and demographic change. Most will be delivered in existing urban areas. Redevelopment and infill will need to deliver at least 138 000 of these additional dwellings"* (at page 17)

The sub-regional narratives for Brisbane identify South Brisbane and West End as 'Existing urban areas.'

The residential component of the development is purported by the applicant to contribute up to 1,350 infill dwellings in the Brisbane CBD frame area.

3. *Ensuring there is an efficient, effective and accountable planning and development assessment system*

The proposed development is located on a site identified as a 'Key development site' in the South Brisbane Riverside Neighbourhood Plan.

The application seeks to have the effect of varying certain levels of assessment, from impact assessable to code assessable, for future applications within the South Brisbane Riverside Neighbourhood Plan, the District centre zone, the Heritage overlay and the High density residential zone of the City Plan including for the following:

- a. a supermarket tenancy of a maximum GFA of 4,500m² (as opposed to 1,500m²) within the Boundary Rd Vulture Precinct (NPP- 003)
- b. on Lot 21 on RP10790 from those of the High Density Residential zone to those of the District Centre zone
- c. a site cover of a maximum of 95% (as opposed to 80%)
- d. development within and adjoining the Heritage Curtilage Area shown on the West Village Master Plan (as opposed to the Heritage Overlay).

The application also seeks to vary the Heritage overlay code to the applicant prepared West Village Preliminary Approval Heritage overlay code.

Varying the level of assessment from impact to code assessable development will remove the public's appeal rights following lodgement of a submission for future code assessable applications.

This development attracted 115 submissions and the filing of a submitter appeal.

Consideration of representations

I gave a proposed call in notice for the development application which was dated 26 July 2016.

The proposed call in notice invited representations about whether or not the proposed development involves a state interest, whether or not I should exercise my powers to call in the development application and any matter stated in the proposed call in notice.

The representation period was for 15 business days, closing on 18 August 2016.

736 written representations have been received in response to the proposed call in notice. I have considered all of the representations and the issues raised therein including issues relevant to the state interests identified in this call in notice. The representations did not raise any new state interests in addition to those identified in this call in notice.

Documents considered

In forming my decision to call in the development application, I had regard to the following material:

Document
Departmental Briefing Note (MBN16/1142) signed 14 September 2016 and attachments
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Copies of all representations received
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Representations Report, prepared by the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning, August 2016
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Draft call in notice, prepared by the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning, August 2016
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Draft Ministerial correspondence to affected parties and other parties (including the assessment manager, applicant, submitters and concurrence agencies), dated 14 September 2016 advising that I have called in the development application, prepared by the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Development application material lodged by Uniacke Pty Ltd
Departmental Briefing Note (MBN16/977) signed 26 July 2016 and attachments
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Request to call in the development application, dated 27 June 2016
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Deputy Premier response to previous call in request for Stage 1
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• West End Community Association Inc. vs BCC Notice of Appeal
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Preliminary Assessment Report prepared by the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning, July 2016

Document
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed call in notice, dated 26 July 2016, prepared by the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ministerial correspondence to affected parties (including the assessment manager, applicant, submitters of which I am aware at the time the proposed call in notice is given, and concurrence agencies) dated 26 July 2016 advising that I am considering calling in the development application, prepared by the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brisbane City Council's decision notice and conditions
Legislation
<i>Sustainable Planning Act 2009</i>
<i>Sustainable Planning Regulation 2009</i>
Other Planning Instruments
<i>State Planning Policy April 2016</i>
<i>South East Queensland Regional Plan 2009-2031</i>
<i>Brisbane City Plan 2014</i>

Dated: 14 September 2016



JACKIE TRAD MP
DEPUTY PREMIER
Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning
and Minister for Trade and Investment