

**Bowen Hills Priority Development Area  
Development scheme amendment no. 2**

**Submissions report**

**June 2019**



**Queensland  
Government**

**The Department of State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning is responsible for driving the economic development program for Queensland by creating a diverse and thriving economy, and generating new jobs.**

#### Copyright

This publication is protected by the *Copyright Act 1968*.

#### Licence



This work, except as identified below, is licensed by the Department of State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) 4.0 Australia licence. To view a copy of this licence, visit: <http://creativecommons.org.au/>

**You are free to copy, communicate and adapt this publication, as long as you attribute it as follows:**

© State of Queensland, The Department of State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning, June 2019.

Third party material that is not licensed under a Creative Commons licence is referenced within this document. All content not licensed under a Creative Commons licence is all rights reserved. Please contact the Department of State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning /the copyright owner if you wish to use this material.



The Queensland Government is committed to providing accessible services to Queenslanders of all cultural and linguistic backgrounds. If you have difficulty understanding this publication and need a translator, please call the Translating and Interpreting Service (TIS National) on 13 14 50 and ask them to contact the Queensland Department of State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning on 07 3452 7100

#### Disclaimer

While every care has been taken in preparing this publication, to the extent permitted by law, the State of Queensland accepts no responsibility and disclaims all liability (including without limitation, liability in negligence) for all expenses, losses (including direct and indirect loss), damages and costs incurred as a result of decisions or actions taken as a result of any data, information, statement or advice, expressed or implied, contained within. To the best of our knowledge, the content was correct at the time of publishing.

Any references to legislation are not an interpretation of the law. They are to be used as a guide only. The information in this publication is general and does not take into account individual circumstances or situations. Where appropriate, independent legal advice should be sought.

Copies of this publication are available on our website at [www.dsdmip.qld.gov.au](http://www.dsdmip.qld.gov.au) and further copies are available upon request to:

Economic Development Queensland

Department of State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning  
GPO Box 2202, Brisbane Queensland 4002.

1 William Street Brisbane Qld 4000 (Australia)

Phone: 13 QGOV (13 7468)

Email: [edq@dsdmip.qld.gov.au](mailto:edq@dsdmip.qld.gov.au)

Web: [www.edq.qld.gov.au](http://www.edq.qld.gov.au)

# Contents

1	Introduction .....	4
2	Overview of public notification process .....	5
2.1	Community engagement .....	5
2.2	Submission registration and review process .....	6
3	Overview of submissions .....	7
3.1	Submission numbers .....	7
3.2	Submission method .....	7
3.3	Submitter interest in the PDA .....	7
3.4	Overarching areas of support or concern .....	7
4	Summary of submissions and amendments .....	8
5	List of all amendments to the development scheme amendment .....	37

## 1 Introduction

The Bowen Hills Priority Development Area (PDA) was declared on 28 March 2008. The Bowen Hills PDA development scheme came into effect on 3 July 2009 and was first amended on 1 April 2010.

Economic Development Queensland (EDQ) has undertaken a review of the Bowen Hills PDA development scheme to ensure it continues to operate effectively as the overarching planning document for the area. EDQ prepared the proposed Bowen Hills PDA development scheme amendment no. 2 and released it for public notification between 29 October 2018 and 7 December 2018.

Following the completion of the public notification period:

- all submissions received were reviewed by the Minister for Economic Development Queensland (MEDQ), and
- the Bowen Hills PDA development scheme amendment no. 2 was changed where considered appropriate in response to submissions received.

This report has been prepared to summarise the submissions that have been considered and provides information on the merits of the submissions and the extent to which the development scheme has been amended.

## 2 Overview of public notification process

### 2.1 Community engagement

The public notification period for the Bowen Hills PDA Development Scheme amendment no. 2 took place between 29 October and 7 December 2018. During the public notification period the MEDQ, undertook the following community engagement initiatives:

- A dedicated Department of State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning (DSDMIP) 'Have your say' webpage for the Bowen Hills PDA providing the opportunity for the community and other stakeholders to ask questions and receive responses in a public forum.
- A dedicated web page for the Bowen Hills PDA development scheme amendment no. 2 on the DSDMIP website.
- A community newsletter was posted to land owners within the Bowen Hills PDA which included 1,787 domestic and 104 international addresses.
- Two drop-in community information sessions were hosted at the Belise Apartments (510 St Pauls Terrace, Brisbane City QLD 4006) on:
  - 10 November 2018
  - 22 November 2018.
- Public notice in The Courier Mail.
- Public notice in the government gazette.
- Advertisements and media releases in local newspapers circulating the region.

EDQ also accepted requests for meetings with several stakeholders during the public notification period to discuss relevant aspects of the development scheme and the submission review process including:

- Industry groups – Property Council of Australia, Urban Development Institute of Australia, Planning Institute of Australia.
- Landholders and other affected entities.

During the public notification period:

- The EDQ website and 'Have your say' web page received more than 1,200 unique visits.
- The proposed Bowen Hills PDA Development Scheme amendment no. 2 document was downloaded 137 times.
- The ePlan received 380 unique page views.
- Approximately 29 people attended the community information sessions.

## 2.2 Submission registration and review process

Submissions were received by post, email and via DSDMIP's Have your say online submission page. Once submissions were received, they were registered and reviewed.

Table 1 below provides an overview of the submission registration and review process.

**Table 1: Submission registration and review process**

Steps	Action
Registration of submissions	Submissions were registered and given a submission number.
Classification of submissions	Submissions were classified by number and section relevant to the development scheme.
Summarising submission issues	<p>Each submission was read, and the different matters raised were entered into the submissions database under headings based on the sections of the development scheme.</p> <p>Each submission often covered several topics; therefore, allowance was made for the same or similar comments being raised in several submissions. This included receipt of multiple submissions with similar views on a topic or submissions having different views on the same topic. For this reason, comments across submissions on topics were identified and these comments were summarised under common headings based on the sections of the development scheme in the submissions report.</p>
Evaluation and responses to issues	<p>Once all comments were summarised, they were assessed and responses were prepared.</p> <p>Potential changes to the development scheme were identified.</p> <p>In evaluating submissions, allowance was made for the same or similar comments being raised in different submissions. For this reason, assessment of comments and resulting development scheme changes were made based on the sections of the development scheme rather than on submission by submission basis.</p>
Submissions report	<p>The submissions report was prepared which collates steps 3 and 4 above, providing a summary of the submissions considered, information about the merits of the submissions, recommendations for changes to the development scheme to reflect submissions.</p> <p>Comments raised through submissions have been summarised to simplify the presentation and review comments.</p>
MEDQ approval	The final submissions report and development scheme amendment were submitted to the MEDQ for review and approval.
Publishing and notification of development scheme amendment.	<p>As soon as practicable after the MEDQ approved the development scheme amendment, the MEDQ published:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a gazette notice which established the date the development scheme amendment came into effect</li> <li>• the development scheme amendment and submissions report on the department's website, and</li> <li>• a notice in at least one newspaper circulating in the local area, stating the development scheme amendment had been approved and it was available on the department's website, along with the submissions report.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, the MEDQ notified state agencies, Brisbane City Council (BCC), and submitters that the development scheme amendment was in effect.</p>

### 3 Overview of submissions

#### 3.1 Submission numbers

Thirty-eight submissions were received by EDQ during the public notification period and two additional submissions were received after the public notification period ended.

#### 3.2 Submission method

Table 2 below identifies the method by which submissions were lodged with EDQ.

Table 2: Breakdown of submissions by submission method

Method of submission	Number of submissions received
Post	1 (also received via email)
Email	19
Online submission	21
<b>Total submissions</b>	<b>40</b>

#### 3.3 Submitter interest in the PDA

Submissions were received from a variety of interested parties. A breakdown of the submissions by interest is outlined in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Breakdown of submissions by interested party

Type of submitter	Number of submissions received
Landowner or resident in the PDA	26
Industry and advocacy groups	3
Public sector entities	3
Other interested parties	8
<b>Total submissions</b>	<b>40</b>

#### 3.4 Overarching areas of support or concern

Submitters identified many topics of support within the development scheme. In some instances, topics received both support and raised concern. A full evaluation of the submissions included consideration of topics of both support and concern as detailed in section 4.

A review of the submissions identified two overarching areas of support, namely:

- Strong support for the vision for the PDA.
- Support for the consolidation of zoning within the PDA.

Several matters of concern were also noted:

- Provisions requiring Green Building Council of Australia green star accreditation of 5 Star for new residential development and 6 Star for new commercial development.
- Provisions requiring new residential development in the mixed-use zone to deliver the equivalent of 100% of site area as communal open space to its occupants.
- Provisions for building heights in the medium density residential zone and high density residential zone on Abbotsford Road and Cintra Road. Some support for these heights was also noted.

## 4 Summary of submissions and amendments

#	Summary of issue	Response	Amendment required?
<b>Development Assessment</b>			
1.	<p>Concern that section 2.2.3 of the development scheme is prescriptive in nature and does not allow performance outcomes.</p> <p>Concern that the framework for demonstrating consistency with the land use plan does not allow a performance-based assessment of development.</p> <p>Concern that applicants are required to provide detailed sufficient grounds; superior design outcomes and overwhelming community need to justify any departures from the development scheme.</p> <p>Concern that requirements to comply with the land use plan may inhibit good development outcomes and inappropriately skew the balance between certainty and flexibility.</p>	<p>EDQ operates a performance-based development assessment process in all Priority Development Areas.</p> <p>Amendments have been made to the following sections to provide greater clarity regarding hierarchy of provisions and the performance-based assessment framework that is operated by EDQ:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 2.1: Components of the land use plan, and</li> <li>Section 2.2.3: Development consistent with the land use plan.</li> </ul>	Yes
2.	<p>Concern that section 2.2.4 states that development in the medium or high density residential zones that does not comply with the maximum building height for the zone is inconsistent with the development scheme and cannot be approved.</p> <p>Concern that the absolute restriction on building height in the medium density residential zone and high density residential zone is contrary to performance-based planning and will potentially restrict good design outcomes.</p> <p>Request that the absolute restrictions on building heights should apply to the entire PDA.</p>	<p>The maximum building heights in the medium density residential zone and high density residential zone have been set to provide community and developers certainty in how the transition in built form and development intensity will be managed between:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mixed use zone west of Abbotsford Road, and</li> <li>Low rise character housing outside the PDA on the eastern side of Cintra Road.</li> </ul> <p>These building heights should not be exceeded in medium density residential zone and high density residential zone.</p> <p>The management of building height transitions in other parts of the PDA, such as the mixed use zone, industrial zone and mixed industry and business zone, are more flexible because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>there is significantly less potential for negative impacts on neighboring properties at these locations; and</li> <li>these areas are planned to accommodate a more intense form of development.</li> </ul>	No
<b>Vision</b>			
3.	Support the transit orientated design principles outlined in the vision	Support is noted.	No
4.	Strongly support the statements made within the vision that the Brisbane Showgrounds is a major year-round events precinct.	Support is noted.	No
5.	Request that the vision be amended to specify a transit orientated media and innovation centre within close proximity to the Bowen Hills Station.	Referencing a media and innovation centre in the vision would limit the flexibility of the instrument and may restrict possible development opportunities.	No



#	Summary of issue	Response	Amendment required?
6.	<p>Support connectivity to public transport infrastructure as it will encourage greater use of public transport.</p> <p>Pedestrian connections over the train lines in the approximate area of Light Street, should be provided to create more walking options.</p>	<p>Support is noted.</p> <p>The rail line proximate to Light Street is not within the PDA. Additional overpass opportunities are not within the scope of the development scheme amendment.</p>	No
7.	Support improvements to the public realm, especially streetscaping as it encourages walking and the use of the street.	Support is noted.	No
8.	<p>The vision should include greater reference to outcomes sought by subsequent sections of the scheme specifically technological and environmental aspects such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• air and noise pollution</li> <li>• environmentally sustainable design (ESD)</li> <li>• integrated water management cycle (IWMC)</li> <li>• urban forest</li> <li>• urban heat island effect</li> <li>• living/green infrastructure, and</li> <li>• technological transformations such as smart cities, car share, autonomous vehicles, etc.</li> </ul>	<p>The vision is the highest order element of the development scheme and deals with strategic intents for the PDA, including the mix and intensity of land uses, transport connectivity and urban design and public realm outcomes.</p> <p>Site specific environmental, sustainable and technological innovations are captured by the PDA-wide criteria, which are then detailed in the zone and precinct provisions. The items referenced are appropriately dealt with without inclusion in the vision.</p>	No
9.	Suggest that the vision reference the requirements for networks within the PDA to connect with the broader citywide networks outside the PDA.	Integration of the PDA with broader citywide transport networks is supported. The vision will be amended accordingly.	Yes
<b>Structural elements</b>			
10.	Suggest the structural elements plan be amended to show the Hudd Street and Mayne Road activity node along the street alignment rather than surrounding the public realm node. The alignment currently proposed is too specific for a structure plan.	<p>The structural elements plan is a spatially indicative depiction of the highest order physical elements described in the vision. The alignment of the activity node represents an intent for the public realm to be framed and activated by activity centre uses.</p> <p>Changes to the alignment of the activity node vary from this planned intent and are not considered suitable without further detailed planning and urban design justifications being established.</p>	No
11.	Suggest consideration of an additional rail station within the northern area of the PDA.	<p>The provision of rail stations in the northern part of the Bowen Hills PDA does not form part of the Queensland Government's planning of the rail network, undertaken by the Department of Transport and Main Roads.</p> <p>The development scheme amendment aims to ensure new development and pedestrian pathways in proximity to existing and planned public transport are provided in an integrated and considered manner, which ensures the greatest accessibility to public transport.</p>	No
12.	Suggest that the PDA include more	The development scheme amendment proposes	No

#	Summary of issue	Response	Amendment required?
	protected, connected, separated cycling paths. Particularly those that connect Bowen Hills to surrounding suburbs such as Windsor and Newstead.	improved cycle connectivity within the PDA through the creation of dedicated cycle paths along key movement corridors.  Planning and delivery of the cycle network outside the PDA is administered by Brisbane City Council.	
13.	Hudd Street and Tufton street extensions are not shown on the structural elements plan.	Map 2: Structural elements plan has been amended to correctly show these new streets.	Yes
14.	Suggest that a cycle and walking route should be shown on Costin Street and Constance Street and between the Royal Brisbane Women's Hospital and Fortitude Valley.	Connectivity through Costin and Constance Street and between the RBWH and Fortitude Valley is supported. These links may be provided as footpaths, plazas, shared zones, separated cycle ways or combination of multiple forms.  The structural elements plan has been amended to show additional routes through the PDA. The legend has been amended to refer to these routes as active transport routes.  Section 2.3.2 of the vision has been amended to include walkways and designated on-street cycle lanes within the meaning of active transport routes.  Map 9 Precinct 2 Plan has been amendment to identify a cycle network along through Costin Street and Constance Street.	Yes
15.	Abbotsford Road northbound bus stop adjacent the railway is incorrectly shown as a bus station, this should be removed.	It is intended that a bus stop on Abbotsford Road will provide interchange functionality connecting bus and rail services. It is acknowledged that the description of this infrastructure as bus station may be misleading. The legend has been amended to reference the bus icon as a bus stop.	Yes
<b>PDA-wide criteria</b>			
16.	Suggest that key views and vistas to places of significance should be identified and enhanced through the provisions in the development scheme.	Heritage views and sightlines have been added to the provisions for precinct 2. Site analysis and development of detailed proposals will need to consider opportunities afforded by particular sites.	Yes
17.	Suggest that some criteria would benefit from performance parameters (i.e. performance-based criteria) and/or concrete quantified outcomes (i.e. numeric based criteria).	The development scheme operates with a hierarchy of provisions. Qualitative statements in the PDA wide criteria inform the quantifiable metrics and standards set out in the zone and precinct provisions. It is not considered necessary to specify additional quantified outcomes within the PDA-wide criteria.	No
18.	Suggest that the scheme establish a maximum block dimensions (e.g. 200 m x 200 m) for permeability.	The alignment for new roads and cross block links are identified in precinct 1 and precinct 2 to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>improve pedestrian and vehicle permeability through these areas, and</li> <li>provide connections to key attractions and destinations in the PDA.</li> </ul> These new roads and cross block links have been prepared as place specific strategies to regulate block size and permeability across the PDA.  Further regulation of block dimensions through a generic measure is not considered as necessary.	No
19.	Suggest that PDA-wide criteria be established to manage the interface between building services and the	Management of servicing areas is dealt with through the zone provisions and the transport and parking schedule.	No

#	Summary of issue	Response	Amendment required?
	public realm.		
<b>PDA-wide criteria</b>			
<b>2.5.1 Urban design and public realm</b>			
20.	Suggest that more street trees be provided to create pleasant walking environments, increase shade, improve amenity and provide a barrier between the footpath and the street.	Various road and streetscape upgrades are specified within the infrastructure plan. Verge upgrades will be carried out as a consequence of development in accordance with BCC infrastructure design planning policy which incorporates requirements for street trees.	No
21.	Suggest including criteria under 2.5.1.2 Sub-tropical design and 2.5.1.3 Building form to reflect the appropriate building layouts, set-backs and design to mitigate impacts of transport air pollutants.	Built form provisions contained within the mixed use zone have been developed in consideration of air quality outcomes. Section 2.5.9.5 of the scheme also addresses air quality requirements and references BCC's transport air quality corridor overlay and transport air quality overlay code.	No
22.	Verge widths need to accommodate footpaths or shared paths, street furniture, signage, vegetation and underground services.  Adequate space for public realm areas is needed in order to provide sufficient capacity and safety at intersections.	The Infrastructure Planning Background Report (IBPR) adopts Brisbane Desired Standards of Services for the transport network (specific exclusions are noted in the IBPR). Generally standard verge widths of 3.75 m have been adopted. There are some exclusions where it is not practicable to obtain the desired 3.75 m verge.	No
23.	Concern that the use of the term 'cross block link' is not consistent with Brisbane City Council's City Plan 2014 and could cause confusion in terms of the facility to be provided	The term "cross block link" has been employed to enable a variety of design solutions to facilitate urban permeability for pedestrians.  The intended form and design for cross block links is flexible and will depend on individual site circumstances. Pathway links, arcades or shared lanes may all be acceptable design solutions.  To provide greater clarity the term cross block link has been defined in Schedule 1: Definitions.	Yes
<b>PDA-wide criteria</b>			
<b>2.5.2 Connectivity</b>			
24.	Suggest that the development scheme prioritise public and active transport over private transport.  2.5.2(i) and (ii) are in conflict with 2.5.4.7 (promoting transport efficiency by supporting a reduction in car ownership). Making it more difficult to access and park in an area is a significant factor in reducing car ownership, suggest removing enhances connectivity for private vehicles, reducing car parking requirements and generally prioritizing road space to active and public transport.	The relationship between promoting transport efficiency and preserving the functionality of the road network requires careful balance. The development scheme supports the reduction in private vehicle ownership through efficient land use allocation encouraging development near transport nodes.  The development scheme must also ensure the impacts of development are managed to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the broader road network is not compromised by the development within the PDA.	No
<b>PDA-wide criteria</b>			
<b>2.5.3 Housing diversity</b>			
25.	Submitters raised concern with the requirement for residential development to deliver 10% of Gross Floor Area (GFA) as dwellings with 3 or more bedrooms.  Submitters cited the following reasons for their concern. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Market trends: there is limited appetite for 3-bedroom dwellings within</li> </ul>	A review of approvals issued within Bowen Hills demonstrated that the existing policy intent to passively encourage housing diversity within Bowen Hills has been ineffective at providing larger dwelling typologies. Less than 2% of all approved dwellings in Bowen Hills consisted of 3 or more bedrooms. This restricted housing choice limits the potential for some segments of the community to reside in the Bowen Hills PDA.  Significant state government investment in the	No

#	Summary of issue	Response	Amendment required?
	<p>the current or future Brisbane apartment market. Market conditions and financing requirements will inevitably dictate the possible dwelling typologies and the minimum 10% requirement could impede development occurring within the PDA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Competitive disadvantage: areas outside the PDA are not subject to this requirement suggesting this will place Bowen Hills at a competitive disadvantage for attracting development investment.</li> </ul>	<p>PDA and surrounds, including the Cross River Rail and the Inner City North State Secondary College will provide vital infrastructure and services catering to a broad range of household types, including families.</p> <p>A requirement for 10% of residential GFA to be provided as 3-bedroom dwellings is proposed to address this housing stock constraint, similar to the policy model successfully applied in 2009 requiring the delivery of affordable dwellings in the PDA.</p> <p>This proposed inclusionary housing policy has also been coupled with a period where the Value Uplift charge for 3-bedroom dwellings will be lifted, effectively decreasing the infrastructure charge for 3-bedroom dwellings by as much as \$37,851 per dwelling compared to the Infrastructure Funding Framework that is applicable prior to the development scheme amendment taking effect.</p> <p>While the submissions indicate resistance to the proposed standard, the development scheme must continue to promote housing diversity, and these minimum requirements are reasonable and progressive actions to provide an adequate supply of housing choice for residents and workers in the PDA.</p> <p>It is proposed that the policy setting be retained at 10% of GFA, coupled together with the reduction in development charges. It is expected proponents will form more efficient and effective processes to design, develop, market and transact 3-bedroom dwellings.</p> <p>EDQ will monitor and review the policy's performance on an annual basis.</p>	
26.	<p>Suggest that affordable housing requirements be excluded from the medium and high density residential zones due to existing heightened levels of social housing in the area.</p>	<p>The vision for the PDA encourages a diversity of housing which caters for a range of income needs. The PDA wide criteria align with the vision by requiring development provide a minimum of 5% of total residential GFA as either or a mix of public housing, social housing or affordable housing.</p> <p>Delivery of public housing, social housing or affordable housing needs to occur across all residential development typologies to facilitate a supply of diverse accommodation options catering to the full range of household types including households who are unable to readily purchase or rent housing at market rates.</p>	No
27.	<p>Suggest that the development scheme clarify what type of non-market price housing is to be provided. It is very different to provide 10% of true public housing than 10% of affordable housing. Potentially, each type of housing would require a separate target.</p> <p>The total target should be increased to a minimum of 10% with development uplift opportunities for those applications that provide a</p>	<p>The development scheme requires a provision of 5% as "either or a mix or" public, social and affordable housing. This provides developers flexibility in how the target can be met.</p> <p>The development scheme cannot mandate the delivery of public or social housing within development.</p> <p>By including public and social housing, the development scheme is enabling compliance to be achieved in circumstances where an agreement is entered with the Department of Housing and Public Works or a Social housing</p>	No

#	Summary of issue	Response	Amendment required?
	higher percentage.	provider for the provision of public or social housing.	
<b>PDA-wide criteria</b>			
<b>2.5.4 Sustainable developments</b>			
28.	<p>Submitters raised concern with the requirement for development to achieve a Green Building Council of Australia (GBCA) design and as built certification for development of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 stars for residential development, and</li> <li>• 6 stars for commercial development.</li> </ul> <p>Submitters cited the following reasons for their concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of sustainability requirement: There are no 5 Star residential developments in Queensland and only 4 nationally. 5 Star residential is the highest rating under the multi-unit residential tool.</li> <li>• Competitive disadvantage: Other areas of Brisbane are not required to obtain GBCA certification for residential or commercial development, suggesting this will place Bowen Hills at a competitive disadvantage to attracting new development investment.</li> <li>• Housing affordability: The costs associated with achieving the minimum standard sustainability requirement will have significant implications for housing affordability.</li> <li>• The development scheme should reference the 6 leaf certification under the EnviroDevelopment rating tool as an alternative rating system.</li> </ul>	<p>The GBCA certification (or equivalent) was proposed to ensure a consistent high standard of building sustainability was achieved across all development to achieve improved outcomes such as reduced greenhouse gas emissions, reduced water and electricity consumption and increased recycling of construction waste.</p> <p>GBCA certification of 5 stars for residential and 6 Stars for commercial was proposed as it represents leading practice for residential and commercial development with existing 6 star commercial buildings already developed in the PDA.</p> <p>While the submissions indicated resistance to the proposed 5 and 6 Star standard EDQ remains committed to promoting sustainable buildings in PDAs and has therefore sought further advice from the GBCA about recalibrating the policy target. Estimates provided from GBCA indicate that the cost of delivering Green Star projects as at December 2018 added:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 Star – 0.9% of total development costs per square meter.</li> <li>• 5 Star – 2.6% of total development costs per square meter.</li> <li>• 6 Star – 2.9% of total development costs per square meter.</li> </ul> <p>The submission to list the EnviroDevelopment rating tool as an alternative rating system is supported.</p> <p>The following amendment will be included in the final development scheme:</p> <p>“Development provides the design, construction and operation of sustainable buildings by achieving either a:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A minimum 6 leaf EnviroDevelopment certification</li> <li>a minimum 4 star Green Star: Design and as Built certification, or</li> <li>an equivalent rating under an alternative rating system”.</li> </ol> <p>The 4 Star certification level is defined by the GBCA as best practice and is considered a very progressive minimum standard for development in the Bowen Hills PDA.</p> <p>Additional amendments have also been made to the corresponding section of the implementation strategy to encourage higher levels of sustainability.</p> <p>EDQ will monitor and review the policy’s performance on an annual basis.</p>	Yes
29.	Suggest that the development scheme should reference the EnviroDevelopment sustainability	The development scheme has been amended to include EnviroDevelopment certification as an alternative rating system for section 2.5.4.1 of the	Yes

#	Summary of issue	Response	Amendment required?
	rating tool as an equivalent rating system.	development scheme.	
<b>PDA-wide criteria</b> <b>2.5.6 Heritage places</b>			
30.	<p>Concern that the requirements for the protection of heritage places should also include requirements to preserve the original location of these places. The ability to permit relocations of heritage houses strips residents and potential buyers of any planning certainty in the area.</p>	<p>The development scheme seeks to protect the heritage value of Bowen Hills. The provisions under section 2.5.6 are principally concerned within ensuring development on a heritage place protects or enhances its heritage value.</p> <p>In assessing applications for the relocation or reorientation of a heritage place, EDQ as the assessing authority will have regard to the heritage citation for the place. There may scenarios where the relocation or reorientation of the building enhances the preservation and adaptive reuse of the heritage place.</p> <p>It is not appropriate to limit how the heritage places are best redeveloped based on the variable interests of external parties.</p>	No
31.	<p>Concern that the land use plan does not include any protections for pre-1911 buildings.</p> <p>It is considered that these buildings form an integral part of Brisbane's heritage and character. City Plan 2014 includes a pre-1911 building overlay which includes specific demolition protections for these character buildings.</p>	<p>The proposed amendment maintains EDQ's current policy setting which does not restrict the demolition or removal of pre-1911 buildings that are not heritage places. Under the Bowen Hills UDA Development Scheme (2009) building work associated with a material change of use is listed as exempt development, therefore not requiring an application be assessed and approved by EDQ.</p> <p>In preparing the Bowen Hills PDA Development Scheme amendment no. 2, EDQ commissioned an independent assessment of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the presence and character of pre-1911 buildings in the PDA,</li> <li>• policy options to related to pre-1911 buildings.</li> </ul> <p>This independent advice confirmed the presence of 13 possible pre-1911 buildings within the PDA, displaying various design and condition characteristics.</p> <p>Further advice from the Department of Environment and Science confirmed none of these buildings would qualify for listing on the State Heritage Register.</p> <p>Additional regulation of pre-1911 buildings in the PDA was considered inappropriate as it would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• be unlikely to result in the retention of pre-1911 buildings in the PDA as the development potential created by the development scheme provides a sufficient value proposition that developers would seek to demolish or relocate these buildings</li> <li>• unnecessarily increase the level of regulation applicable to these properties in the PDA</li> <li>• impact on the development commerciality and timeframes due to additional cost and administration impositions</li> </ul>	No



#	Summary of issue	Response	Amendment required?
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>result in EDQ imposing and administering a potentially difficult condition for relocation to rare vacant land within a mapped traditional character area within Brisbane City. This relocation process would require additional development approvals from BCC and building certifiers.</li> </ul> <p>The proposed Bowen Hills PDA development scheme will continue to enable the redevelopment of these properties.</p>	
32.	<p>Concern that the provisions dealing with the preservation of heritage places are too generalised and are insufficient to qualitatively measure how adverse impacts (on a heritage place) may or may not be avoided.</p> <p>The following phrase should be used – ‘where there is no prudent or feasible alternative’. This is consistent with the language used elsewhere in state planning codes guidelines including State code 14: Queensland heritage of the State Development Assessment Provisions.</p>	<p>State Development Assessment Provisions (SDAP) State code 14: Queensland Heritage adopts a similar approach to the development scheme for the conservation of heritage value. State code 14 requires development to conserve cultural heritage significance and minimising or mitigating unavoidable impacts on the cultural heritage significance of a heritage place.</p> <p>Inclusion of the words no prudent or feasible alternative in state code 14 is in relation to development that proposes to destroy or substantially reduce the cultural heritage significance of a state heritage place.</p> <p>The PDA wide criteria of the development scheme do not provide for the destruction or substantial reduction in cultural heritage significance of a state heritage place. These circumstances would only be considered in extremely exceptional circumstances and would require a sufficient grounds justification under section 2.2.3 of the development scheme. This justification would require the development comply with the vision, including statements regarding the preservation of heritage places.</p>	No
<b>PDA-wide criteria</b>			
<b>2.5.7 Environment</b>			
33.	<p>Public access along the Breakfast Creek waterfront will provide an ideal walking environment, a buffer to buildings and a recreation space for residents and workers.</p> <p>Clarity is sought regarding the tenure and use of this space for active uses, including restaurants, cafes, and temporary uses such as markets.</p> <p>Provision of a setback of at least 10m from Breakfast Creek would provide a natural edge to minimise the worst effects of flooding, could provide some riparian habitat and would be a valuable open space contribution for the whole precinct. (It is noted that a related provision is mentioned as an action in section 4.4).</p>	<p>Section 2.5.7.2 of the development scheme requires land along Breakfast Creek within 10m of the high-water mark be provided as publicly accessible open space.</p> <p>Section 4.4(i) of the Implementation Strategy outlines EDQ's commitment to overseeing the future transfer of the land to BCC as a consequence of any new development approval. Once the transfer has taken effect, its use for markets and other activities will ultimately be at the discretion of BCC as the landowner.</p>	No
<b>PDA-wide criteria</b>			
<b>2.5.8 Flood</b>			
34.	<p>Coastal hazards as indicated in City Plan 2014 show storm tide inundation within the PDA, particularly within Perry Park and the</p>	<p>Section 2.5.8 of the development scheme requires development in a flood hazard area or coastal hazard area to avoid, minimise and mitigate the impacts associated with the hazard.</p>	No

#	Summary of issue	Response	Amendment required?
	<p>industrial zone.</p> <p>In addition to the Flood overlay code, future development in those areas mapped as subject to storm tide inundation should also be assessed against City Plan 2014 Coastal hazard overlay code.</p>	<p>Footnote 29 already references both:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City Plan 2014 flood overlay code, and</li> <li>• City Plan 2014 coastal hazards overlay code.</li> </ul>	
<b>PDA-wide criteria</b>			
<b>2.5.9 Managing the impacts of infrastructure</b>			
35.	<p>The development scheme requires development manage the acoustic impacts from events within the showgrounds. A map should be included which identifies the location of development which needs to consider the impacts from events at the Brisbane Showgrounds.</p>	<p>The PDA currently houses multiple entertainment venues in addition to the Brisbane Showgrounds. As a mixed use precinct, the development scheme provides the opportunity for additional entertainment venues to be located within the PDA.</p> <p>A map identifying the impact area may become out of date and is unlikely to be representative of the actual impact areas as entertainment venues commence or cease operations.</p> <p>Instead it is considered appropriate that development near lawfully operating entertainment venues consider the impact of the of these venues and provide a suitable level of acoustic amelioration in response. The extent of development considered to be near entertainment venues will be determined through the development assessment process.</p>	Yes
36.	<p>The Best Street ventilation infrastructure (referred to as QUU's odour control device) has an important network function. The development scheme should reflect this infrastructure though requirements for positioning and design of future development. Future community expectations regarding odour should be managed through, for example, covenants, buffers and building design.</p>	<p>The scheme includes provisions under section 2.5.9.5 to ensure development does not adversely impact on the function of the odour control device and is appropriately designed to mitigate impacts on the amenity of future residents.</p> <p>The scheme also requires that an air quality report be provided as evidence of these outcomes. It is considered that these provisions are appropriate, and no further change is required.</p>	No
<b>Zone provisions</b>			
37.	<p>Support the simplification of zoning provisions throughout the plan.</p>	Support noted.	No
38.	<p>Suggest considering the need for transitional provisions for owners who purchased land based on current scheme provisions or who are seeking to change an existing development approval.</p>	<p>The Bowen Hills Priority Development Area functions under the provisions of the <i>Economic Development Act 2012</i>, which does not provide transitional provisions when a planning instrument changes.</p>	No
39.	<p>Concern that provisions for the zones contain development standards which are different from the codes in City Plan 2014.</p> <p>City Plan 2014 has been the subject to regular updates and contains the most up-to-date standards for development within the city. The proposed zone provisions should be amended to align with the codes of City Plan.</p>	<p>The development scheme seeks to, where possible, reflect the structure and terminology of City Plan 2014. However, the development requirements for each zone have been crafted to reflect the specific development constraints and opportunities of the PDA to ensure quality development outcomes suited to the locational characteristics of Bowen Hills.</p>	No
40.	<p>Suggest the building set-backs, separations and other urban design</p>	<p>The building envelope provisions in the development scheme have been purposefully</p>	Yes



#	Summary of issue	Response	Amendment required?
	features are consistent with the provisions of the Transport air quality corridor overlay code and the transport air quality corridor planning scheme policy, especially regarding the avoidance of the 'street canyon' effect.	prepared to provide a place specific design solution which facilitates both new urban development and ventilation of road corridors.  City Plan's transport air quality corridor overlay and overlay code are referenced in section 2.5.9.5 of the scheme.  NOTE: Section 2.5.9.5 has been retitled Air quality to better represent its broader application.	
<b>Zone provisions</b>			
41.	The proposed zone plan does include all land intended to be future parkland in the open space zone. Suggest that land along Breakfast Creek as noted in section 2.5.7.2 of the development scheme is included in the open space zone.  The structure plan on page 14 of the development scheme should consider identifying these areas as open space.	EDQ is committed to facilitating the transfer of a 10m corridor of land along Breakfast Creek to BCC as a consequence of any new development approvals in this area. Once the transfer has taken effect, it will be suitable to prepare an amendment to the zone plan to include the land in the open space zone.	No
42.	Suggest that EDQ undertake a built form assessment to ensure that the maximum plot ratios specified, align with the built form provisions i.e. maximum heights, minimum setbacks, maximum site cover etc.	In preparing the development scheme amendment EDQ undertook built form and massing studies to ensure the building envelope provisions were appropriate and could be achieved within the allowable development yield for the site. These studies confirmed that the development yields were achievable within the allowable building envelope.	No
43.	Suggest that the development scheme allow energy generation, cool roofs and green roofs in mixed use, high density and medium density residential zones providing these do not have negative amenity impacts on sensitive habitable spaces (e.g. excessive reflections from a white roof on nearby bedrooms).	This matter has been addressed through the PDA-wide criteria under section 2.5.4 Sustainable developments. Requirements for rooftop communal open are specific to each zone and are dealt with in detail with in the applicable zone provisions.	No
<b>Zone provisions</b>			
Medium density residential zone			
44.	Objection to the zone's building height limit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>building heights of 4 storeys on Cintra Road are out of character with the development form outside of the PDA namely land zoned CR2 (Character Residential 2 storey) east of Cintra Road, and</li> <li>development will overshadow existing low-rise development.</li> </ul> Suggestion that the building height limited to 2 storeys.  Objection to the absolute limit on building heights for the medium density residential zone.  One submission requested	The 4 storey building height is considered a suitable approach to manage the transition of building heights to property: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>outside the PDA on the east of Cintra Road, and</li> <li>in the high density residential zone to the west on Abbotsford Road</li> </ul> Response to the submission about the absolute limit placed on building heights in the high and medium density residential zones is provided in item 2.	No

#	Summary of issue	Response	Amendment required?
	allowance for greater building heights in the medium density residential zones where a project demonstrates exemplary development outcomes and was proximate to public transport.		
45.	Concern that boarding houses are permitted in the medium density residential zone.	<p>The preferred development intent for the medium density residential zone requires development to be compatible with the residential character of the street and surrounding buildings. Uses such as rooming accommodation are considered appropriate for the area where this intent is achieved.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, the development scheme amendment as notified permitted the carrying out of a self-assessable material change of use for rooming accommodation where not involving building work. This provision has been removed to ensure a change of use would require assessment against the development scheme including consideration for how the proposal demonstrates compatibility with the residential street and surrounding buildings.</p>	Yes
<b>Zone provisions</b>			
<b>High density residential zone</b>			
46.	<p>Suggestion that the building height on Abbotsford road should be decreased to 4 storeys.</p> <p>Objection to the absolute limit on building heights for the medium and high density residential zone.</p> <p>One submission requested allowance for greater building heights in the high density residential zones where a project demonstrates exemplary development outcomes and was proximate to public transport.</p>	<p>The 4 storey building height is considered a suitable approach to manage the transition of building heights to property:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mixed use zone to the west of Abbotsford Road where building heights of 30 storeys are achievable, and</li> <li>in the medium density residential zone to the east on Cintra Road.</li> </ul> <p>Response to the submission about the absolute limit placed on building heights in the high and medium density residential zones is provided in item 2.</p>	No
47.	Seek amendment to the zone intent to recognise existing lawful uses. Propose adding new map for existing lawful uses with reference to a new schedule - Schedule 6 Lawful use register.	Section 78 of the <i>Economic Development Act 2012</i> ensures that existing lawful uses of premises are protected following the adoption of an amendment to a development instrument.	No
<b>Zone provisions</b>			
<b>Mixed use zone</b>			
48.	<p>Concern with the maximum building height of 30 storeys on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>it will dilute the primacy of the City Plan's principal centre zone (city centre precinct)</li> <li>it will result in an inappropriate transition to adjoining areas of character which have much lower height limits, and</li> <li>it is unclear what community benefit will result from development of this scale (noting limited</li> </ul>	<p>The mixed use zone provides for a range of building heights dependent on lot size.</p> <p>The sliding scale of building heights within the mixed use zone incentivises the amalgamation of land to form consolidated development sites. Larger sites are more suitable to accommodate sufficient space for carparking, building services, tower separations between buildings and enabling the penetration of natural light and breezes. Larger sites are also better able to deliver significant communal open space which caters for the building occupants.</p> <p>Building heights within the city centre are significantly greater than allowable within the Bowen Hills PDA, and in many areas are limited only by the Airport Obstacle Limitation Surface.</p>	No

#	Summary of issue	Response	Amendment required?
	<p>additional open space is proposed in the PDA beyond what is provided for in the current development scheme).</p>	<p>The mixed use zone's building height provisions, ranging between 8 and 30 storeys, are not considered to be of a scale which would compete with the primacy of the city centre precinct.</p> <p>A building height of 30 storeys is only allowable on sites greater than 3,000 m<sup>2</sup>. Lesser building heights of 8, 16 and 24 storeys are may be accommodated within the mixed use zone on lots less than 3,000 m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>The mixed use zone within the PDA adjoins land external to the PDA that is zoned as mixed use or low impact industry. Buildings of varying height between 8 and 30 storeys may be appropriately co-located without transitional zoning.</p> <p>Other land adjoining the mixed use zone, outside the PDA include the RBWH and mixed use zoned land under City Plan 2014 which provides for various building heights between 5, 8, 20, 25 and 30 storeys.</p>	
49.	<p>Concern with the sliding scale of allowable plot ratio and maximum height on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consolidation of land ownership creates a coarse-grain built environment which tends to exclude smaller developers and businesses and decreases diversity and interest of the area.</li> <li>The controls are set up in such a manner that the implied larger building typology will be four storey podium and tower. There are other building typologies which can provide high density mixed-use environments providing housing and commercial diversity together with market flexibility.</li> </ul> <p>It is suggested to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>include controls to retain some fine grain-built environment within the mixed-used area to add economic and social diversity and resilience into Bowen Hills</li> <li>explore built form controls that do not preclude other high density mixed-use typologies (e.g. perimeter blocks, Vancouver model, Japanese superblocks, etc.) from being proposed. For example, for perimeter blocks there could be a provision to allow for a maximum height of eight storeys, approximately 24</li> </ul>	<p>The sliding scale of development yield and building heights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>incentivises the amalgamation of fragmented land that characterizes the Bowen Hills PDA</li> <li>facilitate variation of building height and yield depended on lot size</li> <li>does not preclude the development of smaller sites, provides design parameters for high density development on lots as small as 800 m<sup>2</sup>, and</li> <li>ensures that development sites are appropriately sized to accommodate their permitted yield.</li> </ul> <p>The built form provisions do promote a podium and tower building typology. This building typology is promoted as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>it delivers a human scale podium addressing and giving casual surveillance to the street and public realm</li> <li>it delivers a consistent interface with the street and public realm, contributing to a sense of place and face</li> <li>facilitates delivery of key urban design elements such as awnings over footpaths and addressed street frontages, and</li> <li>ensures towers are setback from the street and one another, enhancing environmental conditions on the street with adequate natural light, shading, natural air flow and space for street trees.</li> </ul> <p>The development scheme does not preclude alternative development forms. Development proposals may be considered within the performance based assessment framework of the</p>	No

#	Summary of issue	Response	Amendment required?
	m in height, with a front setback of 3 m.	development scheme.	
50.	<p>Support the reduction in minimum site area for the Mixed-use centre zone (formerly) from 1500 m<sup>2</sup> to 800 m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>Objection to the introduction of an 800 m<sup>2</sup> minimum site area for sites that were not previously subject to a minimum site area requirement in the mixed use zone. The following were cited as reason for the concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many lots in the PDA are less than the minimum 800 m<sup>2</sup> lot size. This forces land amalgamation before any there can be any confidence around development taking place, removing existing development potential for many properties that are owned or controlled in isolation.</li> <li>• The amendment creates financial uncertainty for owners of lots less than 800 m<sup>2</sup>. The proposed amendment does not allow for a genuine mix of housing alternatives. Existing scheme rules should remain for sub-800 m<sup>2</sup> blocks.</li> </ul>	<p>A minimum site area has been included for the mixed use zone to manage the risk of further land fragmentation and encourage development on sites with the capacity to delivery on the high density built form intent for the zone.</p> <p>The development scheme adopts a sliding scale for development yield with smaller sites not provided the same yield potential as larger sites. This recognises that in isolation small sites less than 800 m<sup>2</sup> generally are less able to practically accommodate all the functional requirements of delivering high density development such as boundary setbacks, multiple level carparks and vehicle circulation ramps, building separation distances, communal spaces and facilities, lift wells and emergency fire evacuation stair wells in a built form that is functional and feasible.</p> <p>The provisions incentivise the amalgamation of land to achieve higher development yields and facilitate the practical development of the high rise built forms planned for the PDA. Creating alternative provisions for smaller lots could interfere with this incentive, facilitate inefficient small scale redevelopment investment and potentially further exaggerate land fragmentation which could preclude achieving the planned outcome for the PDA.</p> <p>The development scheme operates a performance based assessment framework. This practical approach will enable some flexibility where development may occur on sites less that 800 m<sup>2</sup> where development will be considered on a case by case circumstance against the outcomes sought by the development scheme.</p>	No
51.	<p>Submissions supportive of the preferred development intent for the mixed use zone.</p> <p>A request was made for health and medical uses to be included within the zone.</p>	<p>Heath and medical uses are generally considered as a suitable type of development within the mixed use zone subject to assessment against the development scheme. The preferred development intent for the zone has been amended to specify health and medical uses.</p>	Yes
52.	<p>Concern with the requirement to deliver communal open space in the mixed use zone at a rate equivalent to 100% of site area for residential development.</p> <p>Submitters cited the following reasons for their concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Competitive disadvantage: development outside the PDA is not required to provide open space equivalent to 100% of site area. Brisbane City Plan requires 5% of site area or 40 m<sup>2</sup>.</li> <li>• Housing affordability: the communal open space requirements will add additional development</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed development scheme seeks to improve the delivery and standard of facilities to support the needs and quality of environments for future residents in new high density development in the PDA.</p> <p>New development within the PDA is afforded the potential to realise significant density, and it is considered suitable that new development provides a commensurate supply of communal facilities on site to meet a portion of resident's recreational needs.</p> <p>EDQ has further modelled options for the delivery of communal open space under a range of possible development scenarios. Through the modelling EDQ refined the requirements for communal open space as follows:</p> <p><i>Development which includes a multiple residential component provides communal open space equivalent to a</i></p>	Yes

#	Summary of issue	Response	Amendment required?
	costs and will result in housing affordability impacts.	<p><i>minimum of 80% of the site area or 15% of the multiple residential Gross Floor Area.</i></p> <p>This requirement is considered a reasonable balance between ensuring a high-quality development outcome which responds to the projected population while ensuring that the scheme does not unreasonably constrain development across a broad range of scenarios.</p> <p>It is also acknowledged that requirements for communal open space may place an additional cost on development, however that magnitude of the cost will depend on the level of embellishment that developers choose to include as part of a new development.</p>	
53.	Concern with the minimum 12 m <sup>2</sup> required private open space for multiple residential units is too much. Submitters reasoned that private open space should scale proportionate to dwelling size.	<p>EDQ acknowledges the use profile, and therefore the minimum size of private open space, shares a relationship with the size of the dwelling and its likely number of occupants.</p> <p>The development scheme has been amended to require residential development provide private open space at the following rates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 bedroom dwellings – 9 m<sup>2</sup> with a minimum dimension of 3 m, and</li> <li>• 2 or 3 bedroom dwellings – 12 m<sup>2</sup> with a minimum dimension of 3 m.</li> </ul>	Yes
54.	Concern that the maximum building height of 30 storeys for the mixed use zone does not reflect the building height of the approved Exhibition Quarter development. The maximum building height should be increased to 40 storeys.	<p>The 'Exhibition Quarter' site was approved (DEV2010/047) by EDQ to host 40 storey building heights through a demonstration of sufficient grounds which was required as the 30 storey height limits in the current development scheme were proposed to be exceeded. The increased building heights outcomes can be pursued in accordance with the conditions of this existing development approval.</p> <p>It should be noted that the development scheme does not undermine the validity of any current PDA development approvals. Development may be carried out in accordance with an existing PDA development approval without consideration for the amended development scheme within the nominated approval currency period.</p> <p>It is not considered suitable to embed a higher building height within the development scheme itself for the Exhibition Quarter site, as this would enable proposals for higher building heights without the requirement to demonstrate sufficient grounds.</p>	No
55.	Concern that the Kings Co-Op site should be located within the mixed use zone to better reflect the PDA development approval (DEV2010/047) in place for the Brisbane Showgrounds.	It is recognised that the part of the Kings Co-Op site that is RNA Leasehold land (site 1.05) should be included within the mixed use zone to better reflect the nature and scale of development envisaged by the approved development for the site.	Yes
56.	Concern that the building envelope provisions are highly prescriptive and pose a significant challenge for the development of smaller sites.  The requirement for a 3 m front setback for external walls up to 4	<p>The front setback requirements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the 3 m setback at ground floor is a deliberate urban design technique to improve streetscape and pedestrian outcomes by providing spaces for outdoor dining, street furniture,</li> </ul>	No

#	Summary of issue	Response	Amendment required?
	<p>storeys and 6 m setback above has the consequence of reducing variation and articulation in the building facade. The prescriptive nature of the development scheme means that alternative approaches to achieve variation to in the façade would not comply with the development scheme. It is requested that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• wall encroachments which provide articulation be allowed within the street setback area, and</li> <li>• the street frontage setback requirements be amended to differentiate between balcony and wall setbacks above four storeys to allow 3 m setback to balconies and 6 m setback to external walls.</li> </ul> <p>The requirement for 9m side setback does not allow for a feasible building envelope on lots 1200-1600 m<sup>2</sup>. As an example, a 1500 m<sup>2</sup> lot with a dimension of 30 m by 50 m would require a tower width of 12 m. The scheme acknowledges reduced side setbacks are required for sites less than 1200 m<sup>2</sup> it is requested that the minimum side setback requirement for lots over 1200 m<sup>2</sup> be reduced also.</p>	<p>landscaping, building entries, human movement and informal activation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 3 m setback to the external wall above ground to the 4<sup>th</sup> floor provides for built form variation and articulation and creates an improved relationship between the public realm and the built environment.</li> <li>• The 6 m setback above the podium provides for building form variation between tower and podium elements, the creation of podium top private or communal open space and minimizing overshadowing to the public realm and streetscape environment.</li> </ul> <p>The 9 m side setbacks for sites greater than 1200 m<sup>2</sup> (buildings taller than 8 storeys) are planned to ensure the adequate separation of buildings which maximises access to light, promotes air circulation, minimises overshadowing and maximises amenity and privacy for both occupants and neighbours. A reduction in these setbacks is not considered appropriate as it will impact the development potential of adjoining sites, detract from the quality of the urban environment (private and public realms) and detract from the amenity of future occupants.</p> <p>The development scheme operates as a performance-based plan, whereby development must achieve the outcomes of the provisions in circumstances where the particular quantitative measures are not met.</p>	
57.	Support the application and provisions of the mixed-use zone for the Citilink Site (153 Campbell Street), given the site's position on Bowen Bridge Road and opposite the Royal Brisbane Hospital.	Support is noted	No
<b>Zone provisions</b>			
<b>Industrial zone</b>			
58.	Concern that communal open space in industrial development is not will utilised by employees and becomes a liability. The requirement for communal open space in industrial development should not be mandatory.	The requirements to provide communal open space in the industrial zone have been removed. The need for onsite recreational space for employees in this zone is likely to be very low.	Yes
59.	Concern that side boundary setbacks above two storeys and wall articulations have the potential to place an unnecessary burden on development and increase the construction costs.	It is envisaged that development within the industrial zone will largely consist low impact industry, service industry, warehousing, research and technology industry and showrooms at ground floor with opportunities for ancillary offices above. The setback requirements apply only to the upper levels and are intended to provide appropriate building separations and to enable light and ventilation to penetrate into upper levels of buildings on the premise or neighboring lots. These setbacks are considered appropriate for 3 or 4 storey industrial building typologies.	No
60.	Submission that waterfront land along Breakfast Creek should be	At this time, it is appropriate to retain the industrial zone on land north of Allison Street to ensure the	No



#	Summary of issue	Response	Amendment required?
	<p>zoned residential or mixed-use with an activated creek frontage. Zoning of this land as industry is a waste of prime waterfront land and is a missed opportunity to increase Brisbane's liveability and attraction. The waterfront should connect with the Enoggera Bikeway around the creek edge from Byne's Paddock park to Newstead house and beyond.</p>	<p>availability of land for industrial businesses which provide vital employment and services to inner city residents and business. Zoning additional land for mixed use or residential, would reduce the availability of strategic industrial land, negatively impacting the economic capability and performance of Brisbane and remove opportunity for new investment in innovative enterprise.</p> <p>The proposed development scheme requires that land along the Breakfast Creek be provided for public open space (section 2.5.7.2). Its use as a public space and potential bikeway can be undertaken in future as land progressively is transferred to BCC ownership.</p>	
61.	<p>Concern that the unified landholding of 49 Allison Street and 157 Abbotsford Road has been split between the industrial zone and mixed industry and business zone. Request that the entire landholding be included in the mixed industry and business zone based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it has been a consolidated land holding since 2007, with historic development approvals linking the sites together</li> <li>• the split zoning results in the isolation of a single 10 m wide, 427 m<sup>2</sup> lot which would not be viable for redevelopment as a standalone parcel of land, and</li> <li>• the majority (approximately 28 m) of the landholdings street frontage is addressing Allison Street where the remainder of properties on that street are including in the mixed industry and business zone.</li> </ul>	<p>The zoning of the entire landholding will be amended to mixed industry and business to better recognise the practical effect of the land being in one ownership.</p>	Yes
<p><b>Zone provisions</b> Mixed industry and business zone</p>			
62.	<p>Concern for the change of zoning from Industrial to mixed industry and business area on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic Inner City Industrial Areas (SICIAs) are required to accommodate projected demand for industrial land.</li> <li>• The allowable building heights and development yield for the mixed industry and business area will encourage the use of land for commercial and business uses increasing competition for traditional</li> </ul>	<p>The mixed industry and business zone maintains opportunity for a broad range of service industry, low impact industry, research and technology industry, showroom, warehouse and other enterprise uses that are traditionally accommodated on industrial zone land.</p> <p>The mixed industry and business zone also recognises the evolving industrial enterprise sector and that ancillary office components and various sized premise typologies are desirable to cater for emerging industrial enterprise trends.</p> <p>Greater building height and development yields have the potential to facilitate new forms of innovative industrial uses which leverage their locational advantage, leading to greater employment generation and economic</p>	No

#	Summary of issue	Response	Amendment required?
	industrial uses.	development.	
63.	Seek clarification on the mixed industry and business zone front setback. Setback up to four storeys, can be zero metre whereas the minimum setback at ground floor is 3 m. Effectively this would allow for up to three storeys to be cantilevered over the ground floor.	A 3 m ground level setback is required to provide an improved ground level pedestrian and public realm outcome. Front entries to all buildings activate the street frontage and are emphasised through architectural and landscape treatment, pedestrian paths and the provision of continuous awnings.	No
64.	Suggest that residential uses not be prohibited uses for the mixed industry and business zone. Allowance should be made for them to be assessed on their merit at the time an application is made. It is considered that the intent for the mixed industry and business zone could be amended to provide consideration for future residential uses, if reverse amenity impacts from the adjoining industrial zoned land inside and outside the PDA can be managed.	Prohibition of residential also clarifies the intent for the mixed industry and business zone to accommodate industrial and business enterprise. The allowance for additional residential uses would undermine this intent.  Residential uses also have been prohibited to manage the potential for reverse amenity concerns upon the on-going operation of essential industrial uses within the PDA.  It is considered that there is a sufficient supply of land available in the mixed use zone, high density residential zone and medium density residential zone to cater for long term demand for a wide range of housing typologies.	No
65.	Concern that the proposed scheme does not represent an appropriate outcome for 16-18 Thompson Street. The site has significant opportunities to realise the vision for the PDA and a specific land use intent should be established to facilitate a greater mix of employment generating uses on the site and catalyse renewal and investment in the area.  Options should be considered including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>changing the zone from mixed industry and business area to mixed use and including a precinct to manage the unique characteristics of the area</li> <li>extending the mixed use zone further north, or</li> <li>amending the mixed industry and business zoning to deliver a broader mix of uses and increased density to incentivise development.</li> </ul>	A significant supply of mixed use zoned land has been provided in the Bowen Hills PDA in strategic locations surrounding high frequency public transport nodes to cater for long term demand for residential use. It is considered that this supply of mixed use zoned land is sufficient at this time to cater for forecast development demand.  The mixed industry and business zone provides a finite and vital supply of land focused for enterprise and employment generating purposes. This land supply is strategically significant: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>with the intention for business investment and job creation</li> <li>being located adjacent to an agglomeration of industrial land</li> <li>being located less than 4 km from the CBD and with access to a significant workforce</li> <li>with direct connection to the Inner City Bypass and other major arterial road networks.</li> </ul> Changing the zone of this land to Mixed-use Is not supported at this time as it would reduce the availability of strategically located land for focused employment generating uses.	No
<b>Zone provisions</b>			
Sport and recreation zone			
66.	Suggest the corner of Abbotsford Road and Edmonstone Road should be recognised as an important corner similar to Abbotsford Road and Folkestone Street.	There is no unique role for a landmark built form, public art installation, street furniture or specialized landscaping treatments identified for the intersection of Abbotsford Road and Edmonstone Road. Further provisions within the development scheme are not considered to be warranted.	No
<b>Zone provisions</b>			
Open space zone			



#	Summary of issue	Response	Amendment required?
67.	Concern that the range of uses permitted in the open space zone is limited. Additional uses and associated facilities such as non-organised single sporting facilities, outdoor cultural and educational facilities, public swimming pools, outdoor courts and parkland, and sports grounds are appropriate.	<p>Land zoned as open space includes Bowen Park, Jeays Street Park and Hurworth Street Park.</p> <p>The preferred development intent for the zone refers to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>...<i>'catering for a full range of publicly accessible outdoor recreation, informal sport or events on a casual basis and the facilities and embellishments associated with these,,and</i></li> <li>...<i>ancillary facilities support the primary intent of the zone for recreation and informal sporting uses and are compatible in scale, bulk, design and character of a park'</i>.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, the sport and recreation zone (Perry Park) caters for a broader range of uses such as those listed in the submission.</p> <p>The outcomes envisaged for the open space zone and the Sport and recreation zone are collectively considered able to cater for the submitters comments.</p>	No
68.	Suggest that additional provisions be included within the open space zone to ensure the impacts of major infrastructure barriers within the site (railway lines, road ramps, busy roads) are considered.	The open space zone has limited interface with major infrastructure. Additional provisions are not considered necessary.	No
<b>Zone provisions</b>			
<b>Special purpose (transport) zone</b>			
69.	Allow for air rights over infrastructure corridors to provide for efficient and direct access to the Exhibition Railway Station through precinct 2.	<p>Section 2.6.8.1 Preferred Development Intent for the Special Purpose (transport zone) states:</p> <p><i>Opportunities for building over infrastructure within the special purpose (transport) zone are facilitated, where compliance with the provisions of the zone immediately adjoining the Special Purpose (transport) zone can be demonstrated.</i></p> <p>Opportunities for building over infrastructure would be explored on a case by case basis in consultation with the asset owner.</p>	No
<b>Zone provisions</b>			
<b>Special purpose (entertainment) zone</b>			
70.	Strongly support this creation of this zone to cover the core of the Brisbane Showgrounds given it establishes an expectation that the site comprises events and entertainment uses.	Support is noted.	No
71.	Concern that the preferred development intent does not adequately reflect the use of the Brisbane Showgrounds for events other than the Ekka throughout the year.  The preferred development intent should be amended to greater	It is acknowledged that the Brisbane Showgrounds operates as an events venue throughout the year. The preferred development intent for the zone has been amended to better reflect this outcome.	Yes

#	Summary of issue	Response	Amendment required?
	reflect the use of the Brisbane Showgrounds for other events.		
72.	Support the intent for a visual and functional relationship between the Brisbane Showgrounds and the Old Queensland Museum. This should acknowledge the operational limitations and heritage values of both sites.	Support is noted. Heritage limitations of the site are appropriately dealt with through the zone provisions and PDA wide criteria.	No
73.	It is suggested that the scheme include a map showing the important views and vistas referred to in the preferred development intent for the special purpose (entertainment) zone.	The benefit of specifying significant heritage views and vistas within the development scheme is acknowledged, these views and vistas have been listed under in the precinct 2 urban design provisions.	Yes
74.	Concern that the amenity requirements for the zone are inappropriate given the onus is placed on the Brisbane Showgrounds to manage its impacts on surrounding residential areas. The onus should be on new development to be treated in a way that ensures the legal operating rights of the Brisbane Showgrounds are not affected.	The amenity requirements for the specialised centre (entertainment) zone require that new buildings be designed to mitigate their impacts on adjoining development. These provisions do not have effect on the existing lawful operations of the Brisbane Showgrounds.  Section 2.5.9.3 of the development scheme recognises the lawful operation of the Brisbane Showgrounds and requires that new development for a residential use minimise noise impacts from the Brisbane Showgrounds.	No
<b>Levels of assessment for zones</b>			
75.	Concern that self-assessable development cannot be undertaken on both a heritage place and on land adjoining a heritage place. This is an onerous requirement given that self-assessable development can only be undertaken where no building work is proposed. This approach is inconsistent with BCC's City Plan which only triggers an application where a Material Change of Use for a new building, or an extension to an existing building is proposed.	It is acknowledged that a material change of use, not involving building work on a property adjoining a heritage building would not adversely impact on the significance of the heritage place.	Yes
76.	Concern that development outcomes in the proposed amendment are linked to outdated overlay mapping. By way of example BCC has not updated its overlay mapping to reflect trunk infrastructure works carried out in the Brisbane Showgrounds. It is inappropriate for development to be excluded from the self-assessable development category because it is located within a BCC overlay.	It is acknowledged that the BCC flood overlay mapping does not reflect stormwater works carried within the Brisbane Showgrounds. However, it is considered that the existing PDA development approval (DEV2010/047) for the Brisbane Showgrounds provides for a change of use to be carried out without relying on the self-assessable change of use provisions established in the development scheme amendment.  It is not considered appropriate to remove references to council overlay mapping which are generally accurate for broader areas of the PDA.	No
77.	Approved uses for the Brisbane Showgrounds should be recognised as appropriate uses	Appropriate uses may be carried out as a self-assessable change of use, without the need to obtain a PDA development approval. While the uses approved for the Brisbane Showgrounds support the preferred development intent for the zones, the listing of these uses as appropriate uses would enable a change of use to occur without any requirement to obtain a compliance endorsement in accordance with the conditions of	Yes

#	Summary of issue	Response	Amendment required?
		<p>approval</p> <p>While it is not considered necessary that the list of appropriate uses be amended, the development scheme has been amended to improve the clarity regarding a self-assessable change of use for an appropriate use.</p> <p>It is also noted that the development scheme does not undermine the validity of current approvals. Development may be carried out in accordance with an existing approval without being constrained by the development scheme.</p>	
78.	Suggest that the levels of assessment table should be amended to impose a floor space restriction for an office, similar to how there is a limit in City Plan 2014, in order to ensure it remains an ancillary use.	The existing PDA development approval (DEV2010/047) limits the extent of private development within the Brisbane Showgrounds. Additional restrictions on the provision of office space are not required to manage development in the Brisbane Showgrounds.	No
79.	<p>Suggest further clarification for interim uses be provided to give certainty to existing owners within the PDA.</p> <p>There appears to be no scenario where any level of building work for a preferred use can be undertaken without application to EDQ and further scrutiny of the interim nature of such a proposal.</p> <p>It is requested that parameters be devised to enable certainty around accepted development involving building work. This may include limitation on additional GFA or building height for interim development, but at the very least must provide a degree of certainty around development permitted in the interim.</p>	<p>The development scheme provides for a material change of use for an appropriate use involving only minor building work to be carried out as self-assessable development in particular circumstances. It is appropriate that in instances where these circumstances are not met, the development be subject to assessment by EDQ against the development scheme and considered on its merits.</p> <p>Regard will also be had to section 2.2.9 of the scheme which establishes the relevant considerations for the assessment of an interim use.</p>	No
<b>Precinct 1</b>			
80.	Support the incorporation of a bus interchange adjoining the Bowen Hills train Station.	Noted	No
81.	Further detail is sought regarding the tenure and land use intent for the land identified as closed road area.	Road closures are intended to be processed under section 124 of the <i>Economic Development Act 2012</i> . The closed road is intended to be converted to freehold land and vested to Economic Development Queensland. It is intended that the newly created land be redeveloped as part of the mixed use zone.	No
82.	<p>Support for the planning of park at the corner of Mayne road and Hudd Street.</p> <p>Support for introduction of a plaza west of Mayne road.</p> <p>Request for flexibility regarding the size and location of the identified park and plaza. Opportunities for innovative approaches to providing open space should be supported. Including on top of basement or in conjunction with an at-grade or</p>	<p>EDQ as the PDA planning authority is committed to ensuring the delivery of additional public open space within the Bowen Hills PDA. Significant additional development is proposed within precinct 1 and at present there is a limited amount of public open space to support future residents, employees and visitors.</p> <p>The proposed location of public open space at the junction of Hudd Street and Mayne Street has been selected to respond to the land use, place making, build form and road layout outcomes proposed for Precinct 1. Its location ensures the</p>	No

#	Summary of issue	Response	Amendment required?
	<p>underground plaza.</p> <p>It is requested that Map 8 be amended to remove the park and relocate the plaza and public realm nodes to the south west corner of the intersection of Mayne road and western extension of Hudd Street. It is requested that the active frontage treatment be amended to reflect the removal of the park.</p>	<p>public space will have good level of solar access, contribute to the streetscape amenity, utility and vitality of Hudd Street and Mayne Road as a key activity centre for the PDA.</p> <p>Development applications in the PDA that propose the delivery of alternative, additional or innovative public realm outcomes and will be assessed on the merit on a case by case scenario.</p>	
83.	<p>A civic plaza next to the Bowen Hills railway station is mentioned in table 3 (page 62) but is not included within the Precinct. From an urban design perspective, a public station forecourt plaza is a good outcome to improve the civic qualities of this transport node.</p>	<p>A pedestrian concourse as described in Precinct 1 plan is the desired outcome for this civic space adjoining the Bowen Hills station.</p> <p>References to the civic space in table 3 have been amended to refer to this space as a pedestrian concourse.</p>	Yes
84.	<p>Support the incorporation of a cross block link along the western side of the railway corridor.</p> <p>Support for the overall future street network including pedestrian cross block links.</p> <p>Suggest that map 8 be amended to remove the cross-block link west of Mayne Road to the Tufton street extension. The proposed cross-block link between Mayne Road and the extension of Tufton Street is not required and due to topology of the land would require a complex and expensive design arrangement to achieve.</p>	<p>Cross block links are important parts of urban environments and improve walkability, connectivity, permeability, amenity, utility and convenience for pedestrians of all abilities. The proposed cross block link between Mayne Road and Tufton Street is required to ensure that the significant scale of high density urban development planned for Precinct 1 is permeable for pedestrian human movements.</p> <p>The development scheme operates as a performance based plan. The final location of cross block links may be resolved through the development assessment process having regard to the outcomes sought.</p>	No
85.	<p>Support for the extension of Hazelmount Street and the closure of Jamieson Street.</p> <p>Concern with the proposed extension of Edgar Street and Hazelmount Street. The precinct plan is considered to be too rigid, and as a result will unnecessarily dissect private land holdings by favouring vehicular traffic. Provisions that promote permeability across the site can still be inbuilt as performance criteria. Amend Map 8 to remove proposed new roads (Edgar street extension and Hazelmount extension).</p>	<p>Road network planning in precinct 1 has been revised from the 2009 Development Scheme which determined that the delivery of the Jamison Street and Edmonstone Street connections were not feasible due to physical constraints. Alternate road networks that could feasibly be delivered required planning.</p> <p>The Hazelmount Street extension is planned as the most suitable substitute between Hudd Street and Campbell Street providing a vital north-south vehicle and pedestrian connection that facilitates access to new development and permeability (pedestrian and vehicle) through the precinct. Hazelmount Street extension will be retained.</p> <p>The Edgar Street extension was established in the 2009 Development Scheme and its future delivery has been facilitated by EDQ through development approval DEV2014/622. Edgar Street extension is an important vehicle and pedestrian connection that facilitates access and permeability through development in the precinct and will be retained.</p>	No
86.	<p>Concern with the introduction of a new vehicle bridge between Mayne Road and Abbotsford Road (support active travel access).</p>	<p>The Hudd Street extension across the rail line is part of a strategically significant transport infrastructure strategy for the PDA. The Hudd Street extension (bridge):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• will provide for greatly improved</li> </ul>	No

#	Summary of issue	Response	Amendment required?
		<p>pedestrian and cyclist access and connectivity to the Bowen Hills rail station</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is required to cater for the additional volume of traffic the will be generated by significant scale of development planned for the precinct, and</li> <li>connects to the proposed Tufton Street extension which will provide a vital vehicular bypass from the Campbell Street-Hamilton Place-Brookes Street-O'Connell Terrace link.</li> </ul> <p>This bridge is part of an important alternate road linkage which will reduce congestion and enable improved pedestrian and cyclist pathways through the heart of the PDA along the Campbell Street-Hamilton Place-Brookes Street-O'Connell Terrace link.</p>	
87.	Concern that the precinct map and legend are hard to read. Additional street names and missing symbology should be added to the precinct map.	Additional street names and missing symbology have been added to the plan.	Yes
88.	Suggest that development that integrates with the Bowen Hills Railway Station provides substantial improvements to the station itself, station access and the station's interface with the public realm.	Upgrades to the Bowen Hills Railway Station will be planned and delivered by the Department of Transport and Main Roads.	No
89.	Concern with traffic issues and connectivity through the precinct. Brookes Street has a posted speed limit of 60 kph and is affected by RNA road closures.	Planned upgrades to Brookes Street will seek to improve pedestrian and cyclist conditions, streetscape amenity and road safety. Detailed planning of Brookes Street upgrades will be undertaken in consultation with BCC who is responsible for establishing speed limits on local roads.	No
90.	Support for railway station and corridor upgrades. Any additional land take requirements should be specified to ensure development does not preclude future rail upgrades.	Specific rail corridor requirements are not yet determined. Section 2.5.9 of the development scheme deals with development in a railway environment and refers to the State Development Assessment Provisions and Development Assessment Mapping System (DAMS). This reference is considered sufficient to capture future railway corridor widenings.	No
91.	Suggest that high level design guidance should be provided for land north of Hudd Street on the east and west side for the rail line. Design guidance should seek to maximise the opportunities for Transit Orientated Development and for 'stitching' the eastern and western sides of the rail corridor. It is also an opportunity to further enhance a network of high quality public open spaces.	<p>While the development scheme does not preclude these outcomes, it is not considered practical to require that development must connect land north of Hudd Street on the east and western sides of the rail line.</p> <p>Existing development approvals, fragmented land ownerships and resolving complex development issues for building over rail corridors make such a requirement onerous and may in effect deter new development proposals.</p>	No
<b>Precinct 2</b>			
92.	It is suggested that additional street names and symbology be added to the precinct map to improve the readability between the text and	Amendments to include additional street names and symbology have been made.	Yes

#	Summary of issue	Response	Amendment required?
	map.		
93.	<p>Suggest that the scheme provide for safe crossing points and direct and efficient pedestrian movement between the Bowen Hills and Herston Quarter through improved pedestrian connectivity between Exhibition Station and Herston Road and between the RBWH busway and O'Connell Terrace.</p>	<p>Pedestrian connectivity from the future Exhibition Station to the RBWH and Herston Quarter is provided for via a network of existing and planned pathways through the Brisbane Showgrounds and Bowen Park, along O'Connell Terrace and across Bowen Bridge Road signaled intersections.</p> <p>Other access arrangements may be facilitated through delivery of station upgrades planned as part of the Cross River Rail project.</p>	No
94.	<p>Objections to the proposed cross block link between Costin Street and Constance Street. Submissions cited the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The cross-block link doesn't provide a useful connection and there is no meaningful origin or destination.</li> <li>• The cross-block link will impact negatively on property values.</li> <li>• The cross-block link creates uncertainty for potential purchasers limiting its capacity to be delivered.</li> </ul>	<p>The cross block link has been proposed to improve pedestrian connectivity and walkability within the precinct.</p> <p>Its proposed alignment provides direct connectivity through to the newly created Carriage Street and the King Street precinct of the Brisbane Showgrounds which is the local activity centre providing retail, commercial and entertainment services to the surrounding community.</p> <p>The crossblock link will enhance the pedestrian permeability through an otherwise unbroken block length of 200 m on the southern side of Costin Street from Gregory Terrace to Water Street.</p> <p>To deliver a safe and functional cross-block link it is important that the cross-block link be integrated into an appropriately sized development in this vicinity.</p> <p>The development scheme has been adjusted to remove the mapped location and rely on the item being listed in the precinct's connectivity provisions.</p> <p>This will allow EDQ to resolve the final form and location of this cross-block link to be as part of a future development assessment process for land between Water Street and Gregory Terrace.</p> <p>The scheme will require the cross-block links to be delivered in the vicinity of Carriage Street providing a connection toward King Street.</p> <p>Additional detail has been added to the Implementation Strategy to detail how EDQ will engage with applicants to provide cross-block links, including where larger development forms are proposed.</p>	Yes
95.	<p>It is suggested that the rail and bus interchange located adjacent the Exhibition Railway Station on O'Connell Terrace be removed or its composition and impact on the Brisbane Showgrounds be clarified. It is unclear what purpose the infrastructure is serving given its proximity to the RBWH Busway Station, Bowen Hills Rail Station, Fortitude Valley Station and upgraded Exhibition Railway Station.</p> <p>Other submissions supported identification of the bus interchange.</p>	<p>The bus interchange is a future bus stop intended to provide for public transport servicing and opportunity for inter-modal transfers at Exhibition Station.</p> <p>The interchange will be included within the road design of O'Connell Terrace. The development scheme has been amended to describe the bus interchange as a bus stop to avoid confusion regarding the intent for the infrastructure.</p>	Yes
96.	The identification of the southern	O'Connell Terrace serves an important pedestrian	No



#	Summary of issue	Response	Amendment required?
	<p>side of O'Connell Terrace as an active frontage does not align with the approved development for the site.</p> <p>Concern with the prescriptive setback requirement for O'Connell Terrace given the final design for this frontage has not been finalised.</p> <p>A 4 m property boundary setback will enable separated cycle facilities on road. Any verge widening for active frontages will need to be provided by the development at ground level.</p> <p>On street car parking cannot be accommodated within O'Connell Terrace.</p>	<p>movement role providing east-west connectivity across the PDA and direct publicly accessible linkages to entry points for the RBWH, the future Exhibition Station and the RBWH Busway station. The design of O'Connell Terrace as well as the buildings that front it will need to be considerate of its increasing role as a pedestrian access route.</p> <p>Ground level setbacks have been set to provide adequate space for pedestrian movement, outdoor dining, retail display and place making embellishments such as landscaping, street furniture, public art installations which will improve the amenity of the urban environment.</p> <p>Activated frontage treatments can be achieved through a variety of measures, including providing a high frequency of foyers, front entries, windows or doors to a mix of retail, commercial and community use, articulated building access points and continuous awnings over footpaths. The detail and extent of activation will be resolved as part of the development application process.</p>	
97.	<p>Improved connectivity throughout precinct 2 could be provided by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• additional connections from Exhibition Station to Bowen Bridge Road</li> <li>• direct linkage from Exhibition Station to O'Connell Terrace to access the RBWH and Busway on Bowen Bridge Road, and</li> <li>• direct linkages with Herston Road; QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute, the University of Queensland Herston Campus, Herston Quarter PDA including the new public health facility currently under construction on Herston Road.</li> </ul>	<p>Improved connectivity through the Brisbane Showgrounds and to Exhibition Station is conceptually supported. These connections are reflected in the PDA development approval DEV2010/047 for the Brisbane Showgrounds. The development scheme has been amended to better reflect these connections.</p> <p>Other access arrangements may be facilitated through delivery of upgrades to Exhibition Station as part of the Cross River Rail project.</p> <p>Existing pedestrian crossings provide controlled connectivity between the RBWH and toward the future Exhibition Station at the signalised intersection of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bowen Bridge Road and O'Connell Terrace, and</li> <li>• Bowen Bridge Road and Herston Road.</li> </ul>	Yes
98.	<p>Intersections at the corner of O'Connell Terrace and Bowen Bridge Road; and Herston Road and Bowen Bridge Road should be recognised as significant corners as they act as wayfinding reference points for pedestrians.</p>	<p>Under the development scheme, significant corners are locations for improved ground level building and landscape design which contributes to the identification of Bowen Hills as a distinct destination.</p> <p>No new development is envisaged for property in the PDA at the intersection of Herston Road and Bowen Bridge Road, therefore significant corner treatment is not required.</p> <p>The intersection of O'Connell Terrace and Bowen Bridge Road includes Bowen Park and land not included in Precinct 2, therefore significant corner treatment is not proposed.</p>	No
99.	<p>Suggest that the development scheme provide guidance on the design for Gregory Terrace.</p>	<p>The development scheme includes treatments at the corner of King Street and Gregory Terrace. Streetscape outcomes outside of the footprint of the intersection are to be provided in accordance with the Bowen Hills Infrastructure Planning</p>	No

#	Summary of issue	Response	Amendment required?
		Background Report and RNA Master Plan. These outcomes are considered appropriate for the street character envisaged for Gregory Terrace.	
100	Propose that a cross block link connect Alexandria Street and Exhibition Street.	Exhibition Street and Alexandria Street are separated by a substantial change in grade over a short distance making connectivity between the two streets difficult to deliver and unlikely to provide universal accessibility. Existing approvals over the site do not envisage such a connection. It is not considered necessary to add this additional cross block links at this location.	No
101	Include pedestrian / cycle connection along Costin Street / Constance Street.	Map 2: structure plan and map 9: precinct 2 plan have been amended to identify an active transport route in this location.	Yes
102	Concern about potential development on the northern boundary of the Old Museum site. The Development scheme should only consider redevelopment of the site if it removes the existing poor-quality sheds and does not increase GFA and height above existing structure. Architecture must be sympathetic to the heritage setting.	The protection of the heritage significance of the Old Museum is considered to be appropriately dealt with through the vision and PDA-wide criteria section 2.5.6. Further regulations within the precinct provisions are not necessary to manage heritage values.	No
103	Clarification is sought regarding the wedge site within the Brisbane Showgrounds identified as open space.	The wedge site, known as Alexandria Park, forms part of the public open space provision within the Brisbane Showgrounds and includes the adaptive reuse of Building 8 as a publicly accessible pavilion space. Alexandria Park is also identified in the Development Charges and Offsets Plan (DCOP). Alexandria Park is currently under construction.	No
104	Clarification is sought regarding the rationale for the civic plaza between Bowen Bridge Road and Diggles Close.	The civic plaza in this location reflects public realm outcomes that have been secured through existing PDA development approval at this location. The public realm space includes the refurbished Heritage place (Drill Shed, Care takers cottage and Orderly room) and forecourt area.	No
<b>Infrastructure Plan</b>			
105	All transport infrastructure upgrades within the road reserve are to be agreed with Council, as Council is likely to become the responsible entity.	EDQ will continue to liaise with BCC as the relevant local government for the PDA regarding infrastructure works.	No
106	All pedestrian and cycle connections should be listed under the streets, intersections and active transport categories.	Cross block links may be integrated within developments through a variety of design solutions. The requirement for the delivery of these connections is outlined in the precinct plans. As they are not proposed as dedicated infrastructure items it is not considered appropriate for these items to be listed in the infrastructure plan.	No
107	Concern with the impact of development including the Fortitude Valley School on the capacity of the local road network, particularly Brookes Street.	EDQ has developed a transport model which responds to the growth anticipated through to 2031 within the PDA. Subsequently, EDQ has identified road upgrades which are required to ensure a functioning road network which can accommodate the anticipated traffic volumes. The road upgrades are identified within in the	No



#	Summary of issue	Response	Amendment required?
		Development Scheme in the precinct provisions and infrastructure plan as well as the DCOP.	
108	Concern that the existing 60 kph speed limit on Brookes Street is too high and is unsafe for residents.	Speed limits are determined by BCC as the road authority for the local government area. This comment has been passed onto Brisbane City Council.	No
109	Brookes Street requires public realm improvements to support its function under the development scheme and as a pedestrian connection from the train station to the Fortitude Valley School.	For the parts of Brookes Street that have planned road upgrades (the eastern side of the street), the upgrades are to be provided in accordance with BCC road standards. Brookes Street is currently allocated a City Street Minor category which includes the requirement to provide a street tree every 6 m.	No
110	Consider intersection upgrades at the intersection of Edmondstone Road and Thompson Street to cater for increased traffic from development inside and external to the PDA.	Intersection works for Thompson Street and Edmondstone Road are listed in Table 3 of the infrastructure Plan.  An intersection upgrade is planned for this intersection and is specified in the DCOP.	No
111	Suggest EDQ further investigate utilising the existing road network to achieve the desired vehicle movements whilst placing a stronger emphasis on creating high quality entrances to existing future public transport nodes and enhancing the walkability and cycling opportunities in the precinct.	As part of the development scheme review EDQ has undertaken detailed assessment and planning of the road network to determine how it can be appropriately managed to support its wider network function, pedestrian and cyclist connections, improved urban amenity and ongoing development within the PDA.  EDQ has also examined land use planning and built form design provisions to ensure that development and streetscapes are considered and designed together.  Road infrastructure upgrades listed in the Infrastructure plan are required to support the additional traffic demand from anticipated development within the PDA.	No
112	More detail should be provided regarding the timing for delivery of infrastructure such as the extension of Hudd Street. This would allow landowners to give certainty to tenants and allow future building works to coincide with the delivery of planned infrastructure.	The timing of infrastructure delivery is detailed in the DCOP.	No
113	Suggest widening or treatment of footpaths along Bowen Bridge Road to separate pathways for pedestrians and cyclists	Widening to facilitate upgrades to Bowen Bridge Road have been secured south of Gregory Terrace.  Separated cycleways are not proposed along Bowen Bridge Road beyond the PDA boundary, therefore it is not practical to provide them within the PDA as they have no wider network connection.	No
114	Concern that there is a need safe route from Bowen Bridge Road to RBWH Cycle Centre.	Existing at grade pedestrian crossings at the signaled intersection of Bowen Bridge Road and O'Connell Terrace provide access to the RBWH Cycle Centre.  Access to the RBWH Cycle Centre on the western side of Bowen Bridge Road is not within the boundary of the PDA.	No
<b>Implementation strategy</b>			
115	Suggest that a new section be added to the Implementation	The continued lawful operation of the Brisbane Showgrounds is supported by the development	No

#	Summary of issue	Response	Amendment required?
	strategy which provides greater details on how the Brisbane Showgrounds and its program of events will be protected from inappropriate uses. The objective of this section would be to support the ongoing use of the Brisbane Showgrounds as Brisbane's premier inner-city events venue by ensuring that surrounding mixed use development is designed to minimize impacts from the legal operations of the Brisbane Showgrounds.	<p>scheme through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Specialised centre (entertainment) zone, and</li> <li>PDA wide criteria 2.5.9.3 which requires new residential development manage potential noise impacts from lawfully operating entertainment venues.</li> </ul> <p>The purpose of the Implementation Strategy is to supplement the Land Use Plan and outline the actions and strategies which cannot be adequately addressed through the regulatory function of the Land Use Plan.</p> <p>It is considered that the Land Use Plan adequately addresses these matters without any further items needing to be included in the Implementation Strategy.</p>	
<b>Implementation strategy</b>			
Conservation and adaptive re-use of heritage buildings			
116	The actions set out in the implementation strategy are generally supported.	Support is noted	No
<b>Schedules</b>			
Definitions			
117	It is suggested that shade structures on rooftops be excluded from the definition of storey to further encourage the provision of rooftop communal open space.	The intent to exclude rooftop communal open spaces from the definition of storey is supported in principle, however its application is only appropriate for the mixed use zone. Accordingly, the built from provisions under section 2.6.3.2 of the scheme has been amended to exclude rooftop areas containing communal open space.	Yes
118	<p>Concern that all maximum height provisions are provided in storeys instead of, or in addition to, being provided in metres. This approach can lead to significant variations in the maximum height of buildings depending on the floor to ceiling heights. This is particularly notable in the case of industrial sites and mixed used buildings where it could represent greater than 25% in height differences. In addition, major sports venues such as stadiums (refer to section 2.6.6 Community facility major sports venue zone) are not easy to define in terms of storeys.</p> <p>Include a definition in Schedule 1 for the average floor to ceiling heights assumptions and how to use these to calculate maximum allowable heights. The other option is to directly include the maximum heights in metres in the built form provision tables. This will minimise potential community misperceptions about height.</p>	<p>The variation in overall building height between commercial and residential development is noted, however it is not considered to be a significant concern requiring detailed management within the PDA.</p> <p>The review of submissions indicated that the focus of concern regarding building heights was within the medium density residential zone and high density residential zone, where commercial developments are not supported.</p> <p>The difference between commercial and residential floor to ceiling heights within the mixed use zone or the mixed industry and business zone is not considered to result in an unacceptable impact to the surrounding urban environments. Limiting floor to ceiling heights may constrain the potential for new economic activity in commercial development and may limit opportunities for residential development which provide greater floor to ceiling heights.</p> <p>Development which cannot be defined in terms of storeys will be assessed against the qualitative statements for the intended built form for the relevant zone.</p>	No
<b>Schedules</b>			
PDA exempt development			
119	Support the clarification of exemptions within the development scheme.	Support is noted.	No
<b>Schedules</b>			

#	Summary of issue	Response	Amendment required?
Transport, access, parking and servicing			
120	Support car parking rates for non-residential uses. Consider opportunities for increased non-residential car parking where it can be demonstrated that the car parking is required to service the intended use.	<p>Parking rates are intended to encourage a gradual transition toward a significant modal shift to public and active transport. Parking rates also align with the significant public transport infrastructure investment within and surrounding the PDA.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that specific uses may require car parking at different rates depending on the nature of development. These outcomes will be considered as part of the performance based assessment framework operated by EDQ.</p>	No
121	Concern regarding the increase in car parking requirements for visitor car-parking for multiple dwellings.	<p>Car parking rates for residential uses have altered to include a new provision for the supply of 0.15 spaces per dwelling of onsite visitor parking. This approach recognises the need for new development to cater for visitors to their premises and acknowledges the limited amount of on street carparking available and other commercial car parking facilities in the PDA.</p> <p>PDA wide criteria 2.5.4.7 Transport efficiency encourages development that supports a reduction in car ownership and vehicle trips by providing car share facilities, ride share access, cycle access, cycle storage facilities and pedestrian permeability.</p> <p>To encourage ongoing reduction in car ownership and corresponding vehicle use and traffic generation, EDQ has reduced the development scheme car parking rates for multiple dwellings to provide an average of 0.75 spaces per dwelling plus 0.15 visitor parking space per dwelling.</p>	Yes
122	Loading and servicing areas need to ensure minimal impact and safety risk on adjacent road users. All vehicles to exit loading and servicing areas in forward gear.	Support the proposed amendment.	Yes
Schedules			
Heritage places			
123	<p>Concern regarding the inclusion of the Tivoli Theatre as a Local Heritage place awaiting listing in the Brisbane Heritage Register. The following were cited as reasons for the concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Tivoli Theatre has little heritage value. It was converted from a warehouse to a restaurant theatre in 1989 and has only been operating as a live music venue since the late 1990s.</li> <li>There is minimal historic value in the building itself.</li> </ul> <p>One submission supported the inclusion of the Tivoli Theatre.</p>	<p>BCC is currently progressing a proposed amendment to City Plan 2014 to list the 52 Costin Street as a local heritage place. As part of this process BCC publicly notified the proposed amendment, including notifying the property owner about the heritage listing and citation. All interested parties were provided an opportunity to make a submission to BCC about the amendment during the public notification period.</p> <p>The pre-emptive inclusion of 52 Costin Street within the PDA development scheme as a pending item may create ambiguity regarding the actual heritage status of the building.</p> <p>The identification of 52 Costin Street as a "heritage place awaiting listing in the Brisbane Heritage Register" has been removed from the development scheme and may be included at a future date once the Brisbane City Plan amendment is finalised.</p>	Yes
124	References to BCC Heritage Register should be a reference to the City Plan Heritage Overlay.	Support this amendment, changes have been made.	Yes



## 5 List of all amendments to the development scheme amendment

Amendment #	Section details	Nature of/reason for amendment
<b>General</b>		
1.	Throughout the document	To reflect the finalisation and adoption of the scheme amend the terminology through the document from 'proposed development scheme amendment no.2' to now read 'development scheme'.
2.	Throughout the document	To reflect the month the scheme was adopted.
3.	Throughout the document	For accuracy, amend minor formatting, typographical errors, word omissions or referencing.
4.	Throughout the document	BCC records local heritage listings within the Heritage Overlay of Brisbane City Plan not the Brisbane Heritage Register, amend references Brisbane Heritage Register to Read Brisbane City Plan Heritage overlay.
5.	Throughout the document	To reflect changes made by the <i>Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2018</i> , PDA self-assessable development and PDA exempt development have been changed to PDA accepted development.
<b>Section 1.0 - Introduction</b>		
6.	Section 1.1 – 1.4	To improve readability of the document additional cross references to relevant sections and maps have been included.
<b>Section 2.0 - Land use plan</b>		
7.	Section 2.1	To provide greater clarity regarding the hierarchical nature of the development scheme section 2.1 has been amended as follows:  2.1 Components of the land use plan  The land use plan establishes a hierarchy of provisions through the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• vision for the PDA and</li> <li>• the PDA development requirements, which are organised in a hierarchy where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the structural elements and PDA-wide criteria establish outcomes and quantitative measures to achieve the vision, and</li> <li>○ the zone and precinct provisions establish outcomes and quantitative measures, to achieve the structural elements and PDA-wide criteria. (refer to table 1).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
8.	Table 1	To reflect amendments made to section 2.1 amend Table 1 to show PDA-wide criteria and structural elements on the same level.
9.	Section 2.1.4	Add footnote to EDQ guidelines to provide link to EDQ website where guidelines are saved.  Remove footnote referencing State government guidelines available at <a href="http://www.dilgp.qld.gov.au">www.dilgp.qld.gov.au</a>

Amendment #	Section details	Nature of/reason for amendment
10.	Section 2.2.3	<p>To remove any ambiguity regarding the performance based nature of the development scheme amend section 2.2.3 as follows:</p> <p>PDA assessable development is consistent with the Land use plan if it is consistent with all outcomes of the relevant PDA development requirements, including the relevant outcomes for any quantitative measures<sup>10</sup>.</p> <p>To reinforce the hierarchy of provisions under section 2.1 of the scheme amend section 2.2.3 to include footnote 10 as follows:</p> <p><sup>10</sup> Refer to the hierarchy of provisions described under section 2.1 of the scheme for further guidance.</p> <p>To enable the approval of interim uses that are inconsistent with the development requirements. amend section 2.2.3 as follows:</p> <p>[...]However, development that is inconsistent with any of the outcomes of the relevant PDA development requirements, may be consistent with the Land use plan if the development is consistent with the Vision, and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the development is an interim use; or</li> <li>• there are sufficient grounds to justify the approval of the development despite any inconsistency with the relevant PDA development requirements.</li> </ul> <p>In this section 'grounds' means matters of public interest, which include the matters specified as the main purposes of the Act as well as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• superior design outcomes<sup>1</sup>, and</li> <li>• overwhelming community need.</li> </ul> <p>'Grounds' does not include the personal circumstances of an applicant, owner or interested third party.</p> <p><sup>1</sup> An urban design review panel will provide guidance on the assessment and acceptance of superior design outcomes. Refer to Implementation strategy.</p>
11.	Section 2.2.5	<p>Section 2.2.5 to the development scheme as notified required public notification of a development application which 'compromises the implementation of the development scheme'. Development which compromises the implementation of the development scheme would be inconsistent with the Land use plan under section 2.2.3 and could not be approved. Amend the development scheme to remove 'compromises the implementation of the development scheme'</p>
12.	Section 2.2.7	<p>To remove any ambiguity regarding the application of local laws in a PDA amend section 2.2.7 to add:</p> <p>Relevant local laws made under the <i>City of Brisbane Act 2010</i> apply in the PDA to the extent they are not replaced by a by-law made under the ED Act.</p>
13.	Section 2.2.8	<p>To provide greater clarity regarding the application of Brisbane City Plan 2014 within the PDA amend section 2.2.8:</p> <p>Schedule 6 of the <i>Planning Regulation 2017</i> prohibits Brisbane City Plan 2014 from making PDA-related development assessable under the <i>Planning Act 2016</i>. However, schedule 2 adopts definitions from Brisbane City Plan 2014 and the development scheme calls up various other parts of the Brisbane City Plan 2014 as guidance.</p> <p>Under section 71 of the ED Act, if there is a conflict between the development scheme and a planning instrument or assessment benchmarks prescribed by regulation under another Act, the development scheme prevails to the extent of any inconsistency.</p>

Amendment #	Section details	Nature of/reason for amendment
14.	Section 2.2.9	<p>To create greater clarity regarding the circumstances where an interim use may be appropriate section 2.2.9 has been amended as follows:</p> <p>An interim use is a land use that, because of its nature, scale, form or intensity, is not an appropriate long-term use of the land, but may be appropriate for a short or medium-term period as the PDA develops.</p> <p>A PDA development application for an interim use must demonstrate that the use will not prejudice or delay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• appropriate long-term uses(s)</li> <li>• an appropriate intensity of development, or</li> <li>• infrastructure delivery envisaged by the vision for the PDA.</li> </ul> <p>Relevant PDA development requirements also apply to all PDA assessable development that is an interim use.</p> <p>An interim use will only be approved if it can be demonstrated that the use will not preclude or delay an appropriate long-term use; or intensity of development; or infrastructure delivery.</p> <p>The MEDQ may impose conditions of approval related to the interim use including, for example, limiting the duration of an interim use.</p> <p>Information to support a PDA development application for an interim use may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a suitability assessment; and</li> <li>• plans showing how the development could transition from the proposed interim use to an appropriate longer-term use.</li> </ul>
15.	Section 2.3.2	<p>To ensure development within the PDA is integrated with the broader transport network amend section 2.3.2 of the vision to state:</p> <p>The Bowen Hills PDA is integrated with citywide transport networks and is well connected, accessible and permeable to a full range of pedestrian, cyclist, public transport and private vehicle movements.</p>
16.	Section 2.3.2	<p>To improve the policy line of sight between the vision and structural elements plan amend section 2.3.2 of the vision to reference.</p> <p>A network of active transport links including walkways and designated on-street cycle lanes supports the movement of people throughout the PDA. Pedestrian connectivity radiates from public transport stations ensuring movement to surrounding areas is direct and efficient.</p>
17.	Section 2.4 – Map 2	<p>To align with amendments made to the vision (amendment # 9 above), amend the legend for Map 2: structural elements to change ‘walking and cycling route to ‘active transport route’.</p> <p>Map 2 has been amended to identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hudd Street and Tufton Street extensions as local road.</li> <li>• active transport route along Constance Street and Costin Street.</li> <li>• Bus stop on O’Connell Terrace.</li> </ul>
18.	Section 2.5.4.1	<p>To refine the approach to requiring sustainable development accreditation, amend section 2.5.4.1:</p> <p>Development provides the design, construction and operation of sustainable buildings by achieving 4 star Green Star: Design and as Built (or equivalent rating system) for residential development and/or commercial development.</p>

Amendment #	Section details	Nature of/reason for amendment
19.	Section 2.5.7.2	<p>To ensure the effective implementation of section 2.5.7.2 section 4.5(i) of the scheme in relation to the provision of publicly accessible land along breakfast creek, amend section 2.5.7.2:</p> <p>Development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ensures that land along Breakfast Creek within 10 m of the high water mark is transferred to BCC as publicly accessible open space.</li> </ul>
20.	Section 2.5.9.5	To greater reflect the broad intent of section 2.5.9 amend the heading from 'Point source pollutants' to 'Air quality'.
21.	Section 2.5.9.3	To ensure noise amelioration is incorporated for development affected by lawfully operation entertainment venues, amend footnote 35 to refer to development 'near' rather than 'adjoining' a lawfully operating entertainment venue.
22.	Section 2.6 – Map 6	<p>Map 2 has been amended to rectify errors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mixed use zone applied to property known as Kings Co-Op located on King Street between Gregory Terrace and Machinery Street.</li> <li>• Mixed industry and business zone applied to lot 1 on RP165998.</li> </ul>
23.	Section 2.6.3.1	Amend the preferred development intent for the mixed use zone to include health and medical uses.
24.	Section 2.6.3.1	<p>To provide greater context to the outcomes sought by quantitative measures for built form and communal open space for the mixed use zone amend the preferred development intent to include the following:</p> <p>Building form improves streetscape and pedestrian outcomes by providing spaces for human movement and informal activation at ground level. Podiums are human scale and encourage passive surveillance of the public realm.</p> <p>Residential amenity is maximised through creation of generous, high quality, private and communal open spaces which improve occupant lifestyles suited to the sub-tropical environment.</p>
25.	Section 2.6.3.2	To encourage the delivery of communal open space qualify the maximum plot ratio requirement for the mixed use zone to exclude areas of communal open space.
26.	Section 2.6.3.2	To encourage the delivery of communal open space qualify the maximum building height requirement for the mixed use zone to exclude a space on top of a building used primarily as communal open space whether roofed or not.
27.	Section 2.6.3.2	<p>To remove any potential ambiguity regarding the required setback for sites under 800 m<sup>2</sup> amend the note for side setbacks to specify that the setback requirements from the high density zone apply only to lots between 800 m<sup>2</sup> – 1200 m<sup>2</sup> and not for all lots under 1,200m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>Note: minimum lot size in the mixed use zone is 800 m<sup>2</sup></p>
28.	Section 2.6.3.2	<p>To refine the approach to communal open space, amend the communal open space requirement as follows:</p> <p>Development provides universally accessible communal open space as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development which includes a multiple residential component provides communal open space equivalent to a minimum of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 80% of the site area, or</li> <li>○ 15% of the multiple residential Gross Floor Area.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



Amendment #	Section details	Nature of/reason for amendment
29.	Section 2.6.3.2	<p>To refine the approach to the provision of private open space amend the private open space requirement for the mixed use zone as follows:</p> <p>Development provides all dwellings with private open space or balconies at the following rates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 bedroom dwellings – 9 m<sup>2</sup> with a minimum dimension of 3 m, or</li> <li>• 2 or 3 bedroom dwellings – 12 m<sup>2</sup> with a minimum dimension of 3 m</li> </ul>
30.	Section 2.6.3.3	Amend the urban design requirements for the mixed use zone to require development ensure safe access to active uses within the podium.
31.	Section 2.6.4.2	To refine development requirements for industrial uses, amend Section 2.6.4.2 to remove the communal open space requirements for the industrial zone.
32.	Section 2.6.5.1	To reinforce the primary intent for the mixed industry and business zone amend the preferred development intent to remove community facilities.
33.	Section 2.6.9.1	<p>To better reflect the use of the Brisbane Showgrounds as an events and exhibition precinct, amend the preferred development intent to include event uses. Also amend the preferred development intent as follows:</p> <p>Outside the times of year that the Royal Queensland Show operates, the Brisbane Showgrounds is used as an events and exhibition precinct. It is also used to provide car parking for Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital employees.</p>
34.	Section 2.6.10	To provide greater clarity regarding appropriate uses within the levels of assessment, amend column 1 to column 1A and column 1B. Column 1A specifies the circumstances in which a self-assessable change of use may be carried out for an appropriate use. Column 1B specifies the appropriate uses for each zone.
35.	Section 2.6.10	<p>To enable a self-assessable change of use adjoining a heritage place where not involving building work remove 'or adjoining' from column 1A.</p> <p>Note: development on a heritage place, or development adjoining a heritage place and involving building work will still require a development application for a change of use for a preferred land use.</p>
36.	Section 2.6.10	To provide greater clarity regarding appropriate uses for self-assessable change of use of an existing premise within the medium density residential zone, rooming accommodation has been removed from column 1B.
37.	Section 2.7.1	<p>To reflect the existing pedestrian connection from Abbotsford Road to the Bowen Hills Station amend the precinct 1 plan connectivity requirements to include as follows:</p> <p>Development provides publicly accessible cross block links providing pedestrian connection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to the Bowen Hills railway station from Abbotsford Road.</li> </ul>
38.	Section 2.7.1 – Map 8	<p>To improve clarity, amend Map 8 to identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bus stop on Abbotsford Road</li> <li>• additional road widening locations</li> <li>• streetscape treatment locations</li> <li>• cycle network locations, and</li> <li>• additional street names.</li> </ul>

Amendment #	Section details	Nature of/reason for amendment
39.	Section 2.7.2	<p>To reflect the important heritage views and vistas in precinct 2, amend section 2.7.2 Urban design as follows:</p> <p>Important views and vistas to and from the Old Museum and Brisbane Showgrounds will be maintained including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to Show Ring 2 &amp; John Macdonald Stand from Bowen Park and the Royal Brisbane Women's Hospital</li> <li>• into Side Show Alley from Bowen Bridge Road</li> <li>• Gregory Terrace Streetscape views towards Show Ring 1 (north)</li> <li>• Gregory Terrace Streetscape Views Towards Show Ring 1 (South)</li> <li>• along Alexandria Street Towards Show Ring 1 and John Macdonald Stand, and</li> <li>• to Stockagents Building from Stockman's Rest.</li> </ul>
40.	Section 2.7.2 – Map 9	<p>To reflect the conditions of the RNA master plan approval (DEV2010/047) in relation to public access within the site, amend precinct 2 connectivity requirements as follows:</p> <p>Development provides publicly accessible cross block links providing pedestrian connections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• through the Brisbane Showgrounds between Exhibition Railway Station and Bowen Bridge Road</li> </ul> <p>Amend map 9 to include this cross block link.</p>
41.	Section 2.7.2	<p>To clarify the intent for the bus stop on Abbotsford Road amend the public transport section to state:</p> <p>A bus stop is located adjacent to the Exhibition Railway Station access point on O'Connell Terrace. Providing a rail and bus interchange function.</p>
42.	Section 2.7.2 – Map 9	<p>To provide greater flexibility on the location of the cross block link between Anderson Street and Costin Street:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• amend map 9 to remove the cross block link in this location, and</li> <li>• amend the connectivity requirements for the precinct to require the cross block link between Anderson Street and Costin Street be provided near and linking to Carriage Street.</li> </ul>
43.	Section 2.7.2 – Map 9	<p>To improve clarity about known transport network upgrade requirements amend Map 9 to identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• additional road widening locations,</li> <li>• additional cycle network along Costin Street and Constance Street,</li> <li>• additional street names</li> </ul>
<b>Section 3.0 – Infrastructure Plan</b>		
44.	Table 3 – Transport	Additional road network upgrades listed.
45.	Table 3 – Community facilities	To clarify the intent for the land adjacent the railway corridor, amend table 3 – community facilities to replace the term civic plaza with pedestrian concourse.

Amendment #	Section details	Nature of/reason for amendment
46.	Section 3.6- Infrastructure standards	<p>To clarify standards that EDQ may call up during a PDA development application, amend the section to include a new footnote as follows:</p> <p>Infrastructure will be delivered in accordance with the standards of EDQ<sup>51</sup> or the applicable local or state government, or relevant infrastructure providers at the time a PDA development application or Infrastructure Master Plan is approved.</p> <p><sup>51</sup> Refer to the Bowen Hills PDA Infrastructure Planning Background Report.</p>
<b>Section 4.0 – Implementation Strategy</b>		
47.	Section 4.1	<p>To explain the nature of EDQ’s ongoing involvement in the Bowen Hills PDA, amend the implementation strategy to add the following section:</p> <p>4.1 Place management</p> <p>Objective</p> <p>Manage the progressive renewal of private and state government land and enabling infrastructure and services within the Bowen Hills PDA.</p> <p>Actions</p> <p>Plan making – Economic Development Queensland is the delegated planning authority for the Bowen Hills PDA and has prepared the development scheme and Development Charges Offset Plan which establishes the land use and infrastructure plans regulatory instruments to manage growth and development.</p> <p>Development assessment – Economic Development Queensland is the delegated development assessment authority for the Bowen Hills PDA and is responsible for the assessment and approval of new development proposals in the PDA.</p> <p>Infrastructure delivery – Economic Development Queensland will progressively fund and deliver new infrastructure and upgrades to existing infrastructure to catalyse investment in property development and business enterprise.</p>
48.	Section 4.2	<p>To clarify how the design review panel operates amend text as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design Review Panel – utilise members of the Design Review Panel during the pre-application and assessment processes to provide assessment managers and applicants qualified professional expert advice in landscape, architecture, development, engineering, heritage and urban design matters.</li> </ul>
49.	Section 4.3	<p>To describe EDQ’s approach to the securing of cross block links within the PDA amend 4.3 to include the following:</p> <p>Cross block links – EDQ will seek to facilitate the delivery of cross block links as part of an integrated design solution for suitably sized developments proximate to the locations identified in the precinct plans.</p>
50.	Section 4.5	<p>In reference to the change made to section 2.5.7.2 item 18 above, amend section 4.5 to remove the following action:</p> <p>Land management – oversee the transfer of land along Breakfast Creek that is mapped within a local waterway corridor under Brisbane City Plan to Brisbane City Council.</p>
51.	Section 4.5	<p>To correct an error referencing an outdated policy amend section 4.5 to remove the following action:</p> <p>Incentives – the development industry is encouraged to better the land use plan’s provisions and obtain an exemption form the payment of the component of the uplift of land value identified to be applied to ecological sustainability.</p>
<b>Section 5.0 – Schedules</b>		

Amendment #	Section details	Nature of/reason for amendment
52.	Schedule 1: Definitions	<p>To clarify the meaning of cross block link, amend schedule 1: definitions to include the following definition:</p> <p>Cross block link</p> <p>Means a privately owned publicly accessible connection between two streets that may be covered or uncovered and may include an arcade or shared lane.</p>
53.	Schedule 1: Definitions	<p>To clarify the meaning of high-water mark, amend schedule 1: definitions to include the following definition:</p> <p>High-water mark</p> <p>Means high-water mark as defined by the <i>Coastal Protection and Management Act 1995</i>.</p>
54.	Schedule 3: Transport, access, parking and servicing	<p>To improve the alignment between the PDA-wide criteria section 2.5.4.7(ii) related to the provision of car-parking and the applicable car parking rate, amend schedule 3 as follows:</p> <p>Multiple dwellings provide an average of 0.75 spaces per dwelling plus 0.15 visitor parking space per dwelling.</p>
55.	Schedule 3: Transport, access, parking and servicing	<p>To ensure development provide adequate service vehicle arrangements, amend schedule 3 to require:</p> <p>Development ensures that all loading and servicing areas are designed to enable all vehicles to exit loading and servicing areas in forward gear.</p>
56.	Schedule 4: Heritage places	<p>To ensure the development scheme does not predetermine the outcome for the Brisbane City Plan amendment and to ensure the development scheme does not undermine the proper and orderly process for identifying and regulating local heritage places, amend Schedule 4: Heritage places to remove item 21 Tivoli Theatre and associated footnote.</p>