

Our ref: 110056

Date: 24 March 2026

Level 8, 31 Duncan Street
Fortitude Valley QLD 4006
T +61 7 3539 9500

Economic Development Queensland
Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning
GPO Box 2202
Brisbane QLD 4000

Dear Sir / Madam,

**Request to Change Greater Flagstone PDA Development Approval pursuant to Section 99 of the
Economic Development Act 2012
Whole of Site Material Change of Use Approval (EDQ Ref: DEV2012/209)
New Beith Road, Mountain Ridge Road and Homestead Drive, Flagstone & Silverbark Ridge**

We act on behalf of *Peet Flagstone City Pty Ltd* ("the Applicant") regarding the Whole of Site Material Change of Use (MCU) development approval (EDQ Reference: DEV2012/209) over the land at the abovementioned site/s, that are now formally described as Lot 1 on RP35155, Lot 5 on S312569, Lot 9 on S312569, Lot 10 on SL6002, Lot 907 on SP332140, Lot 908 on SP354746, Lot 910 on SP356636, Lot 911 on SP356636, Lot 988 on CP857841, Lot 989 on SP354743, Lot 50050 on SP332140, and Lot 4 on SP332712.

The lot description of the 'Approved Land' under the Decision Notice was described as *LOT 1 ON RP35155, LOT 5 ON CP S312569, LOT 10 ON CP SL6002, LOT 989 ON RP854074, LOT 9 ON CP S312569, LOT 988 ON CP857841 AND FORMER LOT 910 ON RP857850, FORMER LOT 4 ON RP45728, FORMER LOT 2 ON RP47120, FORMER LOT 911 ON RP857870, FORMER LOT 906 ON SP216472, FORMER LOT 907 ON RP819216, FORMER LOT 873 ON SP166448 AND FORMER LOT 908 ON RP819216*. The changes in the lot description is a consequence of the development that has been occurring on the project. Additionally, the suburb names have evolved to now being Flagstone and Silverbark Ridge for the lots within the subject site.

The original development approval was granted by EDQ on 19 October 2012 to establish approved zoning and land uses across the abovementioned sites, generally the in accordance with the intent of the *Greater Flagstone PDA Development Scheme* ("the Development Scheme").

Three (3) change approvals have since been issued, superseding the original approval. Most recently, a change that sought minor amendments to the approval package was issued by EDQ on 28 April 2025 (EDQ Ref: DEV2012/209/25).

On behalf of the Applicant, we seek minor changes to the latest version of the approval. The proposal seeks to make two key amendments to the Whole of Site Approval, including:

- Change to Condition 23 – Community Greenspace
- Correction of Table of Approved Uses

The proposed changes are further detailed within this letter. The amendments proposed do not result in a substantially different development compared to the approved development.

Proposed Amendments

APPROVED LAND USES

In the 2025 approval of a minor change to this application, two (2) different copies of the Table of Approved Uses were accidentally incorporated into the decision. To reduce potential for confusion we seek to remove the superseded copy and incorporate only the updated table stamped approved in the recent decision notice.

This is an administrative correction which does not seek to alter the previously approved amendment to the Table of Development.

CHANGE TO CONDITION 23

The proposal seeks to amend Condition 23 of the Approval that pertains to community greenspace.

Condition 23 currently reads as follows:

Community Greenspace

- a. *Submit for compliance assessment an infrastructure master plan for community greenspace.*
- b. *In addition to the requirements set out in UDA condition 3 of this Approval, this infrastructure master plan must:*
 - i. *reflect the land transfer rates set out in Table 1 below, unless a relevant infrastructure agreement provides to the contrary*

Table 1: Land and embellishment requirements for community greenspace

Column 1 Park Types	Column 2 Rates of Space (ha/1,000 pop)
Recreation Parks	2.8
Sports Parks	1.8
Total Parks	4.6

In particular, provide the greenspace infrastructure including land and embellishments as set out in Table 2 below, unless a relevant infrastructure agreement provides to the contrary.

Table 2: Land and embellishments requirements for greenspace

Park Type	Number of Facilities
Regional Recreation Park	1
District Recreation Park	2
Civic Park	3
Regional Sports Park	1
District Sports Park	2

- ii. *detail how and when the community greenspace will be dedicated or transferred to the State or Logan City Council and include undertakings for monitoring and reporting on the achievement of the infrastructure master plan outcomes.*

PROPOSED CHANGES

- The rates of open space supply nominated in Table 1 are at the upper limit of potential supply of open space nominated in the PDA Guideline 12 and are inconsistent the area required for the number of facilities nominated in Table 2 and the Greater Flagstone Development Charges and Offset Plan (DCOP). We propose to replace the rate per hectare requirement and replace it with reference to compliance with the DCOP and approved IMP requirements and Table 2. This approach to the number of park facilities removes confusion and substantial inconsistency between the requirements of the two tables. This also means that the approval condition is reflective of the expectations of the current infrastructure planning for greenspace.
- It is also proposed to update Table 2 to reflect the mix of parks set out in the Flagstone Community Greenspace Infrastructure Management Plan (IMP) and the DCOP. Both of these documents incorporate three (3) District Recreation Parks and two (2) Civic Parks, whereas Table 2 nominates

three (3) Civic Parks and two (2) District Recreation Parks. The switch to reflect the requirements of the DCOP and IMP will confirm the inclusion of an additional 5ha District Recreation Park replacing a 2000m² Civic Park.

- To ensure that the requirements for local parks in accordance with Guideline 12 are addressed in the condition, a provision for a cumulative total of approximately 39ha of local parks (as per the requirement in the IMP) has been included in the amended condition.

JUSTIFICATION FOR PROPOSED CHANGES

- The number and type of parks described in Table 2 for required district and regional greenspace dedication is consistent with the approved Flagstone Community Greenspace IMP and reflects the stated intent and requirements for the area within that document and the DCOP. Aligning the greenspace requirements with Table 2 provides a clear expectation for the extent of open space to be provided across the project.
- Where the calculation of required open space is based on population rates it is always estimated (as the final population and dwelling numbers are unknown when identifying key open space elements during context area planning). For example, in the case of the land subject to the overall Flagstone MCU there are five possible additional school sites in the DCOP with a combined area of 45ha, which results in a substantial variation in the required area of greenspace due to the resultant variations in population. Therefore, when the population is unknown, the use of Table 2 provides a clear expectation at all stages of the project life regarding the extent, type and location of the required greenspace.
- The rate of supply nominated in Guideline 12 is highly variable when considered in relation to the park types (See Attachment A which calculates the varied rates which can apply in compliance with Guideline 12). The base rate for required size of parks is reflected in the park sizes nominated in the Greater Flagstone DCOP (e.g. for Sports Parks the DCOP park areas equates to the minimum rate of 1.25ha of sports parks per 1000 people in Guideline 12, instead of 1.8ha as nominated in Table 1). Therefore, where adopting Table 2 and the DCOP/IMP rate of open space provision, the project and condition remain compliant with Guideline 12.
- Additionally, the adoption of a higher rate of supply (for example based on 1.8ha per 1000 people for sports parks) results in creation of additional parks that were not allowed for in infrastructure planning being undertaken for the Greater Flagstone DCOP. Additional sports parks of this scale are not envisaged by the funding and credits within the DCOP or broader open space planning and positioning for the expected demand across the entire PDA undertaken in the preparation of the DCOP.
- The number of parks per population requirements specified within Guideline 12 indicate that a major recreation park is required for populations exceeding 20,000 people and a major sports park for populations exceeding 25,000 people. However, the adoption of a per hectare rate of supply can trigger a requirement for additional major parks when they are not justified (for example the highest rates of provision calculation could result in space for an additional major sports park where the number of residents don't require that level of infrastructure – 30,000 people at 1ha/1000 people results in 2 x 15ha Major Sports Parks in a project, whereas the threshold for 1 x Major Sports Park is reaching 25,000 people). Across the PDA this is a very impractical outcome that demonstrates the value of the whole of PDA infrastructure planning carried out in the Greater Flagstone DCOP which identifies the required extent of infrastructure and its desired location across the PDA, and the importance of approval conditions being consistent with the provision of infrastructure planned for within the DCOP.
- The use of additional land for open space, as well as being problematically noncompliant with the DCOP, results in an unreasonable additional burden on the developer. For example, the allocation of 20ha of land to additional sports park results in a reduction of yield of 300-400 dwellings. This results in a significant reduction in return for the developer, in addition to the significant additional cost associated with the construction of an extra sports park. This has an unreasonable impact of the viability of the

project and is additional to the published expectations for provision of infrastructure within the DCOP, and will increase the underlying development cost of all other housing within the project (as higher development costs are distributed across significantly less lots).

- The removal of 300-400 dwellings from an area which has been identified within a PDA as being intended for residential development will also result in a less efficient use of other infrastructure and work established to deliver housing within Flagstone. Given the importance of delivering housing to address the current housing crisis and the shortage of available and affordable housing, it is a poor outcome to decrease the number of dwellings which have been planned for within Flagstone and deliver them at a higher cost.
- The reduction in dwellings delivered as a result of requiring additional sports park will also impact on the anticipated dwelling yield achieved across Greater Flagstone and the anticipated income from infrastructure charges. For example, where 300-400 dwellings are foregone that would be paying \$51,172 per dwelling, this equates to a loss of between \$15.35M- \$20.46M in charges payments received.

Accordingly, the proposed amendment to Condition 23 is considered to be a reasonable and relevant amendment to the requirements related to open space within the overall MCU approval that remains compliant with the rate of supply for open space in Guideline 12 and the Greater Flagstone DCOP, which results in a practical condition with clear requirements.

Amendments to Decision Notice

Approved Plans

The proposed consolidation (deletions / **insertions**) will superseding the approved document list, as identified in **Table 1**.

Table 1: Changes to Approved Plans and Documents

Approved Plans and Documents		Number	Date
1	Table of approved uses		25 March 2025
2	Flagstone Land Use Plan Prepared by RPS	110056-216C	12 March 2025

It is noted that no change to the Table of approved uses currently included in the list of approved documents is proposed. However, an outdated version of the table is appended to the decision notice after the conditions of approval. We are requesting that this outdated table be removed.

Conditions

Condition 23 of the approval is proposed to be changed to remove the Table 1 content, which as discussed above is inconsistent with the requirements of Table 2 and the Greater Flagstone DCOP. It is proposed to replace Table 1 with text that sets out the required types and extent of open space to reflect the IMP and Greater Flagstone DCOP, with the addition of the reference to local parks totalling 39ha drawn from the IMP. The changes also reflect the switch discussed above that occurs in the DCOP and IMP where there are 2 Civic Parks and 3 District Recreation Parks.

It is noted that the original MCU includes Context Area 2 which is now owned and being developed by Frasers. The condition includes reference to the greenspace within Context Area 2 which formed part of the original IMP and the list below. We note that following the purchase of Lot 4 on SP332712 by Frasers Property New Beith Pty Limited that Frasers prepared a subsequent Context Area 2 (New Beith) Greenspace IMP specifying the relevant details of the proposed greenspace on their land. For clarity with respect to the obligations which

sit with both landholders we have also differentiated in the draft conditions which open space commitments are associated with Lot 4 to ensure that there isn't confusion in the future regarding who is supposed to provide what open space as their required contribution going forward.

Table 2 summarises changes to conditions of approval (~~deletions~~ / **insertions**):

Table 2: Changes to Conditions

No.	Condition	Timing
23	Community Greenspace	Prior to lodgement of the first context plan area strategy
	(a) Submit for compliance assessment an infrastructure master plan for community greenspace.	
	(b) In addition to the requirements set out in UDA condition 3 of this Approval, this infrastructure master plan must:	

~~(i) reflect the land transfer rates set out in Table 1 below, unless a relevant infrastructure agreement provides to the contrary~~

Table 1: Land and embellishment requirements for community greenspace

Column 1 Park Types	Column 2 Rates of Space (ha/1,000 pop)
Recreation Parks	2.8
Sports Parks	1.8
Total Parks	4.6

- (i) **Incorporate:**
- **District and Regional Recreation Parks and Sports and Civic Parks** set out in Table 2 and the Greater Flagstone DCOP 2022,
 - **Indicative major linear park and local linear parks** as set out in the Greater Flagstone DCOP 2022 that are subject to further detailed design and positioning through the context area planning process and subsequent subdivision applications.
 - **Local parks** comprising local recreation parks, neighbourhood recreation parks and local linear parks positioned in accordance with the requirements of Guideline 12 and cumulatively totalling approximately 39ha across the entire area of this approval subject to further detailed design and positioning through the context area planning process and subsequent subdivision applications (Note: The neighbourhood recreation parks Lot 4 on SP332712 are required to total 3.2ha in accordance with the approved Context Area 2 (New Beith) Community Greenspace IMP)

In particular, provide the greenspace infrastructure including land and embellishments as set out in Table 2 below, unless a relevant infrastructure agreement provides to the contrary.

Table 2: Land and embellishments requirements for greenspace

Park Type	Number of Facilities
Regional Recreation Park	1
District Recreation Park	2 3
Civic Park	3 2
Regional Sports Park	1
District Sports Park	2

Note: Of the land and embellishments of identified in Table 2 only one (1) district sports park is required to be located in Lot 4 on SP332712

- (ii) detail how and when the community greenspace will be dedicated or transferred to the State or Logan City Council and include undertakings for monitoring and reporting on the achievement of the infrastructure master plan outcomes.

Substantially Different Development Criteria

The proposed changes are not considered to result in a substantially different development to the approved development.

It is noted that the application is subject to Section 99 of the Economic Development Act 2012, which states that a change to an approval may be made only if the change would not result in the development being 'substantially different', which is the same term used for the definition of a 'minor change' under the *Planning Act 2016*. In the absence of any PDA specific guidance, Schedule 1 of the Development Assessment (DA) Rules is used in assessing the amendment application in this instance.

An assessment of the proposed changes against the "substantially different development" criteria is provided in Table 3.

Table 3: Substantially Different Development Criteria

DA Rules Schedule 1, Section 4	Response
<i>a. involves a new use; or</i>	No new uses are proposed.
<i>b. results in the application applying to a new parcel of land; or</i>	The change does not include additional land being subject to the application.
<i>c. dramatically changes the built form in terms of scale, bulk and appearance; or</i>	No changes to the built form development are proposed as part of this change application.
<i>d. changes the ability of the proposed development to operate as intended; or</i>	The change does not result in the ability of the proposal to operate as intended. The specified open space facilities required for the site in Table 2 are maintained as is compliance with the DCOP, meaning that the proposed development operates as intended. The amendment seeks to resolve an inconsistency in the condition content.
<i>e. removes a component that is integral to the operation of the development; or</i>	The change does not remove a component that is integral to the operation of the development. The specified open space facilities required for the site in Table 2 are maintained as is compliance with the DCOP, meaning that the proposed development operates as intended with the identified number of sports facilities and open space at their required sizes. The amendment seeks to resolve an inconsistency in the condition content.
<i>f. significantly impacts on traffic flow and the transport network, such as increasing traffic to the site; or</i>	The change will have no impact on the transport network.
<i>g. introduces new impacts or increase the severity of known impacts; or</i>	The changes do not introduce new impacts or increase severity of known impacts.
<i>h. for a development prescribed by the Planning Regulation as requiring social impact assessment identified under section 106T of the Act –</i> <i>introduces new social impacts or increase the severity of known social impacts; or</i>	The Planning Regulation does not prescribe the development as requiring social impact assessment.
<i>i. removes an incentive or offset component that would have balanced a negative impact of the development; or</i>	The change does not remove an incentive or offset component.
<i>j. impacts on infrastructure provisions.</i>	The change will not result in any changes to infrastructure provisions. However, it does resolve an inconsistency with the DCOP and an inference that additional sports parks are required above the nominated number in Table 2.

Owners Consent

The applicant requests that MEDQ accept the application without receiving all owner's consent as provided for in Section 82(3) of the *Economic Development Act 2012*.

The original approval has been partly enacted over the land, and the original allotments have been modified and registered. The land is now formally described as Lot 1 on RP35155, Lot 5 on S312569, Lot 9 on S312569, Lot 10 on SL6002, Lot 907 on SP332140, Lot 908 on SP354746, Lot 910 on SP356636, Lot 911 on SP356636, Lot 988 on CP857841, Lot 989 on SP354743, Lot 50050 on SP332140, and Lot 4 on SP332712.

Hundreds of residential allotments are now sealed, registered and constructed across early stages of the site. These lots have been subdivided and sold to many different owners, and it would be impracticable to obtain their consent. The proposed changes do not materially inhibit the existing dwellings on subdivided land as the dwellings are already constructed.

Peet Flagstone City Pty Ltd was the original applicant and is making this change request. A copy of the owner's consent letter is enclosed as **Attachment C**. Since the original MCU approval issued Frasers Property New Beith Pty Limited purchased Lot 4 on SP332712, and their owner's consent is also provided in Attachment C.

Application Fee

As per section 99 of the *Economic Development Act*, the relevant fee is up to 25% of the current applicable assessment fee. As a Major Type 2 fee the current assessment fee is not nominated in the fee schedule, and is a scale significantly larger than the proposed change to the fee. We note the previous change to this application was charged a fee of \$2858 which we understood to be 25% of a standard fee. Given the scale of the proposed change requiring minor adjustments to the decision and no referral to external consultants we suggest that the change be based on 25% of the Standard Type 3 – which would total \$5,877.

Supporting Information

In support of this application, please find attached the following information:

- **Attachment A:** Calculations of variable rate of greenspace supply in Guideline 12
- **Attachment B:** EDQ Development Application Form
- **Attachment C:** Landowners Consent
- **Attachment D:** Current Decision Notice

We look forward to continuing working with you on this development. In the meantime, if you have any queries, please contact the writer (contact details below) or Nick Meadows (Nick.Meadows@rpsconsulting.com).

Yours sincerely,
for RPS AAP Consulting Pty Ltd



Joanne Cousins

Technical Director, Practice Leader – Planning, Brisbane
joanne.cousins@rpsconsulting.com
+61 7 3437 2023

ATTACHMENT A

VARIABLE RATE OF GREENSPACE SUPPLY IN PDA GUIDELINE 12

Guideline 12 Ha/1000 People Rates	Number of Parks per Population & Required Sizing
Neighbourhood Recreation (Not identified in DCOP)	
1,000 people @ 0.5ha / 1000 people = 0.5ha 1,500 people @ 0.5ha / 1000 people = 0.75ha 1,000 people @ 1.1ha / 1000 people = 1.1ha 1,500 people @ 1.1ha / 1000 people = 1.65ha	1 park per 1,000 – 1,500 people 0.5ha
District Recreation	
10,000 people @ 0.5ha / 1000 people = 5ha 15,000 people @ 0.5ha / 1000 people = 7.5ha 10,000 people @ 1ha / 1000 people = 10ha 15,000 people @ 1ha / 1000 people = 15ha	1 park per 10,000 – 15,000 people 5ha
Major Recreation	
20,000 people @ 0.5ha / 1000 people = 10ha 20,000 people @ 1ha / 1000 people = 20ha	1 park per 20,000 + people 10 ha
District Sports	
10,000 People @ 0.75ha/ 1000 People = 7.5ha 20,000 People @ 0.75ha/ 1000 People = 15ha 10,000 People @ 1.2ha/ 1000 People = 12ha 20,000 People @ 1.2ha/ 1000 People = 24ha	1 park per 10,000 – 20,000 people 7.5ha
Major Sports	
25,000 People @ 0.5ha/1000 people = 12.5ha 25,000 People @ 1ha / 1000 people = 25ha	1 park per 25,000 + people 15ha