

# Agenda – FNQROC Planners Meeting – No.85

## Meeting Details

<b>Meeting No</b>	
<b>Meeting Name</b>	FNQROC Planners Meeting
<b>Date</b>	5 June 2026
<b>Time</b>	10.00am – 2.00pm
<b>Venue</b>	Level 3 Committee Room, Cairns Regional Council / Teams
<b>Meeting Contacts</b>	Darlene Irvine 0403 808 680

## Microsoft Teams meeting

### [Join the meeting now](#)

Meeting ID: 440 297 906 659 0

Passcode: F3Wm9sn2

<b>1.</b>	<b>Welcome &amp; Roundtable Introductions</b>		
<b>2.</b>	<b>Conflict of Interests</b>		
<b>3.</b>	<b>Business arising</b>		
#	Action	Responsible Person(s)	Status
84.1	DSDIP to identify if there can be a state agency team similar to SEQ to review the planning scheme updates related to the Scheme supply fund to expedite the process in FNQ.	DSDIP FNQ	
84.2	FNQROC to include “DA and Enforcement matters” as a regular planners agenda item	FNQROC	Complete
84.3	DSDIP FNQ to investigate the opportunity of reinvigorating the Planning forums.	DSDIP FNQ	
84.4	Water quality SPP – See if we can get someone to the next meeting to help pull it apart and understand the impacts in this region.	FNQROC with DSDIP	

4.	LGAQ Update	
5.	DSDIP Update	
6.	<p><b>State Planning Policy Review (Attached to agenda is current SPP, SPP Review slides)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Mapping</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ States role in mapping State interest going forward?</li> <li>○ Will mapping be updated for GQAL?</li> <li>○ Will the State government look at providing funds to LG should they be required to take on the mapping responsibility?</li> <li>○ If mapping for environment and bushfire is being removed, who supplies the data for mapping?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Biodiversity</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If the entire Biodiversity state interest is being removed, how does the department see the Environment is going to be protected.</li> <li>○ Is the State going to be taking over ownership of environmental matters more broadly through referrals to SARA?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Natural Hazard risk assessments</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ if these aren't mandated as a statutory component of the scheme preparation/amendment process it will create significant challenges for LG and create inconsistent approaches. For example, the previous LNP government removed references to climate change and sea level rise assumptions (0.8m SLT by 2100) in the SPP and guidance material.</li> <li>○ Has the State assessed their potential liability in terms of removing natural hazards from the SPP?</li> <li>○ The SPP required a risk based approach – particularly for flood – this was a response to the Qld Floods Commission of Inquiry (Chapter 4). Removal means there is not consistency across the State in addition to the liability risk, how will this support better communities 'on the ground' and affordable housing and living?</li> <li>○ If a Council does a FAAR, then compensation provisions do not apply. If natural hazards and the amendment process for NH falls away, will LG be triggered for compensation again?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Heritage</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How will heritage matters be addressed or not?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>General</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Potentially the following state interests will be removed: Biodiversity, Coastal environment, cultural heritage, emissions and hazardous activities, natural hazards risk and resilience.</li> <li>○ If the focus of the SPP is significantly changed, how will it meet the purpose of the Act, particularly if the Act isn't changing.</li> <li>○ Will referral triggers change as well?</li> <li>○ Will there be an amnesty period for those with well-developed/progressed planning scheme amendments where any significant changes can be incorporated via an amendment later rather than stall the process?</li> <li>○ Will these changes to the SPP result in a reordering of the hierarchy of instruments and statutory effect of LG planning schemes?</li> <li>○ How will liveability and balancing fundamental matters such as natural hazards, environmental, and the like be considered at</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

	<p>State and regional level – flooding is a significant matter that is not limited to LG boundaries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Is Part B and C of the existing SPP being retained?</li> <li>○ Concerns about shifting the obligations to councils to define, identify, map, assess etc the burden will be heavy.</li> <li>○ Getting councils to continue to support retention of these matters is going to be challenging.</li> <li>○ The insurance industry and APRA are very clear that strong land use planning (locating people/property outside of high risk areas) is essential in order to reduce risks of hazards that are increasing. Insurance affordability and availability are predicted on strong land use planning.</li> <li>○ Removing these aspects from the SPP could have the opposite effect to removing barriers and could actually make LG more risk adverse.</li> </ul> <p><b>Where to from here?</b></p>	
<b>7.</b>	<b>DA and Enforcement Matters</b>	
<b>8.</b>	<b>Round Table</b>	
<b>9.</b>	<b>General Business</b>	
<b>10.</b>	<b>Next meeting – 4 September 2026 – Celebrate 20 years!</b>	