

**Ripley Valley UDA Development Scheme**

# **Submissions Report**

Under section 29 of the *Urban Land Development Authority Act 2007*

**June 2011**



# Contents

1. Introduction .....	1
2. Overview of submissions .....	1
3. Key amendments made in response to submissions .....	1
4. Amendments made in response to operational review .....	2
5. Summary of submissions and ULDA response .....	5

## 1. Introduction

The public notification and submission period for the Ripley Valley UDA Proposed Development Scheme was undertaken from 1 April to 20 May 2011.

This report provides:

- a summary of the key amendments made to the Ripley Valley UDA Proposed Development Scheme in response to submissions received
- a list of the amendments made in response to an operational review of the scheme
- a summary of the submissions considered by the Urban Land Development Authority and
- a response to issues raised in the submissions.

## 2. Overview of submissions

A total of 30 submissions were received, including submissions from Ipswich City Council, seven developers and 15 community/interest groups.

Submissions were also received from:

- Queensland state agencies: Department of Community Safety (DCS), Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR) (including Translink), Department of Communities (DoC), Department of Environment and Resource Management (DERM) and Department of Employment, Economic Development and Innovation (DEEDI) and
- utility provider Energex.

All submissions have been summarised and considered in this report.

## 3. Key amendments made in response to submissions

1.	Amendments to clarify the relationship with the Ipswich City Council planning scheme, particularly Part 15 Ripley Valley Master Planned Area Structure Plan and the Traditional Neighbourhood Design Code.
2.	Amendment to allow further refinement of the Environmental Protection Zone boundary, where it does not align with a cadastral or other identifiable boundary, through the development assessment process as provided for in Ipswich City Council's Conservation zone.

#### 4. Amendments made in response to operational review

Issue #	Section details	Nature of / reason for amendment
1.	Whole scheme, greenspace terminology	Greenspace terminology in the scheme has been amended for consistency with the <i>SEQ Regional Plan 2009-2031</i> .
<b>S3.2 Development assessment</b>		
2.	s3.2.6 Context plans	This section has been amended to clarify the role of context plans.
3.	s3.2.7 Plan of development	This section has been amended for consistency with the Blackwater and Moranbah UDA development schemes.
4.	s3.2.8 Notification requirements (introductory paragraph)	<p>Include a new footnote as follows:</p> <p><i>'A UDA development application will require public notification<sup>1</sup> in the application includes...'</i></p> <p><sup>1</sup> <i>The ULDA practice note provides further guidance</i></p>
5.	s3.2.8 Notification requirements (dot point 1)	<p>Delete the words –</p> <p><i>'one or more of the UDA-wide criteria or'</i></p> <p>Replace with the words –</p> <p><i>'the zone intents'</i></p>
6.	s3.2.8 Notification requirements (new dot point)	<p>Include the words:</p> <p><i>'a proposal for development that is accompanied by a context plan'</i></p>
7.	S3.2.9 Interim use (footnote 1)	<p>Include the words 'for centres' so that the footnotes reads –</p> <p><i>'The ULDA applicable guideline provides examples of how this might be achieved for centres'</i></p>
<b>S3.3 UDA-wide criteria</b>		
8.	UDA-wide criteria 3.3.2 Centres (3 <sup>rd</sup> last paragraph)	<p>At the end of the paragraph, include the words –</p> <p><i>'and the centres hierarchy'</i></p>
9.	UDA-wide criteria 3.3.5 Movement network (last dot point)	<p>At the end of the 1<sup>st</sup> sentence include a new footnote that reads –</p> <p><i>'Where active transport enters the on-road environment, treatment should be consistent with Austroads: "cycling Aspects of Austroads Guides (March 2011)'</i></p>
10.	UDA-wide criteria 3.3.7 Community facilities (dot point 2)	<p>At the end of the dot point, include the words –</p> <p><i>'and reduce physical and social isolation'</i></p>
11.	UDA-wide criteria 3.3.8 Natural and cultural values (new paragraph 1)	<p>Include a new paragraph that reads :</p> <p><i>'Development is sited, designed and constructed to avoid or minimise impacts on natural and cultural values.'</i></p>

12.	UDA-wide criteria 3.3.9 Community safety and development constraints (new paragraph 1)	Include a new paragraph that reads : <i>'Development is sited, designed and constructed to avoid or minimise or withstand the incidence of a development constraint.'</i>
13.	UDA-wide criteria 3.3.9 Community safety and development constraints (new paragraph 2)	Include a new paragraph that reads: <i>'Development does not compromise the integrity or operation of high voltage transmission lines/corridors*.'</i>  <i>* Energex's draft Electricity Overlay Code, Community Infrastructure Code and Safe Street Guideline provides guidance on how to achieve this criterion.'</i>
14.	UDA-wide criteria 3.3.9 Community safety and development constraints (new paragraph)	Include a new second last paragraph that reads – <i>'To ensure protection from bushfire hazard, development is designed to mitigate bushfire risk. In transitional bushfire areas the risk may diminish as development occurs.'</i>
15.	UDA-wide criteria 3.3.9 Community safety and development constraints (dot point 1)	Delete the words – <i>'occurs in areas that are flood free or filled to achieve an acceptable flood event'</i> Replace with – <i>'achieves an appropriate level of flood immunity'</i>
16.	UDA-wide criteria 3.3.10 Service infrastructure (new 2 <sup>nd</sup> last paragraph)	Include a new paragraph that reads: <i>'Electricity distribution network infrastructure is provided and located within the UDA to protect electricity infrastructure from incompatible development, to ensure the safety and reliability of the electricity network and not adversely affect the health and safety of the community*''</i>  <i>* Energex's draft Electricity Overlay Code, Community Infrastructure Code and Safe Street Guideline provides guidance on how to achieve this criterion.'</i>
17.	UDA-wide criteria 3.3.11 General requirements, <i>Parking and end of trip facilities</i> (new footnote)	Last paragraph, include a footnote after the words ' End of trip facilities' that reads – <i>'Refer to the Queensland Development Code 4.1 – Sustainable Buildings.'</i>
<b>S3.4 Zone provisions</b>		
18.	Introductory paragraph (dot point 4)	Paragraph 1, dot point 4, Industry and business (2) has been deleted.
19.	Major centre zone, Major centre frame (paragraph 4)	At the end of the dot point, include the words – <i>'and low impact industry'</i>
20.	Major centre zone, Major centre frame (dot point 1, 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence)	After the words 'are pedestrian' include the words 'and cyclist'.
21.	Industry and business zone (paragraph 1, 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence)	After the word 'low' insert the words <i>'and medium'</i>

22.	Table 2: Levels of assessment, In the Urban living zone, column 2, UDA self-assessable development	To enable the self-assessable provisions to apply to display homes.
23.	Table 2: Levels of assessment, In the Major centre zone, column 1 Exempt development, item 2, introductory paragraph	Before the word 'for', insert the words 'or operational work'
24.	Table 2: Levels of assessment, In the Major centre zone, column 3B Prohibited development	Add a new item 3 'Medium impact industry' and renumber Noxious and hazardous industry to 4.
<b>S4.2 Infrastructure plan</b>		
25.	S4.2 Infrastructure agreements	Amended to expanded to provide greater clarity..
<b>S5.2 Implementation strategy</b>		
26.	S5.2 Housing options (paragraphs 2 and 3)	Amend paragraph 2 by deleting the words "as a range between \$41,000 p.a. and \$94,000 p.a.' and delete paragraph 3.
27.	S5.2 Housing options (table)	Amended to re-order the columns in the table and added 'Goals' in relation to diversity of housing product.
<b>Schedule 2: Definitions</b>		
28.	Residential use category, Home based business (new dot points)	Amend the definition by including the following new dot points- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>the maximum height of a new building, structure or object does not exceed the heights of a House or Multiple residential and the setback is the same as, or greater than, buildings on adjoining properties</i></li> <li>• <i>car parking is in accordance with the planning scheme</i></li> <li>• <i>there is no display of goods</i></li> <li>• <i>the number of employees does not exceed 4.</i></li> </ul>
29.	Sport, recreation and entertainment use category, Park (new paragraph)	Amend the definition to include a new last paragraph that reads – <i>'A park does not include pest vegetation as listed by state and local government. A park may include small scale community gardens.'</i>
30.	Sales office and display home	Amended to provide two separate definitions.
31.	Environmental management register	Amended to delete last sentence.
32.	Significant vegetation	Amended to include remnant vegetation.
<b>Schedule 3: Self-assessable provisions</b>		
33.	For the primary house on a lot	Amended to clarify that the criteria is in relation to front fencing only.
34.	For secondary dwelling on a lot (Outdoor living space)	Amended to reduce the minimum area from 16m <sup>2</sup> to 9m <sup>2</sup> and the minimum dimension from 4m to 3m

## 5. Summary of submissions and ULDA response

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
<b>Comments of support</b>			
	<p>Several submissions indicated support for the scheme. Specific points raised in the submissions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the ULDA is to be commended for its foresight in establishing sound and achievable Sustainability Goals. A transition to a more ecologically sustainable community is an imperative and the ULDA has taken a positive lead in setting a more ambitious agenda for the rest of Queensland</li> <li>the ULDA is to be congratulated on the preparation of the scheme and the extent of hard work completed over a short time to prepare a planning document that is a credit to its staff</li> <li>overall, the vision and intent of the scheme is supported. The clear and concise strategic direction, the sustainable development objectives and the setting of a development approval process that will deliver the targeted sustainability, affordability and model community outcomes</li> <li>the ULDA's recognition of the significance of Ripley Valley to play a key role in the delivery of dwelling targets for the South East Queensland Region. The Vision and broad development principles are supported</li> <li>support for vision, intent, clear and concise strategic direction, objectives of development scheme &amp; streamlined approval process to deliver sustainability, affordability and model community outcomes</li> <li>support for retaining approach that</li> </ul>	The support is noted.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
	<p>Council's previous work and ULDA guidelines providing guidance rather than all detail being contained in the development scheme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• support for sustainability measures to ensure consistency with Council's Structure Plan whereby Ripley Valley "has been designed based on global best practices in sustainability</li> <li>• support for densities in Table 1</li> </ul>		
<b>Issues raised</b>			
<b>Drafting, administrative and editorial</b>			
1.	Only 400 people live in Ripley, excluding the 800 residents within Ripley township.	The development scheme accurately reflects Ripley's population.	N
2.	Insert 'ultimately' – "passenger rail line from Springfield will <i>ultimately</i> be extended to the UDA..."	Development scheme amended to include 'ultimately' in s2.1 Background.	Y
3.	Section 3.1.3 - clarify which division and part of SPA.	This is for individual applicants to determine depending on their development proposals; wording is based on legal advice.	N
4.	There is a lack of clarity about the role of context plans and Plans of Development. Applications involving new or amended context plans that influence development potential of land no part of the application should be publicly notified.	The development scheme has been amended to clarify the role of context plans and plans of development and to ensure all context plans are publicly notified.	Y
5.	Notification requirements need to be clarified – first dot point under this heading should include "as determined by the ULDA".	Notification wording has been clarified: <i>A proposal for development which does not comply with the <del>one</del> or more of the UDA wide criteria-zone intents.</i>	Y
6.	Notification needs to be clarified: as many of the UDA wide criteria are performance based rather than prescriptive it will be hard to consistently apply and if it only takes one criterion for each and every application it would result in virtually all applications being notified – sufficient grounds needs to be clarified – is it 'and' or 'or'	Notification wording has been clarified: <i>A proposal for development which does not comply with the <del>one</del> or more of the UDA wide criteria-zone intents.</i> 'or' has been included	Y
7.	Advertising devices should identify that third party advertising is not supported	Applications for signage will be assessed on their merits and will need to meet the development criteria regarding amenity etc.	N



Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
8.	Clients land currently exists across two separate neighbourhoods. Request that land be included in only one concept plan.	This has been addressed with the following wording: <i>A context plan may cover two or more contiguous context plan areas.</i>	Y
9.	Context plans (section 3.2.6) should be strengthened to act as master plans over areas where multiple lots are owned and future development applications will be lodged.	The context plan will perform a similar role to a master plan, which will assist in the planning of the fragmented ownership of Ripley Valley UDA. However, it will not be a statutory instrument.	N
10.	Submitter would like to be considered an affected land owner. Their land is situated adjacent to the urban core but is separated by Bundamba Creek and the Centenary Highway meaning they do not satisfy the affected landowner test. Their landholding, the Swanbank New Chum Enterprise Park, is 277ha generates considerable planning and infrastructure issues for both their site and the UDA.	The term 'affected owner' is defined by the ULDA Act which recognises adjoining owners.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
11.	<p><u>Schedule 1:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern re: MCU for park as exempt (Desired Standards of Service)</li> <li>Satellite dish should have a height limit</li> <li>Operational works filling or excavation should not be exempt where flood constrained</li> <li>add a new row – Exempt Development to include “Development consistent with an approved Plan of Development”.</li> </ul> <p><u>Schedule 2:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>‘car park’ should refer to land use</li> <li>Include vet clinic &amp; medical centre</li> <li>Home based business should include No of employees, hours of operation &amp; car park</li> <li>ERA should be relocated</li> <li>Include definition of context plans, mixed use &amp; neighbourhood (so that average net residential density can be calculated)</li> </ul> <p>Delete definition of public benefit (does not appear to be mentioned)</p>	<p>Clarify Schedule 1 as identified (other than satellite dish as it has a height limit – note: guidelines are being amended to ensure consistency with ICC’s Desired Standards of Service). Operational works are only exempt where associated with an approval.</p> <p>Amend definitions in Schedule 2 (other than neighbourhood which is dealt with by Guideline 5 vet clinic and medical centre as this is covered by existing definition of business and health care services).</p> <p>Home based business definition now addresses car parking, employees and display of goods.</p> <p>ULDA Guideline 5 and a practice note will assist in determining ‘neighbourhood’ for the purpose of calculating average net residential density, context plans and plans of development.</p> <p>Definition of public benefit deleted.</p>	Y
12.	An amendment to legislation is required to include appeal rights for interested parties.	Notification is required for certain applications; however any legislative amendment is outside the scope of the development scheme.	N
13.	Section 3.2.7 should be strengthened to require a PoD unless otherwise determined by the ULDA. Should the existing approach be retained then clarification is required as to when a PoD is or is not required.	The wording for PoDs has been clarified.	Y

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
14.	The second last paragraph of section 3.2.7 advises that development in accordance with a PoD requires no further approval under the proposed Development Scheme, thus inferring that a significant amount of detail is to be incorporated in the initial PoD approval. Dependant on the information supporting an application and conditions of the approval, further applications may be necessary. This statement limits the ULDA's ability for additional applications to be triggered if necessary and this determination should form part of an approval rather than reliant on the proposed Development Scheme to determine if further applications are required.	The wording for PoDs has been clarified and the guideline will provide further clarity.	Y
15.	Section 3.2.8 requires a practice note identifying the particular defined triggers or requirements for public notification (i.e. letters to affected owners).	Notification requirements are set out in the Act – a footnote has been added regarding a practice note providing further clarity on notification.	N
<b>Previous planning comments</b>			
16.	Needs to be better linkage from the vision to remaining development scheme requirements – better reflect Council vision elements	ICC's Vision Development Themes are reflected and adequately linked to the development scheme requirements.	Y
17.	All references to the word 'draft' should be removed from the Traditional Neighbourhood Design Code title and Note 2 amended accordingly, as the code has been approved by the Department of Local Government and Planning and has been incorporated into the Ipswich Planning Scheme.	References to 'draft' have been deleted and footnote 2 amended accordingly.	Y

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
18.	<p>The role of Part 15 (Ripley Valley Master Planned Area Structure Plan) and the TND code have a greater assessment role in the formulation and development of UDA applications rather than just “providing guidance and spatial representation” as implied in s3.2.10 – they have a role in the formulation and linking of context plans. The diagram at Figure 1 should reflect the role of Part 15 and the TND code and be illustrated above the ULDA guidelines. Currently this diagram makes no reference to Part 15 or the TND Code, inferring that only the UDA wide guidelines are applicable in assessment and development. Needs to be some clarity about what to do where conflict between Part 15 &amp; TND &amp; guidelines arises; currently seems disjointed. Section 3.1.1 is inconsistent with section 3.2.10 in regards to the application of the guidelines and whether they provide guidance or are a mandatory requirement.</p>	<p>Figure 1 amended: <i>ULDA guidelines/planning scheme (refer s3.2.10).</i> Appendix 1 has also been amended to further clarify the relationship with Part 15 and the TND code.</p>	Y
19.	<p>Relationship with planning scheme – the TND code and guidelines get called up and it is not clear which outcomes are intended to take precedence –what role do the guidelines have?</p>	<p>Figure 1 amended: <i>ULDA guidelines/planning scheme (refer s3.2.10).</i> Both the guidelines and the TND code provide examples of how the UDA development requirements can be met.</p>	Y
20.	<p>Parking and end of trip facilities should make specific reference to the TND (Note: DoC &amp; TMR recommends reference be made to the QDC 4.1- Sustainable Buildings re end of trip facilities)</p>	<p>Insert footnote: <i>Refer to Queensland Development Code 4.1- Sustainable Buildings.</i></p>	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
21.	Innovative, best practice design solutions for active transport should exceed minimum requirements set by QDC, Austroads and Complete Streets. Development should provide bicycle parking facilities for employees/residents and customers/visitors in accordance with Table C2 Austroads Guide to Traffic Management – Part 11: Parking (2008), except where development is subject to the QDC mandatory part 4.1 – Sustainable Buildings	Insert footnote: refer to the Queensland Development Code 4.1 Sustainable Buildings <i>Refer to Queensland Development Code 4.1- Sustainable Buildings.</i>	Y
22.	Figure 15-8 should be amended as the active transport routes indicated do not provide adequate connections to some neighbourhood areas and in parts do not have a logical hierarchy – amend as per Attachment 2	Figure 15-8 is part of Council's planning scheme (adopted September 2009). In addition, the proposed regional route traverses areas of conservation.	N
23.	Values & constraints mapping which rely on Council's maps should only be regarded as a guide – current wording and footnotes do not sufficiently clarify the level of accuracy – further investigations through PoDs & context plans should ground truth these. It is important that the development scheme is clear on what terms (such as biodiversity values) means – offsetting should be negotiated as required. Include a footnote that how the natural and cultural values (e.g riparian corridor) are protected will be demonstrated through more detailed planning	Wording regarding the role of constraints and values maps has been amended.	Y
<b>Neighbourhoods</b>			
24.	Second last paragraph regarding small scale activities should not cause detrimental impact on residential amenity should be expanded to "residential amenity & other centres"	Wording changed to " <i>residential amenity &amp; centres hierarchy</i> ".	Y
25.	The grouping of uses listed in Table 1 is inconsistent with the definitions in Schedule 2.	Table 1 and the definitions categories to be made consistent: <i>Retail and indoor entertainment use categories</i> <i>Commercial use categories.</i>	Y

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
26.	Support to retain position that no minimum residential lot size be prescribed.	Noted.	N
<b>Centres</b>			
27.	Table 1 needs better linkage with the Figures of Appendix 2.	The development scheme has been amended so that each Figure from Appendix 2 is adequately explained.	Y
28.	<p>Table 1 needs to differentiate between the Major Centre and the Major Centre Frame – the Special District transect was intended to function as a transition to allow development over time to become more compatible with the Urban Core. Part 12.3.5 of the TND code provides guidance on how this is achieved and should be referenced.</p> <p>Centres hierarchy: there is confusion how to relate the centres information called up in the Appendix and Table 1. There is inconsistency between references to major neighbourhood centres and neighbourhood centres within the scheme and these should be reviewed. In particular scheme mapping and the text in section 3.3.2 and table 1.</p>	<p>Wording regarding the urban core and frame have been clarified.</p> <p>Table 1 amended to be consistent with ICC GFAs.</p>	Y
29.	Retain proposed GFA allocations in Table 1 & Major Neighbourhood Centre within Paradise Waters, ensure Local Centres (up to 3,000m <sup>2</sup> GFA) to be contemplated as in Council's Structure Plan	Table 1 has been amended to reinstate neighbourhood centres (up to 3, 000m <sup>2</sup> GFA) to be contemplated.	Y
30.	S3.3.2 should strengthen the importance of the urban core and the secondary urban centres as subordinate	The importance of the urban core and secondary urban centres is adequately addressed in s3.3.2. (Note: Phasing now references figure 15-14)	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
31.	Concerned the development of secondary centres could compromise the viability and highest order of the urban core. Context Plans (section 3.2.6) should give weight to the urban core being the major centre. In table 1, the maximum GFA for secondary centres should reflect the GFAs in the Ipswich Planning Scheme or only allow development of secondary centres after the urban core has constructed 25 000m <sup>2</sup> GFA.	There are difficulties in regulating when construction has reached a certain GFA, however an explanation of the staging (as exhibited in ICC's Figure 15-14) has been included.	Y
32.	Map 15-12 identifies 8 centres including one on client's site. Yet section 3.3.2 states that actual centre numbers and locations will be determined through context plans. More certainty is required as to the number and location of these centres. Submitter has requested confirmation of major neighbourhood centre on clients site.	This will be ultimately be determined through Context Plans and PoDs however wording has been enhanced to ensure centres are evenly distributed relative to their catchment and accessibility, taking into account existing and approved centres.	Y
33.	Client has an imminent approval of a major neighbourhood centre with Ipswich City Council in the South Deebling Creek Road area. Would like no further major neighbourhood centres to be located within the subject commercial catchment to ensure the viability of the proposed centre. Any other references to major neighbourhood centres in the subject commercial catchment should be removed with an including updates to scheme maps.	This will be ultimately be determined through Context Plans and PoDs however wording has been enhanced to ensure centres are evenly distributed relative to their catchment and accessibility, taking into account existing and approved centres.	Y
<b>Housing Diversity &amp; Affordability</b>			
34.	Housing affordability: best way to reduce costs is remove the imposition of landowner agreements in favour of placing an emphasis on reviewing the quantum of infrastructure charges and appropriate dwelling product mix as well as streamlining the assessment process. Need clarity on how it is intended for inclusion/implementation of land owner agreements.	More clarity will be provided through the final Infrastructure Funding Framework.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
35.	Strategies need to be developed to ensure delivery and retention of affordable housing over time.	The draft Housing Strategy includes more clearly articulated mechanisms that the ULDA may use to ensure that targets will be achieved.  Ongoing affordability is provided through the diversity in the market. Smaller dwellings are more affordable relative to the broader market. This is for both rental and purchase properties. Also, the diversity provided in the market will create varying price points and different levels of ongoing affordability in the market.	N
36.	Provision of 5% Social Housing is acceptable, however public housing would only be developed in the area in the later stages of development and subject to housing need.	Ongoing discussions will be held regarding the provision of social housing.	N
37.	Support for exemption of development undertaken by the State...for the purposes of public housing.	Noted.	N
38.	Support for retaining percentages of dwellings required to meet affordability criteria & diversity objectives.	Noted.	N
<b>Employment</b>			
39.	S3.3.4 recommends the establishment of local business & industry areas – it should also state that these areas be located generally adjacent to or within a centre, to avoid the undermining of the function of centres. This section should also be expanded to include 'unacceptable types of traffic (ie heavy service vehicles)' into residential areas.	Scheme amended to include ' <i>unacceptable types of traffic (ie heavy service vehicles)</i> ' into residential areas.  Scheme amended to add: ' <i>local industry &amp; business areas do not compromise the form and function of the centres hierarchy.</i> '	Y
40.	The reference to the 'Bremer Business Park' in second last paragraph of section 2.1 should be amended to 'Citiswich' as it is currently identified.	The reference has been amended in the scheme.	Y
41.	The development scheme is too dismissive of the need to supply industrial related jobs and needs to give stronger indication of how jobs will be provided	A range of jobs are promoted in centres, local industry and business areas and home-based businesses (which are exempt). Recognition is also given to the nearby key employment generators.	N



Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
<b>Social</b>			
42.	The ULDA should develop and commit to a new social contract with the SEQ community, particularly residents of the UDA's that reflects the principals of affordability and sustainability.	These aspects are addressed in the development scheme requirements. The Implementation Strategy describes how the ULDA will work with others to undertake the development of sustainability, economic and social strategies and projects.	N
43.	The proposed population of the UDA is unsustainable and an assessment of the carrying capacity of the SEQ region is needed.	Population is consistent with ICC's Structure Plan and is to be accommodated to achieve SEQ Regional Plan objectives.	N
<b>Movement Network</b>			
44.	S3.3.5 should make greater reference to the relevant provisions not just call up the Figures in appendix 2. The wording 'elements of' & 'generally in accordance' is too vague.	The Figures in Appendix 2 are now adequately referenced.	Y
45.	Figures 5-9 & 10 should be updated reflecting more recent work. Thoroughfare Hierarchy Plan shows an interchange at Wensley Rd/South West Arterial Road (SWAR) – TMR's modelling is currently investigating this area. The Plan should be amended and a footnote added : "Interchanges at Ripley Road/SWAR and Wensley Rd/SWAR are subject to further technical investigations and may change in the future" – ICC advise footnote as follows: <i>Interchanges at Ripley Road/SWAR and Wensley Road/SWAR are subject to further technical investigations to establish the final form of the interchanges.</i>	Footnote included : <i>Interchanges at Ripley Road/SWAR and Wensley Road/SWAR are subject to further technical investigations to establish the final form of the interchanges.</i>	Y
46.	Where active transport network enters the on-road environment treatment should be in keeping with the Austroads publication 'Cycling Aspects of Austroads Guides (March 2011).	Footnote included reflecting the Austroads Guides.	Y

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
47.	Support for the principle that the development will contribute to a road network that has a functional road hierarchy however development scheme and guidelines need to use common terminology - guidelines 6, 9 & 10 use different terms so it is difficult to interpret this principle.	The terminology used in the development scheme is consistent with ICC documentation and guidelines can be amended to ensure consistency in terminology.	N
48.	Educational establishment is listed as 'exempt' however it has the potential to significantly impact the transport network, particularly the public transport network and therefore should be deleted.	Educational establishment is only exempt when not involving building work; the definition refers to a range of education services that can be delivered in commercial premises and therefore student movement would be similar to workers.	N
49.	Support for intent to provide safe and direct links to key destinations.	Noted.	N
50.	Movement network is generally supported but these should be indicative only and subject to future technical reporting and development design outcomes.	Figures in Appendix 2 are now adequately explained (groundtruthing to occur through more detailed planning through context plans and PoDs).	Y
51.	The movement network needs to clearly explain transport connections between employment and residential uses and timing of transport infrastructure.	Movement networks are based on ICC's Structure Plan signed off by the State in 2009 and linkages between employment and residential uses are emphasised in the proposed scheme.	N
52.	Figure 15-7 Transit Plan shows the neighbourhood transit corridor bisecting the subject site. Relocate corridor to respect existing cadastre and ownership.	No amendment is required given the ICC mapping has been in place since September 2009 and groundtruthing will occur through more detailed planning.	N
53.	Submitter feels a northern access road linking from site to Centenary Highway is warranted on their client's site. This road link if not currently supported by Council (supporting documentation provided).	Adopted by the State in 2009, the movement network is based on ICC mapping and any changes to the road network would need to be supported by Council.	N
54.	As the streets are built a by-law (or covenant) be introduced, whereby on corner allotments no fences, bushes or trees be allowed over 900mm or 1m for a distance back from the corner peg of 3m.	Local laws are ICC's responsibility and outside the scope of the development scheme.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
<b>Greenspace Network</b>			
55.	S3.3.6 should make greater reference to the relevant provisions not just call up the Figures in Appendix 2. The wording 'elements of' & 'generally in accordance' is too vague.	The relationship between the relevant provisions and the Figures in Appendix 2 has been improved.	Y
56.	Vegetation protection: major greenspace corridors within the UDA are partially or totally disconnected by open space designated as parkland and that buffers of open space zoning should be provided along the EP zone boundary. The ULDA should not package green infrastructure space and community open space together. Green infrastructure space should be for the exclusive purpose of protecting habitat and ecological function. Open space is a different designation for the purpose of recreational and other community activities.	Community greenspace provides for multiple purposes and uses, whilst ensuring the protection of significant ecological and environmental values. The ULDA guidelines support this intent and provide guidance as to how this can be achieved.	N
57.	Do not support the clearing of vegetation containing remnant endangered Regional Ecosystems (REs). Recommendation that where remnant endangered and of concerns REs and areas that are subject to unavoidable clearing that offsets are provided in accordance with the current VMA Offset policy. Revise Map 4 (Zoning) to include all areas of endangered regional ecosystems in environmental protection areas.	<p>The development scheme has been amended to make the clearing of a remnant endangered regional ecosystem permissible development, with any approved clearing being subject to an appropriate off-set.</p> <p>Under SPA, the clearing of all native vegetation in a UDA is exempt development. The introduction of the requirement to off-set any approved clearing of a remnant endangered regional ecosystem will achieve an environmental outcome greater than that anticipated under SPA.</p> <p>Consistent with SPA for areas not in a UDA, the clearing of a remnant of concern regional ecosystem or a remnant least concern regional ecosystem will remain exempt for urban purposes in an urban area within the UDA.</p>	Y

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
58.	Opposed to biodiversity offsets as it allows development in inappropriate locations. Concerned there is no adequate ecological offset for Ripley Valley UDA. If offsets are to occur, local conservation groups should be consulted. Activate an Environmental Offsets Policy that requires comparable offsets in the same catchment based upon a 1:3 offset ratio.	The ULDA will prepare a guideline to address environmental offsets.	N
<b>Natural &amp; Cultural Values</b>			
59.	The reference to cultural heritage should include 'indigenous'.	No amendment required as DERM advised that the term relates to both Indigenous and European heritage.	N
60.	Aboriginal Heritage should be amended to Indigenous Cultural Heritage (consistent with DERM).	Indigenous Cultural Heritage map reference has been amended to be consistent with DERM.	Y
61.	Maps should include significant wetlands, remnant vegetation & essential fauna habitat (consistent with Guideline 14).	Constraints mapping is consistent with ICC's Structure Plan and the development scheme seeks to achieve protection of these values.	N
62.	Control order & accepted industry usage means 'sediment and erosion control' should be replaced with 'erosion and sediment control'.	The development scheme has been amended.	Y
63.	Support for the recognition of the maintenance and protection of cultural values (including Aboriginal heritage).	Noted.	N
64.	Mapping should recognise that Deebling Creek is not a significant Riparian Corridor; it is only a 4 <sup>th</sup> order stream by DERM in only a small portion of the site.	Riparian corridors are consistent with ICC's structure plan. Through context plans and plans of development, more detailed planning is to be undertaken to determine the exact riparian corridor location and buffering arrangements.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
65.	Clarify Transitional Bushfire Risk Areas as it is not yet formally adopted by Council	<p>ICC advised the adoption of the Risk Areas is imminent as transitional bushfire risk has been through State interest review. Bushfire Risk Areas align with other constraints; however Transitional Bushfire Risk areas can be overcome with design.</p> <p>Amend:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. s3.3.9 to clarify Transitional Bushfire Risk insert: <i>"To ensure protection from bushfire hazard, development is designed to mitigate bushfire risk. In Transitional Bushfire Areas the risk may diminish as development occurs"</i>.</li> <li>2. Table 2 – level of assessment Column 2 in the Urban living zone amendment: 'or Transitional Bushfire Risk Area if, for the Transitional Bushfire Risk Area, the site adjoins an existing or approved urban development (Note: this term has been defined).'</li> <li>3. Note: additional criteria added to Schedule 3.</li> </ol>	Y
66.	Support the establishment of water bodies and wetlands as part of a WSUD outcome	Noted	N
67.	Land Use Plans for each UDA should reflect the targets established in the SEQ Natural Resource Management Plan and demonstrate how they will contribute to their achievement.	Targets are region-wide and the development scheme contributes to the regional targets.	N
68.	Review, monitor and set conditions for any planned clearing to prevent biodiversity loss and maintain water quality standards.	<p>The development schemes has been amended to make the clearing of a remnant endangered regional ecosystem permissible development, with any approved clearing being subject to an appropriate off-set.</p> <p>Under SPA, the clearing of all native vegetation in a UDA is exempt development. The introduction of the requirement to off-set any approved clearing of a remnant endangered regional ecosystem will achieve an environmental outcome greater than that anticipated under SPA.</p> <p>Consistent with SPA for areas not in a UDA, the clearing of a remnant of concern regional ecosystem or a remnant least concern regional ecosystem will remain exempt for urban purposes in an urban area within the UDA.</p> <p>Guidelines cover other matters.</p> <p>The development scheme seeks to ensure protection of the health and values of surface and groundwater and the hydrological network.</p>	Y

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
69.	A lack of biodiversity assessment has been undertaken. There should be an immediate review of all UDA's to ensure that areas of significant biodiversity/habitat have been fully protected.	The development scheme seeks to achieve protection of these values and has been amended to make the clearing of a remnant endangered regional ecosystem permissible development, with any approved clearing being subject to an appropriate off-set.	N
70.	Where there is insufficient knowledge about biodiversity values and habitat, apply the Precautionary Principle (enshrined in ESD Principles) and prohibit any proposed development until full assessments have been conducted and confirmed.	The development scheme seeks to achieve protection of these values. Prohibition of all development would adversely affect housing affordability and the provision of necessary community facilities & services.	N
71.	All riparian corridors must be protected by an environmental land use category and must be greater than 300m in width.	Through context plans and plans of development, more detailed planning is to be undertaken to determine the exact riparian corridor location and buffering arrangements. It is not considered appropriate for the development scheme to generally prescribe buffer widths to riparian corridors; these widths need to be determined on a case by case basis. Appropriate buffer widths for a particular riparian feature will be resolved during the development assessment process. ULDA Guideline 14 sets out the parameters for determining appropriate buffers.	N
72.	Protection and enhancement of onsite and downstream water quality.	Development schemes seek to maintain or improve the environmental values of surface and groundwater and the functioning and characteristics of the hydrological network	N
73.	Regionally significant corridors within and outside the UDA must be protected from urban development and connected to promote safe fauna movement.	Corridors have remained as agreed in ICC's Structure Plan in place since 2009.	N
74.	Introduce make good requirements for clearing that has already adversely impacted habitat or water quality.	Clearing already undertaken cannot be retrospectively regulated by the development scheme.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
75.	<p>The following areas are fully protected from development and threatening activities now and into the future:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Areas of biodiversity significance</li> <li>• Wildlife habitat and connectivity between these habitats</li> <li>• Riparian areas and areas essential for hydrological flow</li> <li>• Community open and recreational space</li> <li>• Culturally significant sites</li> <li>• Lands for agriculture and community farming</li> </ul>	The development scheme seeks to protect these values.	N
76.	Scenic amenity, open space, prime agricultural lands and areas of cultural significance must be protected from development impacts.	The development scheme seeks to protect these values.	N
77.	Concern that the scheme does not adequately protect koalas or provide a suitable off-set arrangement for loss of habitat (or vegetation)	The ULDA has been advised that the Ripley Valley UDA (as a former master planned area) will not be subject to the Koala State Planning Policy.	N
<b>Community Facilities</b>			
78.	Development facilitation does not directly refer to social isolation	Amended s3.3.7 as follows: <i>'a range of community facilities and services that are accessible and appropriate to the needs of the community and reduce physical and social isolation.'</i>	Y
79.	Land should be set aside for future churches to cope with incoming demand	The development scheme does not set aside land for single uses; places of assembly are included in the Service and community use category and are generally permissible.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
<b>Constraints</b>			
80.	Flooding: remove the words "or filled" – ICC does not support filling within flood constrained areas; remove "to" replace with "at" 'relating to flooding at the time lodgement.'	<p>Wording revised (in all references to ICC documents the term 'planning instrument').</p> <p>Delete dot point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>development occurs in areas that are flood free or filled to achieve an acceptable flood event</li> </ul> <p>Replace with the following wording:-</p> <p>To ensure protection from flooding and appropriate flood management:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>development achieves an appropriate level of flood immunity</li> </ol>	Y
81.	Flooding information and urban stormwater flowpath needs to be reviewed and updated (Note: A number of submitters requested clarification of flooding for their properties)	Flood map information has been amended to ensure consistency with Council's information.	Y
82.	Constraints map should identify areas of local highly dispersive soils or include these in the EP Zone; salinity & soil erosion should be recognised.	Development scheme amended to reference ICC's Soils of Ipswich Field Guide which provides assistance in identifying areas prone to erosion. Dispersive and saline soils wording has been included.	Y
83.	Buildings associated with sporting and recreation facilities should be placed at sufficient height to withstand an Average Recurrence Interval 100 event.	As identified above, development is to achieve an acceptable level of flood immunity.	N



Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
84.	<p>The bushfire risk constraint triggers an application when subdividing, the submitter thinks it is then unnecessary for each individual house on these lots requiring an application because of the bushfire risk trigger as the relevant issues should be resolved with the subdivision application. The level of assessment for development applications and plans of development be clarified to ensure that no unnecessary matters are triggered for assessment.</p> <p>For areas identified as being located within a bushfire risk area, amend to classify bushfire risk as a constraint that can be overcome with specific subdivision design, making subsequent development no longer constrained and triggering a higher level of assessment.</p>	<p>Bushfire Risk Areas align with other constraints; however Transitional Bushfire Risk areas can be overcome with design.</p> <p>Amend:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. s3.3.9 to clarify Transitional Bushfire Risk insert: <i>"To ensure protection from bushfire hazard, development is designed to mitigate bushfire risk. In Transitional Bushfire Areas the risk may diminish as development occurs"</i>.</li> <li>2. Table 2 – level of assessment Column 2 in the Urban living zone amendment: 'or Transitional Bushfire Risk Area if, for the Transitional Bushfire Risk Area, the site adjoins an existing or approved urban development (Note: this term has been defined).'</li> <li>3. Note: additional criteria added to Schedule 3.</li> </ol>	Y
85.	<p>Map 3b has an incorrect representation of the Swanbank power station buffer.</p>	<p>ICC advised the Swanbank power station buffer in the development scheme is correct.</p>	N
86.	<p>ENERGEX needs to ensure their interests which are usually dealt with through Referral Agency powers are frontloaded. ENERGEX has produced documents that could be referenced in the development schemes. Include a map showing 33 kV network &amp; Energex proposal for the provision of future electricity infrastructure.</p>	<p>Attach a footnote to 3.3.9 <i>development does not compromise the integrity or operation of high voltage transmission lines/corridors</i></p> <p>Footnote: ENERGEX's Overlay Code, Draft Energex Community Infrastructure Code and Safetree Guidelines provide guidance on how to achieve this criterion.</p> <p>High voltage power lines have been mapped.</p>	Y
87.	<p>An exemption for all electricity infrastructure that is to be provided underground</p>	<p>Exemptions in Schedule 1 are those that apply across the UDA and are consistent with SPA (if currently not exempt under SPA will not be made exempt in the development scheme).</p>	N
88.	<p>Existing power easements should not prejudice the comprehensive development of a property.</p>	<p>Safety must be maintained and Energex's guidelines referenced above will provide direction in this matter.</p>	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
<b>Service Infrastructure</b>			
89.	<p>Service Infrastructure: the infrastructure charging provisions and UDA wide guidelines are inconsistent with ICC's desired standards of service for infrastructure – the development scheme should be amended to ensure the DSS provided to future residents are consistent with those provided to the rest of the Ipswich community.</p> <p>This section should be reworded to provide greater certainty about securing the provision for future infrastructure in the absence of construction (i.e. capable of being provided at an appropriate time dependant on demand or sequencing)</p>	Amendments to be made to the appropriate guideline.	N
<b>Urban Living Zone</b>			
90.	<p>Where an MCU occurs within an existing building that does not involve building work there are no requirements to address hours of operation, car parking – possibly this development should be made self assessable; e.g. emergency services can have significant impacts re noise etc.</p> <p>Preference that there is no need to lodge an application for emergency services as it may cause delays to response time</p>	Amendment made to ensure uses comply with car parking requirements. Emergency services have been deleted as an exempt use.	Y
91.	<p>Self assessable provisions for a 'house' require a minimum of one covered car parking space only – there is no specific provision addressing a second or visitor car parking space which is inconsistent with Residential 30 &amp; the TND code.</p>	Residential 30 has been replaced by Guideline 7 and the provision is consistent with this.	N
92.	<p>Minimum lot size should be changed from 400m<sup>2</sup> to 300m<sup>2</sup></p>	When preparing the ULDA Guideline Residential 30, the ULDA reached the view that houses on lots less than 400msq with a frontage less than 12.5 metres should not ordinarily be self-assessable. However, an approved plan of development can make houses on lots less than 400m <sup>2</sup> exempt from further assessment.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
<b>Urban Core</b>			
93.	Where an MCU occurs within an existing building that does not involve building work there are no requirements to address hours of operation, car parking – possibly this development should be made self assessable (e.g.s Place of Assembly to Commercial, Sport & Rec to Emergency Services)	Scheme has been amended to ensure uses comply with car parking requirements. Sport, recreation and entertainment have been deleted as an exempt use.	Y
94.	Level of Assessment Tables in Urban Core zone do not prohibit Medium Impact Industries – as QPP identifies that these may include concrete batching plant & tyre manufacturing this should be prohibited	The ULDA definition of medium impact industries refers only to 'noticeable impacts on non-industrial uses'. Concrete batching plant etc would fall into high impact industry; however, to remove all doubt medium impact industries are now in the prohibited column.	Y
95.	Concern that emergency services have to locate in the Urban Core – preference is in the Urban Living zone close to Cunningham Highway.	Note: there is flexibility for the location of emergency services. The level of assessment table excludes emergency services from exemption in the Urban Core given concerns about interrupting traffic in the Urban Core.	Y
96.	In the Major Centre Frame amend to include 'cyclist friendly'.	Amend to: <i>"Key roads...are pedestrian and cyclist friendly with high quality streetscape..."</i>	Y
97.	There is confusion surrounding the definitions of light industry. Either a definition is needed that defines light industry as having no greater impact on surrounding non-industrial uses or if light industry has greater impact on surrounding non-industrial land uses, then the reference to light industry in section 3.4 needs to be deleted.	Reference changed from light industry to low impact industry.	Y
98.	Interim uses (section 3.2.9) for the urban core to include interim residential densities subject to services being provided, e.g. very low density on larger lots (8lots/ha) that can be redeveloped over time.	Low density development creates problems of fragmentation which makes it difficult to redevelop later.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
<b>Environmental Protection Zone</b>			
99.	Environmental Protection zone: Part 15 – the boundary between the Future Urban zone [ULDA equivalent Urban Living] and Conservation zone [ULDA equivalent Environmental Protection zone] is indicative and subject to further assessment to ground truth the most appropriate location (Note: certain submitters raised specific issues regarding their properties).	The boundary between the Environmental protection zone and the Urban living zone is based on ICC zoning and constraints. The EP zone allows for certain development (consistent with ICC use rights) provided environmental values are protected. The wording in the EP zone has been expanded to recognise this.	Y
100.	Within the EP zone 'short term accommodation' and 'intensive animal husbandry' (Note: where stable only) should not be prohibited.	These uses are included in the permissible column to be consistent with ICC provisions.	Y
101.	Support for the extent of land zoned for Environmental Protection zone as it is consistent with previous ecological studies & Council's approach.	Noted.	N
<b>Buffers</b>			
102.	More information is required in relation to the regional transport corridor buffer, in particular what it is to contain and provide.	A guideline is being prepared to provide further clarity. A footnote has been included to reference the guideline.	Y
103.	Section 3.3.10 and 3.4 should include provisions to ensure the protection of sewerage treatment plants from incompatible development encroaching on buffer zones and odour plumes of plants.	The development scheme requires that any use that has significant off-site impacts will be adequately buffered.	N
<b>General Zoning</b>			
104.	Map 4 boundaries are not cadastral based and require better definition. A note should be placed in section 3.4 that allows zone boundary to be defined as part of the preparation of the context plan.	The boundary between the Environmental protection (EP) zone and the Urban living zone is based on ICC zoning and constraints. The EP zone allows for certain development (consistent with ICC use rights) provided environmental values are protected. The wording in the EP zone has been expanded to recognise this. The boundary between the Urban Core and the Urban Living zone is based on cadastre.	Y

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
105.	Buffer areas around natural vegetation and aquatic features need to be included.	The development scheme seeks to protect natural values. However, it is not considered appropriate for the development scheme to generally prescribe buffer widths to vegetation or aquatic features; these widths need to be determined on a case by case basis. The appropriate buffer width will be resolved during the development assessment process. ULDA Guideline 14 sets out parameters for determining appropriate buffers for aquatic features.	N
<b>Infrastructure Plan</b>			
106.	Infrastructure Plan: should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• clarify that roads are to be provided prior to commencement of use</li> <li>• reference Part 15 and Council's DSS</li> </ul>	Council will be responsible for the delivery of the external Council roads and the Developers will construct the internal roads as the uses commence.	N
107.	Clarification is required on who is to secure, deliver and fund community infrastructure if it does not form part of the development at the time adjacent works are occurring as this is not mentioned in table 4.3.2.	Provision of land for community infrastructure is included in the local infrastructure plan with delivery of the infrastructure required by the developer at the development stage.	N
108.	Infrastructure Plan: incorporate funding for initial bus service operations into the infrastructure charging regime	Noted. This has been adequately addressed.	N
109.	QUU have confirmed site is suitable for a proposed water reservoir & support connection of Cumner Rd to this reservoir permitting development of the site before the ultimate water supply system fully developed. Request a local waste water treatment plant for Ripley Valley established north of UDA in the Swanbank Enterprise area as an alternative to upgrading the Bundamba WWTP	Noted. This can be dealt with as part of an application following gazettal of the development scheme.	N
110.	Clarity required as to whether infrastructure agreements will include only local infrastructure requirements or also include contributions to State transport infrastructure	There may not be infrastructure agreement within the Ripley Valley UDA. However the local infrastructure plan does include costs for public transport.	N
111.	It is recommended the infrastructure plan include provision for delivery of physical	These are issues that can be dealt with through the development assessment process and development agreement.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
	public transport infrastructure such as bus stops, shelters, indents and bus interchanges.		
112.	<p>Map 5 should be amended to align with intent of draft <i>Connecting SEQ 2031: An Integrated Regional transport Plan for SEQ (IRTP)</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove rail line extending from Springfield towards Ripley</li> <li>• Include reference to the preservation of the identified corridor “preserve corridor for long term opportunity</li> <li>• Reflect the UrbanLink connection between Ripley and Springfield (bus lanes as per attachment 1 (Map 9.5-2031 Strategic Projects Ipswich)</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. The following amendments have been made to the development scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rail line removed.</li> <li>• Insert footnote referring to the UrbanLink connection between Ripley and Springfield in the draft <i>Connecting SEQ 2031: An Integrated Regional transport Plan for SEQ (IRTP)</i>.</li> </ul> <p>Preservations of the rail line are covered in the local infrastructure plan.</p>	Y
113.	<p>Dot point 1a of section 4.1 of the development scheme states that active transport is included in the definition of local infrastructure, however active transport is not listed as local infrastructure in Table 4.3.1 Transport and network infrastructure – add a new row entitled ‘active transport’ to Table 4.3.1 with accompanying columns ‘description of works’ and ‘when required’ as follows: Active transport infrastructure required to service the development – to be constructed at the time development is being undertaken and delivered before improvements are demanded by additional loading from developments within the UDA Need more clarity and certainty around infrastructure costs and credits and offsets &amp; how infrastructure arrangements between the developer, Council, state and other stakeholders are to be undertaken</p>	Agreed, this has been included in the scheme.	Y

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
114.	<p>Amendments to Table 4.4.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Centenary Highway Extension - Map reference (4) <del>Springfield to Cunningham Highway</del> <i>Augusta Parkway to Cunningham Highway</i>"</li> <li>• "Kerners Road Deviation - Map reference (5) <del>To Cunningham Highway</del> <i>Deebing Creek Connection Road to Warwick Road</i>"</li> <li>• "Edwards Street upgrade and extension – Map reference (6) Ripley Road to <del>Edwards Street</del> <i>Warwick Road</i>"</li> <li>• "Ripley Road upgrade - Map reference (7) <del>Reif Street to Cunningham Highway</del> <i>Edwards Street to Cunningham Highway</i>"</li> </ul>	Recommended amendments have been made to the scheme.	Y
<b>General comments</b>			
115.	There is a lack of detail about local and sub-regional infrastructure requirements.	Local and sub-regional infrastructure details are provided through the Local Infrastructure Plan.	N
116.	The infrastructure charging provisions and UDA wide guidelines are inconsistent with ICC's desired standards of service for infrastructure – the development scheme should be amended to ensure the DSS provided to future residents are consistent with those provided to the rest of the Ipswich community.	The guidelines are being amended to allow this to occur.	N
117.	This section should be reworded to provide greater certainty about securing the provision for future infrastructure in the absence of construction (i.e. capable of being provided at an appropriate time dependant on demand or sequencing)	The finalised Infrastructure Funding Framework will address these matters.	N
118.	To ensure affordability, infrastructure (particularly public transport) within the UDA should be connected with the broader infrastructure networks.	The development scheme seeks to deliver infrastructure in a timely, orderly, integrated and coordinated manner.	N
119.	The plan should demonstrate how development will contribute to achieving a	The Implementation strategies and stretch targets are aimed at achieving these outcomes particularly through pilot projects and	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
	zero-emission (and eventually energy-positive) suburb and be ready for zero emissions electric vehicles	ongoing increasing of standards as the technology becomes more affordable.	
120.	Transmission infrastructure should be built to accommodate distributed energy, including substations	The development scheme seeks to deliver infrastructure in a timely, orderly, integrated and coordinated manner.	N
121.	Sites for centralised on-site renewables should be identified and built grid-ready	This is an innovation which can be dealt with as part of the implementation strategy.	N
122.	Homes should be built to a minimum 8 Star standard with solar hot water as a requirement and PV-ready roofing design.	The Implementation strategies and stretch targets are aimed at achieving these outcomes particularly through pilot projects and ongoing increasing of standards as the technology becomes more affordable.	N
123.	Major infrastructure should be developed so the community is more water efficient and self-reliant, reflect Total Water Cycle Planning principles and introduce decentralised water supply options	The Implementation strategies and stretch targets are aimed at addressing these outcomes.	N
124.	No water or wastewater sub regional infrastructure is proposed.	The development will be connected to Queensland Urban Utilities' existing water supply and waste water systems.	N
125.	An interim infrastructure plan and a finalised infrastructure plan must come into effect on gazettal of the development scheme.	An interim infrastructure funding framework is in place for the operation of the Interim Land Use Plan. The final Infrastructure Funding Framework will be in place at the same time as the development scheme.	N
126.	The plan should require resource recovery facilities for commercial and construction industries	The Implementation strategies and stretch targets, particularly in relation to waste management are aimed at achieving these outcomes.	N
127.	The location of the rail line on Map 5 incorrect.	The rail line has been deleted off Map 5.	Y
128.	The infrastructure plan should include the Bundamba Creek trunk sewer, external water connections, the road crossing Bundamba Creek and active transport infrastructure such as walkways and cycleways.	This is addressed in the local and sub-regional infrastructure plan. However, Map 5 amended to include the Bundamba Creek trunk sewer, external water connections.	Y
129.	Plans, as well as investment and incentive options, for regional economic development should be based on support for clean production and business.	The development scheme seeks to achieve a range of businesses with minimal impacts.	N
130.	There is a lack of certainty about the	Infrastructure details are provided through the Local	N



Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
	supply, funding and timing of necessary infrastructure.	Infrastructure Plan supplied to Council.	
131.	Clarity is needed for the relevant entities in regards to infrastructure ownership, management and being the assessing authority in relevant matters during the life of the UDA and after the area is returned to the local authority.	This has been addressed in a MOU with Council – revocation of a UDA is dealt with under the ULDA Act.	N
132.	Utility installations are currently considered permissible development if not in a PoD. This should be changed to self assessable development if development is in accordance with the agreed infrastructure plan.	The Level of assessment tables and Schedule 1 adequately address this matter.	N
133.	Secure State/Commonwealth Government commitments to relocate agency offices to UDAs	This is a broad State interest matter that is outside the scope of the development scheme, however the ULDA will work with parties to encourage local employment generation strategies.	N
134.	The Infrastructure Plan should require roads to be provided prior to commencement of use	Roads will be required prior to use.	N
135.	A significant increase of traffic has occurred on Ripley Road since the centenary highway extension. Will there be any improved safety measures with the expected increase of vehicles from the construction and new population?	Ripley Road is to be significantly upgraded through the development.	N
136.	The Infrastructure Plan should reference Part 15 and Council's DSS The formulation of a Development Agreement for specific community infrastructure and community development requirements prior to the commencement of development. Content of the Development Agreements role, level of hierarchy and expected timeframe should be included and should take into account Council's DSS.	These matters can be dealt with through the relevant guidelines.	N
137.	The ULDA should negotiate with the appropriate bulk water entity to ensure a continuous supply of water to the water service provider.	The UDA is already serviced by water (ULDA has had ongoing discussions with water entities).	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
138.	Under section 4.1 – to provide clarity dot point 1 should reference section 4.3 – Local Infrastructure, dot point 2 should reference section 4.4 – Sub-Regional Infrastructure and not section 4.3	Recommended amendments have been made to the development scheme.	Y
139.	Table 4.3.1 should include comment on footpath and cycle facilities.	Noted. Table 4.3.1 has been amended to include Active Transport infrastructure.	Y
140.	The statutory head of power or statutory weight to compel payment of contribution fees under the infrastructure framework needs to be commented on in the proposed Development Scheme.	This matter is addressed in the ULDA Act.	N
141.	Clarity is sought on the level of contribution to be provided by developers and responsibility for providing the interim public transport service mentioned in table 4.3.1.	Level of contribution will be dependant on the agreed level of service.	N
142.	The description of Works for all Community Infrastructure in Table 4.3.2 should include reference to Part 15 and Council's desired standards of service (where applicable for open space).	This is covered in the local infrastructure plan which has been supplied to Council.	N
143.	Include the rail service identified on Map 5 in Table 4.4.2.	The rail line has been deleted off Map 5.	Y
144.	Schedule Reference Number 6 illustrated on Map 5 needs to be altered to reflect the correct alignment of the Edwards Street upgrade and extension.	Noted. Map 5 has been amended.	Y
<b>Public transport</b>			
145.	If public transport is not delivered in early stages, target densities in urban core may be hard to achieve.	Noted and addressed in the infrastructure plan.	N
146.	Infrastructure should be prioritised towards active and public transport options with the infrastructure built and ready for operation as soon as development occurs	Noted and addressed in the infrastructure plan.	N
147.	Public transport infrastructure to service both outside connections and internal use must be built and ready for operations as soon as any developments become	Noted and addressed in the infrastructure plan.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
	populated		
148.	Land should be designate for appropriate activities that integrate with public and active transport infrastructure	Noted and can be addressed in the detailed planning stage.	N
149.	The Infrastructure Plan needs to include provision for delivery of physical public transport infrastructure and identify how this will be funded and delivered.	These issues will be addressed through the Infrastructure Agreement (for major infrastructure) or the development assessment process for local infrastructure.	N
150.	Table 4.3.2 should reflect technical guide for school planning: <i>Planning for Safe Transport Infrastructure at schools</i>	Include reference in ULDA guidelines to TMR's <i>Planning for Safe Transport Infrastructure at schools</i> .	N
<b>Funding and charging</b>			
151.	Measures are required to make infrastructure contributions and provision affordable and ensure delivery of affordable housing.	Noted.	N
152.	Where Infrastructure charges for substation and transmission infrastructure should be offset by building renewable instead	The Implementation strategies and stretch targets are aimed at achieving these outcomes.	N
153.	The infrastructure plan should demonstrate a commitment to and funding of water and wastewater infrastructure to be reviewed by the relevant entities.	Queensland Urban Utilities will be involved in the planning and design of water and wastewater infrastructure.	N
154.	A finalised infrastructure funding framework that has been developed by relevant entities is required for the efficient, timely and cost effective provision of infrastructure. This framework must come into effect on gazettal of the development scheme.	The final infrastructure funding framework is currently being completed.	N
155.	Clarity needed on the collection of infrastructure charges.	The final infrastructure funding framework is currently being completed and this includes the infrastructure charges.	N
156.	Insufficient information on headworks charges and infrastructure contributions.	The final infrastructure funding framework is currently being completed and this includes the infrastructure charges.	N
157.	The Infrastructure Plan should state that the cost of relocation or undergrounding of an existing major power supply will be shared across the benefiting neighbourhood.	This is a matter for developers to determine.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
158.	The final development scheme should provide clear direction on how existing electrical easements are to be managed, including how power supply to the whole Ripley area is to be delivered.	This will be resolved during the normal design and development process.	N
159.	Funding for initial bus service operations should be incorporate into the infrastructure charging regime	Noted.	N
160.	The Infrastructure Plan needs to provide clarity and certainty around infrastructure costs, credits and offsets.	This will be addressed in the final infrastructure funding framework which is currently being completed.	N
161.	External adjoining landowner should be consulted on the final infrastructure funding framework	<p>External landowners will not be impacted by the by local infrastructure framework. The framework will establish charging arrangements that will ensure that new development within the UDA provides a fair contribution towards the cost of providing infrastructure, including both the local infrastructure within the UDA, and additional sub-regional infrastructure demands.</p> <p>A special infrastructure levy may also be applied to properties within the Ripley Valley UDA to assist on funding the impacts of the development on areas outside of the UDA; e.g. provision of external road upgrading and provision of public transport.</p>	N
<b>Infrastructure agreements</b>			
162.	An infrastructure agreement that outlines: the relevant parties as well as funding, repayment and construction responsibilities must be in place before the gazettal of the development scheme.	This will be addressed in the final infrastructure funding framework which is currently being completed. The final infrastructure funding framework will be in place at the same time as the development scheme.	N
163.	Section 4.2 should be expanded to provide greater clarity and reference the infrastructure agreement.	These issues are covered in the Local infrastructure plan.	N
164.	Clarification is need on the management of internal infrastructure agreements.	Noted.	N
165.	Table 4.3.1 clarification is needed on the status and nature of the infrastructure plan to confirm the master plan will be referenced in the Infrastructure agreements to be prepared before implementation.	The Development Scheme does not contain a master plan but any infrastructure agreements will have reference to the requirements of the development scheme and the local infrastructure plan.	N
166.	The Infrastructure Plan through the heads of agreement must be amended to ensure that all necessary approvals for water and	This will be addressed in the final infrastructure funding framework which is currently being completed.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
	wastewater infrastructure are in place prior to transfer of the asset to QUU. The heads of agreement must also clarify ownership of assets.		
167.	Infrastructure Funding Framework to include provision that undergrounding of 110kV electricity line within Ripley Valley Urban Centre West would need to identify the need for developer to pay for study into cost of works and costs levied as part of an infrastructure agreement.	Management of Electrical infrastructure is a matter for the Developer and Energex to determine.	N
168.	The Infrastructure Plan needs to provide clarity and certainty of how infrastructure arrangements between the developer, Council, state and other stakeholders are to be undertaken	These issues are currently being addressed and do not need to form part of the Development Scheme.	N
<b>Staging / sequencing</b>			
169.	Development should be staged to enable the emergence of improved standards, technologies etc.	Staging should not assist or impact on the emergence of improved standards etc.	N
170.	The Infrastructure Plan should include sequencing, conditions for out of sequence or inconsistent development and indicative locations of infrastructure.	This will be addressed in the final infrastructure funding framework which is currently being completed.	N
<b>Implementation Strategy</b>			
171.	Clarify: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The meaning of stretch targets and what extent will be mandatorily applied</li> <li>• How long term affordability is to occur not just at point of sale</li> <li>• Ecological sustainability stretch targets should be consistent with TND (walking 20%, cycle 10%, public transport 25% and private vehicle 45%)</li> </ul>	No amendments required; targets are for 2016 and the Implementation Strategy can be readily amended.	N
172.	Stretch targets should be consistent with IRTP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Active Transport: 20% of all trips</li> </ul>	No amendment required; the targets have different timeframes (IRTP targets are 2030 and Implementation targets are 2016).	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public transport 14% of all trips</li> <li>Private Motor Vehicle 66% of all trips</li> </ul>		
173.	Consistent terminology needed across all UDAs (in terms of transport infrastructure).	The development scheme terminology is consistent with ICC documentation.	N
174.	The ULDA should revisit its definition of affordability to reflect the two stated elements of affordability, being the ability to afford the property and the ability to afford the living costs associated with owning the property, and use this definition in all future communications. A definition of housing affordability that captures both of these elements and connects these to ecological sustainability principles is an absolute essential for any future planned development.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The ULDA requires sustainability outcomes in relation to housing that impact on the ongoing affordability of dwellings but are not currently considered in the affordability definition.</p> <p>Housing affordability has been included in the development scheme by reducing living costs including optimising water and energy efficiency, supporting transit oriented development, promotion of pedestrian and cycling networks, and public transport.</p> <p>The implementation strategy includes clear targets on water use and energy consumption and active transport.</p> <p>Development will also be guided by the ULDA Residential 30 Guideline that provides a range of lot and dwelling types to allow for demographic changes in communities, neighbourhood design that provides for connections, local streets, parks, and local shopping.</p> <p>Further detail on these components will also be negotiated with the developer as part of the Development Agreement.</p>	N
175.	Modify the definition of low to moderate income households to be consistent with NRAS (National Rental Assistance Scheme).	<p>The draft housing strategy will be amended to utilise the NRAS income limits. Changes to the ULDA Housing Strategy necessitate corresponding changes to the development scheme for consistency.</p> <p>Recommended amendment:</p> <p>Section 5.2, Remove within paragraph 2 "as a range between \$41,000 p.a and \$94,000 p.a</p> <p>Section 5.2, paragraph 3, Remove text: In 2011, these income thresholds will require dwelling prices to be under \$540k for a household with an income of \$94k to afford to purchase and under \$260k for a household on \$45k to afford to rent.</p>	Y

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
176.	<p>BCE be represented in the Education Master Planning Process to ensure the optimum provision of education services in the UDAs.</p> <p>The land currently owned by BCE within these urban communities be considered within the education master planning process.</p> <p>The planning of 4 additional non-state primary schools in Ripley Valley to meet the demand from the expected incoming population</p> <p>A trigger point of 11,000 dwellings for one non-state primary school with minimum site requirements of 3.5ha for 650 students.</p> <p>Trigger points for secondary schools to be altered to 12,000 dwellings for one state secondary school and 17,000 dwellings for one non-state secondary school with minimum site requirements of 8ha for 900 students.</p> <p>Schools be co-located with regional public open spaces, sporting facilities and playing fields to reduce the need for open space on the school site.</p>	<p>As part of the Implementation strategy the ULDA will work with landowners, government agencies, Ipswich City Council and other organisations as required to identify a range of service delivery options to be delivered in a timely manner to meet the education needs of the community as determined by the Department of Education and Training.</p>	N
<b>DA Issues</b>			
177.	<p>It is not clear how Environmentally Relevant Activities (ERA) are dealt with. There is no provision for mobile or temporary ERAs as they are not currently captured. Department of Environment and Resource Management (DERM) recommends a Memorandum of Understanding with DERM to enable the assessment and appropriate conditioning of ERAs</p>	<p>Currently the ULDA Act does not define ERAs as Material Change of Use (MCU) as per the SPA. Therefore, if an ERA would not ordinarily constitute a material change of use of premises, carrying out operational work or building work, the scheme can not regulate them.</p> <p>An amendment to the definition of MCU for the purpose of administering the ULDA Act in relation to ERAs to be consistent with the definition under SPA, is currently being considered by the Department of Local Government and Planning.</p>	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes/N-no
178.	TMR would like to work with the ULDA during the DA stage to mitigate noise impacts through the application of measures such as noise barriers, landscape buffers or siting non-sensitive land uses near Regional Transport Corridors	Noted.	N
179.	ENERGEX would appreciate ULDA notifying ENERGEX of any development applications that would otherwise trigger referral to <a href="mailto:townplanning@energex.com.au">townplanning@energex.com.au</a>	Noted.	N

[Last page of report]