



**Queensland
Government**

**CQU Rockhampton transitioned UDA
development Scheme**

**MEDQ
Submissions
Report**

Under the Economic Development Act 2012

March 2013

Contents

1. Introduction.....	2
2. Overview of submissions.....	2
3. List of all proposed amendments to the Development Scheme	3
4. Summary of submissions from affected land owners	3
5. Summary of submissions from community members	5

1. Introduction

The public notification and submission period for the Central Queensland University (CQU) Rockhampton transitioned Urban Development Area (UDA) Proposed Development Scheme was undertaken from 29 June to 13 August 2012.

On 1 February 2013 the Urban Land Development Authority Act 2007 (ULDA Act) was repealed and replaced with the Economic Development Act 2012 (ED Act). Under the ED Act, the ULDA has been replaced with the Minister for Economic Development Queensland (MEDQ). Existing UDAs have been transitioned under the ED Act and rights that existed under the ULDA Act have continued under the ED Act. Anything done or in existence in relation to a proposed development scheme under the repealed ULDA Act for a transitioned UDA is taken to have been done or in existence under the ED Act. Any reference to the term UDA in this document is taken to mean transitioned UDA.

Following the end of the public notification, submissions received were considered and the proposed Development Scheme was amended as considered appropriate in response to issues raised. A Submissions Report was prepared which summarised the submissions received, the merits of those submissions and the extent to which the proposed Development Scheme was amended to reflect the submissions.

The Submitted Development Scheme and the Submissions Report were made available on the DSDIP website at www.dsdip.qld.gov.au and given to the MEDQ for his consideration. All parties who made a submission during the public notification period were notified of this on 11 February 2013. If submitters were an affected owner as described in the ED Act and were unhappy with how their issues had been addressed, they had 20 business days from the day they received the notice to write to the MEDQ in a second submission, to ask him to protect their interests.

The MEDQ has considered the issues raised in the second submission period (the submitter's period) which included submissions from both affected owners as described in the ED Act as well as community members. The MEDQ has prepared this report summarising the issues raised, the merits of those submissions and the extent to which the submitted Development Scheme was amended.

2. Overview of submissions

A total of four submissions were received during the second submission period, including submissions from:

- Affected land owners, and
 - Department of Transport and Main Roads,
 - Central Queensland University Council
- Community members

3. List of all proposed amendments to the Development Scheme

Issue #	Section details	Nature of / reason for amendment
S1.0 Introduction		
1.	Section 1.3 Changes to the ULDA Act	Add additional sentence to the end of second paragraph to read: <i>“Any reference to the term UDA in this document is taken to mean transitioned UDA.”</i>
S4.0 Infrastructure Plan		
2.	Section 4.0 Infrastructure Plan	Under the 4.0 Infrastructure Plan, amend wording in the sixth paragraph to read: <i>“Road upgrades will be in accordance with traffic studies undertaken as development proceeds, based on the ultimate development. State controlled roads shall be upgraded in accordance with agreements with Department of Transport and Main Roads (DTMR)”</i>

4. Summary of submissions from affected land owners

Areas of support

Issue #	Issue/comment
1.	In principle support for the Submitted Development Scheme in particular, the promotion for CQU Rockhampton to become a mixed use urban community, integrating commercial, residential, retail, education, recreational and community uses that builds on the existing role of the university.
2.	CQU no longer wishes to be recognised as an objector to the proposal and subject to the agreement on land ownership and management prospects, believes that development of the University site would be advantageous to the Rockhampton region.
3.	Supportive in principle of the proposed new four way intersection on Yaamba Road and the reconfiguration of the Yaamba Road/ College Road and Yaamba Road/ Nuttal Street as 'left in, left out' intersections subject to the Department reviewing further detailed traffic analysis and designs developed through the development assessment process

Areas of concern

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
1.	DTMR notes the Draft Fitzroy Principal Cycle Network Plan (PCNP) proposes cycle routes along the boundaries of the site; Norman Road to the East, Yeppoon Road to the North and Bruce Highway to the West.	Noted. It is acknowledged this plan has not yet been approved or adopted. EDQ will engage with DTMR during the development assessment process.	N
2.	DTMR request future traffic impact studies be certified from a Registered Professional Engineer of Queensland (RPEQ).	Noted. This is a matter for consideration at the development assessment stage.	N
3.	DTMR note there is currently insufficient information to determine specifically how traffic impacts from development within the UDA, in particular on the State controlled road network and other technical queries will be mitigated. DTMR request that future development applications within the UDA undertake traffic impact studies based on the ultimate development.	As discussed with DTMR, the purpose of the Traffic Report is to identify what constraints exist and what upgrades would be required if full development of the site was realised. Detailed design and more refined traffic impact assessments will be undertaken as development occurs. EDQ will engage with DTMR on the detailed intersection design and detailed traffic analysis, during the development assessment process. Under the 4.0 Infrastructure Plan, amend wording in the sixth paragraph to read: <i>“Road upgrades will be in accordance with traffic studies undertaken as development proceeds, based on the ultimate development. State controlled roads shall be upgraded in accordance with agreements with DTMR”</i>	y

5. Summary of submissions from community members

Areas of support

Issue #	Issue/comment
1.	<p>Support from academic staff of Central Queensland University for the plan. Submitter believes students intending to come to Rockhampton to study may find it difficult to find a rental place. Submitter believes this is hindering the growth of our university.</p> <p>Submitter believes it would be extremely helpful to CQU students if development went ahead. Submitter believes those who oppose the scheme are likely to be landlords who have their own interest in mind, not the interests of the community.</p>

Areas of concern

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
1.	<p>Concerned public comment regarding the CQU staff's vision for the Uni has been dismissed and the ULDA have only considered the concerns of CQU and RRC.</p> <p>Submitter believes the process has only taken into account the university's master plan which has not been made available for comment.</p>	<p>The Development Scheme includes a preferred option for development and identifies an outcome which aims to balance multiple competing interests.</p> <p>In relation to the University's masterplan, through consultation with the University, it was determined that the CQU masterplan and UDA Development Scheme would be compatible. The Development Scheme allows the University to overlay their masterplan over the land they intend to retain and generally to undertake more detail design and planning.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that some CQU staff or users of the campus have concerns regarding changes to the university. Ultimately how the university evolves in the future will be decided by decision makers acting on behalf of CQU and the land owner. It is recommended as a member of the CQU community, if the submitter is unhappy, they raise their concerns with appropriate decision making representative within CQU.</p>	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
2.	<p>The submitter notes the confusion created over the University's initial objection to the proposal and recent removal of that objection.</p> <p>The submitter notes that the proposal was generally unpopular among the CQU community.</p>	<p>The ULDA conducted an extensive community consultation program prior to and during the public notification of the proposed Development Scheme. This program through advertising as well as verbal confirmation encouraged the community and stakeholders to make submissions during the notification period and confirmed that the notification period was going ahead.</p> <p>CQU have since written to the State to advise they no longer wish to be recognised as an objector to the proposal and subject to agreement on land ownership and management prospects, development of the university site would be advantageous to the Rockhampton region.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that some CQU staff or users of the campus have concerns regarding changes to the university. Ultimately how the university evolves in the future will be decided by decision makers acting on behalf of CQU and the land owner. It is recommended as a member of the CQU community, if the submitter is unhappy, they raise their concerns with appropriate decision making representative within CQU.</p>	N