

**Bowen Hills and Northshore  
Hamilton UDA Development  
Schemes**

# **Submissions Report**

Pursuant to section 29 of the *Urban Land Development  
Authority Act 2007*

**22 December 2008**



**Bowen Hills and Northshore  
Hamilton UDA Development  
Schemes Submissions Report**

**Common  
issues to both  
schemes**

**22 December 2008**

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=No)
<b>GENERAL DRAFTING</b>			
• <b>Criteria</b>			
1.	<p>The style, composition and format of the development schemes do not use contemporary scheme drafting. The result is in an outdated 'story-book' style document. A contemporary statutory drafting approach would provide greater ease in navigation and interpretation of the development schemes.</p> <p>Style combines explanatory material with regulatory provisions. The vision is largely explanatory material It is suggest that the extrinsic be removed from the regulatory aspects of the development scheme.</p> <p>The role and history of the ULDA is not an aspect of a regulatory plan and should be included in supporting extrinsic material.</p> <p>A development scheme should not include/repeat the Act but it can refer to the Act.</p>	<p>The intent is for the documents to have a different 'look and feel' to a planning scheme.</p> <p>It is considered clear which parts are historical/for information and which parts have a role in development assessment (i.e. the 'forward looking' components).</p>	N
2.	<p>It is acknowledged that the ULDA Act does not provide guidance on how the Vision is to be taken into account in the assessment process. However, the development scheme does not provide any further assistance.</p>	<p>The development assessment provisions section has been amended to provide clarity.</p>	Y
3.	<p>The development scheme does not provide instructions on how assessment of a proposal will be carried out. Nor is there a clear explanation on how different elements of the Land Use Plan interact in development assessment. For example, there is no instruction on what it means if a proposal is considered not to be in keeping with the vision or intent for the zone/precinct etc. There isn't even an instruction to say what happens if the proposal fails to comply with a stated performance requirement. To add clarity and improve the robustness of the development scheme (thereby reducing the success of challenges), the scheme should state clearly what matters are inconsistent. This then pairs with the decision making provisions of the Act whereby an approval cannot be granted if there is inconsistency with the land use plan.</p> <p>The explanation of development that is consistent with the Land Use Plan in section 2.5 does not reflect the decision rules of the ULDA Act nor does it provide guidance on what 'inconsistent with the Land Use Plan' means in development assessment. Clear statements of development that is identified as UDA self-assessable, UDA assessable development and development that 'inconsistent' would help provide guidance for development assessment and interpretation by the Court.</p> <p>Generally, given an absence of any guidance within either the Development Scheme or the Act relating to what is "inconsistent", the assessment appeared to have little purpose, as most decisions became largely subjective.</p>	<p>The provisions relating to development assessment have been modified to be clearer in terms of 'consistent'/'inconsistent'.</p>	Y

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
	Similarly, section 2.5 – Development Consistent with the Land Use Plan, essentially allows for development to be deemed consistent with the Land Use Plan if it does not conflict with the Structure Plan or compromise the Vision for the UDA; and there are sufficient grounds to approve the development despite the non compliance. "Grounds" are further defined as being matters of public interest which include a "superior design outcome" amongst other things. In the absence of a definition of "superior design outcome" there is considerable scope for approval despite any conflict.		
4.	There are two layers of mapping, zones and precincts. It seems that the zones and precincts generally have the same boundaries. In addition, the zones provide a list of uses, which is refined by the precinct intents. Given that the role of the zones in development assessment is unknown they appear to be an unnecessary layer that only adds complexity.	The zones provide some more detail about certain areas (e.g. where open space linkages will occur). The intents of the zones have been further clarified.	N
5.	<p>The Vision component of the Development Scheme appears to sit outside the Land Use Plan which starts at page 9. Section 2.3(iii) references "outcomes" as forming part of the "requirements about carrying out of development for the UDA". However, section 2.5 describes permissible development is consistent with the Land Use Plan where the development complies with the requirements about carrying out of development for the UDA. Whilst the Vision physically sits outside the Land Use Plan, it is still considered to form part of the requirements/outcomes and must be considered when assessing applications against the Development Scheme.</p> <p>Nonetheless, the Vision itself contains a number of statements which provide very high level and general statements of intent, which are considered to be subjective in nature, and of limited value when assessing a development application. The virtue of these statements is that they allow some degree of latitude when assessing, but conversely might be challenged which weakens one of the instrumental decision tools under section 2.5 (first dot point). In saying this, it not clear how/if a third party may gain access to natural justice relating to applications and other matters – section 92 of the Act only makes provision for the "authority" to bring a proceeding in the Planning and Environment Court, and beyond this, applicant may only dispute conditions within the Planning and Environment Court.</p>	<p>The Vision component is intended to inform the entire Development Scheme, not just the Land Use Plan. It is 'called up' in the land use plan as a final backstop (similar to Desired Environmental Outcomes in Planning Schemes) for development assessment – legal advice is that this is appropriate.</p> <p>The ULDA Act sets out provisions relating to challenge of conditions. Decisions also must be made within the context of judicial review.</p>	N
6.	Where an application fails to comply with the stated 'Intent', the 'Structure Plan' must be reviewed to confirm an application's consistency or conflict. 'Sufficient grounds' must be found to justify any conflict with the	The Development Assessment procedures section has been amended which largely addresses these concerns. These have been prepared in the context of flexibility versus certainty.	Y

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
	<p>intent, and this would likely be based on the applications provision of 'superior design outcomes'. This would be the only grounds for compliance (assuming that the other tests for grounds to approve are 'or' statements) as the non compliance could not be considered to be a matter specified in the purpose of the Act nor could the non compliance demonstrate and overwhelming community need.</p> <p>Use of expressions such as "within in the order of" (when relating to maximum GFA limits) are ambiguous and require the determination of an assessing authority. As previously stated, developer's would be benefitted by some more direct guidance in relation to those matters which can be quantified. This provides certainty when dealing with the development scheme, and does not give rise to expectations of permissible higher GFA's than those specified.</p>		
7.	The high level subjective wording of the Development Scheme(s) would make it difficult for any development not to comply. In addition the outcome recommending "the precinct has high exposure to a range of public transport options" is more of a descriptive statement and beyond the control of developers of individual sites as the provision of public transport is generally a function of government.	The Development Schemes have been drafted in a performance based style to provide flexibility with operational rules established to provide certainty.	N
8.	Setbacks – Application of this requirement is based on the outer most projection to the proposed road alignment. Any non compliance is a matter of detail and is not in conflict with the Structure Plan or outcomes of the Vision. Grounds for compliance may include "superior design outcomes" (e.g. where the applicant seeks to provide an awning).	These matters can be dealt with at development application stage.	N
9.	Clean Industry, Research and Development Facilities –some matters may require interpretation by the ULDA, such as the whether or not the application satisfies the requirement to place offices and administration components on main frontages. It is not clear what constitutes a "main frontage". Map 2 identifies "Active Frontages", and does not refer to "main frontages".	Many of these matters may be dealt with at development application. Amendments made to ensure consistent terminology.	Y
10.	A development scheme is inconsistent with a planning instrument, plan, policy or code made under legislation, unless the instrument, plan, policy or code is specifically applied by the development scheme. In the event of an inconsistency the development scheme will prevail.	This statement has been included in the development assessment procedures provisions.	Y
11.	Development criteria/requirements (UDA wide) appear to include conflicting design parameters. There is no guidance provided on how to deal with any conflicts during the assessment of proposals. For example, designing to comply with 6.5 General Air	Include the following words "all elements of this section must be achieved to the greatest extent practicable, having regard to each of the other elements of the section".	Y

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
	Quality is likely to give rise to conflict with 6.7 Energy Efficiency.		
12.	Care needs to be exercised with conflicting codes e.g. 4.3 and 4.4	The Development Schemes do not contain codes. However, to provide clarity the words "all elements of this section must be achieved to the greatest extent practicable, having regard to each of the other elements of the section" have been included.	Y
13.	Many of the development criteria/requirements are subjective and unusable as an assessment criterion. Some of the criteria/requirements are outside the responsibility/realm of ULDA e.g., contaminated land, waste minimisation, harbour, foreshores and marinas.  Assessment of proposals against some aspects of criteria/requirements will involve specialist knowledge likely to be outside the currently available resources of the ULDA resulting in significant resourcing issues for ULDA administration/operation. One way of overcoming this type of issue may be for independent certification to accompany applications but this would require the pre-determination and statement of specific development standards.	The ULDA may nominate assessing authorities for conditions (this does not need to be set out in the development scheme as it is allowable under the Act – it could be an administrative procedure) – the development scheme provides the head of power to apply reasonable and relevant conditions relating to health and safety.  In addition, the ULDA has prepared a development assessment certification procedures manual which addresses many of these concerns.	N
14.	It is unclear whether level of assessment proposals in certain areas would remain assessable and require public notification or whether certain types of development would be prohibited.	Amendments have been made to the Development Assessment Procedures to clarify notification and prohibition.	Y
15.	Figure 3 – Structure Plan is located in Development Scheme Introduction on website, but is referred to in Land Use Plan, which is confusing.	The Structure Plan is included with the Vision which informs the entire Development Scheme, not just the Land Use Plan. The LUP 'calls up' the Structure Plan in the Development Assessment Procedures section (legal advice is that this is appropriate).	N
16.	Section 2.5 (p.9) - clarify whether the Structure Plan Map forms part of the Land Use Plan - visual representation of Land Use Plan required.	The Structure Plan is included with the Vision which informs the entire Development Scheme, not just the Land Use Plan. The LUP 'calls up' the Structure Plan in the Development Assessment Procedures section (legal advice is that this is appropriate).	N
17.	The wording in Section 2.5 results in the Dev. Scheme being too prescriptive, not encouraging creativity and restricting development to a form dictated by the ULDA and desirable.	The Development Schemes have been drafted in a performance based style to provide flexibility with operational rules established to provide certainty.	N
18.	The use of the words 'must' and 'required' makes the Dev. Scheme very prescriptive.	The Development Schemes have been drafted in a performance based style to provide flexibility with operational rules established to provide certainty. The terms 'must' and 'required' are used where certainty is required.	N
19.	The inconsistent use of particular terms throughout the Land Use Plan has potential to cause confusion.	Terminology has been checked for consistency.	Y
20.	The section titled 'Maximum Development Yield and Development Contributions; (section 2 of part 2 of the Land Use Plan) does not seem to fit within the stated outline	These sections apply UDA-wide therefore it is considered appropriate they are in the UDA-wide criteria.	N

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
	of the UDA-wide Development Criteria.		
21.	The drafting of the Dev. Scheme is prescriptive and may make desirable development more difficult.	The Development Schemes have been drafted in a performance based style to provide flexibility with operational rules established to provide certainty.	N
22.	A clear distinction should be made between mandatory 'Development Criteria' and other provisions (particularly Parts 4 - 8) which appear to contain prescriptive criteria, but allow little flexibility to respond to given site specific opportunities/constraints. Suggested that the later be established as, guidelines for good development, recognising that they may not always be achievable in their entirety.	The Development Schemes have been drafted in a performance based style to provide flexibility with operational rules established to provide certainty.  The ULDA will produce guidelines from time to time to provide more clarity.	N
23.	Section 2.5 (p.11) - the provision that "Permissible development that is inconsistent with the Land Use Plan must be refused" conflicts with previous provision that requires for exceptions to the "must be refused" requirement for inconsistency.	The Development Assessment Procedures provisions have been amended to provide clarity.	Y
24.	As Main roads will not be a concurrence agency clarification is sought as to who will deal with State interests if issues arise.	The ULDA may nominate assessing authorities for conditions (this does not need to be set out in the development scheme as it is allowable under the Act – it could be an administrative procedure).	N
25.	Codes do not correlate with the specific levels of assessment for development.	The Development Schemes do not include codes as the ULDA Act does not include 'code assessment'.	N
• Sub-precinct Planning			
26.	The development regulatory system operating in Queensland is based on a 'one bite at the cherry' approval. This is the concept embedded in IDAS of finality and certainty. The proposal put forward in the proposed development schemes is that an UDA approval is not final and may need to be followed by a subsequent approval which varies significantly from an IDAS approach.  A sub-precinct plan is not development and therefore cannot be UDA assessable development. There is no head of power in the Act that enables sub-precinct plans to be made as UDA development application. Nor can a UDA development application vary the effect of a development scheme.  Requiring submission of another application/plan for sub-precincts does not readily facilitate the availability of land (arguably lengthens the process required).	The development assessment provisions have been modified, particularly the section relating to sub-precinct planning and these concerns have been addressed.	Y
27.	Section 2.6 of the Land Use Plan introduces Sub-precinct Plans. Among other things sub-precinct plans can change the: sub-precinct criteria and level of assessment. In a case where permissible development is proposed and this development requires public notification, a sub-precinct plan can be used to negate this requirement. In effect, an application for a sub-precinct plan, which includes a change to the level of assessment, will be advertised once and if this plan is approved subsequent development applications will not require notification. If this strategy is adopted by developers third	The development assessment provisions have been modified, particularly the section relating to sub-precinct planning and these concerns have been addressed.	Y

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
	party submissions will be lodged at the notification stage and then the content of sub-precinct plan will be assessed and approved / refused by the ULDA. Subsequent development applications made in the sub-precinct will rely entirely on the ULDA assessment of development applications to ensure measures are incorporated into the development to mitigate effects of industry on residential amenity. Due to the complexity of environmental assessment required to fully understand the affects of industry, development outcomes would benefit from third party review and submissions. Boral consider these provisions of the Scheme weaken the development assessment process and increase the potential for poor planning outcomes to the detriment of existing industrial uses.		
28.	<p>In relation to sub-precinct development requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a sub-precinct plan must accompany a UDA development application for the first permissible development that requires a sub-precinct plan. It is important to note permissible development may occur in a sub-precinct not just where the sub-precinct plan has been approved, but also where the ULDA is of the opinion that a sub-precinct plan is not required because the nature, size and type of the development will not compromise the principles and outcomes of the sub-precinct and will not unreasonably prejudice the opportunities for the development for the remaining area in the sub-precinct; and</li> <li>a sub-precinct plan must be consistent with a structure plan.</li> </ul>	The sub-precinct provisions have been amended in accordance with the recommendations.	Y
29.	Request that need to identify the assessment category for either a sub-precinct plan where there is no such previously approved plan or for a new plan that will supersede a previous document need to be accommodated within the permissible development category.	The section on sub-precinct planning has been amended to allow certain development to occur without a sub-precinct plan in place.	Y
30.	The requirement for the preparation of a Sub-precinct Plan in certain circumstances is unduly burdensome encumbrance on initial and future development of each sub-precinct.	The section on sub-precinct planning has been amended to allow certain development to occur without a sub-precinct plan in place.	Y
31.	In order for a sub-precinct plan to be prepared (to ULDA's satisfaction), consent must be obtained from all land owners within the precinct. It is acknowledged that the lodgement of a sub-precinct plan is intended to encourage collaboration between landowners. However, it appears that no provisions have been made to facilitate development when consent from all land owners cannot be obtained. It is highly likely that this situation will occur as different land owners may have different intentions for development of the precinct. In addition, it is also likely that some landowners may not	The section on sub-precinct planning has been amended to allow certain development to occur without a sub-precinct plan in place. In addition, the ULDA will facilitate agreement between landowners where conflict occurs – it is not considered necessary to have a formal timeframe for resolution (this will be on a case by case basis).	N



SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
	<p>wish to develop their land in the near future. This may in turn restrict development within the precinct. It is noted that Brookfield Multiplex has also identified the collaboration of land owners (or lack of) as an issue which requires attention prior to the release of the Final Development Scheme.</p> <p>It is recommended that the requirement for all landowners to give consent for a Sub-Precinct Plan be removed or provisions be made for instances when parties cannot agree or do not wish to develop their land. It is suggested that maximum timeframes be established for negotiations between landowners. The Final Development Scheme could include a set number of days for parties to become involved in negotiations and begin drafting a Sub-Precinct Plan. If parties cannot reach an agreement within 90 days (for example), then a mechanism should be included to facilitate development after this timeframe.</p>		
32.	Development should be able to proceed without a detailed sub-precinct plan in the absence of consent from land owners where it can be demonstrated that effort to obtain an agreement was undertaken.	The section on sub-precinct planning has been amended to allow certain development to occur without a sub-precinct plan in place. In addition, the ULDA will facilitate agreement between landowners where conflict occurs	
33.	<p>Too much reliance on sub-precinct plan to guide infrastructure, particularly public transport. Further clarification on the sub-precinct planning approval process is required including who pays for it, who prepares it, do all owners need to consent and will other landowners be involved?</p> <p>Section 2.6 – Sub-Precinct Development Requirements. Clarification over who pays, can a plan be submitted at the same time as a DA, Land owner consent issues. The role of a sub-precinct plan should be more aligned to that a structure plan.</p> <p>It is unclear what will be addressed in sub-precinct plans (e.g. the arrangement and types of uses within spaces).</p>	<p>The sub-precinct plan provisions have been significantly amended. The ULDA will be actively involved in the coordination and assessment of sub-precinct plans to ensure a coordinated approach that fulfils the requirements of the Development Scheme.</p> <p>The ULDA may prepare guidelines to clarify what will be addressed in sub-precinct plans.</p>	Y
34.	The Dev. Scheme states that a sub-precinct shall not be developed unless a details plan for the sub-precinct has been approved as part of the UDA development application applicable to the sub-precinct. Such a requirement creates an encumbrance on initial and future development of each sub-precinct.	The section on sub-precinct planning has been amended to allow certain development to occur without a sub-precinct plan in place.	Y
• <b>Consideration in Principle</b>			
35.	Section 2.7 providing for 'Consideration in Principle' does not have a head of power in the ULDA Act. The Act provides for only one type of application being a UDA development application. If ULDA wants to offer a procedure for consideration in principle, then it doesn't need to justify the procedure through inclusion in the development scheme – especially as despite its inclusion, an	CIP is not an application so it does not conflict with the Act. The CIP process is included in the development scheme to offer some assurance to developers (particularly of larger sites) that a concept may be supported by the ULDA prior to the formal lodgement of an application. In addition, a pre-application process is already in place.	N

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
	applicant for a C-in-P cannot rely on any advice provided in response to the application. It is suggested a ULDA procedure around the concept of pre-development meetings would be more appropriate/useful.		
36.	The term Consideration in Principle is outdated and inconsistent with IPA.	The development scheme is not prepared under the IPA. The term is used as it is a concept that the development industry is familiar with.	N
• Levels of Assessment			
37.	The level of assessment tables are satisfactory, however, it would appear a large number of applications will default to Column 3A – Permissible Development. Under the circumstances, it is reasonable to assume it is appropriate to allow the ULDA to apply its assessment powers to discreet locations such as Hamilton Northshore, however it does not necessarily lead to expeditious decision making as most applications would require detailed assessment by the ULDA.	It is intended that the default is permissible to provide for innovative development to possibly occur based on its merits.	N
38.	A better mechanism would be to provide for more self-assessable development, with a number of requirements conditioned as part of any approval. Arup anticipates that many applications would be accompanied by excessive amounts of supporting material, which might be avoided were the ULDA be prepared to apply conditions to such developments. By way of example, an acoustic report merely adds technical documentation (and expense) which justifies the application can achieve a certain level of acoustic attenuation, which in turn adds to assessment time and cost. ULDA would be better served by simply nominating/conditioning a desired level of acoustic attenuation within buildings.	The ULDA has prepared a development assessment certification procedures manual which addresses many of these concerns.	N
39.	Section 2.4 of the Land Use Plan discusses “levels of assessment” and introduces “prohibited development”. This prescriptive approach to planning and development assessment has not been supported in Queensland since the adoption of the Integrated Planning Act 1997 and related planning schemes. The principle of “prohibited development” is simplistic in nature and ignores the ability of the market, technology, and creative design to deliver optimal land use outcomes. Boral’s sites are located in Precinct 7 - Business Enterprise Park. While, the Precinct intent statement acknowledges the existing industry, it also states that future commercial development can occur in the precinct. It also clearly states that intensification of existing industry will not be supported - the precinct being promoted over time to “cleaner more urban compatible industry”. Boral consider these provisions negatively affect existing concrete and asphalt industry integral to supporting the development of South East Queensland. Boral strongly object to the notation of	Concept of prohibited development is contained in the ULDA Act 2007 and has also been in the SEQ Regional Plan since its release in 2005.  The development scheme identifies prohibited development in accordance with the Act.  Existing use rights are protected under the Act and are not affected by the development scheme.	N

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
	prohibited development its application to the existing Boral industries. This provision will affect how these sites are managed into the future and may severely limit introduction of new technologies and process improvements.		
40.	Levels of assessment are inconsistent with the Integrated Planning Act 1997 or the likely assessment levels as proposed in the IPA reform. (DIP)	Levels of assessment are consistent with the ULDA Act (ULDA does not operate under the IPA).	N
41.	Suggests that the land use plan made reference to prohibited development' rather than 'assessable development which is prohibited. (DIP)	Levels of assessment are consistent with the ULDA Act (ULDA does not operate under the IPA).	N
42.	pp. 10-11 Section 2.5 Does self assessable development require an application to the ULDA? (DMR)	No, Self Assessable development does not require an application to be made to the ULDA	N
43.	Level of assessment table needs to be changed. Column 1 for MCU where not involving building work has potential to be exploited for a use which is undesirable but could easily establish in an existing building. To supplement this approach, it may be necessary to expand the land uses in Column 3B Prohibited Development.	Changes have been made to Level of Assessment Tables.	Y
44.	Page 11 states 'Prohibited Development' may not be carried out in the UDA. It is suggested this be clarified and tied to the precinct or sub-precinct to which it relates.	The Development Assessment Procedures section has been modified to provide greater clarity.	Y
45.	Suggest clarifying whether prohibited development must be refused or even lodged?	Applicants have the right to lodge an application even if it prohibited under the Development Scheme. The Act sets out what comprises a properly made application.	N
• <b>Notification &amp; appeals</b>			
46.	It is not inconceivable that "non compliant" proposals will be lodged aiming to capitalise potential residential opportunities. While submission rights are provided, with no third party appeal rights, development approval decisions rest implicitly with the ULDA. While Boral respects the independence of the ULDA in the decision making process, we do question the ability of the ULDA to accurately and fully assess the potential effects of encroachment upon existing industry. This concern is raised due to the complex nature of environmental impacts, limitations in current impact assessment modelling, and varying application of compliance criteria by regulators. In addition we have found that local government and the Environmental Protection Agency are struggling to obtain experience staff able to assess environmental impacts of developments and it is not unreasonable to consider ULDA will experience similar staffing issues. This issue is highlighted further into the Scheme, as it appears the ULDA has not referenced the appropriate environmental assessment standards and criteria at Section 6 of the Land Use Plan.	There are no third party appeal rights consistent with the ULDA Act 2007 (other than nominated assessing authority conditions). The ULDA may nominate assessing authorities for conditions (this does not need to be set out in the development scheme as it is allowable under the Act - it could be an administrative procedure) – the development scheme provides the head of power to apply conditions relating to health and safety. The development scheme sets out provisions to avoid encroachment on existing industrial development – this proactive approach is preferred to a reactive process (as suggested by an appeal process).	N

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
	Third party appeal rights provided under the Integrated Planning Act provide a backstop in these circumstances and Boral has previously used these rights to protect existing sites from encroachment of incompatible development. As third party appeal rights are not available under the <i>Urban Land Development Authority Act 2007</i> , it may well be noncompliant development / development which adversely affects ongoing industrial use rights is approved without recourse.		
47.	<p>Section 54 of the <i>Urban Land Development Authority Act 2007</i> provides the minimum notification and submission requirements for development in NHUDA. Section 2.9 of the Land Use Plan identifies when public notification of a development application is required - it provides no comment on the mechanics of notification requirements, as such the minimum requirements under the Act apply to NHUDA.</p> <p>Minimum notification requirements are listed at Section 54 (2) of the Act:</p> <p>Considering the obvious land use conflict potential between existing industry and residential development, the provisions under the Scheme facilitating changes to the level of assessment coupled with a complete lack of third party appeal rights under the Act, highlight that there is a need to improve the public notification and submission process for the NHUDA (over-and-above the minimum requirements provided). Boral consider that the Scheme is deficient in this area and consideration should be given to improving notification requirements by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increasing the notification period</li> <li>2. Increasing written notification requirements to include all existing industrial uses in the NHUDA</li> <li>3. Requiring consultation with existing industrial uses (establishment of a NHUDA industry reference group).</li> </ol>	As the provisions for notification are set out in the ULDA Act they are not, and should not be, repeated in the Development Scheme. Applicants may exceed minimum requirements in the legislation; however this cannot be a requirement in the development scheme as the Act sets out the requirements.	N
48.	<p>Section 3 of the Land Use Plan defines the zones of the NHUDA. For the most part, existing industrial uses are within the Medium Impact Employment Zone defined at Section 3.3.</p> <p>Boral consider the Medium Impact Employment Zone definition is deficient in that it fails to define or acknowledge existing industrial uses. At a minimum existing industry should be acknowledged as non-conforming uses – with existing use rights. In addition, the breadth of the definition is such that it renders it meaningless – possible uses in the Zone range from general industry (mechanical workshops), commercial (warehousing and retail), residential (accommodation for “travelling public”) and mixed use (dwellings attached to commercial development). Boral consider that the Medium Impact Employment Zone definition</p>	Existing use rights are protected under the Act. It is not necessary or appropriate to repeat the Act in the development scheme.	N

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
	must be clarified and strengthened acknowledge existing industrial uses and use rights.		
49.	No timeframes or parameters prescribed for public consultation. It is considered important that a clear public consultation timeframe is developed to prescribe a minimum requirement for certain types of development applications.	Section 54 of the <i>Urban Land Development Authority Act 2007</i> provides the minimum notification and submission requirements for development. As the provisions for notification are set out in the ULDA Act they are not, and should not be, repeated in the Development Scheme.	N
50.	Section 2.9 – Notification Requirements. More guidance about what triggers notification and does this include the first sub-precinct application?	The notification requirements have been amended to provide greater clarity.	Y
• Consultation Processes			
51.	There was inadequate consultation with affected landowners about the master planning process	As part of the process for preparing the Bowen Hills UDA Dev. Scheme, the ULDA has undertaken community consultation in excess of that prescribed by the ULDA Act 2007. The additional community consultation has included letter box drops, mail outs and Community Information Days. In addition to these blanket consultation programs, the ULDA regularly meets one-on-one with affected land owners.	N
52.	Landowners were not notified of the 2007 Stakeholder meetings or their outcomes.	The ULDA has acknowledged this however these workshops were undertaken by the Office of Urban Management prior to declaration of the Bowen Hills UDA.	N
53.	Misadvice was given regarding the ULDA's powers to compulsorily acquire land.	Compulsory acquisition powers are not provided under the ULDA Act, but rather State-wide legislation.	N
54.	The ULDA's role, processes and policies ignores the concerns and interests of homeowners.	The ULDA's approach to community consultation reflects the organisations interest in the views and concerns of local landowners. The ULDA believes the Dev. Scheme and the general policies and processes reflect, on balance, the views and concerns of local landowners.	N
55.	The ULDA did not disclose information on the preparation of the initial plans for the Bowen Hills UDA and the widening of Hudd Street.	The ULDA has attempted to keep landowners and business operators informed about the process of preparing the Dev. Scheme. The ULDA is committed to make information available to the public as soon as possible.	N
56.	The Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Premier appears to have accepted the ULDA's decision before the consultation process has been finalised.	To facilitate the master planning process the ULDA Board made certain decisions pertaining to key infrastructure items prior to finalisation of the dev. Scheme. These decisions were notified to the Minister's office.	N
57.	Commendation on community consultation.	Noted.	N
58.	Express appreciation for the efforts to inform and listen. Draft Plan has included many of our concerns.	Noted.	N
59.	Section 3, page 86 refers to consultation with the local community. There is no information about guidelines and parameters to be used for this consultation. How will results be measured?	Consultation with the local community includes a range of processes determined on a case by case basis.	N
• Definitions			
60.	It may be worth expanding the "Schedule 2	These terms are considered clear within their	N

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
	Definitions” to include a broader range of matters such as (but not limited to) “superior design”, “rapid transit” and “within the order of”.	context.	
61.	It appears the use of the word “commercial” may have two meanings within the Development Scheme, which is to say commercial activities broadly (encompassing ventures of a commercial nature), and the definition given to this word by Schedule 2 of the Development Scheme.	Commercial is the ‘heading’ for a range of commercial uses, however, the uses are what are listed in the levels of assessment table.	N
62.	Similarly, a number of other terms are not defined within Schedule 2 which makes interpretation of some requirements difficult (e.g. by defining ‘outer most projection’ to exclude lightweight structures, an applicant would be more easily able to meet the setback requirements and provide meaningful weather protection such as an awning).	Setback requirements are considered adequate.	N
63.	Section 9 provides principle for the design of clean industry, research and development facilities. The term clean industry is not defined.	Definition for clean industry included.	Y
64.	Need definitions for ‘podium’, taller buildings’, ‘network park’, destination park’, connecting park’, civic space’, ‘festival retail’ and ‘clean industry’.	Relevant definitions have been changed (some suggestions are self explanatory and are therefore not separately defined).	Y
65.	Industrial activities should match ERAs (excluding thresholds).	The definitions are based on DIP’s standard definitions. It is inappropriate to use ERA definitions as these have been specifically prepared for the EP Act (not for general use in planning documents).	N
66.	Noise affected uses should use same definition as EPP (noise) 1998.	It is inappropriate to use EPP definitions as these have been specifically prepared for the EPP (not for general use in planning documents) and therefore contains matters not relevant to the Development scheme (e.g. a marine park is a noise sensitive place). However, noise sensitive use has been defined based on the EPP definition.	Y
67.	Definitions should be consistent with DIPs.	Definitions have been prepared based on DIP’s.	N
68.	Community Safety (section 8.1) refers to some issues covered by Bldg Code (e.g. fire safety systems, security systems etc).	Development schemes cover aspects beyond bldg code (e.g. perimeter design to avoid ‘chimney effect’ - refer submission from DES).	N
69.	Sub precinct 3c: Map 2&4. No definitions for primary frontage and key pedestrian connections. Definitions should not compromise cruise ship terminal security.	It is not considered necessary to define Primary frontage and key pedestrian connections. Primary frontages are described in the Urban Design and Sustainability provisions.	N
70.	Precinct 3 - (b) precinct outcomes. Last paragraph use of word harbour, this may be a reference to a small marina please clarify.	This is a reference to a harbour, not a marina. Harbour is not defined as it takes the ordinary dictionary meaning.	N
71.	Cruise Terminal – There is no reference to the statutory requirement of the Cruise Terminal to comply with the Maritime Transport and Offshore Facilities Security Act 2003 (Cwlth). Any planning must take these legislative obligations into consideration.	It is not necessary to refer to a statutory requirement as this will apply regardless; however, to provide clarity a footnote has been added.	Y

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
72.	Need definition of Cinema and Cruise terminal.	Cinema is included in the Indoor Entertainment definition – a cruise terminal definition is not included as it could be too limiting – as an undefined use it will default to permissible.	N
73.	Classing 2 or more shops as a shopping centre is inappropriate – should be based on floor space rather than the number of tenancies. Shopping centre that primarily focuses on display & sale of goods is inappropriate.	Floor space can be regulated through the level of assessment table (it does not change the actual use, just the scale).	N
74.	GFA definition should exclude public lobbies located on car parking levels (i.e. around lifts) & communal recreation areas (where contained within the structure of a building).	GFA definition is consistent with DIP's – no change made.	N
75.	Request for definition of Public Realm to be included in Schedule 2.	The definition of Public Realm is included in Administrative Definitions in Schedule 2 in Bowen Hills and will be included in Northshore Hamilton as well.	Y
76.	'Schedule 2 : Definitions ', should include 'Short Term and Visitor Accommodation' as part of the Residential definition in order to allow for greater variety in the range of residential land uses that can be provided within any defined Residential Precinct.	These definitions fall into the Tourism category.	N
77.	Definition of Shop should be amended to delete reference to department store, discount department store and discount variety stores which are more typical of shopping centres. Shop should also have a GFA limit.	The uses are based on standard definitions developed by the Department of Infrastructure and Planning. The ULDA has the ability to limit the extent of GFA within the Level of Assessment Tables for shop proposals.	N
78.	Section 3.3 – Clarification on the term 'travelling public'. Consideration to be given to high impact uses and whether future expansion or relocation is required.	This term is considered self-explanatory.	N
79.	Suggest Schedule 2 – Definitions form part of the land use plan instead of the Implementation Strategy.	Schedule 2 does not form part of the Implementation Strategy, but rather is a stand alone section.	N
80.	Section 2.8 (p.12) - clarify meaning of "unallocated land" and whether this includes roads and waterways.	Yes – this term includes all land not included in a zone or precinct.	N
81.	The Dev. Scheme needs to define the term "reasonable levels of amenity"	This term is considered self-explanatory.	N
<b>• Editorial</b>			
82.	Part 2, Para 2.3: text should refer to plot ratio rather than GFA for consistency with map.	Amendment not needed as the schemes provides a definition of both plot ratio & GFA	N
83.	The Bus interchange at Bowen Hills railway station should be referred to as a Bus Station.	The Dev. Scheme has been amended accordingly.	Y
84.	Typo p.44 - Bowen Hills is to the "west"	This is not a typo – the wording in the scheme is correct.	N
85.	Section 1 – Typo in 2nd Paragraph. Should be in Figure 8. (POB)	Correction has been made	Y
86.	There is a word missing in second last paragraph of precinct outcomes.	The second last paragraph will be amended to read, "This parkland can incorporate the future provision of a central energy plant to service the UDA."	Y

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
87.	Section 3.2 – Suggested to add the word 'only' to clarify that non-residential uses are to cater for the local community needs instead of the broader community.	The ULDA consider the current wording of this section to be sufficient.	N
88.	Section 3.2 (iii) – the term "provided" should be included after "land or built product".	This section has been amended to be consistent with the AHS.	N
89.	Section 4.7 – Private Open Space. Suggest using the term 'communal recreation area' rather than common open space. (POB)	The ULDA consider the current wording of this section to be sufficient.	N
90.	Section 4.8 – Riverwalk. Typo – change 'modal area' to 'nodal area'.	Typo has been rectified	Y
91.	It is unclear from the document where section 1.2 referenced in both section 2.3 and 2.4 of Part 2 of the Development Scheme can be found.	This is a typo. The correct reference is Section 2.2. This error has been rectified in the Development Scheme.	Y
92.	Section 4.2(b) refers to ground level however prescribes criteria that relates to above ground level.	It is assumed this reference is to Balconies. The provisions relating to balconies have been moved to the section relating to Upper Level Detail	Y
93.	Request amendment to section 4.2(b) (ii) first dot point 'awnings to primary active frontages are continuous along the street alignment to a minimum width of 3.0 metres except where required to accommodate street trees' And second dot point '...to within 0.9 metres of the street kerb for the width of the main entry of the building except where requires to accommodate street trees.'	0.9 metres to the kerb is sufficient distance to allow street trees to be planted. No change required.	N
94.	Request amendment to section 4.2 (b) (iii) third dot point 'in all locations balconies must be screened to ensure privacy from overlooking.'	This has been amended to reflect this issue. The amended wording is as follows <i>In all locations, balconies must be appropriately located and/or screened to maximise privacy between buildings and/or the public realm, whilst not compromising CPTED principles</i>	Y
95.	Drafting Issues – the strategy refers to sections but relevant section is unclear (refer page 89).	The ULDA consider the current wording of this section to be clear	N
96.	Page 43(b) Precinct Outcomes – reference is made to Precinct 4 (Northshore Park) residential uses focussing toward the south adjoining Northshore Central and Northshore Harbour Precincts. In fact the Northshore Park precinct does not adjoin and is quite remote from the Northshore Harbour Precinct.	The Development Scheme has been amended to rectify this error. The new wording is as follows: <i>Residential uses are to be predominantly focused towards the southern part of the precinct, adjoining the Northshore Central.</i>	Y
97.	Section 3 – UDA Zones requires clarification. Second paragraph should read "categorised" rather than "categorises".  Section 3.1 (Mixed Use Centre Zone) should be clarified to relate to the UDA. Should Mixed Use be amended to Mixed Use Residential for consistency?	These UDA zones relate to all existing and future UDAs, not just Northshore Hamilton. As such no change is proposed. Mixed Use Zone seeks to differentiate from the centre area, but still allows for a range of employment and residential uses.  The uses are based on standard zones developed by the Department of Infrastructure and Planning and applies to all UDAs, not just Northshore Hamilton. The future intent of the Business Enterprise Precinct described the intent of the Medium Impact Employment Zone in the context of Northshore Hamilton	N
98.	4.1 Placemaking – under dot point "encourage pedestrian and cycle use" – change 'encourage' to 'promote or prioritise'	Noted – change made.	Y



SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
99.	As BCC's Natural Assets Local Law (NALL) is to cease to have application and a by-law is proposed to only regulate interference with vegetation (as clearing vegetation is development), in order to maintain the status quo in terms of the NALL, the development schemes will have to include Operational Work that is Vegetation Clearing for that vegetation that is identified in the NALL.	Development scheme will address vegetation clearing.	Y
100.	It is noted that ULDA is introducing a By-law to replace BCC's NALL. NALL covers several other vegetation activities (such as pest and hazardous vegetation management) and its replacement in any part of the city is not considered appropriate.	The Development Schemes will address vegetation clearing. The By-law also covers pest and hazardous vegetation management. Together, the By-law and the Development scheme will provide a similar level of control.	N
• Other			
101.	No compensation is available to landowners who have incurred delays during the operation of the ILUP.	Noted.	N
102.	Section 2.1 (p.14) - ULDA needs to recover cost of making land ready for development, including mitigation of external impacts.	Noted	N
103.	Concern development might affect future operations of the airport – BAC seeks to be informed of the more detailed structure height information and associated building levels when concept development for actual building proposals is undertaken.	The height limits for the NSH UDA fall below the OLS and Pans-ops requirements as stipulated in the Brisbane Airport Masterplan. Future development will need to comply with the requirements with SPP 1/02 which references both OLA and Pans-ops.  The ULDA will forward development applications for comment to the BAC where the proposal is outside the current standards/provisions of the BAC.	N
104.	Acknowledge and appreciate the intent of the DS to protect existing marine plants within the NSH UDA but not clear as to how this will be achieved and by what mechanisms any proposals to remove marine plants will be assessed.	The Development Scheme has been amended to address this issue, including changes to the UDA-wide development criteria, precinct and sub-precinct provisions, definitions and Schedule 1.	Y
105.	<i>Land Act 1994</i> – UDA comprises a number of parcels of State land including significant leases and reserve land. Where future tenure of the land is proposed to change, requirements under the <i>Land Act 1994</i> will apply. NRW recommends that the ULDA and NRW's State Land officer(s) discuss future intentions for this non-freehold land prior to the finalisation of the Development Scheme	Development involving State land will be subject to the usual processes contained under the <i>Land Act 1994</i> . It is not the function of the Development Scheme to include these processes that related to State Land.	No
106.	Vegetation Management Act 1999- No remnant Regional Ecosystem vegetation is present over the proposed Northshore Hamilton UDA. Therefore NRW has no jurisdiction within this site under VMA.	Noted	No
107.	<i>Water Act 2000</i> – Any final determination on whether any 'watercourses' under the Water Act 2000 are present within the proposed Northshore Hamilton UDA boundary is pending. If none are present, NRW has no jurisdiction within this site under the Water Act 2000. Updated information will be available on this determination for the next	Noted. The ULDA will review this information when it becomes available.	No

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
	round of consultation.		
108.	Inconsistency with the aims of the ULDA Act	The Development Scheme has been drafted to achieve the main purposes of the Act.	N
109.	Concern that the planning process is likely to delay approval of plans	The ULDA Act has shorter timeframes for determining development applications than IPA.	N
110.	SPP 2/02 – no closure mechanism for signing off against the Acid Sulfate soils SPP	There is no requirement to sign off against the SPP however it has been considered in the drafting of the development outcomes.	N
<b>• Affordable Housing</b>			
111.	It is noted that the criteria for affordable housing is very similar to those used by BCC (for example in the West end/Woolloongabba Local Area Plan). Experience with this approach (both here and in the UK) of allowing developers to defer the obligation for on-site provision in favour of a monetary contribution is unlikely to deliver the desired/expected outcomes for the UDAs. These sites and the specific legislative framework within which their development is facilitated provide a significant opportunity for ULDA to deliver housing diversity including affordable housing and this opportunity is unlikely to be realised through the currently proposed development criteria).	Noted – the ULDA preference is for product over monetary contribution – diversity of product is also sought.	N
112.	ULDA to work with BCC to ensure a consistent approach for housing affordability throughout Brisbane. Support for housing affordability concepts	ULDA is happy to work with BCC in achieving affordable housing & support is noted.	N
113.	Not clear how 'affordability' is implemented, enforced and monitored (identify in AHS).	Implementation Strategy is being currently developed to address these issues. Some matters already covered in the AH Strategy such as use of covenants and management plans on title.	N
114.	Will a development application seeking a varied range of housing products (1 bedroom to 3 bedrooms) be considered as providing affordable housing?	The development application would be providing diversity; however affordability is more about rental & purchase price.	N
115.	Not clear how to avoid developers passing on development/infrastructure charges to end user. Affordable housing will not become cheaper where developers have to pay charges.	The value capture mechanism will be known prior to the purchase of land for development in UDAs. This should then be able to be factored in to any feasibility and purchase price of land.	N
116.	Need mechanism to ensure in lieu contributions must be spent on affordable housing as well as to manage built property provided in lieu.	Agree - will use covenants and management plans attached to title and will develop mechanisms to monitor compliance	N
117.	No further contribution should be required if the subject land is maintained at, or below current BCC City Plan (non-residential) densities.	Noted – this is currently covered by the AHS.	N
118.	Concern that DOH not exempt from ULDA planning process (as per IPA). Concern that social housing provision to be curtailed and incur higher development costs than in LGA. Amend DS to be like IPA provisions.	DOH to have the same exemption as they have in IPA ie DG Housing can approve public housing (as defined in IPA) developments and will not be subject to infrastructure charges. DOH will pay for necessary upgrades to connect to networks as they do now.	Y

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
119.	Need to accept social housing design approaches and standards (rates of car parking provision, minimisation of communal open space, targeted private open space provision based on size and type of dwelling and size and type of household).	It is not considered that the urban design provisions of the Dev. Scheme will affect the ability of the Dept. of Housing to deliver quality social housing and neighbourhood amenity outcomes. However, it should be noted that Part 1, section 2.5 of the Land Use Plan provides for the approval of development that does not comply with the provisions of the Dev. Scheme where there are sufficient grounds to justify approval of the development despite the non-compliance. Sufficient grounds includes superior design outcomes or overwhelming community need.	N
120.	Clarify what is meant by Adaptable housing (p13).	Delete term (term is outdated and is now called universal design). Design guidelines will be available on the ULDA website incorporating, universal, sustainable and affordable design aspects.	Y
121.	The concepts referred to in the Development Scheme need to be consistent with those in the Housing Affordability Strategy, particularly in relation to Affordable Housing and Uplift. A definition in relation to what is a Low to Moderate Income Household may also need to be included.  The references to contributions for affordable housing, infrastructure and ecologically sustainable development in the Land Use Plan are appropriately referenced in the Infrastructure Plan and the Implementation Strategy.  The housing diversity requirement will be imposed as a condition to an approval of a UDA development application.  The maximum development yield is either the greater of the yield permitted in the relevant Development Scheme map or a prior approval, or that permitted by the Development Scheme.	Amended to ensure consistency.  Don't want definition of low to moderate fixed in the development as the income will change.	Y
122.	Appendix B e.g. does not relate to calculation of a monetary contribution but is for conversion of affordable housing contribution into product therefore this e.g. should be included within Appendix C.	This will be amended in the final copy.	Y
123.	Section 3.2 – Clarification is sought over the term 'reflect local housing need'. Do non-residential uses apply to both Medium Intensity and High Intensity Zones? Suggest Child Care use be included in non-residential uses.  There are no specified areas for the delivering of affordable housing, no locational opportunities/constraints.	Data on local housing need in the UDAs will be provided by the DoH and will be available to proponents via a link from the ULDA website.  The Development Scheme states that non-residential uses may be suitable in all Residential zones. Child Care Centre will be added as additional use.	Y
124.	How will the ULDA determine an "equivalent monetary contribution" for the provision of affordable housing. To whom will subsidies be paid?	It is anticipated that a report to the developer from a recognised valuer is required to support market rent figure. The ULDA's Affordable Housing Strategy will provide further details of this process.	N

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
125.	Affordable Housing Contributions – Requests to amend the timeframe for payment until prior to commencement of the use or prior to plan sealing. requires payment to be made.	The ULDA will address this issue within the revisions to the Affordable Housing Strategy.	N
126.	Use of 2 bedroom units of 80m <sup>2</sup> should be reviewed – development costs within the UDA are high which influences affordable housing outcomes. Appendix D identifies \$300,000 minimum product – because of high development costs, a studio/one bedroom unit should be utilised as the benchmark for NSH and not a 2 bedroom unit – more appropriate outcome would be to adopt a 1 bedroom/studio unit of 50m <sup>2</sup> -55m <sup>2</sup> as benchmark.	Not accepted – we need some diversity of product so 80sq mtre unit used as a substitute. Using a smaller unit size would increase the number of units required as the 5% is based on residential GFA.	N
127.	Request Affordable Housing Strategy identifies how the annual market rent in the area is determined and by whom. Adopt a one bedroom/studio unit of 50m <sup>2</sup> – 55 m <sup>2</sup> in the area as a benchmark. Appendix B example of monetary contribution should be included in appendix C.	The ULDA will address this issue within the revisions to the Affordable Housing Strategy.	N
128.	Support for key worker accommodation. Planning needs to provide for 40 sqm unit sizes to reflect the density and affordability.	The Dev. Scheme does not prevent residential units of this size. Any development will need to demonstrate that the size of the units satisfies the development standards of the Dev. Scheme including good urban design sustainability.	N
129.	Definition of affordable housing needs to be clarified (not intended for public housing).	Strategy says we are not providing social housing. The ULDA Affordable Housing Strategy articulates the ULDA's definition of Affordable Housing.	N.
130.	The significant additional infrastructure and rate cost make any development by QNP unviable. The ULDA is seeking to impose unreasonable charges and levies, with no rights of appeal and no accountability. The charges will discourage development in favour of land outside the UDA.  The provision of affordable housing in a high risk project may not be considered viable by the private sector. Any affordable housing would need to be highly incentivised.	Possibly but higher densities may not be available outside UDA.  As part of developing the Infrastructure Contributions Framework the ULDA considered a range of issues for the introduction of infrastructure contributions within the UDAs. The issues surrounding land value uplift have been discussed with the Urban Development Institute of Australia (UDIA) and the Property Council of Australia (PCA) to ensure that any infrastructure contributions would not be seen as a disincentive to development or adversely impact on the viability of any development proposal.	N
131.	Section 3.1 (p.15) - will there be a guide regarding what is the required housing mix and what is considered reasonable in terms of fixtures, services and appliances for affordable housing.	The ULDA will address this issue with the revisions to the Affordable Housing Strategy.	N
132.	ULDA could consider an Affordable Housing incentive scheme that provides for various built form and financial incentives to developers who include affordable housing within their development. E.g. a reduction in development contribution and infrastructure charges for affordable housing components of residential and mixed use developments.	The ULDA will address this issue with the revisions to the Affordable Housing Strategy.	N
133.	The ULDA should identify the reporting and monitoring requirements for any affordable dwellings.	The ULDA is considering the appropriate reporting and monitoring requirements for affordable dwellings.	N

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
134.	BCC would like a consistent approach to be applied between BCC and ULDA for ensuring the affordability of the dwellings remain beyond the first occupier.	This is subject to ongoing discussions with BCC.	N
<b>INFRASTRUCTURE</b>			
• <b>Infrastructure Contributions</b>			
135.	When providing for maximum plot ratio's within the Development Scheme area, a single plot ratio is provided for the whole precinct. It is questionable whether this plot ratio is matched to height limitations which are specified within the Development Scheme. This is to say, if a height limit provides for a certain height, but the plot ratio does not allow for a building to be constructed to that height without developing above the stated maximum plot ratio, a 'relaxation' will be required for the plot ratio to facilitate a development to the maximum heights specified.	Noted. The value uplift provisions contained in the development schemes are considered appropriate.	N
136.	Guidelines are required to calculate approximate charge that will be applied to a particular plan. BCC charge on nearby site was 24% of the land value based on an approved project. Suggest"- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>base a rate per square metre on site area and value with the value used being calculated by a panel of valuers under a ULDA brief;</li> <li>look at a rate per square metre of various floor space uses – could apply for example at a higher rate for office space and a lower rate for affordable housing;</li> </ul> Base charge on all land with an under and over variation based on uses.	This would become complex and moves away from desire to have something simple and not necessarily site specific.  A calculator is currently being prepared by the ULDA and is expected to be available to coincide with the commencement of the Dev. Scheme.	N
137.	Proposed contributions scheme is comparable to a betterment tax and its legality is questionable.	Senior Counsel advice has been sought and the legality of the provisions confirmed.	N
138.	Clarity needed on how infrastructure charges will be collected (e.g. what is mechanism for collecting funding for infrastructure charges for Kingsford Smith Drive work, road links into the development, metropolitan parks etc. How will community infrastructure be established in the UDA?)  Not clear what development outcomes have been used to determine demand on infrastructure and what development infrastructure is required (e.g. a proportion of maximum plot ratio under UDA achieved in all precincts?)  Not clear whether BCC's desired standards of service for infrastructure will be achieved through the development or whether other standards will apply.  Not clear who will eventually retain ownership of infrastructure – need further information on proposed ownership and maintenance of harbours and marinas.	These are matters currently being discussed with BCC.  The major infrastructure works, affordable housing and ecologically sustainable outcomes will be funded by way of the sharing of the land value uplift arising from the ULDA's development scheme.  To ensure transparency and simplicity the land value uplift will be approximated for each UDA, or specific precinct in a UDA where a wide variation is anticipated, as a rate/m <sup>2</sup> of additional GFA.  This rate will be determined by considering various development scenarios and developing a business model, using standard industry assumptions and using this information to then determine the residual land value.  This contribution will only apply to those instances where the applicant elects to utilise the increased plot ratio arising under the ULDA Development Scheme. In that instance a development agreement will be entered into with the	N

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
	<p>Note: BCC has previously used bonding to secure developer contributions however not ideal and practice generally avoided.</p> <p>Clarification is sought on how the 50% uplift in land value arises from the increase in GFA.</p> <p>How will infrastructure contributions be determined and be fairly apportioned across all developments.</p>	<p>development proponent prior to approval which will cover matters such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timing and payment of contributions</li> <li>• Bonding</li> <li>• Credit for works in lieu</li> <li>• Affordable housing agreement (refer Affordable Housing Strategy)</li> <li>• Ecological sustainable outcomes.</li> </ul>	
139.	<p>Not certain how 50% land value uplift, plus the BCC infrastructure contribution based on City Plan will be sufficient to fund necessary trunk infrastructure.</p> <p>Not clear how 50% uplift will be determine or how total infrastructure contributions be fairly apportioned across all development.</p>	<p>Instead of 50%, the contribution rate included in a Development Agreement shall be at a rate per square metre of additional GFA which will be documented.</p> <p>The major infrastructure works, affordable housing and ecologically sustainable outcomes will be funded by way of the sharing of the land value uplift arising from the ULDA's development scheme.</p> <p>To ensure transparency and simplicity the land value uplift will be approximated for each UDA, or specific precinct in a UDA where a wide variation is anticipated, as a rate/m<sup>2</sup> of additional GFA.</p> <p>This rate will be determined by considering various development scenarios and developing a business model, using standard industry assumptions and using this information to then determine the residual land value.</p> <p>This contribution will only apply to those instances where the applicant elects to utilise the increased plot ratio arising under the ULDA Development Scheme. In that instance a development agreement will be entered into with the development proponent prior to approval which will cover matters such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timing and payment of contributions</li> <li>• Bonding</li> <li>• Credit for works in lieu</li> <li>• Affordable housing agreement (refer Affordable Housing Strategy)</li> <li>• Ecological sustainable outcomes.</li> </ul>	Y
140.	<p>Financial incentives should be provided to developers commencing early construction (within next 3 years) through reduction in BCC contributions, nil GST, nil Land Tax and Government loan.</p>	<p>Further consideration of incentive arrangements will be undertaken as the Dev. Scheme is being implemented.</p>	N
141.	<p>A contribution equivalent to 50% of the land value uplift will result in no proposals over and above the existing GFA allocated, and ultimately the underdevelopment of large areas of the Bowen Hills UDA.</p>	<p>The contribution rate included in a Development Agreement shall be at a rate per square metre of additional GFA which will be documented.</p> <p>As part of developing the Infrastructure Contribution Framework, the ULDA considered a range of issues for the introduction of infrastructure contributions within the UDAs.</p> <p>The issues surrounding land value uplift are continuing to be discussed with the UDIA and PCA to ensure that any infrastructure contributions will not be seen as a disincentive to development of adversely impact on the viability of any development proposal.</p> <p>The infrastructure charging mechanisms are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For network infrastructure - the BCC ICS</li> </ul>	Y

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
		<p>charge;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For local area improvement works - a special rate similar to the BCC SCIP model;</li> <li>For major infrastructure, affordable housing, ecological sustainable development – land value uplift.</li> </ul> <p>These charging mechanisms apply to land owners, developers and rate payers depending on the nature of the infrastructure contribution required.</p>	
142.	Not clear if contribution rate will be applied to GFA in excess of BCC City Plan which include affordable housing.	The uplift applies to GFA in excess of the city plan.	N
143.	<p>Principle of funding infrastructure through uplift financial gains is reasonable however needs to be based on a proportion of uplift in value feasible relative to the cost of development and based on realistic pre-development scheme land values. Uplift in Hamilton Harbour site unrealistically high due to assumed base value of sit being significantly undervalued – inflated uplift would result in a development contribution rate totally unsustainable for the project.</p> <p>Plot ratio of 0.5 may be reflective of current GI and CP zones under City Plan, however BCC has for some considerable time declared an intent to support a considerably higher density of development and higher order uses on site (reflected in Draft NSH Neighbourhood Plan April 07 which allocated a plot ratio of 3.0 and Draft LGMS May 07 which reflected BCC's intent for site to be residential growth area to 2026.</p> <p>Devine purchased 3 of the 5 allotment after release of NP &amp; LGMS – sale price of land reflected increased development potential. Valuations have highlighted land value much higher than value of GI land (most likely since inception of Portside Wharf Development).</p> <p>Therefore, uplift from 0.5 is totally inaccurate (3.0 more accurate).</p> <p>Support for credit for provision of works or product in lieu of payment – should go further to formally support and reward developments that incorporate initiatives, such as higher levels of ESD &amp; affordable housing.</p> <p>Development Agreement – Section 2.4 of the proposed Development Scheme identifies that a development agreement may include amongst other things, '<i>credit for the provision of works or product in lieu of payment</i>'. This is supported and should go even further to formally support and reward those developments that incorporate initiatives, such as higher levels of ESD and affordable housing, within their own developments.</p>	<p>Noted. The value uplift provisions contained in the development schemes are considered appropriate.</p> <p>As part of developing the Infrastructure Contribution Framework, the ULDA considered a range of issues for the introduction of infrastructure contributions within the UDAs.</p> <p>The issues surrounding land value uplift are continuing to be discussed with the UDIA and PCA to ensure that any infrastructure contributions will not be seen as a disincentive to development of adversely impact on the viability of any development proposal.</p> <p>The infrastructure charging mechanisms are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For network infrastructure - the BCC ICS charge;</li> <li>For local area improvement works - a special rate similar to the BCC SCIP model;</li> <li>For major infrastructure, affordable housing, ecological sustainable development – land value uplift.</li> </ul> <p>These charging mechanisms apply to land owners, developers and rate payers depending on the nature of the infrastructure contribution required.</p>	N
144.	The concepts referred to in the Development Scheme need to be consistent with those in the Housing Affordability Strategy, particularly in relation to Affordable Housing and Uplift. A definition in relation to what is a Low to Moderate Income Household may also	<p>Noted. The value uplift provisions contained in the development schemes are considered appropriate.</p> <p>It is unlikely that developers will develop to the base plot ratio based on the price of the land and the anticipated yield allowable under the</p>	N

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
	<p>need to be included.</p> <p>The references to contributions for affordable housing, infrastructure and ecologically sustainable development in the Land Use Plan are appropriately referenced in the Infrastructure Plan and the Implementation Strategy.</p> <p>The housing diversity requirement will be imposed as a condition to an approval of a UDA development application.</p> <p>The maximum development yield is either the greater of the yield permitted in the relevant Development Scheme map or a prior approval, or that permitted by the Development Scheme.</p> <p>Transitional provisions in relation to determining whether there has been Land Value Uplift may need to be included, to benefit prior purchasers of land in the UDA that considered they may be able to develop to a greater density than that prescribed as an acceptable solution under the City Plan.</p> <p>The base plot ratio is very low and there is a risk that developers may choose the base development yields which is too low to support mixed use and rapid transit. (DIP).</p> <p>Need to include infrastructure agreements with State govt delivery agencies and local govt.</p> <p>Timing of infrastructure required as UDA reaches ultimate capacity should be indicated (timing of cycle &amp; pedestrian plan, water &amp; sewerage, public transport including the new rail line and station).</p>	<p>Development Scheme.</p> <p>As part of developing the Infrastructure Contribution Framework, the ULDA considered a range of issues for the introduction of infrastructure contributions within the UDAs.</p> <p>The issues surrounding land value uplift are continuing to be discussed with the UDIA and PCA to ensure that any infrastructure contributions will not be seen as a disincentive to development of adversely impact on the viability of any development proposal.</p>	
145.	Consideration should be given to the Uplift Land Value being determined as a rate rather than at 50%.	The contribution rate included in a Development Agreement shall be at a rate per square metre of additional GFA which will be documented.	Y
146.	<p>Section 1 (p.71) - what are the contingencies or impacts if development does not go beyond the current provisions resulting in insufficient funding from uplift. Will the Stage be required to fund additional works?</p> <p>Section 3 (p.72) - will the proposed levying of rates and special charges for catalyst infrastructure and infrastructure improvements be used to fund external works eg intersection upgrades outside UDA.</p> <p>p.11 Section 2.3 Main Roads supports the concept of Development Contribution Rate. More details are required to understand how it will work. If this does not work what are the required contingencies to fund the required upfront and ongoing infrastructure? (DMR)</p> <p>p.85 Section 1 Main roads supports the principle of facilitating redevelopment of this UDA. Given the current economic uncertainties what are the contingencies of impacts if the uplifting of values does not occur. Will the State be required to fund additional works? (DMR)</p> <p>pp.86-87 Section 3 Infrastructure Contributions. No timing or costs are provided</p>	<p>Contributions will be monitored and funding arrangements reviewed over time.</p> <p>Timing of the catalyst infrastructure is expected within the first 5 years of the development scheme being in operation, as outlined in the Development Scheme.</p> <p>As outlined in the Infrastructure Contributions Framework. Contributions will be monitored and funding arrangements reviewed over time.</p> <p>Contributions will be monitored and funding arrangements reviewed over time.</p> <p>Timing of the catalyst infrastructure is expected within the first 5 years of the development scheme being in operation, as outlined in the Development Scheme.</p>	N



SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
	for the proposed catalyst infrastructure. There is also no mention of cycle and pedestrian infrastructure which should be a key part of the early infrastructure. It is stated there will be an investigation for dedicated rapid transit systems. There is no indication as to when this will occur and what strategy might be employed if this option is not viable.		
147.	DOH exempt from local govt infrastructure charges under IPA – need equivalent exemptions for UDAs otherwise DOH proposal will be more costly to deliver in UDAs than in LGAs.	DOH will have the same exemption as they have in IPA i.e. DG Housing can approve public housing (as defined in IPA) developments and will not be subject to infrastructure charges. DOH will pay for necessary upgrades to connect to networks as they do now.  Exemptions for BCC related charges will be as allowed by BCC. A general exemption from Land Value Uplift requirements for affordable housing providers is being considered. An exemption for Dept of Housing is included in the Development Schemes to ensure consistency with IPA provisions.	Y
148.	The Dev. Scheme should be amended to require no Development Contribution for Utility Installations, similar to the exemption for Affordable Housing provisions	In general, utility installations do not constitute GFA and therefore would not trigger development contributions.	Y
149.	The proposed infrastructure contributions will erode incentives to redevelop or on-sell. The cost of the infrastructure should be fairly apportioned between all users. Infrastructure contributions should be fairly apportioned to those benefiting most (i.e. within closer proximity) paying more. The assumed plot ratio used to calculate value uplift is too low and does not take account of existing plot ratio, the GFA recently approved on nearby sites and the performance based approach of the City Plan. The Infrastructure Contribution Framework does not fairly apportion charges across the UDA Precincts The land value underpinning the calculation of the 50% up-lift value should be determined on a per property independent assessment. The BCC and ULDA infrastructure charges both take contributions towards for public realm and road upgrades constituting a "double up". The Proposed Dev. Scheme penalises new development for contributions against old developments approved under BCC processes. Outside the UDA, development above City Plan's acceptable solution can be achieved without paying a special rate or charge. The infrastructure policy should not be based on GFA - its erodes economies of scale. Neither independent or extensive research has been undertaken to formulate the values and figures within the Infrastructure Charging Framework or Affordable Housing Policy. Differential rates should be applied to	This issue will be considered during the finalisation of the Infrastructure Charging Framework. Contributions imposed on development approved under the ULDA Act is not expected to make up any short fall in the total of contributions due to development being approved prior to declaration. As part of developing the Infrastructure Contribution Framework, the ULDA considered a range of issues for the introduction of infrastructure contributions within the UDAs. The issues surrounding land value uplift are continuing to be discussed with the UDIA and PCA to ensure that any infrastructure contributions will not be seen as a disincentive to development of adversely impact on the viability of any development proposal. The infrastructure charging mechanisms are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For network infrastructure - the BCC ICS charge;</li> <li>For local area improvement works - a special rate similar to the BCC SCIP model;</li> <li>For major infrastructure, affordable housing, ecological sustainable development – land value uplift.</li> </ul> These charging mechanisms apply to land owners, developers and rate payers depending on the nature of the infrastructure contribution required.	Y

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
	different types of development with developers able to enter into an infrastructure agreement to allow for staged repayment.		
150.	Recommended that the uplift charge be removed or the base value charge to amended to more accurately reflect the development potential of the land prior to the ULDA's takeover of the land.	Noted. The value uplift provisions contained in the development schemes are considered appropriate.  Contributions imposed on development approved under the ULDA Act is not expected to make up any short fall in the total of contributions due to development being approved prior to declaration. As part of developing the Infrastructure Contribution Framework, the ULDA considered a range of issues for the introduction of infrastructure contributions within the UDAs.	N
151.	The Development Scheme does not contain sufficient information about headworks charges and infrastructure contributions to enable analysis that would confirm economic viability of the masterplan	The Infrastructure framework will provide details of monetary amounts and will be finalised prior to the Development Scheme taking effect in March 2009.	N
152.	The assumed plot ratio of 2.5 under BCC's City Plan is too low. The blanket plot ration assumed should be replaced by a more accurate calculation.  If the subject site is redeveloped will a credit be given for existing buildings on the site.	It is accepted that the local area for covering the proposed site did not set a maximum plot ratio for the site and that the Dev. Scheme, for the sake of convenience and ease in determining infrastructure contributions has assumed a plot ratio for the site of 1:2.5 and that development on the site could exceed 3 storeys and 10 metres subject to an impact assessable application.  Credits for BCC related charges will be as applied by BCC; credits related to land value capture will be assessed by the ULDA at the time of the development proposal being prepared (these credits will generally relate to development outcomes exceeding the requirements of the development scheme e.g. a higher green star rating achieved; higher proportion of affordable housing product).	N
153.	No details are contained within the proposed Infrastructure Plan in relation to the monetary amounts for both the identified catalyst infrastructure and other items.	The Infrastructure framework will provide details of monetary amounts and will be finalised prior to the Development Scheme being adopted in March 2009.	N
154.	ULDA has released Infrastructure Contributions Framework separately to the Development Scheme. In this document it clearly states that future monetary contributions will be based upon land value uplift. This would require a land valuation to be done for every development proposal. A more simpler and economical method would be to establish a set charge rate across the UDA.  The principle of not utilising public funds does not acknowledge that the majority of the land is owned by State Government. The land would be sold on commercial terms providing the ULDA with an income stream which should be used to fund infrastructure.	The ULDA is working closely with the Development Industry to arrive at an infrastructure contribution rate that is equitable and not cost prohibitive. This will be a GFA rate per square metre of GFA above the base plot ratio for all sites in the UDA is included in the Development Scheme. Future uplift can be determined by establishing the new plot ratio as part of future development applications. The infrastructure plan clearly acknowledges that infrastructure costs will be shared between the private and public sector. Money derived from the future sale of land will go directly to the Port of Brisbane, and not the ULDA. As such it is necessary for some contributions to be provided by the private development industry. No change proposed.	N
155.	The preparation of a development agreement will be complex to administer and time consuming which will slow down the development process.  The Draft Infrastructure framework does not	It is intended that the ULDA will provide a development agreement template which will be readily available to Developers and straightforward. Due to the inclusion of affordable housing in proposed developments, the	N

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
	<p>include the infrastructure charges as suggested in Section 5.0 of the document.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Framework does not include details of how the 50% uplift contribution is determined, which should be included for ease of use and certainty. Further to the above point, the Framework makes reference to plot ratios, however the draft Development Scheme does not utilise plot ratios making it difficult to determine. The combination of the BCC infrastructure contributions, a proportion of the land value uplift, a benefited rate and affordable housing contributions will lead to developers going elsewhere – the State Government must be prepared to a larger role in providing the necessary infrastructure.</p> <p>Partial funding of infrastructure is considered inappropriate. Where infrastructure is required this should be undertaken through an infrastructure charging mechanism rather a contribution from uplift. If the ULDA are unwilling to remove the land value uplift contribution then any infrastructure contribution/headworks requirements should be removed. There should not be two separate charging mechanisms.</p>	<p>Development Agreement allows the ULDA to control the long-term affordability of future dwellings.</p> <p>The Infrastructure framework will provide details of monetary amounts and will be finalised prior to the Development Scheme being adopted in March 2009.</p> <p>An example of how the uplift is calculated is included in Appendix A of the Infrastructure Framework.</p> <p>Correct. The Development Scheme does not have plot ratios as these will be determined as part of future development applications based on maximum GFA's identified for the various precincts and sub-precincts. GFA's will be negotiated on an individual basis with the ULDA and will have regard to issues such as building height, setbacks, landscaping and car parking provision.</p> <p>The issues surrounding land value uplift are continuing to be discussed with the UDIA and PCA to ensure that any infrastructure contributions will not be seen as a disincentive to development of adversely impact on the viability of any development proposal.</p> <p>The infrastructure charging mechanisms are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For network infrastructure - the BCC ICS charge;</li> <li>For local area improvement works - a special rate similar to the BCC SCIP model;</li> <li>For major infrastructure, affordable housing, ecological sustainable development – land value uplift.</li> </ul> <p>These charging mechanisms apply to land owners, developers and rate payers depending on the nature of the infrastructure contribution required.</p>	
156.	<p>The combination of the BCC infrastructure contributions, a proportion of the land value uplift, a benefited rate and affordable housing contributions will lead to developers going elsewhere – the State Government must to a larger role in providing the necessary infrastructure.</p> <p>Development Contribution Rate – In determining the uplift in land value resulting from the Development Scheme, a pre-scheme value based on a plot ration of 0.5 is totally inaccurate. Rather, a plot ratio of 3.0 more accurately reflects the value of the site based on Brisbane City Council's panning policy position and reasonable development expectations for the site) River Park should be 2.8 based on NSH Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>The ULDA is working closely with the Development Industry to arrive at an infrastructure contribution rate that is equitable and not cost prohibitive. Affordable housing must be provided as it is one of the key requirements under the ULDA Act. Developers can save costs elsewhere by choosing to develop in the UDA by way of fast tracking approval times, reduced land holding costs and minimise developer risk associated with planning approval times and the potential for long winded court appeals. Added to this is the resultant 'un-earned' increase in land values/unit values which should be partly apportioned to infrastructure provision.</p>	N
157.	<p>Section 2.2 – Maximum Development Yield (iii)', should be amended to state: 'where evidence (satisfactory to the ULDA) is provided of a development approval, <u>that was properly made</u>, before the declaration of the Bowen Hills UDA (a 'pre-existing approval') – the development yield permitted by that approval.' This amended would make the wording of the Bowen Hills Development</p>	<p>Legal advice is that there is no question about an approval – it either is or isn't an approval. Properly made refers only to development applications.</p>	N

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
	Scheme consistent with advice provided to Planning Initiatives by ULDA letter dated 18th November 2008.		
158.	<p>The extent of infrastructure contributions payable by landowners and developers are likely to be cost prohibitive.</p> <p>Infrastructure Charges Schedule appears to have less landowner input and likely to be more expensive. The statement that infrastructure charges will be reviewed from 'time to time' does not allow for certainty from landowners.</p> <p>How will be public transport be funded? Will it be part of the catalyst infrastructure and will there be any Government contribution?</p> <p>Need for more clarity around how, what and when will a transparent and easily calculable development contribution schedule be produced.</p> <p>Catalyst Infrastructure should occur as soon as possible (within first 12 months). No details on cost, staging or timing of infrastructure or by whom. How will funding package mentioned on page 85 be developed and when? On this basis it is unclear how infrastructure will encourage or initiate development upfront and meet affordable housing timeframes.</p> <p>List of catalyst infrastructure does not include any public transport facilities. These need to be in place at the start of the development.</p> <p>2 ferry terminals are shown on maps but not included in words. Should be identified as catalyst infrastructure. Rapid Transit corridor should be shown similarly to ferry stops.</p> <p>Shared central parking stations should be identified as catalyst infrastructure as they are central to the proposal.</p>	<p>As part of developing the Infrastructure Contributions Framework the ULDA considered a range of issues for the introduction of infrastructure contributions within the UDAs. The issues surrounding land value uplift have been discussed with the Urban Development Institute of Australia (UDIA) and the Property Council of Australia (PCA) to ensure that any infrastructure contributions would not be seen as a disincentive to development or adversely impact on the viability of any development proposal.</p> <p>The mix of funding of public transport infrastructure is an issue of ongoing discussion with Queensland Transport.</p> <p>Noted. The value uplift provisions contained in the development schemes are considered appropriate.</p> <p>Infrastructure will be timed to support development as it progresses.</p> <p>It is considered that parking stations are not catalyst infrastructure at this time.</p> <p>The exact timing of public transport services has yet to be determined. ULDA is working closely with QT, BCC and Translink to ensure sufficient public transport is provided at an early stage</p> <p>Ferry terminals will be included under point 10 of the Infrastructure Tables. The structure plan clearly identifies a rapid transit corridor servicing the UDA.</p> <p>It is considered that parking stations are not catalyst infrastructure at this time.</p>	Y
159.	Road Links to Kingsford Smith Drive: QR contends that the consequential loss of development potential should be formally recognised in the Final Development Scheme.	Development Scheme shows this as indicative only and will be subject to further negotiations.	N
160.	The RBWH should be exempt from the requirement to contribute to any significant infrastructure charge for their carpark site as the development will be making a significant contribution towards both community and transport infrastructure for the precinct ie. primary healthcare facilities, accommodation for patients and family, and pedestrian access across Bowen Bridge Road).	Exemptions for BCC related charges will be as allowed by BCC.	Y
161.	The infrastructure contributions for Precinct 9 over and above the BCC rate represents an unreasonable financial burden and will not result in any benefit to this precinct.	<p>As part of developing the Infrastructure Contribution Framework, the ULDA considered a range of issues for the introduction of infrastructure contributions within the UDAs.</p> <p>The issues surrounding land value uplift are continuing to be discussed with the UDIA and PCA to ensure that any infrastructure contributions will not be seen as a disincentive to development or adversely impact on the viability of any development proposal.</p>	N

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
162.	<p>The use of a special ULDA charge over an historic BCC Planning Scheme, unrelated to surrounding no ULDA areas is discriminatory. It is inappropriate that the ULDA Act 2007 provides no rights of appeal and is seeking to impose unreasonable charges and special levies.</p> <p>The basis of the Special ULDA Charge is discriminatory as it applies to a specific planning precinct not the area that will benefit from the infrastructure upgrades.</p> <p>The Special ULDA Charge is discriminatory between Bowen Hills and adjoining suburbs and will impede development. The boundaries of the UDA do not reflect the area of influence of the infrastructure. Other suburbs should be required to contribute.</p> <p>The special infrastructure charge should only be considered where consent is given for a plot ratio 3x that permitted by the BCC City Plan.</p> <p>The area of influence of a refurbished Railway Station is much greater than the designated TOD area.</p>	<p>Special rate is provided for in the ULDA Act. Noted that other suburbs should contribute to infrastructure, and currently discussing this with BCC.</p> <p>The plot ratios and heights provided for under the Dev. Scheme substantially exceed those under City Plan 2000. It is acknowledged with development exceeding that permitted by City Plan additional infrastructure contributions are required. However these contributions are necessary to fund the infrastructure required to support the development intensity permitted by the Development Scheme.</p>	N
163.	<p>The Scheme will create uncertainty on the rating valuations and may impose significant increase holding charges prior to redevelopment.</p>	<p>The plot ratios and heights provided for under the Dev. Scheme substantially exceed those under City Plan 2000. It is acknowledged with development exceeding that permitted by City Plan additional infrastructure contributions are required. However these contributions are necessary to fund the infrastructure required to support the development intensity permitted by the Development Scheme.</p>	N
164.	<p>Govt infrastructure has compromised the site and should now be compensated by the provision of reduced charges.</p> <p>Commercial rents will not support substantial ULDA special charges, similarly the increased land cost for development would not support Affordable Housing.</p> <p>The ULDA's Infrastructure Charging Framework makes development unviable.</p> <p>Certainty must be given over headworks charges.</p> <p>Increased plot ratios do not mean a development will be commercially viable.</p> <p>QN requests a review of risk management of development staging and its impact on development costs.</p>	<p>Many of these matters will be addressed as part of ongoing discussions with Qld Newspapers and in the finalisation of the ICF.</p> <p>As part of developing the Infrastructure Contributions Framework the ULDA considered a range of issues for the introduction of infrastructure contributions within the UDAs. The issues surrounding land value uplift are continuing to be discussed with the Urban Development Institute of Australia (UDIA) and the Property Council of Australia (PCA) to ensure that any infrastructure contributions would not be seen as a disincentive to development or adversely impact on the viability of any development proposal.</p>	N
165.	<p>Where development incorporates innovative co-gen power and other infrastructure, reduction in charges should be considered</p>	<p>To be considered in the finalisation of the ICF.</p>	N
166.	<p>Development levies and offsets: clarification sought on how the development levies will be applied to the RNA site given that considerable community facilities and open space are to be provided.</p> <p>RNA's project feasibility is premised on limited development levies.</p>	<p>The ULDA will continue to liaise with the RNA on these issues.</p>	Y

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
167.	The special annual rate to fund local area improvement works should not be imposed on properties subject to any future acquisition.	This issue will be considered during the finalisation of the Infrastructure Charging Framework.	N
168.	Question 'windfall gain' for site (1.75 to 8) – BCC's plot ratio of 1.75 does not take into account existing TOD intent – clear intent for significant density increase (exemplified by DAs at Milton & Albion).	Noted. The value uplift provisions contained in the development schemes are considered appropriate.  As part of developing the Infrastructure Contributions Framework the ULDA considered a range of issues for the introduction of infrastructure contributions within the UDAs. The issues surrounding land value uplift are continuing to be discussed with the Urban Development Institute of Australia (UDIA) and the Property Council of Australia (PCA) to ensure that any infrastructure contributions would not be seen as a disincentive to development or adversely impact on the viability of any development proposal.	N
169.	The base plot ratio identified for the Cruise Ship Precinct, and in particular 5 & 9 Hercules Street, is considered to be well below the existing value of the site. The plot ratio identified for 5 & 9 Hercules Street (0.5 times site area) does not take into account existing uses on the site and existing development approvals in the surrounding area. Due to the rapidly changing nature of the Hamilton area it is considered that the identified plot ratio is well below what could have been achieved through a Development Application to BCC prior to the establishment of the ULDA. As identified in the Brookfield Multiplex submission, the Proposed Scheme does not take into account the Preliminary Approval issued over the site. This Preliminary Approval granted an overall plot ratio of 3.07 times the site area which is well in excess to the 0.5 identified in Map 1. Whilst the BCC Preliminary Approval did not include 9 Hercules Street it would be logical to assume that BCC wouldn't have viewed the site as being limited to Light Industry with a plot ratio of 0.5 times the site area. In addition, it is noted that the existing building has a plot ratio exceeding 0.5 times the site area. Therefore, 0.5 times site area is considered to be well below would have been possible on the site prior to the ULDA taking control of the area. As a result of the significant underestimation of existing plot ratios, it is necessary that the existing base value used in determining uplift value be reassessed.  It is recommended that the uplift value charge be removed or the base value charge be amended to more accurately reflect the development potential of the land prior to the ULDA's takeover of the land.	Noted. The value uplift provisions contained in the development schemes are considered appropriate.  As part of developing the Infrastructure Contributions Framework the ULDA considered a range of issues for the introduction of infrastructure contributions within the UDAs. The issues surrounding land value uplift are continuing to be discussed with the Urban Development Institute of Australia (UDIA) and the Property Council of Australia (PCA) to ensure that any infrastructure contributions would not be seen as a disincentive to development or adversely impact on the viability of any development proposal.	N
170.	Disagree with the value uplift formula of "value capture". The method of valuing the land "pre-UDA" does not take into account the true value of land. Land sales have been based on an expectation of significant height and density increases for a number of years.	Noted. The value uplift provisions contained in the development schemes are considered appropriate.  As part of developing the Infrastructure Contributions Framework the ULDA considered a range of issues for the introduction of infrastructure contributions within the UDAs. The	N

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
		issues surrounding land value uplift are continuing to be discussed with the Urban Development Institute of Australia (UDIA) and the Property Council of Australia (PCA) to ensure that any infrastructure contributions would not be seen as a disincentive to development or adversely impact on the viability of any development proposal.	
171.	One of Government's fundamental responsibilities is to provide infrastructure that encourages the ongoing well being of a society and the citizens/taxpayers. The focus should be on the provision of benefits to the community at large, not about whether or not a so-called "windfall gain" is made by landowners.	Sharing of cost between those who benefit is a key principle. It is recognised that the provision of infrastructure benefits a range of stakeholders. An appropriate contribution to off-set infrastructure costs is considered a fair and reasonable approach to reflect the benefits received from the infrastructure provided.	N
172.	A funded and committed major infrastructure plan is required to catalyse development in the area. There is significant and unreasonable commercial risk and legal exposure attached to committing to a major project at Bowen Hills prior to the commitment of major funding and commencement of works to upgrade the transport infrastructure - not enough certainty exists.	The funding of major infrastructure will be considered by Government within normal budgeting processes.	N
173.	The infrastructure charging burden coupled with uncertainty of infrastructure delivery will affect the competitiveness of UDA's when compared with BCC controlled Urban Renewal areas such as Woolloongabba and Fortitude Valley. This will delay development in the UDA for a number of years.	Noted. The value uplift provisions contained in the development schemes are considered appropriate.  It is not expected that the approach for infrastructure contributions will constrain development. The UDIA and PCA are being consulted regularly in this regard.	N
174.	An exemption should be provided on the development contribution rates for charities and not-for-profit organisations who sell or develop their properties so that the investment in their charitable activities can be maximised. The Heart Foundation does not believe they should be levied the same rate as private organisations.	This issue is satisfactorily addressed in the Infrastructure Contributions Framework.	N
175.	Who will fund the encapsulation of the Bowen Hills Railway line?	This issue will be the subject of ongoing discussions with QT.	N
176.	Recompense to the landowner should be made for the proposed new road in Precinct 4.	It is not considered that compensation is required to be paid as it is reasonable to assume that GFA for the affected site would be calculated on the basis of the net site area and any road dedication and construction would be likely to be credited against relevant infrastructure charges.	N
<b>• Infrastructure Plan</b>			
177.	Currently the Implementation Plan appears to be aimed at monitoring the progress/success of the development scheme/land use plan. However, the Act provides that the Implementation Plan should identify strategies to achieve the main purposes of the Act that are not otherwise embedded into the land use or infrastructure plans.	The actions outlined in the Implementation Strategy provide the basis for a range of activities that will achieve the main purposes of the Act.	N

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
178.	Upgrades to the RNA and potential links to the Old Museum and Bowen Park should be included in the Infrastructure Plan.	It would not be appropriate to include this in the Infrastructure Plan. However the desire for greater connections between the RNA and Bowen Park will be considered in a review of the Precinct Intent for Precinct 2.	N
179.	<p>In the table of Proposed Infrastructure timing should be shown for proposed infrastructure. No mention of cycle and pedestrian infrastructure. More details required on proposed road widenings (extent, purposed etc).</p> <p>The TOD outcomes are unlikely to be realised unless all the assumed transport upgrade works are provided (as detailed in the previous Option Development report). These need to be funded through development levies or else provided for by the State.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Plan should define the types of infrastructure the ULDA considers to be catalyst infrastructure e.g. public transport infrastructure.</p>	<p>Timing will be subject to development proceeding. The table included in the Infrastructure Plan does articulate the infrastructure the ULDA considers to be catalyst infrastructure.</p>	N
180.	It is noted that the Infrastructure Plan does not contain any discussion of electricity infrastructure whatsoever.	Ongoing discussion with Energex will be undertaken to include electricity infrastructure where appropriate.	Y
181.	Precinct 1, outcome 4 – upgrading of KSD should form part of the Infrastructure Plan. Compensation should be provided for effected land owners. Access to sites can not be removed until adequate access is provided by the ULDA.	Upgrading of KSD and alternative access to sites will be considered as development progresses	N
182.	<p>Section 1 – Infrastructure Funding Principles to Facilitate Redevelopment, the last paragraph should be amended to state: 'For fairness, landowners that do not want to redevelop above current permitted BCC City Plan densities or a <u>'pre existing approval' defined in Section 2.2 (iii) of the Bowen Hills Development Scheme</u>, should not be penalised.</p> <p>'Section 2.2 – Infrastructure Improvements (ii)' should be amended to provide certainty that Infrastructure Improvement, which are imposed as a condition of the development approval, will either be 'reasonable and relevant conditions' or where this is not the case, be subject to an Infrastructure Agreement with the ULDA in order for the developer to be able to re-coup costs either from the ULDA, Brisbane City Council or from future developments through the Infrastructure Agreement.</p> <p>'Section 2.4 – Community facilities, transport and affordable housing (i) &amp; (ii)' should be amended to state:</p> <p>(i) 'The standard BCC ICS approach for development intensity less than or equal to the current BCC City Plan provisions or as stated under a <u>'pre existing approval' defined in Section 2.2 (iii) of the Bowen Hills Development Scheme</u>', or.</p> <p>(ii) 'A UDA specific contribution rate applied to the additional GFA approved in excess of the</p>	<p>Strategy approach is that those that do not take advantage of the uplift only have to provide diversity requirements.</p> <p>The ULDA conditions must pass the reasonable &amp; relevance test as required by legislation.</p>	N



SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
	<p>BCC City Plan provisions or a '<u>pre existing approval</u>' defined in Section 2.2 (iii) of the <u>Bowen Hills Development Scheme</u>. This infrastructure will be provided over time at the time of development being undertaken within the UDA ,</p> <p>'Section 3 – Infrastructure Contributions (i) &amp; (ii)' should be amended to state:</p> <p>(iii) 'BCC Infrastructure Contribution Schedule approach used up to current City Plan GFA or as stated under a '<u>pre existing approval</u>' defined in Section 2.2 (iii) of the <u>Bowen Hills Development Scheme</u>'.</p> <p>(iv) 'Special ULDA charge (for major infrastructure and affordable housing) applied to extra GFA, over and above City Plan, or a '<u>pre existing approval</u>' defined in Section 2.2 (iii) of the <u>Bowen Hills Development Scheme</u>'.</p>		
183.	<p>Infrastructure such as station upgrades are for benefit of greater public and not sole benefit of landowners.</p> <p>A special rate/levy to fund catalyst infrastructure is supported.</p>	<p>Agreed – ULDA not intending to fund full station upgrade from land owners.</p> <p>The ULDA is currently discussing with BCC, the area of influence of the benefits from improvements to infrastructure.</p>	N
184.	<p>What work has been done to scope Stage 1 of the Station upgrade and the costs?</p> <p>What is the staging plan and costs associated with delivering Hudd Street to Abbotsford Road?</p> <p>How will government contribute to the cost of the Stage 1 upgrades to Bowen Hills railway station?</p>	<p>The costing of the Stage 1 upgrades to the Bowen Hills railway station are yet to be finalised.</p> <p>The staging plan and costings associated with delivering Hudd St to Abbotsford Rd are yet to be finalised.</p> <p>The costing of the Stage 1 upgrades to the Bowen Hills railway station are yet to be finalised.</p>	N
<b>IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY</b>			
185.	Unclear who is responsible for certain aspects of the implementation strategy (e.g. under 1.2, event management o enliven and activate spaces) and when and how certain aspects will be achieved (1.2 ....will be instituted as part of the ULDA's activities as the UDA develops).	The ULDA will manage and coordinate ongoing activities with relevant stakeholders as the development scheme is implemented.	N
186.	Need for better 'balance' in section 2 as to environmental vs commercial outcomes.	Include words "all elements of this section must be achieved to the greatest extent practicable, having regard to each of the other elements of the implementation strategy".	Y
187.	Some actions seem to conflict with the land use plan (p 92) – need for more clarity around actions (who pays for additional studies), how will actions be monitored.	The ULDA will manage and coordinate ongoing activities with relevant stakeholders as the development scheme is implemented.	N
188.	When, how and under what framework will ICS formulation occur – what if agreement can't be reached?	This is the subject of ongoing discussions with BCC.	N
189.	Seems to be a lack of transparency in relation to collecting money and expenditure (p94).	Further details will be outlined in the Infrastructure Contributions Framework.	N
190.	Ecological Sustainability section is somewhat meaningless and does not explain how anything will actually be achieved (5 star ratings, best practice etc – guidelines mentioned but no status or idea when will be prepared – who pays for documentation and	ULDA Act states ULDA may keep a register of other documents (this would include guidelines). Draft Ecological Sustainability policy has been prepared and will be released early in 2009.	N

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
	promotion of ecological sustainable examples developed within UDA p 95).		
191.	Best Practice Urban design section does not say how anything will be achieved and does not provide any useful measures (who, what, when, how why).	The ULDA will manage and coordinate ongoing activities with relevant stakeholders as the development scheme is implemented.	N
192.	The preparation of a development agreement will complex to administer and time consuming which will slow down the development process.	It is intended that the ULDA will provide a development agreement template which will be readily available to Developers and straightforward. Due to the inclusion of affordable housing in proposed developments, the Development Agreement allows the ULDA to control the long-term affordability of future dwellings.	N
193.	The Infrastructure Charging Framework makes reference to plot ratios, however the draft Development Scheme does not utilise plot ratios making it difficult to determine.	Correct. The Development Scheme does not have plot ratios as these will be determined as part of future development applications based on maximum GFA's identified for the various precincts and sub-precincts. GFA's will be negotiated on an individual basis with the ULDA and will have regard to issues such as building height, setbacks, landscaping and car parking provision.	N
194.	P85 Section 2.1 The provision of public transport should be one of the top priorities. It is not clear from the Development Scheme what take up of development is anticipated and hence when public transport will be necessary.	Agree- provision of public transport is one of the top priorities however the rate of development take-up cannot be predicted – ULDA will work closely with DMR & other infrastructure providers to ensure infrastructure provision is in line with demand.	N
195.	Implementation Strategy – 3 Housing Options first clarification in the context of the current economic changes and the lowering of interest rates.	Noted. The Affordable Housing Strategy has been amended.	N
196.	Sustainability initiatives should be outlined in the implementation strategy and key items of infrastructure to support these initiatives.	A Draft Ecological Sustainability policy has been prepared and has informed the preparation of the development scheme – the final policy will be released early in 2009.	N
197.	An appropriate management plan should be outlined in the implementation strategy to show how housing stock will remain affordable to purchase or rent.	This will be covered in the revised Affordable Housing Strategy.	N
198.	The methodology for determining land valuation needs to be documented.	The contribution rate included in a Development Agreement shall be at a rate per square metre of additional GFA which will be documented.	N
199.	Overall, Implementation Plan is light on in terms of details and contains inconsistencies, while other aspects are unclear and somewhat confusing.	Noted	N
200.	It is not clear how the purpose of the Act will be achieved through the implementation strategy.	The Implementation Strategy is structured as per the 5 purposes of the ULDA Act	N
201.	The document states that the Implementation Strategy will be a living document; it is not clear how this will work within the legislation and how it will be achieved.	The Implementation Strategy can be amended by the Minister where it does not change the land use plan. This is pursuant to Section 35 of the Act.	N

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS – ISSUES COMMON TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES			
Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
202.	Section 1.1 states the ULDA has a blank slate to try alternative methods of delivery. Within what constraints and parameters will this be achieved?	The ULDA Act provides the parameters to which the ULDA can guide the delivery of Infrastructure	N
203.	Section 1.2 mentions role of community in creating urban spaces. What is the role of community and how will this change over time as stated?	The ULDA will manage and coordinate ongoing activities with relevant stakeholders as the development scheme is implemented.	N
204.	QR is willing to work in partnership \ with ULDA to create a new entry statement on the basis of this partnership commitment. QR contends that the consequential loss of development potential from the eastern portion of Lot 70 should be formally recognised in the Final Development Scheme.	<p>ULDA is willing to work with QR on catalyst development to achieve good outcome for the Northshore Hamilton area sand community.</p> <p>The road widening provisions for Kingsford Smith Drive are a requirement of Brisbane City Council.</p> <p>The Development Scheme has been amended for Precinct 3 – Northshore Urban Village – Development Requirements to include provisions with respect to the Kingsford Smith Drive Widening. This was an omission which has been rectified.</p>	N
205.	New and Upgraded Roads – no certainty as to what the particular development requirement is?)	As per the Infrastructure Framework.	N
206.	Public will access private marinas by crossing the Riverwalk which is contrary to Council Policy.	A determination on future use of marinas has not yet been made. Likely Marinas may be a mix of public and private use.	N
207.	Concern that access to the Riverwalk will be obtained from privately owned boats.	A determination on future use of marinas has not yet been made. Likely Marinas may be a mix of public and private use.	N
208.	Clarity is required on the status of the Riverwalk and who will maintain the Riverwalk, riverwalks and the beach.	This will be the subject of ongoing discussions and agreements with BCC.	N
209.	<p>Maintenance requirements of the highly refined landscape and streetscape are of concern</p> <p>Parks and streetscapes should be designed and embellished in accordance <i>with Council's Subdivision and Development Guidelines 2008</i>.</p>	This will be the subject of ongoing discussions and agreements with BCC (including BCC agreements with POB).	N
210.	Need to involve and consult on catalyst projects, including the Remora Street park embellishment.	The ULDA will continue to work closely with the BCC on relevant projects, policy and development to ensure positive development outcomes for the Northshore Hamilton area.	N

**Bowen Hills and Northshore  
Hamilton UDA Development  
Schemes Submissions Report**

**Bowen Hills  
UDA specific  
issues**

**22 December 2008**

**BOWEN HILLS PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Proposed Changes or Comments</b>	<b>Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)</b>
<b>Car parking ratios</b>			
1.	Small landowners should not be required to provide the same quantity of car parking as large landowners.	Car parking ratios are prescribed as maximums in the Dev. Scheme rather than minimums.	N
2.	Higher car parking ratios should be provided throughout the UDA.	Underpinning the planning within the UDA are the principles of Transit Oriented Development (TOD), in accordance with the Government's Statement of Intent in Relation to the Intent and Outcomes for the Area. However, the Dev. Scheme has been amended to include the provision " <i>Where a request is made to provide car parking at a rate exceeding that prescribed for the Precinct, the request must be accompanied by a strategy to maximise use of pedestrian, cycle and public transport opportunities over private vehicle use.</i> "	Y
3.	Imposing TOD will adversely affect operational costs.	There is no evidence to support this assertion. Instead, it is suggested that development that incorporates TOD principles is likely to save on the cost of constructing and maintaining car parking facilities.	N
4.	A restriction of on-site car parking ratios will result in development favouring areas outside the UDA.	It is considered that the declaration of Bowen Hills as a UDA together with the provisions of the ULDA Act 2007 provide incentives for development to locate within the UDA boundary.	N
5.	Destination retail requires adequate public car parking. However, the ability to provide sufficient car parking will be difficult to achieve.	For a shopping centre the Dev. Scheme makes provision for a maximum car parking ratio of 1 car space per 50 sq. m of GFA.  In the Bowen Hills UDA it is expected that a significant number of trips to destination retail will be generated from within the UDA, reducing the requirement for on-site car parking.  The Dev. Scheme has been amended to include the provision " <i>Where a request is made to provide car parking at a rate exceeding that prescribed for the Precinct, the request must be accompanied by a strategy to maximise use of pedestrian, cycle and public transport opportunities over private vehicle use.</i> "	Y
6.	Parking ratios are overly generous for such a transit-rich environment.	The car parking ratios for Precinct 1 of the Proposed Dev. Scheme contained an error. The Dev. Scheme has been amended to stipulate a maximum of 1 car space per 200 sq. m of GFA for commercial and business uses. The car parking ratio for residential development in Precinct 1 has also been amended to stipulate an average of 1 car space per dwelling (including visitor parking).  It is considered that the car parking ratios contained in the Dev. Scheme balance the principles of TOD with the commercial desire to provide more on-site parking for development.	Y
7.	Concessions / incentives should be offered for developments that incorporate innovative car parking responses such as: car pooling / rental / share schemes attached to the body corporate, to reduce the need to on-site parking.	To deliver on the principles of TOD the Dev. Scheme sets maximum car parking ratios rather than minimum ratios.  Development that incorporates strategies to minimise the demand for on-site parking is supported.	N

**BOWEN HILLS PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Proposed Changes or Comments</b>	<b>Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)</b>
8.	It is not clear how a residential unit is defined for the purpose of car parking spaces - if a 1 bedroom unit is being treated the same as a 3 bedroom unit parking could be grossly underestimated.	For residential development, the Dev. Scheme stipulates an average of 1 car space per residential dwelling. How these car parking bays are distributed amongst units within a development will be considered at DA stage. It is possible that some units will be without on-site car parking while others may be attributed with more than 1 car space.	N
9.	Define the nature and how car parking will be provided in the short term. What is the exit strategy for on-site car parking?	The Short Term Car Parking Strategy will be formulated and delivered as part of the Implementation Strategy.	N
<b>Development potential</b>			
10.	Blanket height limits lead to unrealistic valuation of small sites. Incentives are required to ensure site amalgamation.	In Precinct 1 the minimum development parcel is 1500m <sup>2</sup> which in some circumstances will require amalgamation of land.	N
11.	Sites below 1,500m <sup>2</sup> in Precinct 1 should be able to be redeveloped - perhaps with a lower plot ratio.	The minimum site area within Precinct 1 has been put in place to ensure delivery of the Precinct Intent. However, development can be considered on smaller land parcels under the provisions of Part 1, Section 2.5 of the Land Use Plan which enables the ULDA to consider development that does not comply with the requirements, where there are sufficient grounds to justify the decision.	N
12.	230 Abbotsford Rd should be included as a landmark building/site and be allocated a greater height and plot ratio.	This site is not considered a gateway to the UDA and therefore has not been identified for a landmark building. However, Section 2 of the Dev. Scheme provides for the approval of a development with a height or plot ratio exceeding that specified for the Precinct or Sub-precinct where there are sufficient grounds to justify approval of the development despite the non-compliance.	N
13.	High rise should not be allowed along the western side of Brookes St as it will: reduce the value and quality of buildings and investment attractiveness of development along the eastern side of the street; result in a wind tunnel effect; reduce of natural light and result in an inferior cityscape.	Part 1, Section 4 of the Land Use Plan addresses urban design and sustainability. In particular, section 4.5 addresses building form which requires development to consider building arrangement and form, taking into account local microclimate conditions.	N
14.	The provisions for Precinct 3 are supported if land at 9 Tufton Street is not parkland	While the parkland proposed in Tufton St is not shown on the zoning map for the precinct, the Structure Plan continues to identify that land on Tufton Street is required for parkland and the preferred location is on the eastern side of the street.  As part of the Implementation Strategy the ULDA will be clarifying the need, size and exact location of this parkland and at an appropriate time will pursue the delivery of this park through mechanisms such as purchase of the affected properties, land resumption or through negotiation as part of a development application.	N
15.	The prescribed rear and side boundary setbacks are not appropriate for land at 480 St Pauls Terrace.	The rear and side boundary setbacks are considered appropriate to ensure sufficient separation between buildings so as to maximise light and ventilation and minimise impacts.  However, it should be noted at that Part 1, Section 2 of the Land Use Plan provides for the approval of development that does not comply with the prescribed site and rear boundary setbacks where there are sufficient grounds to	N

**BOWEN HILLS PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Proposed Changes or Comments</b>	<b>Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)</b>
		justify approval of the development despite the non-compliance.	
16.	The dev. Scheme offers little incentive for redevelopment within the UDA.	<p>The plot ratio and heights provided for under the Dev. Scheme substantially exceed those that applied under City Plan 2000. It is acknowledged that with development exceeding that permitted by City Plan additional infrastructure contributions are required. However, these contributions are necessary to fund the infrastructure required to support the development intensity permitted by the Dev. Scheme.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is considered that the declaration of Bowen Hills as a UDA together with the provisions of the ULDA Act 2007 provide incentives for development to locate within the UDA boundary.</p>	N
17.	Significant new road infrastructure within Bowen Hills has negatively impacted land values and development opportunities within the area.	<p>It is acknowledged that new regional road infrastructure in the area has impacted on the permeability of Bowen Hills. Particularly east - west connections.</p> <p>The master planning process and the resultant Dev. Scheme requirements mitigate impacts from these to the greatest extent possible through the allocation of land use and the delivery of new or improved road, pedestrian and cycle connections.</p>	N
18.	Fragmented ownership will delay development opportunities.	It is not expected that land fragmentation will prevent the achievement of the long term vision for the Bowen Hills UDA.	N
19.	Planning should allow for horizontal mixed use as well as vertical.	The Dev. Scheme allows for both horizontal and vertical mix of uses.	N
20.	Planning needs to recognise the hierarchy and conflict of uses for access.	The land use provisions of the Dev. Scheme have been prepared to manage conflicts that may occur as a result of mixed use development.	N
21.	Retail projects will not be supported until a critical mass is achieved.	The Implementation Strategy articulates how the ULDA is proposing to catalyse development within the UDA so as to encourage development and deliver critical mass as soon as possible.	N
22.	The proposed Dev. Scheme suggests a development density of up to 10:1. Transitional development is unlikely to achieve these densities either by demand or competition. The provision of high yield is unlikely to benefit the site.	The maximum plot ratio provided for in the Dev. Scheme is applies to Precinct 1 and is 8:1. The economic analysis undertaken as part of the master planning process indicates that Bowen Hills could deliver development with a plot ratio of up to 8:1.	N
23.	Buildings need to be showcased with significant setbacks and landscaping.	On Primary and Secondary Active Frontages it is not considered appropriate for buildings to be significantly setback from the street with landscaping. In accordance with the principles of good urban design the Dev. Scheme requires buildings on Primary and Secondary Active Frontages to be built on or close to any street or public realm frontage.	N
24.	Residential / commercial mix will require a variance of heights to allow for significant light penetration.	The Dev. Scheme makes sufficient provision for height variation. In addition, the Dev. Scheme has been amended to include a UDA-wide Development Requirement that requires development to minimise impacts from potential over-shadowing.	Y

**BOWEN HILLS PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Proposed Changes or Comments</b>	<b>Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)</b>
25.	The substantial costs associated with developing over the railway line have the potential to significantly delay the future development opportunities until the remainder of the site is complete.	The desire to build over the railway corridor is a longer term objective. In the short term it is considered that there is sufficient development opportunity around the Bowen Hills station to satisfy development demand and catalyse the redevelopment of the area.	N
26.	Heights should be increased from 8 to 10 storeys in Precinct 4.	A general height restriction in Precinct 4 of 8 storeys is considered appropriate. The precinct does however make provision for 12 storey landmark buildings. Part 1, Section 2.5 of the Land Use Plan also enables the ULDA to consider a height exceeding that prescribed for the Precinct where there are sufficient grounds to justify the decision.	N
27.	Does the mix of uses specified in a Precinct apply per site or throughout the precinct?	The mix of uses applies throughout the precinct but can also be delivered on a site by site basis.	N
28.	The plot ratios for a Precinct should not be prescribed but rather determined based on how the development addresses setbacks, height, landscaping, building treatments and articulation, views, overshadowing and other impacts on adjoining properties.	Articulating a plot ratio for a precinct provides a certain level of development certainty. However, to balance certainty with flexibility, Part 1, Section 2.5 of the Land Use Plan provides for development to achieve a greater plot ratio where there are sufficient grounds to justify the decision.	N
29.	The increase in height provided for a Gateway site should be matched by a corresponding increase in plot ratio to enable the development of an aesthetically notable landmark building that is commercially viable to develop.	The plot ratios provided for under the Dev. Scheme are considered generous. It is not considered necessary to increase the plot ratio for landmark buildings.	N
30.	The Dev. Scheme does not detail the RBWH's desire to deliver a car parking facility within Precinct 3 to support the staff and visitor population of the hospital campus.	The Precinct Intent for Precinct 3 has been amended to state " <i>The ULDA will consider a development application for a multi-level car park for use by staff and visitors to the hospital where the application is accompanied by a strategy to maximise use of pedestrian, cycle and public transport opportunities over private vehicle use.</i> " However is not appropriate to identify multi-level car park as a Preferred Land Use in the Precinct, as the ULDA would not generally support applications for multi-level car parks in Precinct 3.	Y
31.	The Dev. Scheme should support the re-use of existing buildings.	The Dev. Scheme enables the re-use of existing buildings. However, the use of these buildings may trigger a development application where a change of use is proposed. The resultant use would need to be either a preferred land use or consistent with the intent for the Precinct.	N
32.	The Dev. Scheme's requirement for a component of residential development around the Bowen Hills station is prescriptive could limit commercial and office space development opportunities. If residential development is given priority business will be forced to the periphery constraining the type of development which will choose to locate in Bowen Hills and limiting growth.	While the Bowen Hills heart will have a significant employment focus the principles of good planning and TOD reinforce the requirement for an appropriate component of residential development to help activate the area day and night, to support retail within the UDA and to provide opportunities for people to live and work within the UDA.	N



**BOWEN HILLS PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Proposed Changes or Comments</b>	<b>Amendment (Y=Yes/N=no)</b>
33.	The restriction of 5,000 -7,000 sq. metres of local convenience retail floor space in Precinct 2 (with individual tenants limited to 250m <sup>2</sup> ), will greatly inhibit and may actually stop the redevelopment of the precinct.	All of the economic analysis that has been commissioned by the ULDA regarding this issue confirms that limiting convenience retail floor space within Precinct 2, at least until retail is sufficiently established in Precinct 1, is critical and that the development provisions in the Dev. Scheme limiting this nature of retail in Precinct 2 to 5-7,000 m <sup>2</sup> is appropriate and necessary.  To date, sufficient evidence to challenge the view held by the ULDA has not been submitted.	N
34.	A plot ratio of approx 5.0 across Precinct 2 should be provided for.	A plot ratio of 4.0 across Precinct 2 will potentially deliver approximately 800,000 m <sup>2</sup> of GFA. Even with the GFA required to accommodate the Exhibition activities on the site, it is considered that the remaining GFA delivers sufficient redevelopment opportunities for the site.  The redevelopment opportunities of the RNA must be balanced with the development opportunities for the wider UDA.	N
35.	High density residential development in Precinct 3 is unlikely to occur given poor amenity. Instead more business park type uses should be encouraged.	It is acknowledged that some land within the precinct may not be suitable for residential development due to the inability to deliver appropriate amenity for tenants. However, it is considered that there is other land within the Precinct where it will be possible to achieve appropriate standards of residential amenity. The mixed use zoning that applies to the area together with Precinct Intent, Precinct Outcomes, Preferred Land Uses, and Development Intensity and Built Form Relationship provisions provide sufficient flexibility to deliver both residential and non residential development within the Precinct.	N
36.	Precinct 5 should include 'Short term and Visitor Accommodation' in the list of preferred uses in the Residential High Intensity Zone.	It is considered that Visitor Accommodation would be more appropriately located in Precincts 1, 2 or 3. The Dev. Scheme has been amended to make Visitor Accommodation a preferred land use in these precincts. Visitor Accommodation remains Permissible Development in Precinct 5 enabling an application to be considered on its merits.	Y
37.	The 'Development Intensity and Built Form Relationship' requirements for Precinct 5 are overly prescriptive, allowing little flexibility for innovative, site responsive proposals.	Part 1, Section 2.5 of the Land Use Plan provides for the approval of a development that does not comply with the Development Intensity and Built Form Relationship' requirements where there are sufficient grounds to justify approval of the development despite the non-compliance.	N
38.	The Allison St area (as defined) should be removed from Precinct 9 and included in the 'mixed use commercial (medium density)' designation as an extension of Precinct 8.	The Inner City Bypass is considered to provide a logical boundary between Precinct 8 and 9. As specified in the Precinct Intent, in the short term Precinct 9 will continue to accommodate light industrial activities which provide services to the inner city and business support for the activities in the near by areas.	N
39.	How will Precinct 2 address land uses within the Special Entertainment Precinct as defined in City Plan 2000.	The Precinct Outcomes for Precinct 2b states <i>"Development around the Jubilee Hotel and adjacent to the valley to be located and designed to deliver and maintain reasonable levels of amenity. In particular, new residential development must incorporate high levels of noise insulation to reduce the transmission of low frequency bass noise into bedrooms."</i> These requirements were prepared after review of the provision of City Plan 2000 with respect to the	N

**BOWEN HILLS PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Proposed Changes or Comments</b>	<b>Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)</b>
		Valley Special Entertainment Precinct.	
40.	The Dev. Scheme does not allocate a zone to the land occupied by the ICB and Clem Jones Tunnel connections. This area should be utilised for open space and community uses to activate the space and provide east west linkages for pedestrians and cyclists through the UDA.	The Land Use Plan sets out how land not allocated with a zone is dealt with.	N
41.	The Development Intensity and Built Form Relationship Table for Precinct 6 relates only to the Residential Low Intensity Zone, despite the fact that this precinct includes the Mixed Use Zone, Residential High Intensity Zone and Residential Medium Intensity Zone. Specific provisions should be included for all zones within the Precinct.	The Dev. Scheme incorrectly referred to the Residential Low Intensity Zone. The Dev. Scheme has been amended to refer to the Residential Medium Intensity Zone.	Y
42.	There is insufficient information on the extent and nature of development that is appropriate in Precinct 7. Open space and recreation facilities should be concentrated along Abbotsford Rd.	Precinct 7 identifies that the Preferred Land Uses in this precinct are: Indoor Sport and Recreation and Outdoor Sport and Recreation. The development outcomes for the precinct, identify that development should provide an arrival point into the precinct from the UDA heart and railway station which supports the notion of development being focused along Abbotsford Rd and the western end of Folkstone St.	N
43.	If Mayne Railyards becomes available in the future it is recommended that it be included within the UDA and designated for a specialised industrial precinct.	As identified in the Precinct 9, in the longer term, there is the potential to combine this precinct with the Mayne Railyards possibly providing for mixed use, showrooms and other forms of commercial development.  Should the Maybe Railyards become available and be incorporated into the UDA, further consideration will be given to the development potential for the area.	N
44.	Employment growth will need to be supported by sufficient office space incorporated into mixed use and commercial development within the UDA.	The mixed use zones that apply within the UDA, together with the expressed Precinct Intents, are expected to deliver sufficient office space to support and employment population of 20,000 workers within the UDA.	N
45.	Use and densities inside the UDA should be consistent with those outside the area.	It is considered that uses and densities prescribed for the fringes of the UDA provide an appropriate interface with adjacent areas.	N
46.	Retail not to exceeding 250m2 features heavily across all precincts but where is larger retail such as showrooms or supermarkets to be located.	A sub-regional shopping centre is proposed in Precinct 1a.	N
47.	Precinct 9 should provide for development up to 10 storeys adjacent to the rail line with 6 level podium heights to act as acoustic barrier. Sites < 1000sqm - building heights up to 5 storeys. Sites > 1000sqm - building height up to 10 storeys. No GFA restrictions. Ground floor use restricted to industrial only.	It is considered that the full development potential for Precinct 9 cannot be properly determined until the future use of the Mayne Railyards has been confirmed.  In the short-term Precinct 9 is intended to remain as an area of light industrial activities providing services to the inner city and business support for the activities in the near by areas. There are opportunities in this precinct for small scale offices.	N

## BOWEN HILLS PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Issue #	Issue	Proposed Changes or Comments	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
48.	The site at 527 Gregory Tce (Precinct 4) should be clearly identified as a gateway site and a site suitable for a landmark building with a height of 20 storeys and plot ratio of 8:00.	The Dev. Scheme has been amended to show the subject site as a gateway site suitable for a landmark building. The maximum plot ratio of 4.0 and height provision of 12 storeys for landmark buildings in Precinct 4 are retained. The plot ratios in the Dev. Scheme are considered generous. It is not considered necessary to increase the plot ratio for landmark buildings. However, development of a greater height or plot ratio can be considered under the provisions of Part 1, Section 2.5 of the Land Use Plan which enables the ULDA to consider development that does not comply with the requirements, where there are sufficient grounds to justify the decision.	Y
49.	Should the site on the north east corner of Campbell St and Mayne Rd be considered a landmark site as this is where the on/off ramps to Airport Link connect to Campbell St.	Agreed. The Dev Scheme already identifies this site as a potential 'gateway' location (as identified on Map 5).	N
50.	An increased plot ratio should be contemplated for "Landmark" buildings of up to 30 storeys to encourage the development of these sites as landmarks. Suggest a "Design Based" plot ratio to ensure design excellence.	The plot ratios provided for in Precinct 1 (8:1) is considered generous. It is not considered necessary to increase the plot ratio for landmark buildings.	N
51.	The plot ratio and yield for the Heart Foundation (charitable organisation) site should be increased.	This site is included in Precinct 4 and has been allocated a plot ratio of 4. This is considered a reasonable plot ratio for site.	N
52.	Precinct 1 should not be up-zoned until the Inner City Rail Capacity Study has been finalisation.	When outcomes and recommendations of the Inner City Capacity Study are know, the Dev. Scheme can be reviewed.	N
53.	Remove paragraph 'Longer term, there is the potential to combine this precinct with the Queensland Rail land to the west, possibly provide for mixed use, showrooms and other forms of commercial development'.	It is not considered that this amended is necessary.	N
54.	The property fronting Brunswick and Water Street should contain a landmark building.	The property on the corner of Brunswick Street and Gregory Terrace has been identified as the appropriate location for a landmark building as this site satisfies the criteria for a gateway site.	N
55.	The Dev. Scheme should provide for buildings to be constructed on the site fronting Brunswick Street and Water Street at a plot ratio of 7:1 and to a height of 20 storeys in order for the owner to realise the same gains as under the BCC scheme.	According to the acceptable solutions for the BCC's Fortitude Valley Local Plan the subject site could have been developed up to 3 storeys and 10m above ground level.	N
<b>Economic development</b>			
56.	The Dev. Scheme should reference any specialist economic reports that have been used to support such a large increase in commercial and office floorspace on the edge of the CBD/Fortitude Valley.	It is not considered necessary for the Dev. Scheme to reference supporting economic reports that have been referenced during the preparation of the Dev. Scheme.	N
<b>Environment</b>			
57.	The Dev. Scheme should specify who or how authorisation/sign off of the Acid Sulfate Soils SPP will occur.	Where appropriate, a condition of the development approval will require the applicant to demonstrate compliance with current best practice for ASS investigate and management of which the SPP is an example, to the satisfaction of the ULDA. Where necessary the ULDA may seek advice from NRW.	N

**BOWEN HILLS PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Proposed Changes or Comments</b>	<b>Amendment (Y=Yes/N=no)</b>
58.	How will Site Management Plans, Remediation Action Plans etc, be dealt with?	To the extent appropriate these issues will be addressed through the DA process and through conditions of approval.	N
59.	A number of significant plant species have eeked out an existence in the post industrial and older residential area of the inner northern suburbs. Notably the significant plantings are fig trees and hoop pines.	The Dev. Scheme has been amended to make the clearing of significant identified vegetation permissible development. A by-law will also regulate interference with this vegetation.	Y
60.	For consideration, while this section adopts Queensland Transport current noise internal noise criteria, an amended Environmental Protection (Noise) Policy will be implemented on 1 January 2009. The amended EPP will contain more stringent criteria that should be observed by new sensitive development. Therefore this section should reflect the new noise criteria as set out in the amended EPP (noise).	The Dev. Scheme has been amended accordingly.	Y
61.	Add to dot point 'The design of the new civic plaza will need to consider noise impacts from Campbell Street and Abbotsford Road and the rail corridor, as well as minimise...'. '.	The Dev. Scheme has been amended accordingly.	Y
<b>Heritage</b>			
62.	6 Jeays St is listed as a heritage place but is a vacant lot	MAP 6: Heritage Place Map has been amended to delete a reference to 6 Jeays St. BCC approved the removal of this locally listed heritage building earlier in the year but had not amended its planning scheme.	Y
63.	Heritage protection of the property at 36 Jeays St is unsustainable in the long term and not in keeping with the Residential Very High Intensity Zone of Precinct 5. The permissibility of 12 storey buildings will potential erode the heritage values of properties within the precinct as they become dwarfed by higher development with a consequent reduction in visual aesthetics.	The Dev. Scheme requires that development on or adjoining a heritage registered place respect the heritage values of the site by sensitively managing the interface between development opportunities and the heritage place.	N
64.	Support is sought for the RNA's position regarding heritage conservation in Precincts A, B and G and a potential car park plinth over Sideshow Alley as part of the initial redevelopment program, as set out in its update report to the EPA.	The ULDA will continue discussions with the RNA and EPA on this issue.	N
65.	The desired road connection in Precinct 4 runs along the north eastern property boundary of a heritage place.	The proposed road does not affect the buildings on the site which triggered the heritage listing.	N
66.	The heritage listing on the Tourist Guest House at 555 Gregory Tce should be removed enabling the removal and relocation of the building. This will allow potential site amalgamation for a mixed use development.	555 Gregory Terrace has been identified by BCC as a local heritage site. The Dev. Scheme carries forward this listing. However, the Dev. Scheme has been amended to enable the ULDA to consider applications to remove heritage places identified on Map 4, <i>"in those instances where the retention of the building or structure would prejudice the delivery of the identified Precinct Intent."</i>	N
<b>Miscellaneous</b>			
67.	How do the existing brothels in Jeays Street fit into development scheme?	The ULDA Act 2007 protects existing, lawful use rights so if these uses were lawfully established the Dev. Scheme can not require their removal/closure.	N
68.	There is potential for noise impact from airport	Bowen Hills is not within the ANEF Contours for	

**BOWEN HILLS PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Proposed Changes or Comments</b>	<b>Amendment (Y=Yes/N=no)</b>
	operations.	the Brisbane Airport.	
69.	Incentives should be given to assist development to overcome the immediate barriers of Airport Link, Abbotsford Rd and the ICB.	Any financial impacts experienced by Airport Link of the ICB need to be addressed to the entity responsible for delivering the infrastructure.	N
70.	Tangible Government support to the catalyst projects will bring forward development by up to 10 years.	It is agreed that certain infrastructure will catalyse development within the UDA. Hence the ULDA is considering how to fund and deliver this catalyst infrastructure.	N
71.	It should be noted that the Tivoli is currently subject to an appeal re. planning, acoustic and liquor licensing issues.	This comment is noted.	N
72.	The Scheme makes no mandatory requirement for there to be primary healthcare providers within the UDA.	The Dev. Scheme is a regulatory document and cannot require primary health care providers to locate in the UDA.	N
73.	The future intentions for State Land need to be considered prior to the finalisation of the Dev. Scheme.	It is not considered necessary for these discussions to occur prior to finalisation of the Dev. Scheme. However, the ULDA will pursue such discussions with NRW's state land officers as part of the Implementation Strategy for the UDA.	N
74.	The UDA boundary with the Mayne Railway Yards should be more permeable given the future potential role this area and its links to Breakfast Creek.	Planning for the UDA has had regard to possible future integration with the Mayne Railyards should the area become available redevelopment.	N
75.	The Dev. Scheme should highlight the opportunity to create physical links between the RNA site and the Old Museum site and Bowen Park.	The Dev. Scheme has been amended to require development adjoining Bowen Park to address the park to improve safety within and around the park.	Y
76.	An overall summary of expected population, densities, types and numbers (low, medium, high) and GFA for commercial areas is required to provide an overall picture of what the UDA is aiming to achieve.	This is not considered necessary as this is a regulatory document not a master plan.	N
77.	The Dev. Scheme should provide a staging plan for development.	A staging plan is not considered necessary for the Bowen Hills UDA.	N
78.	The Queensland Police Service should be consulted regarding the development of public spaces, major affordable/public housing complexes and major transport infrastructure.	This comment is noted.	N
79.	Current fire fighting for high rise is problematic due to inadequate water pressure necessary to pump water to higher building levels - include requirement for upgrading of water mains to an acceptable standard for high-rise fire fighting.	This issue is noted and water pump water pressure within the UDA will be addressed as part of the delivery of the Infrastructure Plan and Implementation Strategy.	N
80.	Include requirement for appropriate movement of fire fighting and ambulance vehicles.	Section 5.2 Circulation has been amended to state <i>"Development is to support increased accessibility, permeability and movement for pedestrians and cyclists and appropriate movement by vehicles, including emergency vehicles."</i>	Y
81.	It is recommended that discussions occur with Queensland Fire and Rescue Services regarding requirements under section 7.1 community safety.	Previous section 7.1 Community Safety has been renumbered as section 4.3 and includes the requirement <i>"Development is to incorporate safety features in line with current standards and best practice guidance including: fire safety and emergency vehicle access."</i>	Y

## BOWEN HILLS PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Issue #	Issue	Proposed Changes or Comments	Amendment (Y=Yes/N=no)
82.	It is recommended that consideration of SPP 1/03 Mitigating the Adverse Impacts of Flood, Bushfire and Landslide be included in the Dev. Scheme to ensure consistency with jurisdictions adjacent to Bowen Hills UDA (Section 8 Lot Design).	Part 2, Section 7: Lot Design of the Land Use Plan has been amended to state " <i>Lots sizes and dimensions must enable buildings to be sited to - address site constraints including slope, soil erosion, flooding and drainage, (having regard to State Planning Policy 1/03: Mitigating the adverse impacts of Flood, Bushfire and Landslide.</i> "	Y
83.	Include requirement for entries to allow access and egress of ambulances.	Section 5.2 Circulation has been amended to state " <i>Development is to support increased accessibility, permeability and movement for pedestrians and cyclists and appropriate movement by vehicles, including emergency vehicles.</i> "	Y
<b>Pedestrian and cycle</b>			
84.	Pedestrian accessibility from the RBWH will be minimal.	The Dev. Scheme promotes pedestrian and cycle links between the RBWH and the UDA including the Bowen Hills Railway Station.	N
85.	Hudd St should be the main spine between the Station and the remainder of the Precinct.	The Dev. Scheme identifies Hudd St together with Mayne Rd as major activity spines for the UDA becoming the focus for retail shopping and social life. The precinct outcomes for Precinct 1 states " <i>Hudd St will be widened on the southern alignment, extending through to Abbotsford Rd and developed as a new main street. It states that Hudd St will become one of the most important public streets within Bowen Hills due to its proximity to the Bowen Hills Railway Station and new Bus Station. It will be an attractive tree lined avenue with generous footpaths to optimise the area available for commercial and pedestrian activity to spill out onto the street.</i> "	N
86.	Activation of building frontages are required to provide attractive pedestrian flow.	The Dev. Scheme does require activation of building frontages. Refer to Part 2, Section 4 of the Land Use Plan.	N
87.	Dev. Scheme should include road/cycle/pedestrian map illustrating the important connections required.	A new map will be included in Part 2, Section 4.9 of the Land Use Plan showing proposed public realm works including proposed new road connections, bikeways, street scaping and public open space.	Y
88.	RBWH is currently negotiating with Qld Transport re. provision of and End of Trip Facility in the under-croft of the RBWH Busway Station. If this proceeds RBWH should be exempt from the requirement to provide End of Trip Facilities.	Any request for an exemption from providing End of Trip Facilities in non residential development will be considered at the time of Development Application.	N
89.	The proposed segregated bike lanes have advantages in terms of the security of being physically separated from motor traffic, however also throws up challenges with intersection design and usage by higher-speed cyclists, who may be better encouraged to use the roads.	The intersections of bike lanes with traffic lanes will be addressed as part of the detailed design work.	N
90.	An improved route to the Valley is needed to foster more trips by bicycle to the CBD.	The ULDA will contribute in anyway possible to providing improved cycle linkages between the UDA, Valley and the CBD.	N
91.	End of trip facilities should be located in each building. Street facilities can be simple bike racks.	Part 2, Section 5.3 of the Land Use Plan requires non-residential development to provide end of trip facilities. Additional bike racks are intended to be provided at communal locations such as Precinct 1's Market Plaza.	N

**BOWEN HILLS PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Proposed Changes or Comments</b>	<b>Amendment (Y=Yes/N=no)</b>
92.	A key to liveability is the prioritisation of the streets as a part of the living space through the use of lower speed limits, design (LATM and geometry and vision commensurate with balanced needs) and shared zones where cars, pedestrians and cyclists have to co-exist.	Priority for pedestrians and cyclists has underpinned the master planning process and preparation of the Dev. Scheme. Part 2, Section 4.9 of the Land Use Plan requires development to give priority to pedestrian, cycle and public transport modes over private vehicle use.	N
93.	Public access should be provided along Breakfast Creek in Precinct 3. The vegetation along the creek should also be retained and enhanced.	Precinct 3 of the Dev. Scheme has been amended to require a minimum 10m setback from Breakfast Creek.	Y
94.	The existing network of shared pedestrian and cycle paths is considered to be fragmented and lacks connectivity between public open spaces. It is suggested that the network requires a full review. The railway corridor, Mayne railway yards, major road infrastructure and Break Creek present barriers that could be alleviated by a series shared paths and bridges through new design connections.	A new map will be included in Part 2, Section 4.9 of the Land Use Plan showing proposed public realm works including proposed new road connections, bikeways, street scaping and public open space.	Y
95.	Concerned with translation of the plan and its implementation into practice. Interested in evaluating and constructing an integrated walking and cycling network including the RNA and areas surrounding the UDA. This network, as well as public transport infrastructure, should be provided at the outset to set the scene for desired behaviour of new residents and workers.	This statement is noted.	N
96.	Token provision requiring best practice end of trip facilities in terms of space, design, amenity, safety and attractiveness will not be successful.	It is considered that the provisions included in the Dev. Scheme are sufficient to ensure that details of the required end of trip facilities are adequately addressed at DA stage.	N
97.	Amend and add to paragraph 'Development within this precinct must deliver a high quality pedestrian and cycle linkage from Abbotsford Road <i>and connection to adjoining networks</i> '.	The Dev. Scheme has been amended accordingly.	Y
98.	Amend and add to dot point 'Development within this precinct should facilitate 10m wide Active Transport Corridors that creates permeability through the Showgrounds site from Gregory Terrace to O'Connell Terrace, from Bowen Park to O'Connell Terrace and from O'Connell Terrace to Bowen Bridge Road.'	The Dev. Scheme has been amended accordingly.	Y
99.	Add new paragraph 'Development along Brookes Street must include uses and streetscape treatment that [remove – improves] <i>facilitates</i> pedestrian and cyclist amenity and safety.'	The Dev. Scheme has been amended accordingly.	Y
100.	Add new paragraph 'New Active Transport Corridor 10m wide adjacent to Inner City Bypass to connect O'Connell Terrace with Campbell Street and to connect with the proposed Northern Veloway'.	The Dev. Scheme has been amended accordingly.	Y
101.	Add new paragraph 'New cycle way along Tufton Street to connect O'Connell Terrace and Campbell Street.'	The Dev. Scheme has been amended accordingly.	Y
102.	Add new description 'New Active Transport Corridors between Bowen Park and Gregory Terrace, between O'Connell Terrace and Gregory Terrace and between Gregory Terrace	The Dev. Scheme has been amended accordingly.	Y

**BOWEN HILLS PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Proposed Changes or Comments</b>	<b>Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)</b>
	and St Pauls Terrace'.		
103.	Add to Precinct Plan – an Active Transport Corridor between Bowen Bridge Road and O'Connell Terrace (located between Bowen Park and the Inner City Bypass).	The Dev. Scheme has been amended accordingly.	Y
104.	Amend and add to dot point 'Development within this precinct should facilitate a 10m wide Active Transport Corridor from Gregory Terrace through to the Green Square development and on to Fortitude Valley.'	The Dev. Scheme has been amended accordingly.	Y
105.	Precinct Plan – Amend the legend wording of 'Desired Pedestrian Connections' to 'Active Transport Corridors'.	This amended is not considered necessary.	N
106.	Amend and add to paragraph 'Development along O'Connell Terrace must include uses and streetscape treatment that [remove – improves] facilitates pedestrian and cyclist amenity and safety.'	The Dev. Scheme has been amended accordingly.	Y
<b>Public infrastructure</b>			
107.	Development in Bowen Hills can not occur without additional electricity infrastructure hence Utility Installations should be identified as a "Preferred Land Uses" in Precinct 1 and 3.	This is noted. The preferred location and design of future electricity infrastructure will be determined in conjunction with the delivery of the Infrastructure Plan and Implementation Strategy.	N
108.	Energex Infrastructure will not be able to comply with the urban design requirements for the Dev. Scheme and will therefore be considered inconsistent with the scheme and refused. Whilst this may be able to be overcome during the assessment of an application, this will cause significant expenditure of time and effort. Energex suggests that utility infrastructure including a new sub-station be made "exempt development through schedule 1 of the Dev. Scheme.	This is noted. The preferred location and design of future electricity infrastructure will be determined in conjunction with the delivery of the Infrastructure Plan and Implementation Strategy.	N
109.	BCC is interested in reviewing the modelling currently being undertaken for infrastructure within the ULDA so as to understand the impacts on the overall network.	The ULDA is willing to meet with BCC to review the modelling work undertaken in association with the master planning process.	N
110.	How will the infrastructure in the Dev. Scheme be implemented?	Infrastructure will be delivered by the ULDA or with development.	N
111.	The land required for the provision of community facilities needs to be clearly designated in the Dev. Scheme.	The Dev. Scheme identifies community open space, land required for provision of other community facilities will be determined through the delivery of the Implementation Strategy.	N
112.	It is recommended that desired standards of service or similar be prepared to accompany the Infrastructure Plan eg. detailing how public open spaces and streetscapes should be designed and operated, to ensure consistency across the UDA.	The desired standards of services will be formulated in conjunction with the delivery of the Implementation Strategy.	N
113.	Public transport infrastructure is to be in accordance with the Translink Public Transport Infrastructure Manual or through consultation with Translink.	This comment is noted.	N
<b>Public open space</b>			



## BOWEN HILLS PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Issue #	Issue	Proposed Changes or Comments	Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)
114.	Include a new road behind Bowen Park to provide for better activation and safety	Precinct 2 - Precinct Outcomes have been amended to read: <i>"To improve the safety of Bowen Park, adjoining development is to improve the physical access to and visual surveillance of the Park"</i>	Y
115.	Provision of a new area of public open space in Precinct 8 is unnecessary given the proximity of this precinct to Perry Park. Enhancing Perry Park's facilities and connectivity will increase the usability and functionality of the park without making new areas of open space unnecessary. Should a public plaza be required, this should be located further away from Perry Park to better serve the northern area of Precinct 8. Should new public open space be required in Precinct 8 this should be located within the western part of Murray St as the road closure would not negatively affect any neighbouring properties.	The network of pocket parks including that proposed Precinct 8 is proposed to contribute to a series of small scale urban gardens that are woven into the structure of the proposed new community.  They have been located within the UDA to create a connected network of stepping stones through which residents and visitors to the area can move through a series of small parks, courtyards and urban gardens and ultimately link up with the more significant scale and regionally important spaces such as Perry Park.	N
116.	Further detail could be provided on how the facility at Perry Park sits within the hierarchy of sports facilities in Brisbane. This area could be re-developed into more accessible parkland.	Perry Park is identified in the Dev. Scheme as a major sport, recreation and green space for Bowen Hills.  Perry Park is currently the home of the Brisbane Strikers Football Club. Discussions with BCC and the Strikers confirm that the club is intended to remain on the site in the future.  It is acknowledged that the active recreation facilities in the park currently limit public access and passive recreation. As part of the delivery of the Infrastructure Plan and Implementation Strategy intends to work with stakeholders on a detailed master plan for the park. This plan will consider where best to located further built facilities in the park without compromising its role as the major green space within the UDA.	N
117.	The Infrastructure Plan entitled 'Proposed Community Facilities, Transport and Affordable Housing' should provide greater clarity in terms of size and location of Item 33 'New public open space connecting with existing green space in Precinct 5'. The size and location of this space should not prejudice the pre-existing development approval over 4 - 12 Jeays St.	The exact location and size of new open space proposed between Brookes St, Jeays St, Hurworth St and Markwell St will be determined with the delivery of the Infrastructure Plan and Implementation Strategy. However, it is not intended that this parkland would prejudice any existing approved development.	N
118.	At a simple level, a series of small green spaces can become one dimensional. There are many examples of pockets of open space with a single type of development which are not used well after hours or on weekends, as they do not integrate with adjacent development. Therefore it is proposed that a model of small green spaces be replaced by a linear green space, creating an experiential landscape with ongoing variety as the topography, built form and vegetation changes.	Given the development, ownership and funding constraints associated with the delivery of the UDA, a model of small pocket parks was considered the most appropriate way to deliver the open space network.	N
<b>Public transport</b>			
119.	The current Bowen Hills Railway Station is not suitable for the new operational requirements, including additional usage from current and anticipated development in Newstead.	The required upgrading of the Bowen Hills Railway Station will be determined through the delivery of the Infrastructure Plan and Implementation Strategy.	N

**BOWEN HILLS PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Proposed Changes or Comments</b>	<b>Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)</b>
120.	The Railway Station needs to be a destination area and include landscaped open plaza, retail and other public transport options, i.e. buses and taxis.	This is consistent with the vision for the UDA. Elements of landscaping, plazas etc will be addressed as the detailed design stage.	N
121.	Transitional development does not require the construction of an iconic railway concourse, this should be planned for the future when development can afford to support it.	The delivery of an iconic railway station at Bowen Hills is not proposed in the short term. However, it is considered critical to the delivery of the long term vision for the area.	N
122.	Costs of Railway redevelopment should not be borne by the Private Sector. The economic benefits of the Station upgrade will not be contained in the Urban Renewal area.	There are 2 elements to the proposed Bowen Hills Rail Station up-grade: up-grades of the track and platform capacity and up-grades to the station environs. It is envisaged that the track and platform upgrades will be publicly funded while the station environs are expected to be funded through the Infrastructure Contributions Framework.	N
123.	The Dev. Scheme needs to include some policy statements on desired public transport integration, active transport and local traffic management measures that provide guidance to the precinct-specific measures.	It is considered that the Dev. Scheme provides sufficient reference to the need for development to integrate with public and active transport facilities. Local traffic management measures such as speed limits, on-street parking regulations and intersection and lane treatments will be addressed through the Infrastructure Plan and Implementation Strategy.	N
124.	The Dev. Scheme shows a busway station at Bowen Hills when this would only be an interchange.	The Dev. Scheme will be amended to refer to this facility as a 'bus station' consistent with advice received from TransLink.	Y
125.	Bus priority is to be given for trips from the Hospital to the Bus station.	The Dev. Scheme can not deliver this.	N
126.	The RNA masterplan includes provision for the Valley Busway. There is a need to understand future rail requirements through RNA. Any expansion of rail through the RNA will need to be considered in Precinct 1.	When the future rail requirements through the UDA are known and advised to the ULDA, the Dev. Scheme will be appropriately reviewed.	N
127.	More detailed redevelopment plans required for Precinct 2. Heart Foundation would like to provide further comment - in particular want to see feasibility of re-opening exhibition station for rail commuters, including special services at peak and hospital shift times. Suggest a city loop connecting the Ekka, Bowen Hills, Valley, Central and Roma Street Stations, and / or a Roma Street to Ekka to Bowen Hills shuttle service during peak times.	This comment is noted.	N
128.	Amend and add to description 'Major upgrade to Bowen Hills Railway Station and additional track requirements as proposed by the Inner City Rail Capacity Study technical pre-feasibility'.	It is not considered that this amended is necessary.	N
129.	Add new dot point 'Buildings overlooking the rail corridor must incorporate sub tropical solutions that ensure the safety and operational integrity of railways are protected by obstructing the throwing of objects at trains or onto the overhead line equipment (OHLE) that may cause damage or service interference'.	The Dev. Scheme has been amended accordingly.	Y
130.	Add to paragraph 'Development adjacent to a rail corridor is designed to ameliorate the risks associated with proximity to a rail corridor (such as collisions with rolling stock or dangerous goods and pedestrian trespass).	The Dev. Scheme has been amended accordingly.	Y

**BOWEN HILLS PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Proposed Changes or Comments</b>	<b>Amendment (Y=Yes/N=no)</b>
131.	Add new description 'New Active Transport Corridors between Bowen Park and Gregory Terrace, between O'Connell Terrace and Gregory Terrace and between Gregory Terrace and St Pauls Terrace'.	The Dev. Scheme has been amended accordingly.	Y
132.	Due to the significant level of public passenger transport infrastructure proposed as part of the Bowen Hills UDA, Queensland Transport recommends that a collaborative partnership be instigated by way of a Memorandum of Understanding or other legal agreement to allow Queensland Transport, TransLink Transit Authority and Queensland Rail to provide comment on development applications that would otherwise be referred to Queensland Transport under its IDAS jurisdiction and may impact on the accelerated need for public transport services and infrastructure and the need to protect existing and future public transport corridors and rail corridors within the Bowen Hills UDA.	It is not considered necessary to instigate a Memorandum of Understanding or other legal agreement with these entities. However, it is considered that collaboration between the ULDA and these entities is in the interest of the ULDA and the planning and development objectives for the ULDA. To this end, the ULDA is committed to working with these entities on the delivery of high quality public transport infrastructure with the UDA.	N
133.	Add to description 'New Bus Station Linking to the Bowen Hills Railway Station to include 25m wide road reserve with 2x55m bus bays'.	The Dev. Scheme has been amended accordingly.	Y
134.	Amend and add to paragraph - 'The new bus facility [remove - contemplated] in the vicinity of Hudd Street is to be seamlessly integrated with Bowen Hills railway station with transit supportive land uses supported by continuous, safe and secure pedestrian and cyclists pathways'.	The Dev. Scheme has been amended accordingly.	Y
135.	Precinct Plan – Show a road connection and Active Transport Corridor from the new Bowen Hills bus facility to the north west boundary of sub precinct 1b that provides for a bus link to the new RBH bus way station.	Precinct 1b identifies the need to provide a link through the precinct.	N
<b>Roads and traffic</b>			
136.	Drop-off/pick up parking should be provided at Bowen Hills Rail Station.	This is considered desirable and will be considered as part of the detail design and delivery of the Hudd Street widening.	N
137.	The new realignment of Jamieson St requires resumption of the land at 23 Edgar St taking away redevelopment potential.	The widening and realignment of Jamieson St and Edgar St is critical to the permeability of the UDA Heart which is intern critical to achieving the intended development intensity of the UDA. However, the final alignment of the new Jamieson Street and Edgar Street has not been determined and therefore the full extent of impact on 23 Edgar Street is not known. The ULDA will inform the owner's of 23 Edgar St ASAP of the final alignments for Jamieson and Edgar St.	N
138.	Brookes St has insufficient capacity to accommodate additional traffic generated from high rise development on both sides of street.	As part of the master planning process significant traffic and transport modelling and analysis was undertaken. This suggested that in the foreseeable future Brookes Street will have sufficient capacity to accommodate forecast traffic volumes. The road profile for Brookes Street is 4 lanes of vehicle traffic within on-street parking at off-peak periods.	N

**BOWEN HILLS PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Proposed Changes or Comments</b>	<b>Amendment (Y=Yes/N=no)</b>
139.	O'Connell Terrace should not be the only route between Bowen Bridge Road and Bowen Hills - existing traffic issues already and made worst if high rise development is permitted on both sides of the street.	O'Connell is the only east - west connection available to carry traffic between Bowen Bridge Road and Brookes Street due to the delivery of new regional road infrastructure.  As part of the master planning process significant traffic and transport modelling and analysis was undertaken. This suggested that in the foreseeable future O'Connell Terrace will have sufficient capacity to accommodate forecast traffic volumes.	N
140.	A right hand turn lanes into Brookes Street from O'Connell Terrace will make accessing 8 Brookes Street even more difficult than it is now.	It is acknowledge that access to 8 Brookes St is constrained due to its proximity to the intersection of Brookes St and Hamilton Place and that the Dev. Scheme can not improve on this situation.	N
141.	Alternative approaches to the widening of Hudd Street (i.e. along its southern side) have not be explored.	Alternative options for the widening of Hudd St were explored however, it was determined that delivering the widening of the southern alignment was optimal for delivering the extension of Hudd St to Abbotsford Rd.	N
142.	The intensive traffic routes of Abbotsford Rd and Airport Link need to be factored into development proposals.	The traffic impacts of these roads on future development will need to be appropriately addressed at the time of development application.	N
143.	Airport Link will have a major impact on the permeability of Precinct 1, in particular at the intersections with Campbell and Mayne roads.	This is agreed. Hence the Dev. Scheme proposes the delivery of a new road connection from Mayne Rd through to Tufton St under the viaducts of the Airport Link off-ramps to Campbell Street.	N
144.	Access for 3000 vehicles is required from Mayne Rd for the Campbell St site and the Dev. Scheme should illustrate how traffic flows associated with 3000 vehicles accessing the Campbell St site will be managed to avoid congestion and impede economic development of the site.	This number of vehicle movement far exceeds that which would be expected to be generated by the site given the car parking ratios set by the Dev. Scheme.	N
145.	Campbell and Mayne intersection must allow for slip road entry and exit.	This will be considered during detailed design of the intersection of Campbell and Mayne Street.	N
146.	Hudd St should be widened to the south to allow for improved access and connectivity through the Campbell St site and the overall project.	The ULDA is proposing to widen Hudd Street on the southern alignment. It is considered that this widening will contribute towards improved access and connectivity within and through the UDA.	N
147.	Edgar St should be extended to Mayne Rd to allow for improved site efficiencies and internal precinct access.	The ULDA is proposing to extend Edgar Street through to Mayne Road. It is considered that this will improve access and connectivity within and through the UDA.	N
148.	Tufton St is not an attractive access and should not require activation. As the level of Tufton St is substantially lower than Mayne Rd it should only provide for service access.	The role and conceptual design of Tufton Street will need to be determined at the time of development application when details of the proposed development on the site are known.	N
149.	The proposed road sizes in the UDA will be a barrier to ground floor retail activation as they will discourage street crossing.	It is not considered that the profiles of the proposed roads will discourage street activation and street crossing. The location and design of pedestrian crossings will be determined as part of detailed design work.	N
150.	Sub-precinct 1b must provide for a new local street through the site linking Abbotsford Rd at Edmondstone St through to Hudd St and a new bus facility. The Precinct Plan for the Bowen Hills Heart identifies a route for the desired road connection and there is an apparent inability to	Precinct 1b identifies the need to provide a link through the precinct but does not prescribe the exact route. This detail is expected to be resolved as part of the sub-precinct planning process.	N

**BOWEN HILLS PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Proposed Changes or Comments</b>	<b>Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)</b>
	divert from this route.		
151.	Main Road would like to discuss the underlying assumptions and analysis contained in the Options report and Masterplan Transport Strategy that fed into the Development Scheme.	The ULDA is will to meet with Main Road and discuss the underlying assumptions contained in the Options Report and Masterplan Transport Strategy.	N
152.	The down-grade of Abbotsford Rd and diversion of traffic through Edmondstone Rd and Breakfast Creek Rd and Ann St are likely to reduce the efficiency of this route into the city.	The redevelopment of the UDA does not rely on the down-grading of Abbotsford Rd and diversion of traffic through Edmondstone Rd and Breakfast Creek Rd and Ann St and that any proposal to do this will need to be the subject of detailed discussions with BCC and Main Roads.	N
153.	BCC has a number of proposed road widenings in the area that it is protecting that have not been identified in the Dev. Scheme. These include Abbotsford Rd, Hudson Rd, St Paul's Tce, Markwell St, Constance St, Water St, Brunswick St, Anderson St and Montpelier Rd. Council would like to see concept plans for all new proposed new roads and widenings including cycling and public transport provision, bus facility, and cross section detail.	This information has not been provided to the ULDA. However, as part of the master planning process significant traffic and transport modelling and analysis was undertaken which identified the need for certain roads within the UDA to be widened or realigned. These widenings are flagged in the Infrastructure Plan with details of the extent of widening identified in accompanying reports. The ULDA is willing to meet with BCC to further discuss necessary road widening within the UDA.	N
154.	Why is a new road required connecting Anderson St to Water St?	This new road is required to improve permeability within the Precinct.	N
155.	Add to paragraph 'Development adjacent to a rail corridor is designed to ameliorate the risks associated with proximity to a rail corridor (such as collisions with rolling stock or dangerous goods and pedestrian trespass).	The Dev. Scheme has been amended accordingly.	Y
156.	Add to dot point 'create a network of cycle safe roads and highly interconnected, attractive and efficient bikeways that give cyclists a choice of routes connecting major activity nodes and major transport stops and stations with each other and also linking them to residential areas'.	It is considered that the provisions in the Dev. Scheme are adequate to improve connectivity and permeability within the UDA and the surrounding area.	N
157.	Clarify the intent of the underlined wording having regard to pedestrian and cycleways 'Hudd Street will accommodate four land of vehicle traffic with two way vehicle movement, a cycle way with median buffer, on-street parking outside of peak traffic periods, and ..'.	It is not considered necessary to clarify the intent of this wording.	N
158.	Include a requirement within each precinct for "arterial roads within the precinct are to be designed with a view to maintaining acceptable service delivery standards for the Emergency Services".	This issue will be addressed through the Infrastructure Plan and Implementation Stage and detailed design of arterial roads.	N
<b>Sustainability</b>			
159.	The Dev. Scheme should provide incentives to developers to locate solar energy plants on top of multi storey buildings.	The Dev. Scheme includes Energy Efficiency provisions that require developments to use alternative energy supplies through the use of renewable energy sources. The Infrastructure Charging Framework reinforces sustainability initiatives for development within the UDA through a sustainability contribution which can be off-set against the investment of other sustainability initiatives on-site.	N

**BOWEN HILLS PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Proposed Changes or Comments</b>	<b>Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)</b>
160.	Innovative co-gen power and other infrastructure need to be incorporated in allowance planning.	The Dev. Scheme includes Energy Efficiency provisions that require developments to use alternative energy supplies through the use of renewable energy sources. The Infrastructure Charging Framework reinforces sustainability initiatives for development within the UDA through a sustainability contribution which can be off-set against the investment of other sustainability initiatives on-site.	N
161.	A set of energy efficiency guidelines should be prepared for development in the UDA.	The Dev. Scheme includes Energy Efficiency provisions that require developments to use alternative energy supplies through the use of renewable energy sources. The Infrastructure Charging Framework reinforces sustainability initiatives for development within the UDA through a sustainability contribution which can be off-set against the investment of other sustainability initiatives on-site.	N
162.	BCC request the Dev. Scheme to include alternative water supplies, stormwater harvesting and/or recycled water as part of development in the UDA. Also recommend incorporation of information from the Local Stormwater Management Plan for Water/Campbell St into the Infrastructure Plan.	The Dev. Scheme includes Water Efficiency provisions that require developments to use alternative energy supplies through the use of renewable energy sources. The Infrastructure Charging Framework reinforces sustainability initiatives for development within the UDA through a sustainability contribution which can be off-set against the investment of other sustainability initiatives on-site.	N
<b>Urban design</b>			
163.	Active retail and commercial street frontages should be required for the subject site and surrounding area.	The Dev. Scheme requires activation of building frontages. Refer to Section 4, Part 2 of the Land Use Plan.	N
164.	The general requirement for a podium and tower form, as expressed by the UDA-wide Development Criteria, is not the only way that the UDA can be successfully developed. Recognition that alternative building forms can be developed is some locations in the UDA should be included in the UDA-wide Development Criteria.	The Dev. Scheme has been amended accordingly.	Y
165.	The UDA-wide Development Criteria identifies a number of gateways where landmark buildings can be accommodated. While not likely to be recognised as a gateway per se, it is appropriate for the QR land to be able to be developed with a landmark building (or buildings) that deviates from the common urban design requirements of the UDA.	The Dev. Scheme has been amended accordingly.	Y
166.	Gateways may be reinforced though public art as well as landmark buildings and landscape treatment.	This comment is noted.	N
167.	Is the clustering of public spaces intended to create a plaza space adjacent to the railway station? Is such clustering also to apply to other landmark intersections?	No. The clustering of the public spaces in intended to be on the southern side of Hudd St, east of Jameson St. When encapsulation of the railway line occurs, it is intended that the new development will provide public plazas and a new access to Bowen Hills Railway Station.	N

## BOWEN HILLS PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Issue #	Issue	Proposed Changes or Comments	Amendment (Y=Yes/N=no)
168.	Precinct intent for Precinct 1 needs to more explicitly express the important relationship between future development in the precinct and the railway station.	The existing wording in Precinct 1 of the Dev. Scheme is considered sufficient in that it states <i>"Buildings within the Precinct will deliver a transit oriented development outcome by accommodating significant scale and incorporating a mix of commercial, residential and civic functions focused on the Bowen Hills Railway Station and new bus facility."</i>	N
169.	Abbotsford Rd and the identified pedestrian linkages should have primary active frontages.	MAP 5 in the Dev. Scheme has been amended to include the western alignment of Abbotsford Road south of Edmondstone Rd as a primary active frontage.	Y
170.	CPTED principles should be incorporated in the Dev. Scheme.	Part 2, Section of the Dev. Scheme has been amended to clarify the requirement for development to deliver on principles of CPTED.	Y
171.	Pleasure gardens, botanical variation and early materials such as brick, sandstone and Brisbane tuff all provide suitable sources of inspiration for the Bowen Hills development area.	This comment is noted.	N
172.	The majority of the UDA is characterised by large major roads with minimal streetscape amenity. There is an exciting opportunity to establish a vibrant, iconic and pedestrian friendly public realm in the streetscape treatments.	It is considered that Dev. Scheme will act to improve streetscape amenity and the quality of the public realm within the UDA and the surrounding area.	N
173.	The heavy rail severs a great portion of the study area from Herston and Windsor. A significant contribution of connectivity between Bowen Hills and Windson/Herston is preferable to an attempt to treat the railway edge condition.	It is considered that Dev. Scheme will act to improve connectivity and permeability within the UDA and the surrounding area.	N
174.	The use of floodplain landscape has been limited due to its proximity to the railway lines and lack of crossing points. It is suggested that these places be linked and would benefit the community through greater access and uses such as food production and recreation.	It is considered that Dev. Scheme will act to improve connectivity and permeability within the UDA and the surrounding area.	N
175.	The key massing techniques set out under 'Section 4.3 Building Arrangement' are too prescriptive and will lead to significant additional cost and homogenous architecture.	Whilst the Dev. Scheme retains the requirement for buildings to achieve distinct lower, middle and upper sections, the provisions of the Dev. Scheme have been revised to provide greater flexibility.	Y
176.	The requirement of Section '4.11 Open Space' for a minimum of 16m <sup>2</sup> of private open space is excessive and will work against the achievement of affordable housing outcomes. Balconies should be sized proportionally to the unit size and should not be less than 9m <sup>2</sup> with a minimum dimension of 3m.	Para 4.7(b) Balconies and other Private Open Space has been amended to state: <i>"All residential units must incorporate generous balconies or private open space, attached to major internal living areas and providing room for outdoor private activity and furnishings such as a table, chairs, planting, a BBQ and shade. Balconies should be sized proportionately to the unit size and must not be less than 9m<sup>2</sup> with a minimum dimension of 3 metres. However, it is considered desirable that 16m<sup>2</sup> of private open space or balcony be achieved for all dwelling units"</i>	Y
177.	The requirement of 'Section 4.8 Subtropical Design' for the provision of large windows contradicts the aim of energy efficiency requirement in Section 6.7. A balance needs to be struck between these two provisions.	The Introduction to Section 4 of the Dev. Scheme has been amended to state: <i>"all elements of this section must be achieved to the greatest extent practical, having regard to each of the other elements"</i>	Y

**BOWEN HILLS PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Proposed Changes or Comments</b>	<b>Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)</b>
178.	Advocating healthy by design principles .e.g Neighbourhoods that encourage walking are more likely to be active. Additionally they should provide access to safe places to actively commute, and for recreational physical activity.	This statement is noted.	N
179.	The Mayne yards are a major barrier. It is disappointing QR have not contributed in terms of improved integration and access through this site.	This comment is noted.	N
180.	Insert new paragraph – 'Development within, over or under existing or future rail station and rail corridors must protect the rail corridor's function and operation'.	The dev. Scheme will be amended to require development within, over or under existing rail station and rail corridors to protect the rail corridor's function and operation'. However it is not considered that such protection of a future rail station or corridors is reasonable unless these stations and corridors are formally declared or recognised by the State.	Y
181.	Add to dot point 'Balconies are to be appropriately located and / or screened to maximise privacy between buildings and / or to the public realm and to protect the amenity from transport corridors'.	The Dev. Scheme has been amended accordingly.	Y
182.	Insert new paragraph – 'Development of station area precincts to seamlessly integrate public transport facilities with transit supportive land uses and be linked by a continuous, safe and secure pedestrian and cyclist pathways.	The Dev. Scheme has been amended accordingly.	Y
183.	Insert dot point 'Provide clear and distinctive signage at public passenger transport station entrances that provide a place of reference and orientation'.	This is considered the responsibility of QT/QR	N





**Bowen Hills and Northshore  
Hamilton UDA Development  
Schemes Submissions Report**

**Northshore  
Hamilton UDA  
specific issues**

**22 December 2008**

**NORTHSHORE HAMILTON PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment (Y = yes/N = no)</b>
<b>Density</b>			
1.	Requested plot ratio for precincts.	<p>Density for the Northshore Hamilton area is expressed in commercial, retail and residential GFA limits per precinct/sub-precinct.</p> <p>The Dev. Scheme does not have plot ratios as these will be determined as part of future development applications based on maximum GFA's identified for the various precincts and sub-precincts. GFA's will be negotiated on an individual basis with the ULDA and will have regard to issues such as building height, setbacks, landscaping and car parking provision.</p> <p>The maximum GFA identified in the Land Use Plan is considered necessary to regulate the extent of vehicles trips generated by the entire UDA.</p>	N
2.	Precinct 1- precinct intent – clarity should be provided for the GFA allocated to balance sites as it is not clear how much GFA exists in this precinct. This should reflect the project details and allow a plot ratio of 3 x site for both Brett's Wharf East and West sites. In addition, the precinct outcomes do not achieve the precinct intent.	The ULDA sees the future development of the UDA to be focused on newly developing areas. Brett's Wharf precinct is an established area where the intent is to respect the existing residential amenity associated with this precinct. It is considered that future high rise development within this precinct will not achieve this planning intent.	N
3.	<p>Amend the maximum retail floor space for the Cruise Ship Terminal Precinct to 25,000m<sup>2</sup> so that it is consistent with development approvals that have been granted over the Portside Wharf site.</p> <p>Request the GFA cap for the Cruise Ship Terminal sub-precinct needs to increased to approximately 140,000 m<sup>2</sup></p>	<p>The Cruise Ship Terminal sub-precinct has been amended to increase the total GFA from 114,000 m<sup>2</sup> to 135,000 m<sup>2</sup>, including 25,000m<sup>2</sup> of GFA for retail. This reflects in part Brisbane City Council's Preliminary approval for the existing Portside development. It also rectifies the ULDA's previous GFA calculation which was based on assumed GFA and not actual GFA.</p> <p>The revised GFA break up has been amended as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Residential 95,000m<sup>2</sup> GFA;</li> <li>▪ Commercial 15,000 m<sup>2</sup> GFA; and</li> <li>▪ Retail 25,000 m<sup>2</sup> GFA.</li> </ul>	Y
4.	It is recommended that a residential GFA cap of approximately 160,000m <sup>2</sup> for the Sub-precinct 3 (c) Cruise Ship Terminal.	<p>The Cruise Ship Terminal sub-precinct has been amended to increase the total GFA from 114,000 m<sup>2</sup> to 135,000 m<sup>2</sup>, including 25,000m<sup>2</sup> of GFA for retail. This reflects in part Brisbane City Council's Preliminary approval for the existing Portside development. It also rectifies the ULDA's previous GFA calculation which was based on assumed GFA and not actual GFA.</p> <p>The revised GFA break up has been amended as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Residential 95,000m<sup>2</sup> GFA;</li> <li>▪ Commercial 15,000 m<sup>2</sup> GFA; and</li> <li>▪ Retail 25,000 m<sup>2</sup> GFA.</li> </ul>	Y
5.	Request the cap for the River Park sub-precinct needs to increase to approximately 120,000m <sup>2</sup> .	<p>River-park sub-precinct has been increased from 99,700 m<sup>2</sup> to a total GFA of 134,000 m<sup>2</sup>. Whilst the Riverside Residential West Sub-precinct (included in the Waterfront Residential Precinct) has been reduced from 82,000 m<sup>2</sup> to 47,500m<sup>2</sup>. This change is to a precinct drafting error.</p> <p>The revised GFA break up for River-Park Sub-precinct has been amended as follows:</p> <p><i>Residential - 100,00 m<sup>2</sup></i></p>	Y

**NORTHSHORE HAMILTON PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)</b>
		<i>Commercial - 27,000 m<sup>2</sup> Retail - 7,000 m<sup>2</sup></i>	
6.	The maximum GFA specified for Precinct 4 (a) is not sufficient to create a financially viable redevelopment having regard to the additional costs of relocating existing tenants. Occupied and operational land in Northshore will have different economic criteria to succeed compared with vacant land.	The GFA for the Kingsford Smith Drive Sub-Precinct 4 (a) has been amended from 110,500m <sup>2</sup> to 142,500m <sup>2</sup> based on Langford Metals site area of 2ha and the QR site of 7.5ha. Based on the initial report carried out, a 2.75 plot ratio will yield a 52,479m <sup>2</sup> GFA which has been demonstrated to achieve an acceptable economic return. This will allow approximately 90,000m <sup>2</sup> of GFA to be utilised on the QR land. This is considered appropriate given the need to provide sufficient buffering distance to the Neumann's tank farm. Future discussions between QR, Langford Metals and the ULDA as part of the sub-precinct planning process will ensure a fair and equitable distribution of GFA across the Sub precinct	Y
7.	Support 8 storey limit in sub-precinct 4a, but would request removal of GFA limit and inclusion of site cover requirements of 50%	Site Cover is not considered an appropriate mechanism for regulating mixed use development. The maximum GFA identified in the Land Use Plan is considered necessary to regulate the extent of vehicles trips generated by the entire UDA.	N
<b>Heights</b>			
8.	Support minimum setbacks from the river.	Support noted	N
9.	Support for heights in precinct 1.	Support noted	N
10.	Request height limits are maintained especially adjacent to the river	Development applications will be assessed against the UDA wide Development Criteria and Precinct/Sub-precinct Development Requirements, which include height provisions. However, Section 2 of the Land Use Plan provides for the ability to approve a development with a height or GFA exceeding that specified in a Precinct or Sub-precinct despite the non-compliance where there are sufficient grounds to justify approval of the proposal.	N
11.	Request three storey height limit between Brett's Wharf Towers and Portside Towers is enforced to protect the amenity of existing angular buildings.	Precinct 1 – Brett's Wharf has a maximum height of three storeys for most of this precinct, with the exception of a maximum of 10 storeys on the portion of land which contains 10 storey towers (Lancaster, Windermere and Sutherland Towers).	N
12.	Precinct 1, outcome 3 – height of 3 storeys should be replaced by 15 storeys.	The ULDA sees the future development of the UDA to be focused on newly developing areas. Brett's Wharf precinct is an established area where the intent is to respect the existing residential amenity associated with this precinct. It is considered that future high rise development within this precinct will not achieve this planning intent.	N

**NORTHSHORE HAMILTON PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment (Y = yes/N = no)</b>
13.	Precinct 1, outcome 5 – this is only supported with building heights of 15 storeys where this can be achieved.	Noted. The ULDA sees the future development of the UDA to be focused on newly developing areas. Brett's Wharf precinct is an established area where the intent is to respect the existing residential amenity associated with this precinct. It is considered that future high rise development within this precinct will not achieve this planning intent.	N
14.	BAC has noted the proposed permissible heights having regard to the extended centreline. Given the comments in the previous paragraph, BAC is concerned that Precincts 3 and 6 permit buildings up to 23 storeys. The ULDA is urged to consider reducing the permissible building heights in these precincts.	The height limits fall well below the maximum building heights identified in the State Planning Policy. The masterplanning work undertaken by the Consultant Consortium identified that 23 storeys was an acceptable height given the proposed residential densities and the need to promote the skyline appearance of the proposed activity nodes.	N
15.	It is recommended that Sub-precinct 3 (c) Cruise Ship Terminal have its maximum allowable height raised to 20 storeys.	15 stories is considered appropriate for this sub-precinct based on maximum GFA requirements, intent for the area and previous preliminary approval given over the precinct.	N
16.	Height limits are considered subjective as the height limit areas in the Development Scheme are not based on cadastre/scaled or provide definitive coordinates.	The precincts are cadastrally based. The ULDA has amended the definition of storeys which seeks to classify the overall height of buildings.	N
17.	Requests heights are specified e.g. through RL level or metres.	The ULDA has amended the definition of storeys which seeks to classify the overall height of buildings.	Y
<b>Setbacks and separation</b>			
18.	Support for tower separation.	Support noted	N
19.	Request for a 20m setback between residential towers.	The proposed 18 metre separation between residential towers is considered an appropriate separation to achieve amenity for residents such as privacy.	N
20.	Requested that all new buildings in precinct 1 should be setback 20m from the high water mark.	Requirements for the setback from the river are consistent with those of Brisbane City Council, as outlined in the Waterway Code. The Code states that building setbacks must be no less than the setback of buildings sharing a common boundary and that new development must be of a similar height and bulk as that of adjoining buildings.	N
21.	Precinct 2 – Setbacks. Request that no particular building setbacks be prescribed to street frontages. It is felt a 6m setback from Kingsford Smith Drive is arbitrary and will not necessarily lead to a preferred streetscape option. Whilst the need to have street activation and positive streetscape impacts to Harbour Road and Hercules Street in a mixed use environment meant that a prescribed setback requirement is unnecessary and unlikely to have any bearing on the effectiveness of the developments street interface.	The Development Scheme has been amended to reduce the setbacks along Kingsford Smith Drive from 6 metres (after the road widening) to an average of 3 metres (after the road widening). This setback will enable a more appropriate building interface with Kingsford Smith Drive whilst still allowing for significant trees to be established along the Kingsford Smith frontage.	Y
22.	Request for side boundary setbacks to be 5 metres minimum	Appropriate side boundary setbacks will be determined on a site by site basis to ensure adequate setbacks.	N
23.	Request for firm setbacks, not variable.	The Development Scheme is not prescriptive to enable for the most appropriate development outcomes for a site.	N

**NORTHSHORE HAMILTON PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment (Y = yes/N = no)</b>
24.	Setbacks – precinct 1 setbacks are inappropriate and result in 30% of Brett’s Wharf East site being developable. This is unfeasible and setbacks should apply as 5m to the Brisbane River and no setback to Kingsford Smith Drive (given 14m road widening requirements).	<p>The ULDA sees the future development of the UDA to be focused on newly developing areas. Brett’s Wharf precinct is an established area where the intent is to respect the existing residential amenity associated with this precinct. It is considered that future high rise development within this precinct will not achieve this planning intent.</p> <p>The setbacks along Kingsford Smith Drive have been amended from 6 metres (after the road widening) to an average of 3 metres (after the road widening). This setback will enable a more appropriate building interface with Kingsford Smith Drive whilst still allowing for significant trees to be established along the Kingsford Smith frontage</p> <p>Requirements for the setback from the river are consistent with those of Brisbane City Council, as outlined in BCC’s Waterway Code. The Code states that building setbacks must be no less than the setback of buildings sharing a common boundary and that new development must be of a similar height and bulk as that of adjoining buildings.</p>	N
25.	Requests that the privacy and amenity of the Infinity Building is not compromised by overshadowing. Solar access analysis should be undertaken.	There are provisions in the Development Scheme such as minimum tower separation to address amenity issues such as privacy and overshadowing	N
26.	Request for specified amount of landscaping.	The UDA wide Development criteria specify a landscaping requirement of 30% of the site area and recreation opportunities for all residential development.	N
27.	Support for 30% of frontages to have a maximum of 3 storeys.	Support noted.	N
28.	Request for amendment to Map 2 to delete the western part of Lot 6 on SP185300 as being primary active frontage.	The identified primary street frontages identified in Map 2 are considered appropriate and will contribute to safe and active places	N
29.	Precinct 1, outcome 2 – setbacks to the river should be consistent with existing buildings. A 5m setback i.e. at the end of the boardwalk should be the applicable setback for new development.	Requirements for the setback from the river are consistent with those of Brisbane City Council, as outlined in BCC’s Waterway Code. The Code states that building setbacks must be no less than the setback of buildings sharing a common boundary and that new development must be of a similar height and bulk as that of adjoining buildings.	N
30.	It is unclear whether the development requirements specified in relation to the setbacks relate to the setback distance from the building to the road or the frontage of the property.	Building setbacks are to lot boundaries. This is standard planning practice.	N
31.	Request adequate separation between towers is maintained.	Development applications will be assessed against the development requirements, including tower separation. However, Section 2 of the Land Use Plan provides for the ability to approve a development with a height or GFA exceeding that specified in a Precinct or Sub-precinct despite the non-compliance where there are sufficient grounds to justify approval of the proposal.	N

**NORTHSHORE HAMILTON PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment (Y = yes / N = no)</b>
32.	Request for policy to ensure compliance with setbacks, heights etc.	The Development Scheme specifies setbacks and heights. There is no need to include a policy to ensure compliance with these requirements	N
33.	Setbacks – Application of this requirement is based on the outer most projection to the proposed road alignment. Any non compliance is a matter of detail and is not in conflict with the Structure Plan or outcomes of the Vision. Grounds for compliance may include “superior design outcomes” (e.g. where the applicant seeks to provide an awning).	Comment Noted	N
<b>Urban Design</b>			
34.	p.25 Section 9 Clean Industry, Research & Development Facilities. This section should also be based on CPTED principles, particularly the car parking areas.	CPTED principles underpin the design on all development within the UDA, including the design car parking areas. These provisions are outlined under Part 2: UDA – wide Development Criteria, Urban Design and Sustainability - Section 4.3 Community Safety and Well-being of the Land Use Plan.	N
35.	p.19 Section 4.4 Building and Public Realm – it is recommended that CPTED principles be used as a guide in the development of these spaces.	This issue has been addressed through including CPTED provisions and reference to <i>Crime Prevention through Environmental Design Guidelines for Queensland</i> in Section 4.3 of the UDA wide Development Criteria.	N
36.	UDA wide Development Criteria – Suggest Community Well-being be expanded to include Open Space	Open Space is incorporated into the Urban Design section of the UDA wide Development Criteria	N
37.	Section 4 – Urban Design. Suggest including another element that specifically relates to the River.	Provisions relating to the Brisbane River are contained in Part 2- UDA wide Criteria of the Land Use Plan, including a section on Riverwalk and on Harbour, Foreshore and Marinas.  Additional sections on Tidal Works have been included in the UDA wide criteria and level of assessment tables, to further address issues associated with the Brisbane River.	Y
38.	Section 4.3 Building Arrangement - the Proposed Scheme would have the first 4 levels of buildings create a block perimeter with internal communal open spaces and courtyards. Recent experience on the part of the Queensland Fire and Rescue Service (QFRS) has been that this can be problematic by reason of the chimney effect thus created in the event of a fire at lower levels.	This issue has been addressed through amended provisions in Section 4.3 – Community Safety and Well-being of the UDA wide Development Criteria. The amended wording is as follows  <i>Development is to incorporate appropriate safety features in line with current standards and best practice guidance including: fire safety and emergency vehicle access.</i>  During the development assessment process, the ULDA will consult where necessary with the Department of Emergency Services to seek guidance on issues relating to fire and fire safety	Y
39.	Section 5.4 Circulation - The Proposed Scheme requires development to support increased accessibility, permeability and movement for pedestrians and cyclists and appropriate movement by vehicles. Provision needs to be made here for the movement of fire fighting appliances and ambulances, perhaps by stating that “appropriate vehicles” include fire and ambulance appliances.	The Circulation section has been amended to address this issue more clearly. The amended wording is as follows:  <i>Development is to support increased accessibility, permeability and movement for pedestrians and cyclist and appropriate movement by vehicles, including emergency vehicles and priority for public transport.</i>	Y

**NORTHSHORE HAMILTON PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment (Y = yes/N = no)</b>
40.	It is recommended that discussion occur with Queensland Fire and Rescue Services regarding requirements under section 7.1 community safety.	<p>Previous section 7.1 Community Safety has been renumbered as section 4.3 and includes the requirement</p> <p><i>Development is to incorporate safety features in line with current standards and best practice guidance including: fire safety and emergency vehicle access and priority for public transport.</i></p> <p>The ULDA will consult and seek guidance where necessary with Queensland Fire and Rescue Services on issues relating to fire and fire safety.</p>	Y
41.	Section 7 Lot Design - The Proposed Scheme requires lot sizes and dimensions to enable a building to be sited to address site constraints including slope, soil erosion and flooding and drainage. Consistency with the requirements of State Planning Policy 1/03 Mitigating the Adverse Impacts of Flood, Bushfire and Landslide (SPP 1/03), where flood or landslide hazards are present, needs to be added here for the sake of guidance and consistency with jurisdictions adjacent to the Northshore Hamilton Precinct.	The Development Scheme has been amended to address this issue by inclusion of reference to <i>State Planning Policy 1/03 Mitigating the adverse impacts of Flood Bushfire and Landslide</i> in Section 7 – Lot Design of the UDA-wide Development Criteria.	Y
42.	Support for boardwalk and public access to the river.	Support noted.	N
43.	Request for the removal of the walls at Bretts Wharf to open up the boardwalk, suggest replacement with grassed area/landscaping.	The walls/fences along Brett's Wharf Precinct are within the private property boundary of the towers. The ULDA cannot require these walls/fences to be removed. However The ULDA will ensure that any redevelopment and/or new development along the River will have an appropriate and safe interface between development and the Riverwalk.	N
44.	High rise in precinct 1 should take into account pedestrian access to the boardwalk.	Any redevelopment adjoining the river in Precinct 1 will be required to provide/retain public access to the Riverwalk.	N
45.	Section 4.3 (b) (ii) Building Awnings do not allow for street trees to be accommodated	The 0.9 metres that the awnings are to extend allows for the provision of street trees.	N
<b>Open Space and Community Facilities</b>			
46.	No development on parks, remove height limit from scheme.	It is not intended that there will be development on the parks, the height limits are there in case a community facility or structure is built within the park.	N
47.	Concerned about the encroachment on the Remora Road Park by the road widening.	The Road widening along Kingsford Smith Drive is required as part of Brisbane City Council's strategy to improve traffic conditions along Kingsford Smith Drive. The Open Space Strategy for the Northshore Hamilton area includes a range of open and civic spaces, including a 2.8 km public Riverwalk along the River to cater for the needs of the future population of the Northshore Hamilton area.	N
48.	Support for the river park on the south side of precinct 3.	Support Noted	N



**NORTHSHORE HAMILTON PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment (Y = yes/N = no)</b>
49.	More green space in precinct 2.	<p>The Land Use Plan for Northshore Hamilton provides for a variety of well connected open spaces, within walking distance of every home. Key active recreation parks provide the primary open space resource for the community and are underpinned by a linked hierarchy of passive and active public domain spaces.</p> <p>The Land Use Plan provides for a range of open and civic spaces, including a 2.8 km public Riverwalk along the River to cater for the needs of the future population of the Northshore Hamilton area.</p>	N
<b>Pedestrian and Cycle</b>			
50.	Request for pedestrian and cycle bridge to be constructed over the drainage at Coxen Point and extended to the Tangalooma Ferry Terminal.	It is intended to link the Brisbane River to the Gateway Bridge as part of the SEQ Principal Cycle Network. Due to the changes in grade between the RQ Golf Course and the Gateway Bridge, any future connection must be at a grade where bicycle and pedestrian connections can be achieved. It is likely this will require future connections back towards the existing industrial area however the exact route has yet to be defined. Future connections to Tangalooma Ferry will also need to connect with the Gateway Bridge at a suitable grade.	N
51.	Pedestrian and cycle access ways to be provided to the boardwalk.	Pedestrian and cycle ways will be incorporated along the River Walk.	N
52.	The key pedestrian connections may not be suitable for commuter cyclists. Clarification should be provided regarding the proposed cycle network.	The SEQ Principle Cycle network shows future principle routes along Kingsford Smith Drive and along the Gateway Arterial. These roads are outside the boundaries of the UDA and fall under the jurisdiction of Brisbane City Council and Department of Main Roads where future cycle corridors will be incorporated at the detailed design phase. The pedestrian network along the Brisbane River will allow for cycle paths except for the Royal Queensland Golf Course where there is a significant grade separation to the Gateway Bridge.	N
53.	Pedestrian paths are heavily focused on the River. Connections to Medium Impact Employment Zone appear quite limited.	Map 4 – Key Connections show a number of connections from the Brisbane River to the Medium Impact Employment Zone.	N
54.	Bicycle parking is only proposed at the standard rate. Why is this not higher than the standard rate?	The current standards for bicycle parking are considered appropriate.	N
55.	The pedestrian network is fragmented and does not align to likely desire lines.	The UDA is based on a permeable and legible road network which promoted strong north-south connections from the river. In addition, a key philosophy underpinning the proposed layout is to promote street connections to the river. The road layout will complement the pedestrian network.	N

**NORTHSHORE HAMILTON PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)</b>
56.	BAC encourages a strong pedestrian and cycle link to future facilities such as the upgraded Gateway Motorway cycle pedestrian path across the Brisbane River.	The SEQ Principle Cycle network shows future principle routes along Kingsford Smith Drive and along the Gateway Arterial. These roads are outside the boundaries of the UDA and under the jurisdiction of Brisbane City Council and Department of Main Roads where future cycle corridors will be incorporated at the detailed design phase. The key connections along the Brisbane River will allow for cycle paths except for the Royal Queensland Golf Course where there is a significant grade separation to the Gateway Bridge.	N
57.	p.22 Section 5.5 End of trip facilities showers such as secure space for parking showers and lockers are mentioned. Only criteria for secure parking are provided. Are there criteria for lockers and showers?	The location and design of showers and locker provisions will be determined at the development assessment stage.	N
<b>Traffic and Transport</b>			
58.	Support for reduction in traffic movements and heavy vehicle access.	Support Noted	N
59.	Imperative that the proposed new access to Kingsford Smith Drive near the Caltex Station (precinct 2) is installed at an early stage.	The proposed access road is indicated as catalyst infrastructure in the Infrastructure Plan of the Development Scheme. It is anticipated this will occur between 2009 -2012.	N
60.	Support for new exit to Kingsford Smith Drive near the Caltex site.	Support noted.	N
61.	Concerned about traffic on Harbour Road and Remora Road.	It is proposed to widen Harbour Road via the new link to Kingsford Smith Drive as part of the catalyst infrastructure works to accommodate the anticipated growth in vehicle trips	N
62.	Road widening to KSD can not be described as minor. Map 6 should include scope of KSD works.	Reference to 'Minor' Improvements has been deleted. The upgrade to KSD is the responsibility of Brisbane City Council and final design is yet to be completed. The general provisions for the Kingsford Smith Drive road widening have been included in the Development Scheme.	N
63.	Curtain Avenue should remain open for the entire length to promote permeability to the UDA.	Under the <i>Urban Land Development Act 2007</i> , the ULDA has the power to open and close roads. It is proposed to close Cullen Avenue off so as to divert industrial traffic away from the mixed use heart and to KSD via a new Theodore Street extension. It is also proposed to close off the western end of Cullen Avenue as the current intersection with Remora Road is sub-standard.	N
64.	Support for new 4-way intersections to KSD. Can Council help pay for intersections due to benefits to larger area?	Noted. The ULDA and BCC are working closely to ensure the proposed upgrade to KSD is integrated with the Northshore Hamilton UDA. Details of funding apportionment are yet to be finalised.	N

**NORTHSHORE HAMILTON PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment (Y = yes/N = no)</b>
65.	Has potential for rat-running been considered for vehicles trying to avoid KSD. This will be exacerbated should the new Gateway Interchange go ahead.	As part of the Northshore Hamilton masterplan, traffic investigations were carried out with respect to the UDA. It was found that part of Curtain Avenue be closed to help segregate industrial traffic from the mixed use area to the south, as well as to prevent some rat-running through the UDA. The ULDA and BCC will continue to work together to ensure appropriate traffic management is carried out so as to minimise potential rat-running.	N
66.	p.35 Hamilton Harbour –support for BCC requirements for road widening and provision for no direct access.	Support noted.	N
67.	Support bus rapid transit along Macarthur Avenue.	Support noted.	N
68.	It is unclear how the land use plan will ensure opportunities for rail will be preserved.	The Development Scheme provides a planning framework to accommodate the rail corridor identified in the structure plan. At this stage no land has been acquired to preserve this corridor.	N
69.	An at-grade solution for the rail station is preferred.	At grade rail extension is a significantly higher cost than an elevated rail extension and not financially viable. Furthermore an at grade rail extension would have significant impacts and implications on Kingsford Smith Drive	N
70.	The design of Sub-precinct 4b and 4c needs to include the intent that any future rail station should be integrated with other modes of public transport.	Any future rail station in this sub precinct will integrate with other modes of transport located along MacArthur Avenue.	N
71.	Replace rapid transit bus service with high frequency bus service – section 5.1.	The Development Scheme has been amended to align with the terminology adopted by Brisbane City Council. Reference to <i>Rapid Transit Bus Service</i> has been replaced with <i>Bus Rapid Transit</i> .  A definition of Bus Rapid Transit has been included in the Development Scheme as follows: <i>Non-rail based, distinctive, high passenger capacity vehicle which can operate in shared right-of-way with general road traffic or on its own right-of-way</i>	Y
72.	Include priority for public transport through Northshore Hamilton.	The Development Scheme has been amended to address this issue in the Circulation section as follows:  <i>Development is to support increased accessibility, permeability, and movement for pedestrians and cyclists and appropriate movement by vehicles, including emergency vehicles and priority for public transport</i>	Y
73.	Public transport will be a provided though a combination of CityCat and bus services.	Noted and agreed.	N
74.	It may be more appropriate to classify the interim period as when certain frequencies, level of service and coverage are met rather than the provision 'fixed public transport service', This requires further discussion between TTA and ULDA.	It is considered that the fixed public transport is an appropriate term to classify the interim period.	N

**NORTHSHORE HAMILTON PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)</b>
75.	It is suggested that concessions be made for residential and commercial developments that have car pooling / rental / share schemes attached to the body corporate.	The ULDA may consider a concession on car parking rates where it can be demonstrated that initiatives such as car pooling and rental share schemes are put in place and contribute to a reduced car parking need.	N
76.	A traffic study needs to be undertaken to determine locations for bus priority measures within Northshore Hamilton.	The preferred mass transit corridor has been identified along MacArthur Avenue so as to provide the greatest commuter penetration within the UDA. Future corridors beyond Curtain Avenue have yet to be determined however the intention is to extend the corridor beyond the UDA to service the ATC.	N
77.	Proposed City Cat terminal locations need further investigation between TransLink, BCC, QT and the ULDA, The TransLink Authority would like to see the CityCat terminal aligned with a bus station.	Noted. Citycat terminals are only indicative and will be subject to the outcomes of the current BCC EOI process and further discussions with TransLink Transit Authority, Brisbane City Council and Queensland Transport.	N
78.	The proposed rapid transit bus corridor should make provision for bus stop infrastructure however it should preserve a median corridor suitable to cater for light rail in the future. This should initially be vegetated, however not include feature plantings as their removal in the future could cause community upset.	The location of bus stops has yet to be determined but will be based on best practice in consultation with QT and TransLink. A medium strip will be preserved in MacArthur Avenue to allow for Bus Rapid Transit and potential Light Rail. Advice on planting is noted.	N
79.	P.87 Include CityCat terminal in the description of works.	The Dev. Scheme has been amended to include Ferry Terminal in the Infrastructure Plan.	Y
80.	P.87 Include road side bus stop infrastructure in point 2 relating to Macarthur Avenue part of the upgrade.	The Dev. Scheme has been amended to include a road side bus stop infrastructure in the Infrastructure Plan.	Y
81.	P.87 ULDA should primarily direct funding from infrastructure charges to actual infrastructure.	Noted. Infrastructure charges will be directed back to NSH Infrastructure.	N
82.	The ULDA in conjunction with stakeholders needs to investigate the transport requirements for Northshore Hamilton.	On going preliminary discussions have taken place between the ULDA, QT and TransLink on broad transport and traffic issues for the UDA. The level of detail with respect to bus services, implementation etc has not been established at this broad planning stage. This will be undertaken as part of the Implementation Strategy	N
83.	P.8 Fig 3 Has an assessment been made on how these intersections impact on the Gateway Motorway on and off ramps at the existing KSD/Gateway Motorway Interchange and the future new KSD/Gateway Motorway Interchange.	A future Gateway connection has been identified as one possible solution to reduce car dependency on Kingsford Smith Drive. Preliminary discussions with DMR have taken place, however the exact design details have not yet been finalised.	N
84.	Express ferry services should be promoted.	Noted. Future discussions between the ULDA and the relevant transport authorities will explore future options for express ferry services	N
85.	A map of proposed bus routes would be beneficial.	The proposed bus routes have not been finalised as yet with Queensland Transport and TransLink. As part of the master planning process, it was recommended that a BUZ operate along MacArthur Avenue and extend beyond the UDA to service the wider context such as ATC	N

**NORTHSHORE HAMILTON PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment (Y = yes/N = no)</b>
86.	Will the Brett's Wharf ferry terminal be relocated?	BCC is currently going through an expression of interest process for new city cat terminals. This process is yet to be finalised and the proposed location of terminals in the Development Scheme are indicative only.	N
87.	No discussion on the feasibility or potential timing of the rail service is provided	Correct. As part of the Infrastructure Plan, investigations for a dedicated rapid transit system have been identified as future work to be carried out. As part of the Development Scheme, a rail corridor has been preserved	N
88.	There is only one proposed connection across KSD which is insufficient.	While map 4 shows only one key connection across KSD, this has been included to highlight the need for a vista to the south of Racecourse Road. Pedestrian access can still be readily achieved at Remora Road and Theodore Street at existing signalised intersections. Future new connection roads to KSD will have sufficient pedestrian access.	N
89.	Part 3 Precincts and Sub-Precincts - Part 3 of the Proposed Plan provides an overview of what is intended for each of its sub-precincts. The overall layout of each sub-precinct is of direct interest to the Emergency Services, who's service delivery standards (elapsed time to incident) rely, in part, on the carrying capacity and configuration of the proposed arterial network, together with an operational awareness of work in progress.  This can be achieved by adding the following text to the outcomes required for each precinct. "Arterial roads within the precinct are to be designed with a view to maintaining acceptable service delivery standards for the Emergency Services".	The Northshore Hamilton UDA does not include arterial roads. Adjoining major roads such as the Gateway Arterial and Kingsford Smith Drive fall outside the UDA boundary. As such, the requested amendment is considered superfluous.	N
90.	Concerns regarding the capacity of surface transport to cope with growth in Australia TradeCoast Precincts, especially Kingsford Smith Drive.	The Australia Trade Coast Public Transport Study has been duly considered as part of the Development Scheme preparation. Rapid Bus Transit is seen as the most appropriate form of mass transit as it allows for both inward and outward connections between ATC and the UDA.  Brisbane City Council have identified the progressive upgrade of Kingsford Smith Drive which includes road widening works between the existing Gateway Motorway and Brett's Wharf to be included as part of Stage 2. BCC have recently appointed a consultant to carry out the planning work (including traffic modelling) for this project.	N
91.	BAC welcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The initiative proposed under the Land Use Plan to introduce public transport in the form of the use of the river as a transport corridor and connection to the development by that mode; and</li> <li>The introduction of additional bus routes to support this precinct.</li> </ul>	Noted.	N

**NORTHSHORE HAMILTON PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment (Y = yes/N = no)</b>
92.	BAC strongly suggests that additional bus priority measures on the site must be implemented to secure longer-term public transport options for employees, visitors and residents of the Northshore development.	It is the intention of the ULDA as part of the Implementation Strategy to facilitate and negotiate with Queensland transport and TransLink on achieving efficient public transport system to cater for residents, workers and visitors of Northshore Hamilton.	N
93.	As current upgrade to Kingsford Smith Drive does not extend through to the frontage of Northshore Hamilton BAC suggests that key intersections such as Nudgee Road and Kingsford Smith Drive require significant improvements.	Brisbane City Council have identified the progressive upgrade of Kingsford Smith Drive which includes road widening works between the existing Gateway Motorway and Brett's Wharf to be included as part of Stage 2. BCC have recently appointed a consultant to carry out the planning work for this project.	N
94.	Macarthur Avenue should be treated and designed as a main street. Bus stations	Macarthur Avenue will be treated and designed as a main street.	N
95.	It is unclear what an acceptable density for "being serviced by rapid transit" might be, nor what rapid transit may actually refer to (i.e. express services).	The Development Scheme has been amended to align with the terminology adopted by Brisbane City Council, 'Reference to <i>Rapid Transit Bus Service</i> has been replaced with <i>Bus Rapid Transit</i> .  A definition of Bus Rapid Transit has been included in the Development Scheme as follows: <i>Non-rail based, distinctive, high passenger capacity vehicle which can operate in shared right-of-way with general road traffic or on its own right-of-way.</i>	Y
<b>Car Parking</b>			
96.	Parking provision is too low	The proposed car parking rates will not be changed however the Development Scheme be amended to include the following provision: <i>"Where a request is made to provide car parking at the rate exceeding that prescribed for the Precinct, this must be accompanied by a strategy to maximise use of pedestrian, cycle and public transport opportunities over private vehicle use."</i>	Y
97.	If communal car parks are to be used, developers should pay.	Any communal car park provided as part of the interim car parking provisions will be provided by the developer at no charge to residents.	N
98.	Request for visitor parking to be clearly delineated and convenient for visitors.	This will be addressed through development applications. Visitor car parking provisions and location will be indicated in approved plans and/or conditions of approval.	N
99.	Request that separation of residential and commercial parking.	It is intended that generally commercial and residential car parking will be separated where possible and appropriate. This will be addressed at the development application/assessment stage. In some instances commercial car parks may be shared as additional car parks for residential visitors at times where the commercial tenancies are closed.	N

**NORTHSHORE HAMILTON PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment (Y = yes/N = no)</b>
100.	<p>Transitional short-term parking options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request for more detail</li> <li>Should be limited and not mandatory as it is difficult to see how they will be removed after the public and developments have become accustomed to those numbers.</li> <li>A Car Parking Management Plan for the whole UDA should be included in the implementation strategy</li> <li>Will they be turned into Public transport depots?</li> </ul>	<p>The ULDA will work closely with land owners to identify surplus land which could be utilised for interim car parking. The Development Scheme provisions concerning interim car parking rates are not mandatory however future applicants will need to sufficiently demonstrate how it is intended to maximise the use of pedestrian, cycle and public transport opportunities. Short term parking options will be investigated in further detail as part of the Implementation Strategy which is a working document. This will also provide further detail on public transport intervention, proposed routes and modal choice. It is likely that the central car parking areas will be re-developed for mixed use development in accordance with the provisions of the Development Scheme</p>	N
101.	<p>Request above ground podium car parking be surrounded by active uses only where a building façade is identifies as primary active frontage.</p>	<p>This provision has been included in order to contribute to better street design, safety and amenity.</p>	N
102.	<p>Communal Car parking requirements will be extremely difficult to achieve in the part of the UDA from Portside west that is already largely developed. These should be removed from this precinct. Greater clarity on car parking rates for development is required.</p>	<p>The ULDA will work closely with land owners to identify surplus land which could be utilised for interim car parking. The Development Scheme provisions concerning interim car parking rates are not mandatory however future applicants will need to sufficiently demonstrate how it is intended to maximise the use of pedestrian, cycle and public transport opportunities. Short term parking options will be investigated in further detail as part of the Implementation Strategy which is a working document.</p> <p>The proposed car parking rates will not be changed however the Development Scheme be amended to include the following provision:  <i>"Where a request is made to provide car parking at the rate exceeding that prescribed for the Precinct, this must be accompanied by a strategy to maximise use of pedestrian, cycle and public transport opportunities over private vehicle use."</i></p>	Y
103.	<p>p.22 Section 5.3 Car parking rates are not dwelling size or configuration based.</p>	<p>Yes, car parking rates are based on GFA.</p>	N
104.	<p>Section 5.3 - Car Parking. Clarify whether the rates are minimum or maximum? Is monetary contribution required for shared central facility? Danger that developers will withhold development until after the first public transport intervention occurs.</p>	<p>Car parking rates for all development within the UDA is expressed in the Development Scheme as maximums.</p> <p>The ULDA will work closely with land owners to identify surplus land which could be utilised for interim car parking. The Development Scheme provisions concerning interim car parking rates are not mandatory however future applicant will need to sufficiently demonstrate how it is intended to maximise the use of pedestrian, cycle and public transport opportunities. Short term parking options will be investigated in further detail as part of the Implementation Strategy which is a working document. This will also provide further detail on public transport intervention, proposed routes and modal choice.</p>	N

**Environment and Sustainability**

**NORTHSHORE HAMILTON PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment (Y = yes/N = no)</b>
105.	Building heights in areas adjacent to Boral are insufficient to visually buffer the Boral Plant from residential development closer to the River.	The Structure plan has taken this into account to the extent applicable. Further consideration of the visual impacts of development will be given at application stage.  Building heights in precincts closest to Boral's are limited due to potential odour and air quality emissions from existing heavy industry.	N
106.	General Noise requirements The desired measurement protocol for desired noise levels is not clear.	Section 6.4 General Noise Requirements has been amended to read: 50 dB(A) LAeq	Y
107.	General Noise requirements Suggest that the desired noise level is not the appropriate one.	The current level is considered relevant given the location of the development area beneath the flight paths for the Brisbane Airport.	N
108.	General Noise requirements Why is the requirement for a noise report discretionary and what are the parameters for determining when it is required.	Section 6.4 of the Development Scheme has been amended to require an acoustic report to evaluate and address the potential noise impacts and recommend appropriate noise mitigation measures.	Y
109.	General Noise requirements BAC requests a covenant on title be put in place to ensure an awareness and acceptance of the potential amenity impacts that aircraft over-flight might use.	A covenant on land affected by aircraft noise is not considered appropriate. Development will be required to be constructed to Australian Standards to achieve acceptable noise attenuation from aircraft noise. This will be addressed at the DA stage and conditioned in any development approval.	N
110.	General air quality The recommended references for best practice air quality guidelines and standards are inappropriate for development other than industrial.  Concerned that the referenced guidelines were used to create Map 8.	Section 6.5 (General Air Quality) Sustainability and the Environment) has been amended to clarify that development for industrial uses will be in accordance with best practice air quality guidelines and standards.  The Map 8 contours were not solely determined by the referenced guidelines.	Y
111.	General Air Quality- Boral considers that the Scheme reverse amenity provisions do not reference acceptable standards and goals for ambient air quality.	Section 6.5 (General Air Quality) Sustainability and the Environment) has been amended to clarify that development for industrial uses will be in accordance with best practice air quality guidelines and standards.	Y
112.	BAC has commissioned its noise consultant – Wilkinson Murray – to address noise insulation measures and building component requirements. "Northshore Hamilton Urban Development Area – Building Siting and Construction against Aircraft Noise".	The ULDA will have regard to this document and in assessing and conditioning development applications.	N
113.	While some of the proposed precincts are outside the ANEF 20contours, BAC recommends that they should all be considered as 'conditional' for the purposes of applying SPP1/02 as the predictions indicate that aircraft noise could be significant at all precincts in the Northshore development area.	Section 6.4 of the Development Scheme has been amended to require an Acoustic report to evaluate and address the potential noise impacts and recommend appropriate noise mitigation measures.	Y
114.	Section 6.1 – Safety and Risk. Suggest sentence that acknowledges that some of the Marine Industries will be relocated.	The Development Scheme will facilitate the relocation of existing Marine Industry over the life of the plan to coincide with the expiration of leases.	N
115.	Section 6.6 Water - Provision, through the Proposed Scheme, for at least one major transport route above 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) flood events is strongly supported.	Support noted.	N



**NORTHSHORE HAMILTON PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment (Y = yes / N = no)</b>
116.	Maps 7, 8, 9 and 11 refer to impact area. Suggest re-wording to potential impact area or constraint investigation area. Impacts of Langfords Metals should also be included.	Impact Area sufficiently describes the area to which further investigations are required to be carried out. This has been confirmed through independent work carried out on behalf of the ULDA. In the case of Langford Metals, the owners have expressed their intention to develop this land and relocate within the first year of the Development Scheme. The ULDA has been working closely with the developers to assist with the catalyst redevelopment of this part of the UDA.	N
117.	Vision for Northshore Hamilton only scantily mentions the Brisbane Airport which given the flight paths of existing and proposed runways should be considered as a major constraint to the UDA – particularly in terms of compliance of residential building design with BCA standards and the conflict that this may cause with intent statements referring to sub-tropical design and sustainability outcomes for buildings.	The impacts of aircraft operations from Brisbane Airport have been adequately addressed through UDA wide development criteria in section 6. Sustainability and the Environment. Applicants are required to prepare a safety and risk assessment report for development within the aircraft operations impact area. The report will be required to demonstrate that the proposed development will not be adversely impacted by aircraft operations. Noise attenuation for building design and standards to address aircraft noise will be addressed and conditioned at the development assessment stage.	N
118.	It should be noted that construction cranes associated with the development may also impact on airspace surfaces for Brisbane Airport and may require separate assessment and possible conditions of approval.	Section 6.1 – Safety and Risk of the UDA Wide Development Criteria has been amended to include an additional footnote to reference the 4 <sup>th</sup> dot point (Aircraft Operations) to read: <i>"The requirements of State Planning Policy 1/02: Development in the vicinity of Certain Airports and Aviation Facilities will be considered when assessing specific development applications."</i> The State Planning Policy and supplementary guidelines includes reference to the assessment of cranes within operational airspace and the requirement to consult with the Civil Aviation Safety Authority (CASA).	Y
<b>Precincts and Sub-precincts</b>			
119.	Supportive of plan (including DTRDI)	Support noted	N
120.	Support for precinct one	Support noted	N
121.	Precinct 3 – Amend precinct intent to read, <i>"with a supermarket up to 1500m2 GFA <u>for the total precinct</u>"</i> .	Amend precinct 3 intent to read: <i>"with a supermarket up to 1500m2 GFA <u>for the total precinct</u>"</i> .	Y
122.	Precinct 4 – Suggest including community facilities, civic, government uses and park in preferred land uses to align with intent.	Community facilities and park are already included as preferred land uses in this precinct. Civic and government uses are not defined in the Development Scheme therefore not listed as a preferred land use.	N
123.	Precinct 6 – Need to include Shopping Centre as preferred land use. Precinct Intent refers to district sized supermarket whereas sub-precinct 6(a) refers to a neighbourhood size supermarket. These need to be consistent.	The development scheme has been amended to include shopping centre as a preferred land use in Precinct 6 and Neighbourhood sized supermarket has been replaced by District sized supermarket.	Y

**NORTHSHORE HAMILTON PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment (Y = yes/N = no)</b>
124.	Precinct 8 – Suggest including residential as preferred land uses. Other uses such as home based business, visitor accommodation, medical centre, child care and community facilities should also be included.	Precinct 8 is an area identified for transition. The Development Scheme must recognise the current heavy industry uses which are incompatible with residential and community based uses. As such they can not be included as preferred land uses. Should the heavy industry relocate, a review of the Development Scheme could take place in which such uses could be seen as preferred.	N
125.	Precinct 1, outcome 1 – need to consider iconic building to provide entry statement to the UDA.	The ULDA sees the future development of the UDA to be focused on newly developing areas. Brett's Wharf precinct is an established area where the intent is to respect the existing residential amenity associated with this precinct. It is considered that future high rise development within this precinct will not achieve this planning intent. Notwithstanding an iconic building may still be developed at a maximum height of 3 storeys.	N
126.	Precinct 1 preferred land uses – Indoor Entertainment, Food Premises, landing and marina should be added to the preferred land uses for Precinct 1.	The Brett's Wharf precinct has been largely developed as a residential area. The intent for this precinct is to continue to be predominantly residential, with mixed uses concentrating in the Northshore Hamilton Urban Village Precinct. Some non residential uses at a small scale are supported in this precinct, such as food premises, office and shop.	N
127.	Request for amendment of the boundary of sub-precincts 3c and 3d so that it is coincident with the western boundary on Lot 6 on SP195300.)	It is not considered necessary to amend the boundaries of these two Sub-precincts. The development and land use outcomes are more appropriately reflected in the existing Sub-precinct boundaries. Applications can be lodged for part of lots.	N
128.	Provision within the Northshore Urban Village Precinct should be made for a larger supermarket (currently identified as a maximum 1,500m <sup>2</sup> ).	<p>A macro-economic analysis has been undertaken which identified approximately 22,500m<sup>2</sup> of retail will be required by 2014, with most of this space included predominantly in the Cruise Ship terminal sub-precinct and Hamilton Harbour Precinct, with some in the balance of the Northshore Urban Village Precinct.</p> <p>Further research and market analysis undertaken by CBRE on behalf of the ULDA concluded "<i>Larger supermarket retail development in the short to medium term will be impacted by existing and proposed competitive supply in the catchment area, as well as insufficient catchment demand. Shorter term retail development should focus on ground floor convenience, service trail, and shop front professional service.</i>"</p> <p>The ULDA has limited the GFA for a supermarket to 1500m<sup>2</sup> as the district size supermarket has been identified to be located within the Northshore Central Precinct. In addition it is considered that a supermarket with a GFA greater than 1500m<sup>2</sup> has the potential to compromise the vitality and viability of nearby existing centres.</p>	N

**NORTHSHORE HAMILTON PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment (Y = yes/N = no)</b>
129.	Request for amendment of the preferred land uses to say 'Shopping Centre' (currently 'Shopping Centre not exceeding 1,500m <sup>2</sup> ').)	The ULDA has limited the GFA for a supermarket to 1500m <sup>2</sup> as the district size supermarket has been identified to be located within the Northshore Central Precinct. In addition it is considered that a supermarket with a GFA greater than 1500m <sup>2</sup> has the potential to compromise the vitality and viability of nearby existing centres. Research and market analysis undertaken by CBRE on behalf of the ULDA concluded " <i>Larger supermarket retail development in the short to medium term will be impacted by existing and proposed competitive supply in the catchment area, as well as insufficient catchment demand. Shorter term retail development should focus on ground floor convenience, service trail, and shop front professional service.</i> "	N
130.	Amend list of preferred land uses for precinct 3 to include 'cinema'.	Indoor Sport and Recreation is listed as a preferred land use in precinct 3. The definition for Indoor Sport and Recreation includes cinema	N
131.	Proposed that the boundary between Precincts 4 and 7 be amended.	The requested boundary amendment has been reflected in the Development Scheme	Y
132.	Precinct 2 tenancy sizes – Request that the maximum tenancy size for shops within the development be increased to 1,000m <sup>2</sup>	It is intended that the predominant tenancy size for shops is 250m <sup>2</sup> to ensure smaller sized tenancies. The Development Scheme provides the flexibility for the consideration and approval of some larger scale tenancies where appropriate.	N
133.	Precinct 3 - (b) precinct outcomes Draft plan needs to reflect the need to service a marina – the ULDA's mandate does not extend into the river.	The Northshore Hamilton Urban Development Area boundaries extend approximately 50 metres from the high water mark. The need to service a marina is an operational and maintenance requirement and is not appropriate for inclusion in the Land Use Plan.	N
134.	Precinct 3 - (b) precinct outcomes. An essential precinct outcome is that the operations and stevedoring for the Cruise Terminal are not constrained.	The precinct outcomes for Precinct 3(b) have been amended to reflect this issue.	Y
135.	Precinct 3 - (b) It should be clear that there will be no public access to the proposed new cruise terminal wharf.	This will be addressed at the Development assessment Stage should a second cruise ship terminal be developed.	N
136.	Precinct 3 – (c) Preferred land uses. Include the Cruise Terminal and related Cruise Terminal operations.	A Cruise Ship Terminal definition is not included as it could be too limiting – undefined uses will default to permissible. As such cruise ship terminal cannot be included as a preferred land use within this precinct.	N
137.	Sub precinct 3c Cruise Ship Terminal sub precinct principles. P.38 changes to text. ' <i>.. Any development will promote safety and security for all users when cruise ships are berthed, with appropriate areas for wharf operations and stevedoring, passengers, visitors and service vehicles.</i> '	The Cruise Ship Terminal sub-precinct principles have been amended.	Y

**NORTHSHORE HAMILTON PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment (Y = yes/N = no)</b>
138.	Precinct 7 Plan restricts BP from adding additional tanks should demand for fuel increase.	It is the intention for the Business Enterprise Park precinct to transition to cleaner industry and therefore expansion of existing or location of new heavy industries will not be supported. The <i>Urban Land Development Authority Act 2007</i> protects existing, lawful use rights, if these uses were lawfully established. The Development Scheme can not prevent these uses to cease.	N
139.	Precinct 7 Request for clarity about whether BP can replace existing tanks on a like for like basis.	Proposals will be assessed under the provisions of the Northshore Hamilton Development Scheme.	N
140.	Precinct 7 Request for clarity regarding whether can BP can replace existing tanks with a larger configuration e.g. two 20 megalitre tanks with a single 50 megalitre tank.	Proposals will be assessed under the provisions of the Northshore Hamilton Development Scheme.	N
141.	Precinct 7 Land Use Plan is in conflict with the perpetual lease which grants to BP unrestricted use rights to occupancy and use of the land.	<i>Urban Land Development Authority Act 2007</i> protects existing, lawful use rights, if these uses were lawfully established. The Development Scheme can not prevent these uses to operate.	N
142.	Precinct 7 Strong support for the relocation of heavy industry away from the site.	Noted.	N
143.	Section 3.4 – suggested some consideration be given to small scale café, kiosk and restaurant uses.)	The Development Scheme envisages these types of uses being located in the centres and mixed use precincts, as such they were not listed as preferred land uses in the open space zones. However, the Development Scheme provides flexibility to enable assessment of the appropriateness of such uses on a case by case basis.	N
144.	Section 10 – Harbour, Foreshore and Marinas. Suggest another key principle is to ensure public access is maintained. Note that the term minimise conflicts with the word avoid.	The Development Scheme has been amended in the UDA Development Criteria - Harbour, Foreshore and Marina to include the following dot point: <i>Public access is maintained.</i>	Y
145.	Need for clarity on residential densities proposed for the mixed use zones.	Residential densities in all the residential and mixed use Precincts or Sub-precincts are expressed as maximum GFA	N
146.	The Sub-Precinct Principles must be changed to: This sub-precinct will include a large centrally based parkland area which will facilitate local sports and activity to occur. Where appropriate community facilities could be incorporated into this area. A substation will be required within this area to allow for the distribution of energy within the UDA. The park has the potential to incorporate a central energy plant that will provide an alternative energy source for the UDA.	The following sentence has been included in Sub-precinct 4 (b) -Central Park Sub- Precinct Principles <i>A substation will be required to allow for the distribution of energy within the UDA</i>	Y
147.	One major issue seems to be a failure to give specific intent to the creation of public domain along the river. Northshore Hamilton – one does not gain from the vision or the balance of the scheme that the area will compare favourable with contemporary river frontage areas such as Southbank, the West End / Auchenflower or Newstead reaches.	It is considered that the vision including the Vision in detail appropriately reflects the intent for Northshore Hamilton to become a waterfront community that celebrates its river. Precinct and sub-precinct intent and outcomes highlight access to the Brisbane River and the provision of the public riverwalk. UDA wide Development Criteria has specific requirement.	N

**NORTHSHORE HAMILTON PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment (Y=yes/N=no)</b>
148.	Suggest that if under the Northshore Hamilton scheme there is no proposal for residential use of the Royal Queensland Golf Course, then the area should simply be precluded from the UDA. Alternatively, rationalisation of the existing golf course and the existing/proposed industrial area to its north might provide opportunities for development of residential uses on part of the western portion of the existing golf course. Given the ULDA's role/powers/mandate, this type of consideration would be appropriate.	Noted.	N
149.	Precinct 7 should be more permeable to allow access to the bus rapid transit.	The UDA is based on a permeable and legible road network which promoted strong north-south connections from the river. In addition, a key philosophy underpinning the proposed layout is to promote street connections to the river. The road layout will complement the pedestrian network. Map 4 – Key Connections show a number of connections from the Brisbane River to the Medium Impact Employment Zone.	N
150.	Precinct 4 discusses residential use neighbouring Northshore Harbour. This precinct is remote from Northshore Harbour	Amended	Y
<b>Comments on ULDA Development Applications</b>			
151.	Expressed concern at plot ratio for the proposed Devine development.	Comments on the development applications for Devine and Multiplex have been forwarded to the ULDA's Development Assessment Team for consideration. The applications that have been lodged with the ULDA will be assessed under the relevant provisions of the <i>Northshore Hamilton Interim Land Use Plan</i> . Under this Interim Land Use Plan, all material change of use applications are required to be publicly notified in accordance with ULDA Act 2007. The public will have the opportunity to make comments on the proposed developments. Applications lodged on or after the Development Scheme for Northshore Hamilton takes effect (expected to take effect on the 27 <sup>th</sup> March 2009) will be assessed under the relevant provisions of the Northshore Hamilton Development Scheme.	N
152.	Expressed concern regarding the amount of GFA proposed for the proposed Devine development.	Comments on the development applications for Devine and Multiplex have been forwarded to the ULDA's Development Assessment Team for consideration. The applications that have been lodged with the ULDA will be assessed under the relevant provisions of the <i>Northshore Hamilton Interim Land Use Plan</i> . Under this Interim Land Use Plan, all material change of use applications are required to be publicly notified in accordance with ULDA Act 2007. The public will have the opportunity to make comments on the proposed developments. Applications lodged on or after the Development Scheme for Northshore Hamilton takes effect (expected to take effect on the 27 <sup>th</sup> March 2009) will be assessed under the relevant provisions of the Northshore Hamilton Development Scheme.	N

**NORTHSHORE HAMILTON PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment (Y = yes/N = no)</b>
153.	Requested no relaxation of the setbacks for Multiplex building 2. <i>(two people said the wharf should not be included)</i>	Comments on the development applications for Devine and Multiplex have been forwarded to the ULDA's Development Assessment Team for consideration. The applications that have been lodged with the ULDA will be assessed under the relevant provisions of the <i>Northshore Hamilton Interim Land Use Plan</i> . Under this Interim Land Use Plan, all material change of use applications are required to be publicly notified in accordance with ULDA Act 200. The public will have the opportunity to make comments on the proposed developments. Applications lodged on or after the Development Scheme for Northshore Hamilton takes effect (expected to take effect on the 27 <sup>th</sup> March 2009) will be assessed under the relevant provisions of the Northshore Hamilton Development Scheme.	N
154.	Requested no relaxation of the tower separation <i>(one person said between buildings 4 and 5)</i>	Comments on the development applications for Devine and Multiplex have been forwarded to the ULDA's Development Assessment Team for consideration. The applications that have been lodged with the ULDA will be assessed under the relevant provisions of the <i>Northshore Hamilton Interim Land Use Plan</i> . Under this Interim Land Use Plan, all material change of use applications are required to be publicly notified in accordance with ULDA Act 2007. The public will have the opportunity to make comments on the proposed developments. Applications lodged on or after the Development Scheme for Northshore Hamilton takes effect (expected to take effect on the 27 <sup>th</sup> March 2009) will be assessed under the relevant provisions of the Northshore Hamilton Development Scheme.	N
155.	Support for open space within the Devine application.	Support noted Comments on the development applications for Devine and Multiplex have been forwarded to the ULDA's Development Assessment Team for consideration. The applications that have been lodged with the ULDA will be assessed under the relevant provisions of the <i>Northshore Hamilton Interim Land Use Plan</i> . Under this Interim Land Use Plan, all material change of use applications are required to be publicly notified in accordance with ULDA Act 2007. The public will have the opportunity to make comments on the proposed developments. Applications lodged on or after the Development Scheme for Northshore Hamilton takes effect (expected to take effect on the 27 <sup>th</sup> March 2009) will be assessed under the relevant provisions of the Northshore Hamilton Development Scheme.	N

**NORTHSHORE HAMILTON PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

<b>Issue #</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment (Y = yes/N = no)</b>
156.	Devine and Multiplex applications residential and commercial parking should be separated.	Comments on the development applications for Devine and Multiplex have been forwarded to the ULDA's Development Assessment Team for consideration. The applications that have been lodged with the ULDA will be assessed under the relevant provisions of the <i>Northshore Hamilton Interim Land Use Plan</i> . Under this Interim Land Use Plan, all material change of use applications are required to be publicly notified in accordance with ULDA Act 2007. The public will have the opportunity to make comments on the proposed developments. Applications lodged on or after the Development Scheme for Northshore Hamilton takes effect (expected to take effect on the 27 <sup>th</sup> March 2009) will be assessed under the relevant provisions of the Northshore Hamilton Development Scheme.	N
157.	Request that the privacy and amenity of Infinity's low rise apartments is not compromised by the Devine building.	Comments on the development applications for Devine and Multiplex have been forwarded to the ULDA's Development Assessment Team for consideration. The applications that have been lodged with the ULDA will be assessed under the relevant provisions of the <i>Northshore Hamilton Interim Land Use Plan</i> . Under this Interim Land Use Plan, all material change of use applications are required to be publicly notified in accordance with ULDA Act 2007. The public will have the opportunity to make comments on the proposed developments. Applications lodged on or after the Development Scheme for Northshore Hamilton takes effect (expected to take effect on the 27 <sup>th</sup> March 2009) will be assessed under the relevant provisions of the Northshore Hamilton Development Scheme.	N
158.	Expressed concern regarding the ability of the area to cope with traffic and parking generated by the Devine site.	Comments on the development applications for Devine and Multiplex have been forwarded to the ULDA's Development Assessment Team for consideration. The applications that have been lodged with the ULDA will be assessed under the relevant provisions of the <i>Northshore Hamilton Interim Land Use Plan</i> . Under this Interim Land Use Plan, all material change of use applications are required to be publicly notified in accordance with ULDA Act 2007. The public will have the opportunity to make comments on the proposed developments. Applications lodged on or after the Development Scheme for Northshore Hamilton takes effect (expected to take effect on the 27 <sup>th</sup> March 2009) will be assessed under the relevant provisions of the Northshore Hamilton Development Scheme.	N

**NORTHSHORE HAMILTON PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SCHEME  
SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS**

Issue #	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y = yes/N = no)
159.	Object to ingress/egress point to the undercover security parking to Infinity being made available to other towers.	Comments on the development applications for Devine and Multiplex have been forwarded to the ULDA's Development Assessment Team for consideration. The applications that have been lodged with the ULDA will be assessed under the relevant provisions of the <i>Northshore Hamilton Interim Land Use Plan</i> . Under this Interim Land Use Plan, all material change of use applications are required to be publicly notified in accordance with ULDA Act 2007. The public will have the opportunity to make comments on the proposed developments. Applications lodged on or after the Development Scheme for Northshore Hamilton takes effect (expected to take effect on the 27 <sup>th</sup> March 2009) will be assessed under the relevant provisions of the Northshore Hamilton Development Scheme.	N



**Proposed Northshore Hamilton Development Scheme**  
**Summary of Late Submission Issues**

Issue No.	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y/N)
<b>Strategic Context</b>			
160.	Economic rationale for the increased commercial and non residential development from the draft Northshore Hamilton Neighbourhood Plan.	<p>The ULDA has considered both the planning and economic rationale for the future development of Northshore Hamilton. The vision for the Northshore Hamilton area is to create a vibrant, mixed use community.</p> <p>Future uses within the UDA can capitalise of the nearby proximity to major economic drivers such as BAC, ATC and the POB.</p> <p>Given the number of the existing constraints in the UDA, non-residential uses are considered more compatible uses in certain locations.</p> <p>Through the creation of a mixed use area, there is a great opportunity to achieve a more self contained community.</p>	N
161.	Development should not impact detrimentally on viability of existing and proposed centres. The scheme is inconsistent with the existing centres network and the strategic overview of the ATC.	<p>The draft <i>City Shape Implementation Strategy</i> identified Northshore Hamilton as a new "Living Area" to accommodate significant population growth. Furthermore, the principal notion of a centre in this location was previously identified in BCC's draft Northshore Hamilton Neighbourhood Plan, which identified both Portside and Barcham street as centres.</p> <p>Consultation has been undertaken with the ATC and have raised no objection for the strategic intent for the Northshore Hamilton UDA.</p>	N
<b>Height</b>			
162.	Logic to determine heights for the towers. Has a visual view analysis been undertaken to the increase in height.	As part of the masterplanning process a height analysis was carried out based on density thresholds, centre function and height constraints. 3D modelling has also been undertaken to reflect increase in heights.	N
163.	Do the proposed heights comply with Aircraft OLS restrictions.	Yes.	N
164.	No height limits have been specified for houses.	Height limits for all dwellings apply throughout precinct. Houses are acceptable only in some lower density precincts.	N
165.	Support for heights in precinct 1.	Support noted	N
<b>Setbacks and Separation</b>			
166.	Support for tower separation	Noted	N
<b>Urban Design</b>			
167.	4.8 Riverwalk Add the following dot point under the section "The Riverwalk must: -" <i>be designed to minimise or eliminate pedestrian and cycle conflicts and in particular conflicts resulting from lateral movements across the pathway</i>	Development Scheme has been amended to reflect this suggestion.	Y
168.	4.8 Riverwalk - The Development Scheme should specify the final tenure as public ownership.	The Development Scheme does not have the role of identifying tenure for various lots and infrastructure within the UDA. Confirmation of who will retain ownership of the public Riverwalk will be determined in conjunction with the delivery of the Infrastructure Plan and Implementation Strategy.	N

**Proposed Northshore Hamilton Development Scheme**  
**Summary of Late Submission Issues**

Issue No.	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y/N)
169.	4.8 Riverwalk Reference should be made to AUSTROADS Standards - Guide to traffic engineering practice. Part 13 - Pedestrians Part 14 – Bicycles.	The Development Scheme has been amended to make reference to AUSTROADS Standards with respect to Pedestrian and cycle path standards.	Y
170.	Incorporate subtropical design guidelines and refer to the <i>Centre for Subtropical Design – Principles of Subtropical Design</i> publications.	The Development Scheme includes subtropical design provisions in the UDA wide Development criteria. In addressing appropriate sub-tropical design principles and strategies, applicants can utilise publications such as <i>Centre for Subtropical Design – Principles of Subtropical Design</i> .	N
<b>Open Space and Community Facilities</b>			
171.	No open Space Strategy. Need to ensure open space provision is sufficient for needs of projected population.	Throughout the masterplanning process, the proposed open space provisions have been determined to cater for the projected residential and worker population in the area.  The Land Use plan for Northshore Hamilton provides for a variety of well connected open spaces, including a 2.8 km public Riverwalk along the River. Key active recreation parks provide the primary open space resource for the community and are underpinned by a linked hierarchy of passive and active public domain spaces.	N
172.	Parks to be accepted by council for maintenance need to have contamination, identified and remediation completed and sites are removed from the registers. Land for park must also not be affected by oil, gas or electricity supply easements under the Park Planning and Design Code.	Park to be handed back to Council will comply with these standards.	N
173.	No development on parks, remove height limit from scheme.	It is not intended that there will be development on the parks, the height limits are there in case a community facility or structure is built within the park.	N
<b>Pedestrian and Cycle</b>			
174.	4.2 Building Character (iv) Landscaping Add the following dot under the third paragraph "Landscaping must be designed and located so that it..." <i>does not encroach into pedestrian and cycle pathways or obscure visibility of path users</i>	The Development Scheme has been amended to reflect this suggestion.	Y
175.	5.4 Circulation Add : <i>Cycle –friendly environments are created where bicycle riding is a viable alternative to the private vehicle from many trips.</i> <i>Developments should have some focus towards existing or planned cycle networks so there is a clear connection provided between the cycle path and the development which is the attractor.</i>	The circulation provisions are considered sufficient to enable these outcomes to be achieved.	N

**Proposed Northshore Hamilton Development Scheme**  
**Summary of Late Submission Issues**

Issue No.	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y/N)
176.	<p>5.4 Circulation Add the following:  <i>Road design should encourage a walkable neighbourhood by ensuring the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>the street network is of grid design with footpaths and streetscapes that encourage walking</i></li> <li><i>traffic calming is provided to allow safe pedestrian and cyclist movements in residential areas on roads not intended to carry buses</i></li> <li><i>traffic management measures are implemented to make roads pedestrian friendly</i></li> <li><i>regular pedestrian crossings are provided with distinguishable surfaces</i></li> </ul>	The circulation provisions are considered sufficient to enable these outcomes to be achieved	N
177.	<p>5.4 Circulation Add the following:  <i>Pedestrian and cyclist pathways are to be located, designed and constructed to Austroads - Guide to traffic engineering practice standards.</i>  <i>Part 13 - Pedestrians</i>  <i>Part 14 - Bicycles</i></p>	The Circulation section has been amended to include a footnote which makes reference to Austroads standards for pedestrian and cycle pathways	Y
178.	<p>5.5 End of Trip Facilities Reword the first paragraph residential to read:  <i>End of trip facilities for pedestrians and cyclists are to be provided as part of development for <u>residential (excluding houses), retail, commercial and industrial uses</u> including secure, undercover bicycle storage facilities and lockers <u>in accordance with Austroads Part 14.</u></i></p>	<p>The Development Scheme has been amended to reflect requirement for end of trip facilities as follows:  <i>End of trip facilities for pedestrian and cyclists are to be provided for non-residential uses including secure, undercover bicycle storage facilities, showers and lockers. Such facilities are to be provided to a standard consistent with AS2890.3.</i>                      End of trip facilities only apply to non residential uses as residential uses have their own shower and storage facilities</p>	Y
179.	<p>5.5 End of Trip Facilities - The second paragraph specifying targets should be reworded to read:  <i>Bicycle Facility requirements for apartments are-</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Residents – to have 1 secure parking space per dwelling in accordance with Austroads Part 14, designed to AS2890.3 standards</i></li> <li><i>Visitors– to have 1 secure parking space per 4 dwellings in accordance with Austroads Part 14, designed to AS2890.3 standards</i></li> </ul>	The indicated references to Australian Standards are considered sufficient.	N
180.	<p>Map 4 Add 'key cyclist connections' to Map 4 including the Principal Cycle Route identified around the perimeter of the site on the SEQ Principal Cycle Network Plan and local cycle routes</p>	The SEQ Principle Cycle network shows future principle routes along Kingsford Smith Drive and along the Gateway Arterial. These roads are outside the boundaries of the UDA and fall under the jurisdiction of Brisbane City Council and Department of Main Roads where future cycle corridors will be incorporated at the detailed design phase. The key connections along the Brisbane River will allow for cycle paths except for the Royal Queensland Golf Course where there is a significant grade separation to the Gateway Bridge.	N

**Traffic and Transport**

**Proposed Northshore Hamilton Development Scheme**  
**Summary of Late Submission Issues**

Issue No.	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y/N)
181.	<p>General – Maritime Safety - In order to properly discharge its responsibilities for navigation and marine safety, Maritime Safety Queensland, through the Regional Harbour Master (Brisbane), will need to be consulted about the details of any proposals within the UDA involving:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• tidal works that will be used for a port authority operations</li> <li>• a constructed public marine facility, or</li> <li>• marine operations including navigation and safety by, for or safeguarded by Queensland Transport or a port authority</li> </ul>	<p>Under the provisions of the <i>Urban Land Development Act</i>, there is no formal referral agency process. Notwithstanding, the onus will be on the applicant to carry out preliminary discussions with the Harbour Master prior to the formal submission of a development application with the ULDA.</p> <p>The ULDA may nominate assessing authorities for conditions (this does not have to be set out in the development scheme as it is allowable under the Act). The development scheme provides the head of power to apply reasonable and relevant conditions relating to navigational safety and tidal works.</p>	N
182.	<p>General – Heavy Rail Extension - The ULDA is required to undertake detailed feasibility and technical investigations which include patronage/demand modelling to support a passenger railway station within the Northshore Hamilton UDA taking the following considerations into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed alignment of the potential heavy rail within the UDA deviates to that shown in earlier Master Planning documents. The radius of the rail track across Barcham Street as shown in the Structure Plan would not be desirable as it would have a negative impact on train operations.</li> <li>• Similar to the work undertaken by the ULDA for Fitzgibbon, further technical work and consultation is needed with property owners impacted by the proposed heavy rail alignment to the north of the UDA.</li> <li>• The structure Plan does not accurately represent that the heavy rail would most likely be on structure within the UDA.</li> <li>• Development within the future rail corridor should be staged (ie not developed) taking into consideration timing of a detailed rail corridor study</li> <li>• The Doomben line extension may be unattractive as it provides an indirect route to the CBD. A BUZ-style bus service may be quicker than train as there are 9 stations to the CBD.</li> <li>• The potential heavy rail corridor is required to be preserved to a minimum 40m width</li> <li>• The proposed extension needs to be considered in the context of the ongoing Inner City Rail Capacity Study (ICRCS) and Rail Assessment of Capacity Alternative Study (RACAS).</li> <li>• There is currently no time frame on delivery of rail infrastructure at this location</li> <li>• The proposed Doomben rail extension is not identified in SEQIPP 2008-2026</li> <li>• Although the ULDA Act allows for infrastructure charging, it is not clear how this will be done</li> </ul>	<p>As part of the Infrastructure Plan, the ULDA will carry out further investigations, including feasibility and technical analysis of a dedicated rapid transit system. From initial discussions with QT and BCC, the preferred mode of public transport will be bus rapid transit. In response to the individual points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The revised location of the potential heavy rail station goes some way to servicing both the Northshore Urban Village and Northshore Central Precincts as it is centrally located.</li> <li>• The rail alignment shown in the structure plan crosses primarily State land. Should the rail corridor proceed, future discussions will proceed with relevant State Departments.</li> <li>• It is not possible to reflect the elevated structure on the structure plan, however given the potential for the crossing to adversely impact the free flow of traffic along Kingsford Smith Drive, any future crossing must be elevated.</li> <li>• Discussion with affected land owners indicate that the land where the future station may be located will not be vacated until at least 2012, by which time the rail corridor planning will be completed.</li> <li>• As mentioned previously indications are that 'bus rapid transit' is likely to be the most direct and cost effective mode of mass transit to service the UDA.</li> <li>• The 40m corridor width is noted.</li> <li>• Further studies for the future rail corridor will have due regard to the ongoing Inner City Rail Capacity Study (ICRCS) and Rail Assessment of Capacity Alternative Study (RACAS).</li> <li>• It is noted that future rail corridor provision for the UDA will need to be elevated in the SEQIPP Plan. For the purpose of this Development Scheme, a potential rail corridor has been identified linking the UDA with the Doomben line.</li> <li>• The Infrastructure framework will provide details of monetary amounts and charging mechanisms. This will be finalised prior to the Development Scheme being adopted in March 2009.</li> </ul>	N

**Proposed Northshore Hamilton Development Scheme**  
**Summary of Late Submission Issues**

Issue No.	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y/N)
183.	5.1 Public Transport Change terminology ' <i>rapid transit bus service</i> ' to ' <i>high frequency bus service</i> '	The Development Scheme has been amended to align with the terminology adopted by Brisbane City Council, 'Reference to <i>Rapid Transit Bus Service</i> has been replaced with <i>Bus Rapid Transit</i> .  A definition of Bus Rapid Transit has been included in the Development Scheme as follows: <i>Non-rail based, distinctive, high passenger capacity vehicle which can operate in shared right-of-way with general road traffic or on its own right-of-way</i>	Y
184.	5.1 Public Transport The ULDA should ensure that any roads, proposed traffic calming and roundabouts within the Hamilton Northshore area are compliant with Schedule 1 Development Standards on the <i>Transport Planning and Coordination Regulation 2005</i> . Traffic calming on bus routes is discouraged.  Collector roads and identified public transport routes should be designed to create a legible, clear and direct network through the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A clear hierarchy of streets in a grid design serve the area</li> <li>• Streets connected to destinations in the most direct manner</li> <li>• Unnecessary curves are avoided</li> <li>• Pedestrian and cyclist through routes are maintained at any form of road closure</li> </ul>	Future road design will be subject to operational works applications which will include a detailed assessment against Austroads standards.  Location of bus stops have yet to be determined but will be based on best practice in consultation with QT and Translink. As part of this consultation the development standards included in the <i>Transport Planning and Coordination Regulation 2005</i> may be considered.  A medium strip will be preserved in MacArthur Avenue to allow for Bus Rapid Transit and potential Light Rail. The preferred mass transit corridor has been identified along MacArthur Avenue so as to provide the greatest commuter penetration within the UDA.	N
185.	5.1 Public Transport Add the following paragraph: <i>The UDA precincts will include the following requirements as part of the high frequency bus service:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Provision of a high quality bus station including driver facilities within the mixed-use centre zone. The capacity of the station will be dependent on the public transport plan to be developed by TransLink and the ULDA.</i></li> <li>• <i>Provision of on road bus stop facilities to support the bus service (serving 400m walkable catchments). The appropriate location of stops will be dependent on the public transport plan to be developed by TransLink and the ULDA.</i></li> <li>• <i>The design, construction and quality of the bus stop infrastructure is to be consistent with the TransLink Public Transport Infrastructure Manual.</i></li> </ul>	The ULDA will continue to have discussions with Queensland Transport and TransLink on public transport infrastructure matters.	N
186.	Figure 3: Northshore Hamilton Urban Development Area Structure Plan and Map 4 – Key Connections. The proposed CityCat terminal locations need further investigation required between the TransLink Transit Authority, Brisbane City Council, Queensland Transport and the Urban Land Development Authority.	Noted. CityCat terminals are only indicative and will be subject to the outcomes of the current BCC EOI process and further discussions with TransLink Transit Authority, Brisbane City Council and Queensland Transport	N

**Proposed Northshore Hamilton Development Scheme**  
**Summary of Late Submission Issues**

Issue No.	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y/N)
187.	Figure 3: Northshore Hamilton Urban Development Area Structure Plan The proposed rapid transit corridor should make provision for bus stop infrastructure as previously indicated, however it should also preserve a median corridor suitable to cater for light rail if required in the future. This median should be initially vegetated, however not include feature plantings as their removal in the future could cause community upset. The entire route of the proposed rapid transit corridor within the UDA should be illustrated	Location of bus stops have yet to be determined but will be based on best practice in consultation with QT and Translink. A median strip will be preserved in MacArthur Avenue to allow for Bus Rapid Transit and potential Light Rail. Advice on planting is noted.  The preferred mass transit corridor has been identified along MacArthur Avenue so as to provide the greatest commuter penetration within the UDA. Future corridors beyond Curtain Avenue have yet to be determined however the intention is to extend the corridor beyond the UDA to service the ATC.	N
188.	Figure 3: Northshore Hamilton Urban Development Area Structure Plan The potential heavy rail extension should be illustrated as a thick line 'under investigation' from where it deviates from the existing Doomben Line. Similar to the work undertaken by the ULDA for Fitzgibbon, further technical work and consultation is needed with property owners impacted by the proposed heavy rail alignment to the north of the UDA.	The structure plan refers to 'potential heavy rail and station corridor' which indicates that the corridor is under investigation and still subject to SEQIPP funding. The idea of including the rail corridor in the Development Scheme was to preserve the corridor at the initial planning phase. Future discussion with property owners will be carried out should the rail proceed. It should be noted however that most of the affected land is under the ownership of the State Government.	N
189.	Strong commuter links with the ATC should be demonstrated.	The Australia Trade Coast Public Transport Study has been duly considered as part of the Development Scheme preparation. Rapid Bus Transit is seen as the most appropriate form of mass transit as it allows for both inward and outward connections between ATC and the UDA.	N
190.	Not demonstrated that proposed transport infrastructure will adequately accommodate the development's trip generation and impacts on KSD have been adequately addressed. Traffic modelling required	As part of the masterplanning investigations to identify the future trip generation from the NSH development and recommendations were made as to future public transport provision. Traffic modelling was carried out as part of this work. The finding of this work has been carried through the development scheme in terms of land uses, densities, road connections and future public transport infrastructure.	N
191.	ULDAs proposals for KSD not consistent with Council's current concept plan (currently under review) (eg proposed intersection with Oxford street not consistent)	The proposed road network is indicative. Any works and development proposals affecting KSD will be discussed with BCC to ensure alignment with their overall concept for KSD.	N
192.	Building setbacks along KSD do not allow for Council's proposed Road Widening	The development requirements for precincts along KSD clearly state that Road widening will be accommodated in accordance with BCC's requirements. It was not possible to include specific road widening requirements since BCC has not finalised the concept design of KSD.  Building setbacks to KSD refer to the new road alignment which incorporates the Road widening.	N
193.	Requirements for each precinct must be modified to state no future access off KSD for development sites	The development requirements in the Land Use Plan specify "Future access to development sites will not be directly obtained off Kingsford Smith Drive".	N
194.	The ferry terminal at Brett's wharf which is to be relocated as a result of the KSD upgrade should be relocated in the immediate area to serve the existing Hamilton catchment. The proposed ferry terminal location in the Development Scheme is outside that catchment.	The locations of the potential ferry terminals illustrated in the Structure Plan are indicative only. The ULDA will liaise closely with BCC, QT and Translink to ensure an appropriate location for the terminal is achieved.	N

**Proposed Northshore Hamilton Development Scheme**  
**Summary of Late Submission Issues**

Issue No.	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y/N)
195.	Support for new exit to Kingsford Smith Drive near the Caltex site.	Support noted.	N
196.	Not demonstrated that adequate public transport measures will be provided to minimise car use. Further details of public transport proposals required	On going preliminary discussions have taken place between the ULDA, BCC, QT and TransLink on public transport options. Based on work carried out to date, the preferred and most cost effective form of mass transit option will be rapid bus transit and citycat.	N
197.	No commitment to provide the mass transit system or rail extension	Correct. The Development Scheme provides a planning framework to accommodate the rail extension and a mass transit system.	N
198.	Has agreement been reached with TransLink with respect to implementing a TOD scale bus service?	On going preliminary discussions have taken place between the ULDA, QT and TransLink on broad transport and traffic issues for the UDA. The level of detail with respect to bus services, implementation etc has not been established at this broad planning stage. This will be undertaken as part of the Implementation Strategy.	N
<b>Car Parking</b>			
199.	<p>5.3 Car Parking Provision is to be made for car parking at a significantly reduced ratio from that specified in Brisbane City Council's City Plan, especially in mixed use precincts and areas of public transport accessibility. Please see draft TOD Resource Manual (OUM).</p> <p>Further clarification is needed to define 'first fixed public transport service'.</p> <p>A strategy needs to be devised to plan for the 'shared centrally located and managed interim car parking facility' once the interim period is over. It is suggested that long term rates may not necessarily be on site but may be made up by utilising the existing car parks provided in the shared interim facility.</p>	<p>The ULDA will work closely with land owners to identify surplus land which could be utilised for interim car parking. The Development Scheme provisions concerning interim car parking rates are not mandatory however future applicant will need to sufficiently demonstrate how it is intended to maximise the use of pedestrian, cycle and public transport opportunities. Short term parking options will be investigated in further detail as part of the Implementation Strategy which is a working document.</p> <p>The proposed car parking rates will not be changed however the Development Scheme be amended to include the following provision:  <i>"Where a request is made to provide car parking at the rate exceeding that prescribed for the Precinct, the must be accompanied by a strategy to maximise use of pedestrian, cycle and public transport opportunities over private vehicle use."</i></p> <p>First fixed public transport system refers to BUZ service.</p>	Y
200.	Transitional car parking provisions not feasible. If car parks reduced gradually agreements must be provided outlining sequencing	The ULDA will work closely with land owners to identify surplus land which could be utilised for interim car parking. The Development Scheme provisions concerning interim car parking rates are not mandatory however future applicant will need to sufficiently demonstrate how it is intended to maximise the use of pedestrian, cycle and public transport opportunities. Short term parking options will be investigated in further detail as part of the Implementation Strategy which is a working document.	N

**Proposed Northshore Hamilton Development Scheme**  
**Summary of Late Submission Issues**

Issue No.	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y/N)
201.	Higher car parking requirements that the City Frame and visitor parking allocation not specified.	The proposed car parking rates will not be changed however the Development Scheme be amended to include the following provision: <i>"Where a request is made to provide car parking at the rate exceeding that prescribed for the Precinct, this must be accompanied by a strategy to maximise use of pedestrian, cycle and public transport opportunities over private vehicle use."</i> Visitor car parking provisions and location will be determined at the development assessment stage and indicated in approved plans and/or conditions of approval	Y
202.	Parking provision is too low ( <i>one person suggested 1.5 per unit and 1 per 50 commercial</i> )( <i>two people said 1.5 per unit</i> ) ( <i>one person suggested 1 per unit</i> ) ( <i>two people said 1 per bedroom</i> )	The proposed car parking rates will not be changed however the Development Scheme be amended to include the following provision: <i>"Where a request is made to provide car parking at the rate exceeding that prescribed for the Precinct, this must be accompanied by a strategy to maximise use of pedestrian, cycle and public transport opportunities over private vehicle use."</i>	Y
<b>Environment and Sustainability</b>			
203.	There are no specific provisions in precincts 3 & 6 to protect residential amenity even though these precincts indicate preferred land uses such as residential, child care centre, restaurant	Section 6 of the UDA wide Development Criteria include specific reference to residential amenity that will apply to all future land uses. As such they will not be repeated at a precinct level.	N
204.	No strategy to manage transition of uses from industry to residential. No residential development should occur until industrial uses within desired separation distances have ceased	As part of the master planning process assessment and analysis was carried out to determine the safe separation distances between new residential and mixed used development and the established industrial uses. The Development Scheme reflects this work through the provisions in the UDA wide Development criteria – Sustainability and the Environment. This section identifies impact areas associated with existing activities that have the potential to adversely impact development. Development within the impact areas must demonstrate that the proposed development will not be adversely impacted by the potential environmental impacts associated with these activities. A safety and risk assessment report will be required to be prepared by applicants	N
205.	Hours of operation should be considered for industrial uses in proximity to future residential uses without compromising existing lawfully approved industries	Appropriate hours of operation for new industry or expansion of industry uses will be included as part of development approval conditions to address residential amenity.	N
206.	There are no specific provisions to address aircraft noise for sensitive uses. Design and construction requirements for buildings in affected precincts should be indicated.	Section 6.1 has been re-worded to included greater reference to Aircraft noise management. The Wilkinson Murray report, carried out on behalf of BAC, will assist developers in identifying noise criteria to achieve including suggested construction standards. This will be used by the ULDA in pre-application discussions with developers.	Y



**Proposed Northshore Hamilton Development Scheme**  
**Summary of Late Submission Issues**

Issue No.	Issue	Response	Amendment (Y/N)
207.	<p>Section 6.1 – Safety and Risk</p> <p><i>Insert</i> – Development must comply with <i>State Planning Policy 01/02 Development in the Vicinity of Certain Airports</i> primarily in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>structures or temporary construction machinery that penetrate the Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS) of Brisbane Airport; and</li> <li>undertaking any mitigation measures for activities in relation to Australian Noise Exposures Forecasts (ANEF) for Brisbane Airport specifically for- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Land within the ANEF 20 contour and</i></li> <li>- <i>Land outside the ANEF 20 contour.</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Section 6.1 – Safety and Risk of the UDA Wide Development Criteria has been amended to include an additional footnote to reference the 4<sup>th</sup> dot point (Aircraft Operations) to read:</p> <p><i>"The requirements of State Planning Policy 1/02: Development in the vicinity of Certain Airports and Aviation Facilities will be considered when assessing specific development applications."</i></p> <p>The State Planning Policy and supplementary guidelines includes reference to structures or temporary construction machinery that may penetrate the Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS) and the consideration of such structures within operational airspace.</p>	Y
208.	Map 10 Add Obstacle Limitation Surface (OLS) contours for Brisbane Airport onto Map 10.	<p>Section 6.1 – Safety and Risk of the UDA Wide Development Criteria has been amended to include an additional footnote to reference the 4<sup>th</sup> dot point (Aircraft Operations) to read:</p> <p><i>"The requirements of State Planning Policy 1/02: Development in the vicinity of Certain Airports and Aviation Facilities will be considered when assessing specific development applications."</i></p> <p>State Planning Policy 1/02: Development in the vicinity of Certain Airports and Aviation Facilities includes reference to OLS. OLS contours are specific to Brisbane Airport and are included in the Brisbane Airport Masterplan.</p>	Y
209.	Details of the potential energy plant within a future park indicated in precinct 4 should be provided, including strategies to mitigate likely impacts of this use in a public park.	Investigations of the details and impacts of the potential energy plant will be undertaken if/when this energy plant takes place.	N
210.	Has a hazard and Risk Assessment been carried out to determine safe separation distances between new residential development and established industrial uses.	As part of the master planning process assessment and analysis was carried out to determine the safe separation distances between new residential and mixed used development and the established industrial uses. The Development Scheme reflects this work through the provisions in the UDA wide Development criteria – Sustainability and the Environment. This section identifies impact areas associated with existing activities that have the potential to adversely impact development. Development within the impact areas must demonstrate that the proposed development will not be adversely impacted by the potential environmental impacts associated with these activities. A safety and risk assessment report will be required to be prepared by applicants	N
211.	If the ULDA has consulted with The Chemical Hazards and Emergency Services Unit with respect to the Major Hazard Facility, BCC is satisfied that hazard and risk from this facility have been satisfactorily addressed.	The ULDA has consulted with representatives from the Chemical Hazards & Emergency management Services in the Department of Emergency Services. They have raised no objection to the proposed development scheme with respect to the impact on the Major hazard Facility. DES has provided a submission on the development scheme, but does not relate to the Major Hazard Facility.	N

**Proposed Northshore Hamilton Development Scheme  
Summary of Late Submission Issues**

<b>Issue No.</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment (Y/N)</b>
212.	Development scheme does not address the potential impact of sea level rise by global warming. Scheme should investigate this issue and address any determined risk.	The Development Scheme has adopted Brisbane City Council's flood requirements as outlined in Council's <i>Subdivision and Development Guidelines 2008</i>  The Development Scheme has been amended to make reference to the provisions of <i>Brisbane City Council's Subdivision and Development Guidelines 2008</i>	Y
213.	Scheme does not demonstrate how it will contribute to ecologically sustainable development. (ESD)	The Development Scheme includes Energy Efficiency provisions that require developments to use alternative energy supplies through the use of renewable energy sources. The Infrastructure Charging Framework reinforces sustainability initiatives for development within the UDA through a 10% sustainability contribution which can be off-set against the investment of other sustainability initiatives on-site. In addition a Draft Ecologically Sustainability Policy has been prepared and will be released early in 2009.	N
214.	Need for energy efficiency development guidelines.	The Development Scheme includes Energy Efficiency provisions that require developments to use alternative energy supplies through the use of renewable energy sources. The Infrastructure Charging Framework reinforces sustainability initiatives for development within the UDA through a 10% sustainability contribution which can be off-set against the investment of other sustainability initiatives on-site.	N
215.	Acceptable measures for the extent of mangroves to be retained within new development	Additional sections on Tidal Works and Marine Plants have been included in the UDA wide Criteria to further address issues associated with the Brisbane River.	Y
216.	Need to include large shade tree provisions in the UDA wide criteria to reflect the UDA's vision referring to Shade trees in private and public realm that reflect Brisbane's subtropical climate.	The Development Scheme has been amended to include provisions for large shade trees to be provided.	Y
217.	Habitable floor levels for development should be in accordance with Council's <i>Subdivision and Development guidelines 2008</i>	The Development Scheme has been amended to address this issue in section 6.6 of the Land Use Plan as follows. <i>All development must achieve flood immunity, consistent with Brisbane City Council's standards (for example the Subdivision and Development Guidelines 2008)</i>	Y
218.	An integrated water cycle management approach including provision of 'purple pipe' infrastructure should be included in ULDA policy.	Section 6.6 of the Land Use Plan requires an integrated water approach to improving water use efficiency across the area. An option of addressing this could be through the provision of 'purple infrastructure'	N
219.	Clearer description and objectives with respect to ESD is required in the Implementation Strategy	The ULDA is preparing a Sustainability Policy. Elements of the Sustainability Policy have been included in the Development Scheme and will be a tool for assessing development applications.	N
220.	Best practice WSUD should be incorporated in the Development Scheme by meeting the design objectives in Queensland Government's <i>draft Water Sensitive Urban Design – design objectives for urban stormwater management</i> .	Section 6.6 of the Land Use Plan indicates the requirement for precinct lot layout and design to be compatible with current best practice WSUD principles for Queensland	N

**Precincts and Sub-precincts**

**Proposed Northshore Hamilton Development Scheme**  
**Summary of Late Submission Issues**

<b>Issue No.</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Amendment (Y/N)</b>
221.	Precinct 3 (b) Precinct Outcomes Add the following: <i>Public transport will be provided through a combination of Citycat and bus services.</i>	Precinct 3b is not located on the Brisbane River. Development Scheme currently notes "future public transport infrastructure" which is considered sufficient."	N
222.	More specific details required regarding what community facilities, indoor sport and recreation land will be provided.	The Development Scheme identifies open space, land required for provision of community facilities will be determined through the delivery of the Implementation Strategy	N
223.	Supportive of plan	Noted	N
224.	Support for the river park on the south side of precinct 3.	Noted	N