

Final Implementation Report of the SEQ Regional Landscape Strategy Advisory Committee

to the

SEQ Regional Coordination Committee

July 2003

Since the last meeting of the Regional Coordination Committee, the Regional Landscape Strategy Advisory Committee (RLSAC) met on 28 April and, for its final implementation meeting, 23 June 2003. Members also met in a workshop to finalise the SEQ 2021 Issues and Options Paper and many attended a forum presented by environmental planning students from Griffith University.

This is the final report of the RLSAC to the RCC on the implementation of the SEQ Regional Landscape Strategy under the sponsorship of the EPA. The major issues being:

1. RLS Post June Arrangements

Priority concern was the post June 2003 arrangements and how the EPA will approach the following:

- 1.1 The **Regional Landscape Business Plan** being prepared for this meeting of the Regional Coordination Committee. The members were willing to contribute to the plan through suggestions and comments. EPA representatives were unable to commit to consultation prior to the RCC receiving the business plan. Members are disappointed that the RLSAC views and experience have not been considered as input to a business plan.

Recommendation: *That the RCC note the views of the RLSAC*

- 1.2 The role as the **Regional Landscape Policy Working Group**, to the RCC remains a priority for the members of the RLSAC. The members of the RLSAC are keen to continue their voluntary efforts to complete regional landscape policy development for the SEQ2021 Project and the new RFGM. It is understood that policy development is due for completion in 2004 but unless executive support is maintained, the RLSAC cannot be expected to complete the work allocated by the RCC.

When the RCC agreed to transfer reporting arrangements and designated the RLSAC the Regional Landscape Policy Working Group for SEQ 2021 the essential executive support for the RLSAC was not addressed. It seems clear that the EPA's lead agency responsibilities for the RLS under the RFGM should now apply to support this role. There has been no response from the EPA on this matter and the advice of the RCC would be appreciated.

Recommendation: *That the RCC support the provision of appropriate executive support to the RLSAC to continue policy development for SEQ 2021.*

- 1.3 The priority **RLS Projects** the **RLSAC** would prefer to have completed in conjunction with the SEQ policy development role are Regional Trails Network,

Regional Parks Discussion Paper, Glen Rock Regional Park Management Plan implementation and the Scenic Amenity methodology. The RLSAC is concerned that the work and the partnerships around these critical projects should continue to a genuine completion. Members are concerned that the arbitrary end point will mean that much of the work will never reach fruition. Such an outcome would waste the member's commitment and in some instances put at risk the personal credibility of members with their stakeholders. The termination of stakeholder input in these projects as at the end of June will adversely impact on the credible of outcomes.

The RLSAC considered how this might unfold and developed the options set out in **Attachment A**. RLSAC recommended Option 6 as the immediate post June 2003 option but this is dependent on sufficient resources being available. This might be possible with the underspend from the 2002-3 RLS budget.

While Option 5 is a fall back position it will not allow these major projects to mature nor will the essential partnerships around these projects be sustained. There is interest for the longer-term models, which are removed from Government (as exemplified by Options 4 or 7), but these will take time to explore and there is an immediate need to maintain momentum.

The RLSAC is hopeful the RCC will see the benefits of supporting the new approach. Moving to Option 6 and providing executive support gives stakeholders an opportunity to input into your Business Plan and to see that the momentum of the Strategy is not lost. A change to the existing institutional arrangements would be best aligned with the broader review of the SEQ 2021 institutional arrangements being done next year. There has been no response from the EPA on this matter and the advice of the RCC would be appreciated

Recommendation: *That the RCC support Option 6 (Attachment A) of the RLSAC options for implementation, which is that the "RLSAC continues as a Working Committee for the SEQ 2021 Project and maintains a limited coordination/brokerage role"*

2. RLS Charter signing

There are now 64 signatories to the RLS Charter. Since signing the Charter, many of the signatories have participated in RLS workshops, the invitation to comment on the Issues and Options Paper and student forums. Among the signatories are organisations that were not previously involved in the SEQ2021 Project. There are some long term partners yet to sign.

3. SEQ 2021 Issues and Options Paper: RLS

The RLSAC convened a second workshop to consider the RLS Issues and Options Paper for SEQ 2021 to examine the linkages with the Papers of other sectors. The Policy development will be a challenging and important task. With many of the RLS stakeholders now identified the RLSAC is confident of a robust and widely supported outcome, subject to adequate resources being applied.

4. RLS Funding

Alternative funding options for the RLS have not progressed. Some key agencies have still not responded to correspondence. Whole of government approaches to whole of government problems such as the Regional Landscape Strategy need a clearer mandate.

5 Report on Priority Actions of the RFGM

Attachment B is a statement of the work to date, achievements and responses by the RLSAC to the Priority Actions of the Regional Landscape section of the RFGM for the years 1998-2003.

Recommendation: *That the RCC note the status report of the RLSAC on the Regional Landscape Priority Actions of the RFGM*

6 Report on RLSAC Tasks from the Terms of Reference

Attachment C is a statement of the work to date, achievements and responses by the RLSAC to the tasks required of the Committee under its Terms of Reference for the years 1998-2003.

Recommendation: *That the RCC note the status report of the RLSAC on the tasks of the Terms of Reference for the RLSAC.*

7 Factsheet:SEQ Regional Landscape Strategy

Attachment D is a snapshot of the institutional arrangements, achievements and “corporate” understandings of the RLSAC as at the time their implementation roles terminate on 30 June 2003. Much work needs to be done and the Committee leaves its tasks with regret but it is confident that the ground work is done, and that the community is better informed of the benefits, opportunities and challenges of the RLS objective:

“To protect through equitable processes the regionally significant open space of South East Queensland for present and future generations”.

Recommendation: *That the RCC note the contents of the Factsheet for the SEQ Regional Landscape Strategy as a resource for future reference*

8 Conclusion

In concluding this final report for this era of the RLSAC I wish to place on record my sincere thanks to the members of the committee, particularly for their commitment, dedication and professional input into the work of the RLSAC. This is especially the case for those members who have been with the initiative since the early ROSS review.

Darryl Low Choy

Chair

Regional Landscape Strategy Advisory Committee

21st June 2003

ATTACHMENT A

**FUTURE OPTIONS FOR A REGIONAL LANDSCAPE STRATEGY IN SEQ
(post June 2003)**

At its meeting on 28th April 2003 the RLSAC considered a number of options for the future of the RLSAC post June 2003.

The RCC has endorsed the RLSAC as its Working Group for the development of regional landscape policy for the SEQ2021 RFGM. The RLSAC has conducted a workshop and held consultation with stakeholders to prepare the RCC approved draft Issues and Options paper for the regional landscape. It is scheduled to conduct a second workshop in May as part of the ongoing policy development process.

With so much invested in the Regional Landscape Strategy by so many people, the members of the RLSAC are keen to continue their voluntary efforts to achieve completion of policy for the SEQ2021 RFGM. They see this as the best means to ensure that the objectives that the RLSAC and its stakeholders have been working towards for the past 3-4 years can be achieved. To this end the committee has considered which arrangements would be best suited to the needs of the Strategy its stakeholders and the SEQ2021 process?

Options considered by the RLSAC are set out on the attached table. Some options will require lead-time to establish (eg Options 4 or 7).

Broadly the options are:

- No further role for the RLSAC (Option 1)
- Reassign the RLSAC's role (Options 2, 3 and 4)
- A minimalist interim policy development role (12 months) for the RLSAC (Option 5)
- Policy and limited coordination/brokerage role for RLSAC (Option 6)
- Reorganise RLSAC into a community alliance (Option 7)

At its meeting on 28th April 2003, members of the RLSAC unanimously committed to continue and provide their advice and expertise to achieve the objective of the Strategy.

The RLSAC has endorsed Option 6 as the preferred immediate post June 2003 option but acknowledged that this would be dependent on sufficient resources being available to the committee to undertake this limited role. These resources exist in the current underspend in the RLS budget but the Minister has not agreed to a proposal from the RLSAC Chair that these funds need to be carried over for use by the RLSAC. Should resources not be available the RLSAC has endorsed Option 5 as a minimum fall back position. There is strong interest for the longer term model (exemplified by Options 4 or 7) but acknowledgement that these time to explore and consider.

OPTIONS FOR IMPLEMENTING THE RLS FOR SEQ (post June 2003)

	Options For RLS LEAD AGENCY or Implementation Responsibility	COMMENTS
1	No lead agency - in lieu the responsibilities will be delivered as core business of the EPA. Delivery by other agencies through their core business only) The default seems to be to assign the local government coordination role to SEQROC although no negotiations have emerged.	The delivery of the RLS through core EPA business remains untested and undefined. Few if any stakeholders believe this approach to be credible or feasible. The coordination role of the RLSAC and obligations to the SEQ RFGM process seem not appreciated or undervalued. The problems are recognized by SEQROC and local government and a coordination role at least on a project basis will be needed
2	Assign RLS Lead agency responsibility and RLSAC secretariat role to another State Agency eg • DLGP • DNRM • SRQ • Premiers	No one agency is responsible for open space and so a compromise lead agency is needed. The EPA is primarily concerned with nature conservation. SRQ is primarily concerned with recreation. There is synergy with the SEQ 2021 project of DLGP. The multiple use approach needed for the RLS is more naturally “at home” in a more diverse agency like DNRM. However it still requires a “whole-of-government” approach
3	Assign RLS Lead agency responsibility and RLSAC secretariat role to another organisation eg • SEQROC • Local government (eg BCC) • Moreton Bay Waterways and Catchment Partnership (MBWCP)	SEQROC appreciates to problem of inadequate regional open space and the lack of a coordinated response. SEQROC could ensure coordination across local governments but State agencies are major stakeholders and managers of regional open space. SEQROC could delegate operations for agreed tasks to a member Council. Regional Open space is aligned to many aspects of water quality, but a combined responsibility could dilute efforts of the MBWCP and not all stakeholders are the same.
4	Assign RLS Lead agency responsibility and RLSAC secretariat role to a new organisation (Statutory Authority) eg • Queensland Trust for Nature • A new Partnership arrangement (similar to MBWCP?)	The structure of the MBWCP is a model for the coordination needed for regional open space and regional landscape values. The QTfN is not yet formed and it may become a vehicle for the protection nature conservation and biodiversity rather than the broader landscape values proposed by the RLSAC. Stand alone arrangements would need a start up period
5	RLSAC continues as a Working Committee for the SEQ 2021 Project	A policy development role only - would ensure completion of the policy development for the SEQ 2021 project. Support from existing RLSAC members is needed to maintain the core expertise and working relationships. A “holding” arrangement until another option policy can be negotiated. It will be twelve months work to complete policy for SEQ2021.
6	RLSAC continues as a Working Committee for the SEQ 2021 Project and maintains limited coordination/brokerage role	As for Option 5 plus: Allows coordination of ongoing key projects by RLSAC to continue beyond Jun 2003 to their successful completion (incl Scenic Amenity, Regional Trails, Regional Parks).
7	Establish a new (external to government) Alliance to advocate and lobby Governments to address the loss of open space and lack of open space in SEQ	The Friends of Oregon, the Fraser Basin Council and Greenbelt Alliance are North American working examples of this approach. This approach could devalue the “partnership” approach with Government in terms of responsibilities. Set up time and costs need to be factored in to lead times.

ATTACHMENT “B”

Report on the RFGM Priority Actions of the RLS by the RLSAC

The Priority Actions of the RFGM were given to the RLSAC as the Cabinet endorsed tasks of the Committee. Achievements are significant but since late 2002 there was a loss of momentum and an inability to commence intended projects due to:

- Lack of funding
- Downsizing of the Regional Landscape Unit
- Uncertainty of program since the announcement of cessation of funding beyond June 2003 was announced mid 2003.

RFGM Priority Action	Status/Progress
Develop policy and an operational plan to define, identify and protect regionally significant open space within SEQ.	Not finalised - emphasis has been on defining and identifying regional landscape values for protection through local government planning schemes and developing “tools” that will protect regional open space. Since 1998 uncertainty over budget allocation, staffing, lead agency arrangements and support have not enabled a realistic operational plan to be developed. In lieu an annual Business Plan has been advised to the RCC and the Minister.
Continue a Regional Landscape Strategy Advisory Committee (RLSAC) to assist with the development and implementation of policy and the operational plan	Participation in the RLSAC has expanded since its inception with industry, agencies and professional organisations accepting observer status. Development and implementation of RLS by RLSAC ending June 2003. EPA states that it is able to provide the operational aspects of the RLS through its core business. The decision is not supported by the community or local government members of the RLSAC while some members feel the emerging top down approach mirrors the worse features of the former ROSS program. The RLSAC resolved to continue the RLS Policy Development role for SEQ 2021 Project subject to secretariat support being secured.
Ensure there is appropriate public consultation in the coordination, development, and implementation, of the Regional Landscape Strategy.	The RLSAC has moved to a collaborative approach of community involvement. This approach included: • an extensive alliance of Charter signatories & a network of stakeholders (anticipating input into the policy development for SEQ 2021); • project partnerships (about 80) involving community groups, industry, state and local government; • use of broad based technical Working Groups to develop innovative tools and solutions for: - o Scenic Amenity - o Statutory Planning - o Economic Benefits of open space - o Regional Trails - o Regional Parks - o Communication strategy - o Statutory covenants (by DNRM) • community based membership of property management advisory committees (MACs); • Community and public attendance at community open days at Glen Rock (3) and Springbrook • Community conferences & forums including: - o Regional Trails (2) - o Regional Parks - o Statutory Covenants - o Trust for Nature - o Community action in the RLS. With the EPA’s termination of support for the RLSAC most of the collaboration will likely cease.

	Other public consultation in the implementation of the Strategy included: • Public comments on draft plans of management, discussion papers and project reports. • Scenic amenity methodology depends on extensive consultation and measuring community preferences. This has proven very popular with community representatives involved in the completed studies. Public involvement in open space and green space planning has reached new levels in the past month, as evidenced by the series in the <i>Courier Mail: Green space, our region your say</i>. The <i>Courier Mail</i> initiative has demonstrated that there is increasing awareness that the livability and lifestyle of the region are under threat from continued urbanisation and that coordination across public and private sectors is essential.
Develop and provide planning advice and information to assist Local Governments identify and protect areas of regionally significant open space within SEQ.	The first step towards best practice planning for open space and regional landscape values was the Draft guidelines. These were circulated to local government and other organisations to assist protection of regional landscape values. Local Government Workshops were deferred due to resource constraints in the RLU (and never held) The effectiveness of the Guidelines should be reviewed in cooperation with SEQROC Councils and the Guidelines finalised (originally intended for 2003/4).
Ensure areas referred to in Principle 5.5 are identified and protected in planning schemes.	Progress on the regional landscape values has been varied: • Cultural heritage and social significance (started but not progressed) • Linking open space lands (started but not progressed) • Separation of urban areas (started but not progressed) • Land and water conservation (started but not progressed) • Significant progress by EPA for nature conservation and biodiversity planning. • Scenic amenity methodology developed and implemented through two operational studies. The methodology needs to be further developed by the Scenic Amenity Working Group and other stakeholders. State support for the SEQ wide project being convened by SEQROC remains disappointing. • The photo model for assessing visual impacts from development has advanced but needs further work. • Planned workshops requested by planning and land use professionals on how to use the RLSAC scenic amenity methodology were not held. • Guidelines for outdoor recreation and sustainable nature based recreation were developed by SRQ in the RLS context.
Develop and apply an agreed common terminology, with clear definitions and criteria, in implementing the Regional Landscape Strategy.	Progress made through conferences, steering groups and discussion papers). Some progress was made with the RLS Factsheets, project reports and business papers of the RLSAC. (more work is required)
Develop options for funding, incentives, research and marketing to ensure equitable protection of regionally significant open space in SEQ.	Options for whole-of-government funding explored through DNRM budget process in 1999 and 2001 A consortium approach by agency and local government members of the RLSAC had limited promise of success. The RLSAC recommended a budget \$3M pa to implement the RLS. A Regional Open space fund was recommended to the RCC to achieve outcomes similar to the Sydney Regional Development Fund. The RLSAC recommended Statutory Covenants and the Queensland Trust for Nature and both have been adopted

Develop planning and management arrangements, which coordinate across tenures and agencies, for regionally significant open space areas. These arrangements, for land in public ownership and private land by voluntary agreement should be transparent and optimise the delivery of open space outcomes for the community. These outcomes will include nature conservation, economic production, cultural heritage protection, outdoor recreation opportunities, scenic amenity and water catchment management.	Community-based multiple-use management planning has been demonstrated at Glen Rock Regional Park. Pilot projects were proposed that coordinate across tenures and landholders. (started but not progressed). Proposed networks for regional trails and regional parks will need to operate across tenures and jurisdictions Cross tenure arrangements could be facilitated by legislation more suitable than the <i>Recreation Areas Management Act</i>.
Protect and enhance appropriate public access to regionally significant open space areas, rivers and water bodies, consistent with the principal purpose of these areas, through the planning and development process.	More RLS coordination would improve outcomes. RLS lands provide multiple use recreation access. There is a need for projects to test incentives and commercial aspects to extend access into private lands (started but not progressed).
Develop policy guidelines for outdoor recreation in relation to the planning and management of regionally significant open space, consistent with the principal purpose of these areas.	Projects are under way to coordinate Regional Parks and Regional Trails. These projects should be followed up with pilot projects. Outdoor recreation has yet to be effectively recognised as a land use in planning schemes.
In planning and managing regionally significant open space, provide for the broadest diversity of ecologically sustainable outdoor recreation to cater for the existing and future needs of SEQ residents and visitors to the region.	The Management Plan for Glen Rock Regional Park demonstrates how diverse recreational needs can be managed in a context of stewardship. Further regional parks will be required to meet the rising demands and the needs of a growing population
Promote the development of a regional trails network in SEQ, including: • linking regionally significant open space areas; • considering the economic and social benefits and cultural opportunities of trails; • considering the cultural and environmental impacts of trails; and • building community awareness of open space issues.	The Regional Trails Coordination Committee is established with stakeholders funding a full time project officer to produce a regional trails strategy by 2005. Project funding was only secured when the RLSAC secured the cooperation of Q Health as the fourth State agency. Although funding is secured the project has yet to commence The Regional Trails strategy should have proceeded to coincide with the outcomes for the SEQ Region Forest Agreement. The regional trails will assist to cater for the growth in recreation demand under the scenario of the SEQ 2021 and help offset increased demand since the SEQ RFA commenced. There is a need for projects to test incentives and commercial aspects to extend access into private lands (started but not progressed).

ATTACHMENT “C”

Report on the tasks of the Terms of Reference for the RLSAC

The Terms of Reference were developed and endorsed by the RLSAC then endorsed by the Minister and the Regional Coordination Committee. Achievements are significant but since late 2002 there was a loss of momentum and an inability to commence intended projects due to:

- Lack of funding
- Downsizing of the Regional Landscape Unit
- Uncertainty of program since the announcement of cessation of funding beyond June 2003 was announced in mid 2003

	Tasks:	Status as at 30 June 2003
1	Development of the policy and operational plan to define, identify and protect regionally significant open space within SEQ	Not finalised - emphasis has been on defining and identifying regional landscape values for protection through local government planning schemes and developing “tools” that will protect regional open space. Since 1998 uncertainty over budget allocation, staffing, lead agency arrangements and support have not enabled a realistic operational plan to be developed. In lieu an annual Business Plan has been advised to the RCC and the Minister. The policy and operational plan will support: A Vision The RLS is envisioned to result in an accessible, renowned network of parks, reserves, corridors, scenic landscapes, and other open spaces that are: • integrated with the pattern of settlement; • generous to future generations; • based on respect for traditional, cultural and historical links; • managed sustainably in partnership with local government, community and industry; • protecting the rural character and farming tradition; and • improving the liveability of the region The Principles From its experience since 1996, the RLSAC has formulated a number of key operating principles. These form the basis of the RLS Charter and are central to the SEQ RLS: • Multiple-use stewardship of the landscape • Community and industry partnerships • Whole-of-Government approach • Transparent processes and community management • Broad outcomes for the environment and the community • Respect for Indigenous and community heritage • Local demonstration projects • Long term planning, locally and regionally • Respect for rural communities and rural character • Safeguarding bushland for future generations • Voluntary cooperation of private landholders • Respect for Traditional Owners (RFGM 2000 s13). Future Milestones • Covenants to protect regionally significant open space • Queensland Trust for Nature to receive donations • Network of regionally significant parks • Network of Regional Trails • Regional landscape values defined, identified and protected

		• Planning Schemes protecting regional landscape values • Scenic amenity methodology • Regional Landscape Areas • Promotion and advocacy of the RLS • Voluntary Statutory Covenants for private landholders
2	Mechanisms for State and Local Government to ensure appropriate and adequate open space is provided in SEQ;	The RLSAC recommendations accepted by the relevant Minister or the RCC or SEQROC included: • Provisions for statutory covenants • Queensland Trust for Nature • Regional Trails • Scenic amenity methodology • Multiple use planning for Glen Rock regional Park • Community attitude survey to the loss of open space • Draft Guidelines for incorporating RLS values in planning schemes • An RLS Charter and Principles
3	The rights of land owners are assessed as required by Principle 5.2 of the RFGM	Principles discussed and confidence restored but a formal assessment has not been undertaken.
4	Priority projects to best achieve the objective of the Strategy	Projects were developed and implemented through a coalition of State agencies, local government and community groups. In all about 80 partnerships were developed to service specific projects
5	The budget requirements to implement the Strategy	The RLS establishment funding (\$0.5 million was inadequate for the delivery of the RLS). The RLSAC recommended the budget requirements at \$3 million per annum as recommended to the RCC in 1999 & 2000. Other than the initial interim allocation and a special allocation by DNR in 2000 there was no addition funding to the interim announced in 1998.
6	The planning and development of the acquired properties of the Regional Landscape Strategy	Glen Rock Regional Park (Gatton Shire) A community based management advisory committee developed the multiple use management plan. A high level of community engagement and support was achieved and the Park represents a tangible outcome from the SEQ 2001 project and the RLS. The implementation of the management plan is yet to be approved. Management was transferred to the QPWS. Springbrook Regional Park (Gold Coast City) The community based management advisory committee developed a Draft Management Plan which was exhibited late 2002. The RLSAC was relieved of responsibility for completion of the plan and EPA/QPWS proposes a new approach to determining the future use and tenure. Rathdowney (Beaudesert & Boonah Shires) Management Planning has not commenced due to lack of resources. Mt Neurum Caboolture Shire Council as Trustee developed a Management Plan Ewen Mattock Dam Caloundra City Council as Trustee developed a Management Plan Logan Riverside Reserve (Gold Coast City) Gold Coast City as trustee is developing the reserve. Mt Tamborine Hang-gliding site Managed by Beaudesert Shire Council

7	Performance of the Regional Landscape Strategy	A framework for a performance review was developed. Performance evaluation was discussed but not commenced due to resource constraints and the cessation of the RLSAC.
8	Advise on the Communication Strategy of the Regional Landscape Strategy	Draft Communication Strategy developed with the strap line “a lifestyle for all” approved by the then Minister. Implementation of the communication strategy was not resourced. Not completed.
9	Prepare a statement to clarify the term ‘equitable processes’ as used in the stated objective	Projects were developed and implemented through a coalition of State agencies, local government and community groups. In all about 80 partnerships were developed to service specific projects
10	The impact and effects of growth in SEQ on the loss of open space	The economic impacts estimated. Social and ecological impacts need to be determined or collated. Not completed.
11	Community sensitivities about open space planning initiatives and the loss of open space in SEQ	Community sensitivities about open space planning was aimed at assessing the sensitivities of rural stakeholders given the concerns this sector had about the previous open space initiative (ROSS). The RLSAC largely overcame the concerns of rural industry and landholder organisations that were evident about the previous open space program. The sensitivities likely remain but have been managed through the RLSAC and the open decision making processes adopted since the inception. Started but not completed. Community sensitivities about the loss of open space assessed through a small RLSAC survey which found over 90% of people are concerned or very concerned about the loss of open space in SEQ. These results of the RLSAC survey were broadly confirmed by the SEQ 2021 Issues and Direction Paper considered by the RCC in March 03. Open space was one of the five priority planning issues identified. Community sensitivities to loss of open space are shown to be high by the recent series in the <i>Courier Mail</i>. Sensitivities were assessed by the RLSAC through programmed conferences and public forums, and public consultation including: • Queensland Trust for Nature • Covenants • Regional Trails (2) • Regional Parks • Community Action • Charter signing (over 60 signatories) • Glen Rock Regional Park Management Plan • Springbrook Management Plan • Scenic Amenity projects (Lockyer & Caboolture) • Community Attitude Survey to the loss of open space
12	Whether or not the public interest in the implementation of the Regional Landscape Strategy is being upheld	Objective of the Regional Landscape Strategy is to: <i>“To protect, through equitable processes, the regionally significant open space of South East Queensland for present and future generations.”</i> (Started by RLSAC but not completed) Objective of the Regional Landscape Strategy Advisory Committee is “To advise the Minister on issues of public interest in the implementation of the Regional Landscape Strategy in order to ensure the objective of the Strategy is achieved. <i>Advice of the RLSAC is no longer required by the Minister”.</i> The Minister advised the RLSAC in mid 2002 that he no longer requires this advice.

Factsheet: SEQ Regional Landscape Strategy

The Regional Landscape Strategy Advisory Committee (RLSAC) membership	
State Agencies - Natural Resources & Mines - Queensland Parks Service - Sport & Recreation Queensland - Environmental Protection Agency - Local Government & Planning - Main Roads Industry - Powerlink Queensland - SEQ Water Corporation - Urban Development Institute Australia - Moreton Bay W/ways & Catchment Partnership - Queensland Dairy Organisation - Queensland Fruit & Vegetable Growers	Local Government - Brisbane City Council - NORSROC - SouthROC - WESROC Community - Queensland Conservation Council - National Parks Association (Queensland) - Queensland Outdoor Recreation Federation - Parks & Leisure Australia - Traditional Owners - Tourism - Dayboro Rural Landholders Conservation Group
RLSAC has 80 project partners working to develop and demonstrate new approaches to protect the regional landscape 60 organisations agreed to be signatories to the RLS Charter - found 90% of SEQ residents concerned and 2/3 very concerned at the loss of open space in SEQ - found that with development rates there will be no private land in coastal areas above 5 ha within 100 yrs. - found the public land of SEQ (16%) is far less than any other Australia cities (eg Sydney 45%) - Parks and Leisure Australia award for excellence in park planning. - Planning Institute Australia awards for scenic amenity projects (Caboolture and Lockyer) - concerns that another 1 million people in SEQ by 2021 (40%) will increase the urbanised area by 120% .	
Regional Landscape benefits - Individual – recreation, self-discovery and spirituality, scenic amenity, environmental appreciation - Community – life-based ethos, social bonding, community & cultural identity, communal responses - Production – agriculture, livestock, quarry materials, eco-tourism - Ecosystem Services – water, air, soil, pollination, flood mitigation - Ecosystem Amenity – support for human and other communities - Planning system – separated urban areas, development impacts, community boundaries	
RLSAC estimates of economic benefits derived from the regional landscape are:	
Annual benefits \$1000 million for outdoor recreation \$2000 million for tourism \$800 million for agriculture \$2000 million for water production Halving the annual loss of could save: \$20 million for local government roads and water \$40 million for state education \$70 million for road congestion \$2 million for direct health costs	Uncosted economic benefits are: - Quality of life - Life-fulfilment for individuals - Attraction of businesses - Avoidance of significant land resumption - Reduced pollution - Avoided loss of agricultural production salinity - Avoided flood mitigation works and flood damage - Unforeseen economic opportunities dependent on land availability
SEQ Outdoor Recreation Demand Study conclusions: - outdoor recreation participation is high (170 million activity events by residents of SEQ) - community preference for natural settings - concern about urban encroachment, loss of natural areas and crowding of outdoor sites - participation for passive reasons rather than for active reasons - strong interest in becoming involved in outdoor recreation - constraints: time, costs, access and places - outdoor recreation is a significant component of lifestyle for majority of SEQ residents	