

Economic Development Queensland



Ripley Valley Priority Development Area Submissions Report

Effective June 2022



Queensland
Government

Copyright

This publication is protected by the Copyright Act 1968.

Licence



This work, except as identified below, is licensed by the Department of State Development under a Creative Commons Attribution-No Derivative Works (CC BY-ND) 4.0 Australia licence. To view a copy of this licence, visit: <http://creativecommons.org.au/>

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

© State of Queensland, Department of State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning, June 2022.

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



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

Disclaimer

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

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

Copies of this publication are available on our website at www.edq.qld.gov.au and further copies are available upon request to:

Economic Development Queensland

Department of State Development,
Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning

GPO Box 2202, Brisbane, Queensland 4001.
1 William Street Brisbane Qld 4001 (Australia)

Phone: 13 QGOV (13 7468)
Email: edq@dsdilgp.qld.gov.au
Web: www.edq.qld.gov.au

Contents

1	Introduction	4
2	Overview of public notification process	5
2.1	Community engagement	5
2.2	Submission registration and review process	5
3	Overview of submissions	7
3.1	Submission numbers	7
3.2	Submission method	7
3.3	Overarching areas of support or concern	7
4	Summary of submissions and amendments	8
4.1	General	8
4.2	State Community Facilities	13
4.3	Transport	21
4.4	Open Space	23
4.5	Local Community Facilities	27
4.6	Water and Sewer	27
4.7	Stormwater	31
4.8	Infrastructure Planning Background Report (IPBR)	31
4.9	Schedule Of Works (SOW)	48
4.10	Mapping	56
4.11	Development Charges and Offset Plan (DCOP)	75
4.12	DCOP Technical Reports - Appendix D	85

1 Introduction

The Ripley Valley Priority Development Area (PDA) was declared on 8 October 2010 under the Urban Land Development Act 2007 (since repealed and replaced with the Economic Development Act 2012).

The PDA comprises approximately 4,680 hectares of land and is located approximately five kilometres south-east of the Ipswich CBD and south of the Cunningham Highway.

The Ripley Valley PDA Development Scheme (development scheme) is applicable to all land within the boundaries of the PDA. The development scheme commenced on 8 October 2011.

The Development Charges and Offset Plan (DCOP) has been prepared to provide guidance on infrastructure matters by stating the development charges applicable to development within the PDA, identifying any trunk infrastructure within the water supply, sewerage, stormwater, transport, parks and community facilities networks made necessary by development of the PDA as well as matters relevant to calculating a credit, offset or refund for the provision of trunk infrastructure.

The Ripley Valley Priority Development Area (PDA) draft Development Charges and Offset Plan (DCOP) and Infrastructure Planning Background Report (IPBR) was publicly notified for 30 business days from Monday 7 March to 5:00pm on Friday 22 April 2022.

Following the completion of the public notification period:

- all submissions received were reviewed by the Minister for Economic Development Queensland (MEDQ), and
- the Ripley Valley PDA DCOP was changed where considered appropriate in response to submissions received.

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

2 Overview of public notification process

2.1 Community engagement

The public notification period for the proposed Ripley Valley PDA draft DCOP took place between Monday 7 March to 5:00pm on Friday 22 April 2022. During the public notification period the following community engagement initiatives were implemented:

- A dedicated Department of State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning (DSDILGP) 'Have Your Say' (HYS) webpage for the Ripley Valley PDA – draft DCOP.

The HYS page included:

- Downloadable copies of draft DCOP and the draft Infrastructure Planning Background Report (IPBR) which summarises the technical studies undertaken in the development of the DCOP
- FAQs for the Ripley Valley PDA draft DCOP.
- Information on the Ripley Valley PDA page on the DSDILGP website
- Public notice advertisement on the web page
- Email or Letter to key stakeholders
- The 'Have your say' webpage statistics include:
 - Page Views: 4,273
 - Visitors: 1,757
 - Downloaded at least a document: 647
 - Visited Multiple Project Pages: 529
 - Visited at least one Page: 1,630

Library downloads

Downloads
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 232 downloads of the draft Development Charges and Offset Plan (DCOP)• 73 downloads of the FAQs• 260 downloads of DCOP Mapping• 82 downloads of the draft Infrastructure Planning Background Report (IPBR)

2.2 Submission registration and review process

Submissions were received by email. Once submissions were received, they were registered and reviewed.

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

Table 1: Submission registration and review process

Steps	Action
Classification of submissions	Submissions were registered and classified by number and section relevant to the Development Charges and Offset Plan, Infrastructure Planning Background Report and supporting documentation.
Summarising submission issues	Each submission was read, and the different matters raised were entered into the submissions database under headings based on the sections of the Development Charges and Offset Plan, Infrastructure Planning Background Report and supporting documentation.

	<p>Each submission often covered several topics; therefore, allowance was made for the same or similar comments being raised in several submissions. This included receipt of multiple submissions with similar views on a topic or submissions having different views on the same topic. For this reason, comments across submissions on topics were identified and these comments were summarised under common headings based on the sections of the Development Charges and Offset Plan, Infrastructure Planning Background Report and supporting documentation in the submissions report.</p>
Evaluation and responses to issues	<p>Once all comments were summarised, they were assessed, and responses were prepared.</p> <p>Potential changes to the Development Charges and Offset Plan, Infrastructure Planning Background Report and supporting documentation were identified.</p> <p>In evaluating submissions, allowance was made for the same or similar comments being raised in different submissions. For this reason, assessment of comments and resulting Development Charges and Offset Plan, Infrastructure Planning Background Report and supporting documentation changes were made based on the sections of the Development Charges and Offset Plan, Infrastructure Planning Background Report and supporting documentation rather than on a submission-by-submission basis.</p>
Submission report	<p>The submissions report was prepared, providing a summary of the submissions considered, information about the merits of the submissions, recommendations for changes to the Development Charges and Offset Plan, Infrastructure Planning Background Report and supporting documentation to reflect submissions.</p> <p>Comments raised through submissions have been summarised to simplify the presentation and review comments.</p>
MEDQ approval	<p>The final submissions report and Development Charges and Offset Plan, Infrastructure Planning Background Report and supporting documentation were submitted to the MEDQ for review and approval.</p>
Publishing and notification of Development Charges and Offset Plan	<p>After the MEDQ's delegate approved the submissions report and endorsed the DCOP, the DCOP was published on the Departmental webpage.</p>

3 Overview of submissions

3.1 Submission numbers

A total of 1072 submissions and 2 petitions (5259 and 8 signatures respectively) were received by EDQ at the completion of the public notification period. One petition remained active following the public notification period and received 5,480 signatures as at 30 May 2022.

3.2 Submission method

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

Table 2: Breakdown of submissions by submission method

Method of submission	Number of submissions received
Post	N/A
Email	1072
Petition (signatures)	5488 (@ 30 May 2022)
Total submissions	1072 + 2 petitions

3.3 Overarching areas of support or concern

- General
- Additional State community facilities
- Increase in network costs
- Use of a discounted cashflow methodology
- Location of an additional state community facility on “Scott’s Farm”
- Demographic analysis and Ultimate dwelling yield
- COVID impact
- Open space planning
- Infrastructure Planning Background Report
- Commitment and timeliness of state government investment (road and rail infrastructure)
- Conditioning of state road infrastructure to be provided by developers
- Adjoining use precincts – Swanbank (future energy hub)
- Waiving of development application fees for change applications to meet DCOP requirements
- Update development scheme
- Update EDQ guidelines and practice notes
- Water and sewerage network
- Schedules of works
- Transport
- Desired standard of service
- Cost of works
- Minor Or Editorial Changes

4 Summary of submissions and amendments

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
4.1 General			
State Infrastructure Investment	1.	<p>a) Major concerns with the current lack of commitment and significant investment (mainly TMR) in relation to State Infrastructure provision and services</p> <p>b) Significant delay in State Infrastructure delivery impacts on local road network and PDA rollout</p> <p>c) EDQ to continue lobbying for State Infrastructure spend for the PDA</p> <p>d) Recommended EDQ receive formal support or endorsement for assumed State transport network upgrades before DCOP is finalised</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>a) to d) Not in scope of DCOP and forms part of a broader whole of government directive</p>
Road Infrastructure Conditioning	2.	Request the DCOP be amended to clarify that TMR assets are not funded through the IFF and are to be funded by TMR through normal budgetary processes and that developments should not be held responsible for delivering or constrained, conditioned to deliver TMR infrastructure	<p>No change</p> <p>Not in scope of DCOP and forms part of a broader whole of government directive</p>
Financial Analysis	3.	A high-level check of income versus revenue balance has been completed. Recognised that not all the detail information was available to complete the analysis accurately. Analysis suggests that there may be a planned collection of municipal charges in excess of the value of the municipal infrastructure. Request EDQ review the analysis and confirm if the analysis is correct or not. EDQ is requested to provide an opportunity to review how the charges are calculated and if the analysis is correct amend the charges as needed. It is requested the calculation be included in the IPBR for reference and to confirm that the cost of delivering the infrastructure equals the charges collected.	<p>No change</p> <p>The desktop analysis conducted by the submitter did not consider all aspects associated with the charging and funding of infrastructure. The financial model for the DCOP establishes a net zero correlation between charges and infrastructure delivery.</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
Energy	4.	<p>a) Swanbank provides opportunity to develop a future energy and hydrogen precinct and continues to play a critical role in supporting the energy transformation and the development of the next generation of energy jobs in Qld</p> <p>b) Request to consider current and future industrial operations and their proximity to Ripley Valley in EDQ's considerations of developing the region including locations of future community infrastructure</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) Current industrial operations at Swanbank have a buffer surrounding the uses under the Ipswich City Council Planning Scheme. Future uses in the PDA and Swanbank area to have regard to adjoining uses at the time of establishment. DoE plans for new state schools within the existing PDA framework including the constraints mapping. The department intends to continue planning on the assumption that the future urban development areas, identified as suitable for urban development within Ripley Valley PDA, will remain suitable for sensitive uses including new state schools, community uses and residential development. Should any use be approved which has offsite impacts over the Ripley Valley PDA area shown as a future school site, the department will require further information be provided by EDQ to ensure that future state school infrastructure is able to be safely located within the PDA.</p>
Waiving of Development Application Fees and Acquisition Process	5.	<p>a) As a result of additional state community facilities, it is requested that fees are waived for any change application required for an existing approval impacted by this additional state infrastructure land acquisition</p> <p>b) Recommends EDQ provides clarity on the acquisition process including timing certainty for the acquisition process and any impacts for the costs of delivering development stages affected by the proposed infrastructure</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>a) Not in scope of the DCOP</p> <p>b) Negotiation or Acquisition of land for state community facilities is driven by development growth and indicative time horizons have been provided in the DCOP or when the facilities are to be required.</p>
Development Scheme	6.	<p>a) DCOP SOW and Mapping differs from Development scheme</p> <p>b) Following adoption of DCOP, request an amendment to the Development Scheme occur</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>Development Scheme to be considered for a review</p>
Establish a Guideline	7.	The DCOP introduces new provisions for state	No change

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
State Community Land Acquisition		community facilities. These provisions are untested and subject to broad interpretation by the industry. State Agency's proposed to undertake a joint exercise with EDQ to establish a guideline for state community land acquisition within the PDA.	Further discussions to be held between EDQ and State Agencies in relation to the need for a guideline
Guideline 11 - Community Facilities	8.	Request EDQ initiate the amendment process to PDA Guideline 11 - Community Facilities	No change Not in scope of the DCOP. It is envisaged several guidelines are to be reviewed following finalisation of the DCOP
Demographics Impacts of COVID	9.	<p><u>Impacts of Covid</u></p> <p>a) Demographics analysis completed in Feb 2020 and does not recognise any impacts that have resulted from the Covid Pandemic such as changes in dwelling yield forecasts, population growth rates and employment forecasts</p> <p>b) Last 12-18 months has seen significant shift in the property market and the way people live as a result of covid</p> <p>c) Impacts of Covid are a fundamental issue which should be addressed before DCOP is finalised</p> <p><u>Ultimate Dwelling Yield / Forecast</u></p> <p>a) Suggest for the purposes of calculating dwelling forecasts and population, the document should reflect approved dwelling titles</p> <p>b) Sekisui likely to provide 6,285 dwellings and not 12,102 dwellings as contained in demographic analysis</p> <p>c) Concerns "other" expected to accommodate 13,860 dwellings which is an over estimation based on site constraints (i.e., South Ripley estimated at 2,600 dwellings and SUCW estimated at 3,200 dwellings)</p> <p>d) Density targets for earlier applications have not been</p>	<p>No change</p> <p><u>Impacts of Covid</u></p> <p>a) to c) Demographics analysis is a long-term view taken at a point in time. The dwelling yield analysis considered a top-down bottom up approach and engaged with the Developer cohort to determine a realistic and aspirational dwelling yield for the first 10 years to 2031. The identified dwelling forecasts appear to generally correlate to the actual dwelling provision over the course of the last two years. Whilst the demographic analysis was undertaken prior to Covid, analysis and comparison since indicates similarities between the estimated growth and the impacts of Covid on growth rates. When compiling and using the base works unit rates, the rates have been taken from a median set of 2021 market rates. Any increases in infrastructure costs will be reviewed during the 5 yearly updates.</p> <p><u>Ultimate Dwelling Yield</u></p> <p>a) to g) - A spatial 'bottom-up' analysis was undertaken to test the SGS ultimate dwelling projections, which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constraints analysis • Consideration of existing approved lots/dwellings • Assessment of remaining dwelling potential

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>achieved</p> <p>e) Ultimate Dwelling Yield / Forecast does not appear to take into account additional State Community Facilities, Open Space, Non-Government schools</p> <p>f) Indicative mapping estimates Ripley Valley PDA will only achieve 34,500 dwellings</p> <p>g) Methodology used to forecast the ultimate dwelling yield is flawed and should be addressed before DCOP finalised</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of development land for infrastructure and other purposes <p>While the feedback is valid, the additional assessment found that the targets are achievable, albeit with some challenges to be monitored and managed into the future. Noting that development to date has not achieved assumed densities, key outcomes of the assessment found:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased dwelling densities would be required in the town centre • Growth should be monitored to inform future revisions/updates of the dwelling projections <p>It is noted that this is a 40-year plan, which may involve redevelopment opportunities on key sites around the town centre in the later years</p>
Population, Dwelling Split, Base Date Population, Population, Employment	10.	<p><u>Population</u></p> <p>a) Estimated reduction in ultimate yield noted though appears low noting most of the additional sites will likely be in centre locations</p> <p>b) Unclear whether reduction has been applied in the cost apportionment calculations</p> <p><u>Dwelling Split</u></p> <p>a) Report does not provide split in the type of dwelling (attached and detached). Table 3.1.2.2 Residential dwelling mix cannot be used as clear substitute for the type / form of development</p> <p>b) Unclear how 48,750 dwellings will be achieved or when development will shift towards delivery of missing middle</p> <p>c) impact on infrastructure planning / delivery and overall financial modelling</p>	<p>No change</p> <p><u>Population</u></p> <p>a) and b) - Estimated reduction has considered the provision of additional state community facilities. The reduction has been applied to the CAUs</p> <p><u>Dwelling Split</u></p> <p>a) to c) - Attached and detached dwellings have not been separately calculated. Dwellings refer to houses and units. 5 yearly updates to DCOP are programmed</p> <p><u>Base date Population</u></p> <p>a) and b) - Noted. No change to demographics analysis.</p> <p><u>Employment</u></p> <p>a) and b) - Noted. Ripley Valley employment generating activities are located adjacent to the PDA. Point b) has been</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p><u>Base Date Population</u></p> <p>a) Base date population data appears significantly higher than ABS 2020 ERP for the entire SA2</p> <p>b) Annual growth of over 4,500 persons per annum for first 10 years is extremely high (i.e., ERP from 2018 to 2020 did not exceed 2000 persons per annum)</p> <p><u>Employment</u></p> <p>a) Large variance in employment numbers between Ripley Valley, Greater Flagstone and Yarrabilba</p> <p>b) Demographics report does not provide adequate reasons for low level of employment in Ripley Valley, such as likely increased travel beyond the PDA for employment and services and is this captured in the network planning</p>	<p>captured in network planning</p>
Discounted Cash Flow (DCF), Cashflow, Infrastructure Timing, WACC	11.	<p>a) Developers do not support a DCF in the current format as the use of a WACC for capital expenditure provided by the developers is inappropriate and an incorrect use of a DCF</p> <p>b) DCF should only apply to EDQ's actual exposure, where EDQ is funding the infrastructure</p> <p>c) Where infrastructure is funded by the developers, no DCF should be applied</p> <p>d) Cashflow for the PDA is too biased towards the early stages of the project with no expenditure in the last ten years</p> <p>e) The proposed infrastructure delivery and anticipated debt level is too aggressive and needs to be reviewed to a more realistic and commercial level</p> <p>f) It is requested that an independent audit be carried out on the financial model and the results provided annually to the developers in the form of a peer review</p>	<p>The DCF method allows for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • risk to be assessed and quantified thus allowing for equitable sharing of the gains and losses in the process. • comparison of various capital investment options to determine an optimal or preferred delivery strategy. • consistency with state and Federal project investment frameworks (e.g., QLD PAF) widely used by Treasury's across Australia and overseas as the preferred method to assess projects within business case reporting. • support from Treasury as the appropriate means of price setting for a range of revenue raising environments (water, electricity and many other socialised commodities amongst users over time). <p>The debt level identified in the modelling reflects the projected growth modelling which was informed by developer cohort input.</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		g) Developers request further opportunity to explore DCF matter with EDQ before finalisation to understand assumptions behind the DCF	The DCOP is proposed to be reviewed every five years which will include a review of the financial modelling
WACC	12.	<p>a) Do not support the application of a WACC as the risk factors are sufficiently accounted for by other cost escalations factored into the base infrastructure costing (i.e., escalation of land and works costs and inflation of levied charges) and the additional contingency that is added to the already escalated infrastructure costs</p> <p>b) Little to no risk of necessary community infrastructure failing to be provided by developers as the infrastructure must be delivered prior to development commencing, which means the risk to delivery is self-limiting and obviates any measure to mitigate that risk.</p> <p>c) Adopting a WACC charge on developer funded PDAs should be removed as retention of this charge would in effect, amount to developers paying the Qld government an interest payment on infrastructure they are delivering without any government funding</p>	<p>a) to c) The use of the WACC is consistent with government policy. EDQ considered and reviewed the operation of the WACC on the DCOPs. The inclusion of a WACC is necessary to produce comparative net present values for expenditures and revenues in long run modelling, this allows for the appropriate setting of pricing or charges.</p> <p>It is not intended to remove the WACC from the financial modelling</p> <p>The debt level identified in the modelling reflects the projected growth modelling which was informed by developer cohort input.</p> <p>The DCOP is proposed to be reviewed every five years which will include a review of the financial modelling</p>
4.2 State Community Facilities			
DCOP	13.	<p>a) There will be no requirement for local police stations (P002 and P003) within the Ripley Valley PDA.</p> <p>b) PO01 land transfer anticipated 2022/2023 and not 2031/2041. Construction to be completed in 2024</p>	<p>a) Non requirement of PO02 and PO03 noted and to be removed from Mapping and SOW</p> <p>b) Note advice that construction to be completed in 2024</p>
DCOP	14.	Full support for Draft DCOP in particular the rationalisation of the number of proposed schools and proximity planning of schools to transport.	<p>No change</p> <p>Submission support noted</p>
DCOP	15.	<p>a) Primary School - PS008 - express concern to proposed location of primary school subject to State Agency Acquisition</p> <p>b) subject site topography has 6.6% grade and</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>b) Majority of school sites in Ripley Valley do not meet the</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>steepness considered inappropriate for a primary school.</p> <p>c) multiple school sites in close proximity and PS008 not considered necessary to meet future demand of the subject catchment.</p> <p>d) Proposed location in close proximity to a proposed independent primary school and considered unnecessary to meet future demand.</p> <p>e) Proposed location conflicts with already approved Context Plan.</p> <p>f) Proposed location conflicts with the future proposed realignment of Bryant's Road in existing ICOP mapping.</p> <p>g) Proposed location is not supported and should be relocated to a more suitable site with the necessary anticipated future demand.</p>	<p>site selection criteria in the lands raw state and require earthworks to achieve suitable pads and benching.</p> <p>a), c) and g) School locations have been determined in the PDA by Dept of Education based on the number of dwellings per catchment.</p> <p>d) State education facilities and independent school facilities cater for different catchments and make up the whole education demands for the PDA. Additional schools are to be part funded by the DCOP Infrastructure Charges and Commercial Acquisition by State Agency</p> <p>e) The Context Plan provides an indicative infrastructure network for developers. The school site when required is to be commercially acquired.</p> <p>f) Proposed location is whole of site location and is to be adjacent the future realigned Bryant's Road.</p>
DCOP	16.	<p>a) Object to locations of State Community Facilities HCC003 and AMB003</p> <p>b) Impractical to have community facilities sitting by themselves and not located in precincts</p> <p>c) HCC003 located adjacent POS003 which should have high density residential surrounding</p> <p>d) HCC003 and AMB003 should be co-located with FR001 or other suitable community facilities.</p> <p>e) Question need for 3 ambulance stations to service Ripley Valley</p> <p>f) Consider higher residential densities surrounding recreational areas (i.e., POS003)</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>a) AMB003 - QAS has purchased land for district ambulance station</p> <p>b) HCC003 - Department of Health confirmed the need for the facility. Co-location with the existing Fire and Rescue facility is not suitable due to area requirements (refer to point g))</p> <p>c) Comments noted. Development Scheme identifies low density housing opportunities on allotment. Limited opportunity for dwelling yield under Scheme</p> <p>d) Comment noted. AMB003 land purchased by QAS. Department of Health reviewed the comments relating to HCC003 and confirm the requirement for the additional location HCC003 (Lot 348 S3173) adjacent to Ripley Road. While sometimes useful, not all health facilities need to be collocated with other community services so having a lot</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
			<p>without the colocation provides different opportunities as development progresses. There is no benefit to colocation with district fire and rescue and the smaller site is not appropriate.</p> <p>e) QAS have identified that Ripley Valley requires servicing by two local stations and one district station</p> <p>f) Higher densities are generally located in close proximity to transport nodes and urban centres (i.e., Ripley Town Centre, Secondary Urban Centre East and West)</p>
DCOP	17.	<p>a) SS006 has been moved to sit across the boundary and local access road and is in a different site to the ICOP</p> <p>b) Question the need for the number of primary and secondary schools within the PDA</p> <p>c) Grades associated with proposed school sites and location of SS006 over the boundary of two allotments may make the facilities difficult to deliver.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>a) SS006 - State Secondary School has been positioned generally in accordance with the approved Context Plan and the repositioned local access road lies to the south (see below)</p> <p>b) The provision of primary and secondary schools is in accordance with the Dept of Education requirements for servicing (i.e., 1 PS per 3,000 dwellings and 1 SS per 8,000 dwellings), requiring a total of 16 state primary schools and 7 state secondary schools</p> <p>c) State community facilities to be provided generally in the location as identified by the Context Plan</p>
DCOP	18.	<p>a) Form and number of proposed primary school sites is unclear</p> <p>b) Impact of state community facilities on transport and road infrastructure</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>a) the dots on the mapping for the state community facilities are indicative whole of site locations and are subject to further planning by the State agencies. The dots are not representative of scale</p> <p>b) State community facilities have been generally positioned considering the state agency requirements/inputs and the nominated catchment. High level due diligence has been</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
			undertaken to ensure that the sites will be adequately serviced by road and transport infrastructure
DCOP	19.	<p>a) Opposed to the proposed changes to community facilities Primary School (PS002) and Secondary School (SS002)</p> <p>b) Proposed changes to PS002 and SS002 have no regard to existing land use approvals (34/2015/MAPDA/B (31 July 2019) or previous infrastructure planning under the ICOP June 2020</p> <p>c) EDQ confirm verbal advice to Ipswich City Council that the draft Final DCOP should be viewed as 'government policy'</p> <p>d) It is worth noting also that Education Queensland advised that:</p> <p>The investigations were actioned by the department upon request of Economic Development Queensland (EDQ) for the purposes of their Development Charges and Offset Plan (DCOP) project". The above advice along with the subsequent district recreation (POS002) area imposition leave Goldfields questioning EDQ's motivation and role in manipulating the development outcomes in the PDA.</p> <p>e) Education Queensland disclosed that the 2020 FSG report was the second commissioned geotechnical study, and at Goldfields request, provided the 2018 Douglas Partners report that concluded of establishing schools within the Community Use (Education) Zone that: "Few difficulties are expected from a geotechnical perspective for the proposed development as a school although due consideration will have to be given to excavation conditions and subgrade preparation in proposed filling areas.</p> <p>f) The addition of new schools included in the DCOP,</p>	<p>a) The submission refers to the Context Plan approval issued by the delegate of MEDQ (ICC). Developer maintains a MCU development permit for the location of the schools as per the ICOP. PS002 and SS002 to be relocated to the ICOP school positions in the north east of the site. DoE and Developer may continue to hold discussions regarding finalised extent and location of the two schools. It is not the Department of Education understanding that the approval 'rezones' but rather provides a high-level structure plan which guides future development over the site (subject to conditions and other influences). MCU Development Permit 34/2015/MAPDA/B contains a context plan and establishes the uses over the site. MEDQ cannot require an applicant to amend an existing approval. Department of Education may seek alternative locations for schools as part of a commercial negotiation with a landowner. School locations to be as per MCU approval and consistent with ICOP mapping.</p> <p>b) The location of the indicative school site was included in the decision notice for the Context Plan subject to conditions. DoE notes that the conditions of the approval included a requirement that the proposed school infrastructure could be suitably located in the indicative location shown in the Context Plan. DoE remains committed to working with the developer to determine the suitability of the proposed school site. DoE encourages the developer to make contact to progress this matter further.</p> <p>c) Once the draft DCOP was exhibited ICC may have regard to future infrastructure networks in considering applications lodged during and after public notification before DCOP commences.</p> <p>d) DoE does not support the re-instatement of the dots as requested by the developer. The current location of the dots</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>over and above those already in the ICOP has increased the concentration of proposed State schools within the area of the PDA north of the Centenary Highway. Based on the land requirement of seven hectares for each State primary school, proposed schools would virtually about each other, creating several undersized catchments.</p>	<p>aligns with the department's current understanding of the undermining risks and site suitability over the development site. MCU Development Permit 34/2015/MAPDA/B contains a context plan and establishes the uses over the site. MEDQ cannot require an applicant to amend an existing approval. Department of Education may seek alternative locations for schools as part of a commercial negotiation with a landowner.</p> <p>e) The location of the school will need to demonstrate compliance with the PDA Development Scheme, PDA Guideline 11, DoE's New School Site Selection Guideline, and the conditions of the Context Plan approval. Any development application resulting in the creation of land for the future state primary school and state secondary school will need to demonstrate that a cost-effective, well-located, and fit for purpose site can be delivered to DoE as per the above policies. DoE considers that the developer has not met conditions 14 and 36 at this time and will continue to advocate that these conditions are complied with as the application /development progresses.</p> <p>f) DoE supports the relocation of the dots to the new location as depicted in the draft DCOP mapping. This is on the basis that the location of the current indicative school site (depicted in the Context Plan) is not currently demonstrated to be fit for purpose to deliver a cost-effective and well-located site capable of enabling the DoE to deliver the required state primary school and state secondary school.</p> <p>g) DoE remains open to further discussions with the developer to better understand the suitability of the proposed school site.</p> <p>h) The DCOP review provided a basis to undertake necessary further investigations to better understand the suitability of the indicative school sites shown on the Context Plan over the Hayfield development site. In particular, the department engaged with a licenced geotechnical engineer</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
			<p>to inform of the undermining risks associated with the indicative school site featured in the context plan. This was a necessary step understand whether the proposed school site would be capable of complying with the context plan approval conditions and the department's New School Site Selection Guidelines.</p> <p>i) The geotechnical investigations undertaken over the proposed school site establish that there is a high level of subsidence risk over the area associated with historical undermining activities.</p> <p>j) To inform the location the Ripley Valley DCOP schools, EDQ engaged with a licensed Traffic Engineering Consultancy (Jacobs) to inform dwelling catchments based on the future road network which aligned to the department's DSS (e.g., clusters of dwellings totalling 3,000 and 8,000 lots). To inform the indicative location of the schools, DoE consulted with the development industry and EDQ and undertook high level due diligence and site investigations to assess and evaluate development constraints (e.g., land use rights, existing approvals, overlay constraints etc). As reflected in draft Ripley Valley DCOP, specific location for DCOP schools is still subject to detailed due diligence and assessment and negotiation with the department."</p>
DCOP	20.	<p>a) Object to the potential location of SS003 over the allotment</p> <p>b) Small allotment impacted by drainage</p> <p>c) Request SS003 is located on larger property in vicinity</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>a) This location was selected as the area to the north, south and east of the state primary school shown as PS006 (identified in the original ICOP) will contain more than 6,000 dwellings on full development. SS003 will complement the proposed primary schools in the locality.</p> <p>b) School locations have indicatively been determined in the PDA by Dept of Education based on the number of dwellings per catchment.</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
			<p>c) The Department of Education understands that the 'dot' on the draft DCOP mapping, which identifies location of the state secondary school, represents a requirement which applies to that lot generally (i.e., 'Whole of Site') rather than a fixed, specific location.</p> <p>d) DoE supports further engagement with the landowners and EDQ to identify the most suitable location to provide a fit-for-purpose and well-located state secondary school.</p> <p>e) To meet the strategic intent of the Urban Core Zone of the PDA, the department has communicated to EDQ and Sekesui that it would be committed to exploring innovative design options to deliver a semi-vertical state secondary school in this location with the potential to have a reduced site area from the conventional 12 ha land requirement for a state secondary school.</p> <p>f) Design and delivery of this school would be led by a master-planning process undertaken by the department and the developer to determine suitability. DoE has undertaken further due diligence over the proposed location for the Sekisui town centre high school (SS003) and has noted significant constraints over the proposed location including in relation to flooding and drainage corridors, road access, koala habitat and noise and vibration from the nearby rail corridor. Due to these concerns, the department does not support that the DCOP reflect a reduced secondary school site land allocation currently. The department will work with the developer and undertake further planning for the area to confirm a workable land size for this school. The DCOP is to reflect a reduced area of 6 hectares as offsetable to encourage the Department of Education to undertake future planning for a semi vertical outcome adjacent the Ripley Town Centre.</p>
DCOP	21.	a) Object to the size and location of SS003 as the proposed school removes potentially 12ha of employment generating land or potential high-density	No change

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>housing from the Urban Core</p> <p>b) additional school significantly impact overall yield of the PDA</p> <p>c) at a minimum, a significant reduction in the school site area requirement is requested and for a better urban, employment and housing outcome the school should be relocated out of the Urban Core</p> <p>d) Location of P001 to be relocated to correct position on the mapping</p>	<p>a) This location was selected as the area to the north, south and east of the state primary school shown as PS006 (identified in the original ICOP) will contain more than 6,000 dwellings on full development. SS003 will complement the proposed primary schools in the locality.</p> <p>b) School locations have been determined in the PDA by Dept of Education based on the number of dwellings per catchment.</p> <p>c) The Department of Education understands that the 'dot' on the draft DCOP mapping, which identifies location of the state secondary school, represents a requirement which applies to that lot generally (i.e., 'Whole of Site') rather than a fixed, specific location.</p> <p>d) DoE supports further engagement with the landowners and EDQ to identify the most suitable location to provide a fit-for-purpose and well-located state secondary school. DoE has undertaken further due diligence over the proposed location for the Sekisui town centre high school (SS003) and has noted significant constraints over the proposed location including in relation to flooding and drainage corridors, road access, koala habitat and noise and vibration from the nearby rail corridor. Due to these concerns, the department does not support that the DCOP reflect a reduced secondary school site land allocation currently. The department will work with the developer and undertake further planning for the area to confirm a workable land size for this school. The DCOP is to reflect a reduced area of 6 hectares as offsetable to encourage the Department of Education to undertake future planning for a semi vertical outcome adjacent the Ripley Town Centre.</p> <p>e) Amended location of P001 noted to be relocated to approved location on the State Community Facilities Mapping.</p>
DCOP	22.	a) DCOP inconsistent with approved Context Plan -	No change

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
State Community Facility - PS001		<p>23/11/2021</p> <p>b) Request DCOP is updated to include alternate location of PS001 school site on Crown Reserve as PS001A and PS001 be renamed as PS001B</p>	<p>Location of PS001 is contained on land parcels originally identified to accommodate a secondary school. The alternate location may or may not materialise depending on the investigations and ultimately approval from DNRM to create a separate freehold allotment to accommodate a school. Should the creation of an allotment for a school occur at some point in the future, the DCOP mapping could be altered. Not appropriate to amend the DCOP mapping at this time until certain that a school could be located on the crown reserve</p>
4.3 Transport			
DCOP	23.	<p>a) RO28 be extended to include a corresponding SRIP component for road extension and structures for grade separated flyover of the Centenary Highway and intersection connecting with ICC LGIP transport corridor project 149 (Juillerat Drive)</p> <p>b) RO45 and RB005 - hydraulic analysis/investigation to be included to understand impacts</p> <p>c) Hydraulic investigation to include site grading and elevation levels for the creation of the district and regional sports fields</p> <p>d) RB005 structure estimated at 500m extending from western bank across floodplain to eastern bank comprising two 19m wide bridge deck structures with indicative cost of \$20.7M. Preliminary engineering cost exceeds DCOP estimates. Request EDQ to review costs of RO45 and RB005.</p> <p>e) RO45 and RB005 should be considered as part of TMR planning for Swanbank Rail Station and Park 'n' Ride facility design and construction</p> <p>f) Generally, supports for DCOP which reflects elements</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>a) Overbridge and connecting road were not included in the SRIP as it is considered the works are the responsibility of TMR when providing access to the park 'n' ride facility.</p> <p>b) RO45 and RB005 - hydraulic analysis would form part of the engineering investigations at the time of works scheduled and is not required at network planning.</p> <p>c) Hydraulic investigation would form part of the design of the recreation and sporting fields development at the time of delivery. Note AVID have an Infrastructure Agreement with ICC for the delivery of the facilities. Costs would normally form part of the project owner obligations.</p> <p>d) RB005 @ 100m long by 15m in cross section is deemed sufficient. EDQ has not received a detailed submission to substantiate anything more, noting also that the suggested culvert/bridge extending across the flood plain is external to the PDA and predominantly services rail and industrial areas</p> <p>e) To be raised with TMR. Not part of DCOP scope</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		contained in landowner landholdings.	f) Noted. No further response required
DCOP	24.	<p>a) Fischer Road/Swanbank Road intersection RI004A&4B - DCOP allowance insufficient to deliver intersection in accordance with conditions. An estimated additional \$1.03M is required (with 30% contingency) for additional items</p> <p>b) Maguire Street - EDQ to complete modelling to determine whether traffic numbers are less than 7,500vpd</p> <p>c) Grampian Drive - confirmation of lane numbers (2 or 4 lane)</p> <p>d) Ripley Road south of Centenary to Providence Parade to be reinstated as 4L+B</p> <p>e) McHale - Emerald Ridge - request 4-way intersection at school</p> <p>f) Add junction if Cumner Road south added as trunk road</p> <p>g) Shared Paths - add crossing at Ripley Road - signalised intersection to facilitate shared path crossing at Ripley Road and Southeast Arterial</p> <p>h) RC005 - Grampian Drive - Culvert for one stage only (2 lanes) and road is two stages (4 lanes). EDQ requested to amend SOW</p> <p>i) RC007 - Binnies Road - Culvert excluded from DCOP mapping. EDQ requested to amend existing infrastructure mapping</p>	<p>a) It is noted that this intersection is more complex than is typically the case so EDQ will apply a Complexity Factor of 1.3 to the SOW whilst maintaining 20% contingency</p> <p>b) EDQ sought advice from Jacobs who have confirmed that the Montereia Road/Maguire St T-intersection whilst just over 7,500vpd only does so give the southern connection is modelled further south than actual given recent approval. Consequently, more direct East West movements will lessen the flow through the above intersection. Currently intersection included as trunk but not Maguire St. No change proposed to DCOP</p> <p>c) Grampian Drive to be 4 lanes. Initial construction to be ultimate earthworks and interim pavement</p> <p>d) Ripley Road to be reinstated</p> <p>e) Amend RI053 to four-way staged intersection.</p> <p>f) The section of Cumner Road south of Barrams Road is currently designated as a Neighbourhood connector road in the road hierarchy (as indicated in the above image). The daily volumes south of Barrams Road fall below the 7,500vpd threshold whilst the function of this section of Cumner Road is to provide more for adjacent development traffic rather than through traffic.</p> <p>g) Provision included within intersection design to cater for pedestrian and cycleway crossing. No change proposed to DCOP</p> <p>h) The intent is to construct ultimate culvert and earthworks for interim pavement. No change proposed to DCOP</p> <p>i) RC007 constructed as part of catalyst works and to be included in existing infrastructure mapping.</p>
DCOP	25.	a) Request McGuire Street be included in the SOW as trunk as Jacobs Model has the road carrying more than	a) EDQ sought advice from Jacobs who have confirmed that the Montereia Road/Maguire St T-intersection whilst just over

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		7,500vpd b) Request 4-way intersection at school site in Emerald Ridge estate, south of Centenary Hwy.	7,500vpd only does so give the southern connection is modelled further south than actual given recent approval. Consequently, more direct East West movements will lessen the flow through the above intersection No change proposed to DCOP b) Amend RI053 to four-way staged intersection to service the future primary and secondary schools.
DCOP	26.	Ripley Road south of Centenary to Providence Parade to be reinstated as 4L+B - RO22B is a 4 lane + bus ultimate grade separated configuration. Request interim 4 lane (without bus) at grade upgrade. Include on mapping	Ripley Road to be reinstated - original mapping error in draft document
DCOP Culverts	27.	a) Additional culvert required on road R020 adjacent proposed on ramp to Centenary Hwy, west of Ripley Road b) RC034 requires further work to accommodate ultimate Ripley Road and should not be marked as completed	a) This additional culvert may have merit based on nature surface levels however the road design could alter. b) RC034 catered for in SOW and Mapping. Existing culvert and future culvert symbols overlaid on the mapping. No change
DCOP Intersections and Culverts	28.	a) RI048 currently documented in DCOP as a priority-controlled intersection however provisional offset approval issued in July 2020 approved the intersection as signalised. Request DCOP be amended to reflect provisional approval. b) RC023A & RC023B currently located in incorrect location and should be moved south to the sag as the eastern end of the straight along bayliss road.	a) Consider inclusion of signalised intersection in the DCOP mapping b) Intersection to be relocated further south on the mapping
4.4 Open Space			
DCOP	29.	a) District Sports Park POS049 - express concern to proposed relocation b) Multiple Park sites in close proximity and not needed to meet future demand	a) POS049 relocated from Crown Reserve resultant of development constraints. Facility to be moved to locality identified in the Sekisui House Context Plan. Ipswich City Council noted location adjacent to Ripley Road to be a superior site and identified in the 2013 Sekisui House Context Plan. Facility provides proximity planning to State Community Facility PS006 and SS003

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
			<p>b) District Sports Park to service future population in area</p> <p>c) Other recreation parks in vicinity and Regional Sports Facility to the southwest</p>
DCOP	30.	Local linear Park POS350 should be amended to follow both tributaries of the state mapped watercourse	<p>No change</p> <p>Local Linear Parks are planned to provide community access adjacent to some watercourses. It is not proposed to provide offsetable local linear parks to all designated watercourses. Developers may carry out works adjacent to watercourses not identified on the network mapping at own cost.</p>
DCOP	31.	Support for DCOP mapping as drafted	<p>No change</p> <p>Support provided for the DCOP mapping as is with no suggested changes.</p>
DCOP	32.	<p>a) Location of district recreation park POS012 is inappropriate due to the topography and natural features of the land</p> <p>b) POS012 now disconnected from Regional Sports park</p> <p>c) Request POS012 be relocated to another area of the PDA</p> <p>d) POS012 has been moved onto Lot 242 within the DCOP though not included in the approved context plan</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>a) and d) POS012 indicatively located on allotment in vicinity as identified in Context Plan (see below) which is identified as local park and drainage area. POS012 proposed to include in part the area on Lot 242 and the area adjacent to Bundamba Creek leading south towards the proposed Regional Sports facility.</p> <p>b) Regional Sports Park moved slightly south to council owned land and away from a substantial gully/erosion area which was not suitable for the facility. Connectivity still occurs through the major linear park network and off-road shared path.</p> <p>c) Note the Context Plan approved in 2020 did not consider the existing POS012 District Recreation Park in the ICOP. EDQ considers District Recreation Park should still occur in</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
			the vicinity and consider planning/investigate utilising the local park/drainage areas in the context plan as a linkage to the Regional Sports Ground
DCOP	33.	<p><u>Open Space DSS</u></p> <p>a) Support approach to DSS on qualitative rather than quantitative measures</p> <p>b) In general, the principles and direction of the proposed new DCOP DSS are sound though requiring a greater level of due diligence and analysis to assist developers meet requirements</p> <p>c) Appears limited due diligence or desktop analysis undertaken when assessing site capacity or suitability to achieve DSS or consider adjacent or competing infrastructure needs</p> <p>d) DCOP sites conflict with or are not reflected in existing approvals</p> <p>e) DCOP park quantities, location and areas conflict with DSS</p>	<p>a) Comment noted. No further response to be provided</p> <p>b) Noted. The DCOP is a strategic network planning document and lodgement of relevant applications will inform the fine grain analysis of the sites</p> <p>c) Comment noted. No further response to be provided</p> <p>d) Existing development approvals have been considered in the identification of network planning. It is noted that context plans, IMPs and OSSs should be updated on a regular basis as infrastructure planning is refined</p> <p>e) The DCOP is a strategic network planning document and outcomes may vary from DSS guidelines</p>
DCOP Parks and OS outside PDA Boundary	34.	<p>a) What processes are in place to secure POS066 and POS059</p> <p>b) Who is responsible for planning, design and due diligence</p> <p>c) EDQ should engage with land owners to the east of the Urban Core to include in PDA and reallocate unfeasible park land values towards acquiring land to the east of the urban core</p> <p>d) Re-evaluate spatial capacity of existing and future parks</p> <p>e) Reconfirm and quantify the area and costs of deficient open space</p> <p>f) Commence a detailed due diligence, planning and</p>	<p>a) and b) Infrastructure Agreement between ICC and Investa (AVID) identified the timing, delivery, design for both open space areas</p> <p>c) and g) Extending the PDA boundary to the northeast is beyond the scope of the DCOP. A review of the Development Scheme may consider this issue</p> <p>d) The DCOP is a strategic network planning document and spatial capacity analysis to occur at detailed application stage</p> <p>e) The DCOP is a strategic network planning document</p> <p>f) and g) The DCOP is a strategic network planning document. Not in scope of the DCOP</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>design process to establish capacity, potential and regional parkland opportunities</p> <p>g) Provide a regional parkland to accommodate equivalent to POS062, POS059, POS068, POS066, POS194, POS052, POS192, POS064, POS067 (total of 95HA), second pedestrian crossing, Ripley to Swanbank Road link and Off Road Bikeway (OFP03 and PB01)</p>	
DCOP	35.	<p><u>Open Space</u></p> <p>a) Conduct a spatial analysis of existing and future sites to calculate realistic land area</p> <p>b) Conduct spatial analysis of accessibility and walkability requirements of each type</p> <p>c) Conduct spatial analysis of modelled flood</p> <p>d) Overlay competing network needs</p> <p>e) Undertake priority forward planning and network planning and establish a funding model and infrastructure sequencing</p>	<p>a) to d) - location of higher order open space areas have taken into consideration existing parks and facilities in the ICOP and additional or relocated sites considered utilising land areas, walkability and accessibility parameters. Many of the locations have previously been located because of the Ripley Valley Structure Plan and preceding ICOP network planning. The topography of the PDA does not easily facilitate large flat areas for higher order open space facilities and the use of areas adjacent to Bundamba Creek and Deebling Creek are appropriate. detailed design of open space areas is to occur during applications stage as the DCOP is a strategic network planning document.</p> <p>e) The Schedule of Works and IPBR contain the forward planning and funding model of all networks.</p>
DCOP	36.	Impact of overland flow or linear park on property - POS350	<p>No change</p> <p>Linear Park to provide access adjacent to drainage areas. Location of linear park to be refined at the time of lodging an application over the land and adjoining lots. General location of POS350 to be reviewed.</p>
DCOP	37.	<p>a) Oppose the location of a district recreation park (POS002) on the allotment as an additional impost on the development</p> <p>b) Area where the proposed POS002 to be located is designated for the primary and secondary schools</p>	<p>a) POS002 proposed to service the northeast area of the PDA. Original consideration to replace the extent of linear park (POS030) in ICOP as a District Recreation Park b) POS002/POS003 catchments overlap, and the area can be adequately serviced from POS003.</p>
DCOP Open Space	38.	a) Is POS067 intended?	No change

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>b) Local Neighbourhood parks - No feedback provided on 1ha parks. Embellishment rate is too low for 1ha parks and should be amended in SOW</p> <p>c) District Recreation Parks - EDQ to provided clarification on increase in park sized)</p>	<p>a) Regional Sports Facility required in this location</p> <p>b) 0.5ha neighbourhood park to be honoured as part of existing RAL approvals. New neighbourhood parks to be 1ha in area. Embellishment rate reflects the intent of the larger park area</p> <p>c) District Recreation Park size increase reflective of EDQ Guideline</p>
4.5 Local Community Facilities			
DCOP and IPBR	39.	Request location of local community facilities 0.4ha be identified as per current council request on the mapping and in the SOW.	Sekisui House Context Plan approved in 2013 identified 5 local community facilities to be provided at 0.4ha each. ICOP mapping has not identified local community facilities in the vicinity. Following discussions with council and Sekisui House it is considered appropriate to include two of the five local community facilities (one adjacent the district sport facility and the other south of CHE) in the general locations as indicated in the approved context plan and IMP. EDQ considers it appropriate to slightly amend the location of the local community facility on the southern side of Centenary Highway to the requested location.
4.6 Water and Sewer			
DCOP	40.	<p>a) Draft DCOP provides improved confidence in the planning and therefore greater certainty to the development industry</p> <p>b) Continue to work with EDQ to refine the sub-regional infrastructure planning to support ongoing refinement following public notification and commencement</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>a) Comment noted</p> <p>b) EDQ to continue collaborating with ICC and UU to clarify the shared funding arrangements for the delivery of future upgrades to sub regional wastewater infrastructure outside the PDA</p>
DCOP	41.	<p><u>Sewer</u></p> <p>a) AT&L - EDQ to consider interim system as offsetable on Coleman Road as option defers CAPEX expenditure for Bundamba Creek sewer. Business Plan agreed in</p>	<p>a) The proposed interim solution does not catalyse enough of the surrounding development to be offsetable unless part of staged works. EDQ will consider business case.</p> <p>b) SOW to be updated to reflect the network change for</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>principle with UU</p> <p>b) Scott PDI - SOW to be updated to reflect endorsed provisional offset</p> <p>c) Sekisui House - SGM049 planned at 300mm. EDQ modelling has sewer at 225mm. EDQ requested to wait confirmation by Sekisui engineers on pipe diameter.</p> <p>d) McHale - Missing link through Ripley Village. EDQ requested to update mapping and SOW</p> <p>e) Stockland Botanica - EDQ to include micro tunnelling cost rate in SOW</p>	<p>sewer and water which has been subsequently included in a provisional offset</p> <p>c) Comment noted. No change proposed to the DCOP as developer to verify. Only assets approved prior to 30 June 2020 included</p> <p>d) Sewer linkage currently identified as 225mm existing sewer to be upgraded to 300mm sewer. Mapping and SOW to be updated</p> <p>e) As per Table 6.3.3.4 of the IPBR an adjustment factor of 5 for micro tunnelling has been employed where evident. The reliance on micro tunnelling for this scenario pending with the developers and heritage owners.</p>
DCOP	42.	<p><u>Water</u></p> <p>a) Water Masterplan - Requested EDQ review with UU. Lack of information is creating uncertainty for developers. Uncertainty on how whole of network functions - use of PRV (high zone - low zone), use of existing permanent PS, connections across conservation land, topography, connections between reservoirs - east and west, interim network connections (i.e., AT&L). High and Low Level Zones to be shown clearly on the Water Supply plan to enable clear servicing strategies for each area (Supported by RV077 as well)</p> <p>b) Eastern Reservoir - Request EDQ confirm proportional cost split between PDA and non PDA development and update SOW</p> <p>c) PRVs - EDQ requested to include note in DCOP/IPBR - See Table 7.1 in IPBR</p> <p>d) West bulk Water Supply - Requested to include allowance to lower existing 450mm main south of centenary Hwy to western reservoirs</p> <p>e) West bulk supply to pump station - UU advised</p>	<p>a) Network methodology and analysis included within Chapter 3 of the IPBR Appendix D. Consideration will be given as to how the high level and low level zones can be delineated on the maps</p> <p>b) All cost for the 100% allocation of the Water Reservoirs is included within the SOW, including the cost of the Northern and Eastern Sub-Regional Water Supply Reservoirs</p> <p>c) Refer Section 3 for methodology and Table 3.6 in Appendix D of the IPBR for the modelled PRV's and projected timing</p> <p>d) Any vertical realignment of the 450mm main will be included within the design and construction of the 600mm main given their common horizontal alignment</p> <p>e) EDQ continues to liaise with UU who will approve in accordance with unless deemed unnecessary in the presence of a more efficient solution</p> <p>f) EDQ to re-confirm with UU the presence of existing mains and update mapping as necessary</p> <p>g) To date the Developers IMP has not been receipted. When approved it will be included within the next update of</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>Stockland a 450mm main required at 3,000 lots. May not be required now as eastern reservoirs are proposed. EDQ to confirm UU requirements</p> <p>f) Providence - DCOP mapping does not reflect endorsed trunk works. EDQ requested to update mapping and SOW (Supported by RV077 as well)</p> <p>g) Botanica - Stockland to finalise master planning and request SOW be amended. Request the possible inclusion of booster pump as offsetable</p>	the DCOP
DCOP	43.	<p><u>Sewer</u></p> <p>a) EDQ to consider interim system as offsetable on Coleman Road as option defers CAPEX expenditure for Bundamba Creek sewer. Business Plan agreed in principle with UU. Stockland support the temp sewer solution being creditable if consideration to the location servicing lots 241 and 242 were included.</p> <p><u>Water</u></p> <p>a) Unclear how Lots 241 and 242 will be serviced by trunk water, along with the timing and delivery of SRW02 by 2026. Clarification requested as to connection with the existing HL zone within adjacent Providence development. (Supported by RV077 as well)</p>	<p>a) The proposed interim solution does not catalyse enough of the surrounding development to be offsetable unless part of staged works. EDQ will consider business case.</p> <p>b) Improved clarity will come from delineating between high and low-level zones</p>
DCOP	44.	<p><u>Water</u></p> <p>a) West Bulk Water Supply - Requested to include allowance to lower existing 450mm main south of Centenary Hwy to western reservoirs, adjacent WM094, WM093</p> <p><u>Sewer</u></p> <p>b) Request inclusion of trunk main through existing Ripley Township. This is an existing main that will require upgrading to accommodate upstream flows</p>	<p>a) Any vertical realignment of the 450mm main will be included within the design and construction of the 600mm main given their common horizontal alignment</p> <p>b) Sewer linkage currently identified as 225mm existing sewer to be upgraded to 300mm sewer. Mapping and SOW to be updated.</p>
DCOP	45.	<p><u>Sewer</u></p> <p>a) Scott PDI - SOW to be updated to reflect endorsed</p>	a) SOW to be updated to include provisional offset where network improvement has been identified

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		provisional offset and costings <u>Water</u> b) Existing water main adjacent WM058 to be relocated to ultimate location (previous construction funded by catalyst infrastructure)	b) Ultimate water main location to be included in DCOP mapping and SOW
DCOP	46.	<u>Water</u> a) DCOP network planning is not consistent with development layout and preliminary sizing of sewer pipes in Ripley Town centre b) Request offsets are based on actual pipe sizes constructed and not modelled water network in DCOP <u>Sewer</u> c) ICOP previously had SGM049 and SGM046 to service the southern part of development. The DCOP proposes to service the site via main GM051 which appears problematic and costly as the main is required to be tunnel bored under the Centenary Hwy. Request Cop be amended to revert sewer solution to previous ICOP planning d) GM038 not required in accordance with network planning for Ripley Town Centre e) Current sewer network should include 315PE located between SGM046 and SGM049 (currently in ICOP for ease of reference). Request main be included in DCOP mapping and costs schedule f) Current water network should include 355PE west of Ripley Road. Request main be included in DCOP mapping and costs schedule	a) Presence of existing mains or approvals to be confirmed and update mapping as necessary b) Offsets to be updated within the SOW. Developers initially to plan in accordance with Model and variations to considered on a case-by-case basis following detail site analysis c) GM051 to be removed from SOW and Mapping. Extend GM045 south to CHE and turn west along CHE d) SOW and Mapping to be updated to remove GM038 e) and f) Review of the water and sewer networks have provided the opportunity to plan for a more efficient network.
DCOP	47.	<u>Sewer</u> a) Request EDQ consider an interim solution to sewer in the South Ripley area which seeks to defer significant capital expenditure up to 2034 as offsetable	a) The proposed interim solution does not catalyse enough of the surrounding development to be offsetable unless part of staged works. EDQ will consider business case. b) EDQ to consider extending GM062 further east to service

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>infrastructure</p> <p>b) Construct rising sewer main (DN315mm) and pump station between GM054 and GM062 along Coleman Road. ICOP had sewer main previously identified as SGM023</p> <p><u>Water</u></p> <p>c) WM141 located in steep undulating topography and located in lands identified as environmentally protected under current state mapping. Alternatives marked up as below</p>	<p>the AT&L site. Modelling has 225mm main extending from GM062. Further modelling to be conducted by Developer at time of RAL and reviewed during the assessment of the application</p> <p>c) Agreed, amend connection of WM106 and WM141 to Pump Station and reduce WM141 length to suit</p>
DCOP	48.	<p><u>Sewer</u></p> <p>Object to location of GM022 on northern boundary of Lot 178 - Fischer Road</p>	Delete GM022 on the basis the current lot is serviced by SRS02
4.7 Stormwater			
DCOP Stormwater	49.	Various comments provided to Figure 1 - Ripley Valley PDA Proposed regional Stormwater Management Infrastructure regarding R01, R02, R05, R06, R07, R08, R09, R11	A regional stormwater analysis was conducted as part of the background information and technical reporting for the DCOP. Regional stormwater outcomes are not included as offsetable infrastructure under the DCOP
4.8 Infrastructure Planning Background Report (IPBR)			
Section 1.3 Purpose	50.	<p>a) Recommend section 1.3 reference section 4 of the Ripley Valley UDA (PDA) Development Scheme</p> <p>b) Recommend review and updating of development Scheme Infrastructure Plan to reflect proposed changes to infrastructure plan material in the draft DCOP</p> <p>c) Recommend describing IPBR as supporting material to both the Development Scheme Infrastructure Plan and DCOP</p> <p>d) the DCOP being subordinate policy guidance supporting the Development Scheme</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>a) Reference to Development Scheme to be reviewed</p> <p>b) Noted. Not in scope of the DCOP</p> <p>c) Reference as supporting material to be reviewed</p> <p>d) Reference as subordinate policy guidance to be reviewed</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
Section 2.4 - Development Constraints	51.	<p>a) Not convinced that the exercise undertaken to inform the Development Scheme has been robust enough to guarantee the necessary infrastructure delivery</p> <p>b) Numerous parks located in flood prone areas along riparian corridors of Deebing Creek and Bundamba Creek below Q20 level and plenty of parks overlap with the 'adopted flood regulation line'. Advice requested as to the level of current flood analysis that has been relied upon to inform the site selection and feasibility of the park network</p> <p>c) Request a GIS-based spatial analysis be undertaken mapping provided to council to determine a reasonable achievable park network considering surrounding constraints and land uses</p> <p>d) EDQ to clarify what constitutes a current 'development approval'. If development approval does not include a context Plan, IMP or OSS, it is requested that this is made clear so as to avoid future arguments with developers about inconsistencies between DCOp mapping and approved Context Plans, IMP's and OSS's. Specific guidance required regarding what affect the DCOp has on existing Context Plans, IMP's, OSS's and whether these need to be updated to reflect the updated DCOp infrastructure maps</p>	<p>a) Not in scope of the DCOP</p> <p>b) EDQ generally utilised the 20yr ARI flood levels. Extent of impact on sport and recreation parks appears exaggerated. Review of site locations conducted following receipt of comments. Changes made where required.</p> <p>c) to be determined following commencement of DCOP</p> <p>d) Infrastructure planning for the PDA remains dynamic and will change over time. The expectation is that applicants should update context plans, IMPs and OSSs on a regular basis to be consistent with the projected infrastructure planning and outcomes for the entire PDA.</p>
Section 2.5 - Growth Rates	52.	<p>a) Demographics analysis completed in Feb 2020 and does not recognise any impacts that have resulted from the Covid Pandemic such as changes in dwelling yield forecasts, population growth rates and employment forecasts</p> <p>b) Last 12-18 months has seen significant shift in the property market and the way people live as a result of covid</p> <p>c) Impacts of Covid are a fundamental issue which</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>a) to c) Demographics analysis is a long-term view taken at a point in time. The dwelling yield analysis considered a top-down bottom-up approach and engaged with the Developer cohort to determine a realistic and aspirational dwelling yield for the first 10 years to 2031. The identified dwelling forecasts appear to generally correlate to the actual dwelling provision over the course of the last two years.</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		should be addressed before DCOP is finalised	
Section 2.6 - Growth Projections Summary	53.	<p>a) Greater confidence needed on the likely growth rate in the PDA</p> <p>b) Recommend appropriate processes and funding sources be established to facilitate provision of lead infrastructure proportionate to growth. Funding is fundamental to supporting and unlocking development fronts, reducing infrastructure impost on developers and council, facilitating growth rates, infrastructure sequencing and prioritisation</p> <p>c) Note 41ha removed from residential yield to account for additional state community facilities though DSS indicates 54-57ha as minimum land requirements. Is there expectation that some facilities will have a smaller footprint and this should be clearly identified</p> <p>d) Clarification on how it was established the reduction in ultimate residential yield of 1,250 dwellings was calculated</p> <p>e) Noting additional State facilities required after demographic analysis completed, request clarification of exactly how the capacity reduction will not impact upon the growth rates that were identified in the demographic analysis</p> <p>f) Clarification whether private/independent schools has been considered in any reduction of developable residential land</p>	<p>a) Growth rates established via a demographic analysis which considered expected growth in conjunction with realistic and aspirations projections from the developer cohort</p> <p>b) Comment noted. No further response required</p> <p>c) - e) The spatial 'bottom-up' analysis that was undertaken to test the SGS ultimate dwelling projections, found that the dwelling targets were achievable, and included removal of land for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open space • Local, and state community facilities (as identified at the time of assessment) • Urban centre requirements <p>The requirement to consider the additional state community facility land was identified after this assessment had been undertaken, which is why this was specifically identified as a separate reduction in section 2.6 of the IPBR.</p> <p>f) The only item raised by the submitter that was not removed was non-government schools, and while these may be located in residential zone areas, they will still place demand on the network, and be subject to development charges, which will reduce any potential impact in such a scenario. This is potentially an item that can be reviewed and considered as part of future updates to the DCOP but will require more detailed analysis of the likely quantity, size and location of non-state facilities that may ultimately develop in the area.</p> <p><u>Calculation of Reduction</u> The 1,250 dwelling reduction is based on a 59ha reduction across several zones with varying dwelling densities (the 'blended' <u>gross</u> density of the reduced area is 21.3 dwellings per hectare. Gross density accounts for land dedication</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
			<p>requirements for roads and local parks, which results in a lower overall 'per hectare' rate).</p> <p>The assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified the location of each of the additional facilities (these were generally located within the 'Urban Core – Living' and 'Urban Living' areas, and then • Removed dwellings based on the applicable <u>gross</u> dwelling density (i.e., including consideration of road and local park requirements). <p><u>Why doesn't this impact the growth rate?</u></p> <p>The growth rate was set within the SGS demographics analysis, and has nothing to do with the number of, or the location of, schools. That additional schools are now located in areas previously identified for residential development is not expected to impact the timing or rate of growth but will impact the location of growth and ultimate capacity.</p> <p><u>Were private schools considered in the reduction?</u></p> <p>No indication of what the extent of these uses is likely to be, has been provided. It is noted that future private schools are likely to be located on residential land, these still place demand on the infrastructure networks, and any loss in revenue from residential dwellings will be offset to some extent by revenue from development charges applicable to the school. This is potentially an item that can be reviewed and considered as part of future updates to the DCOP but will require more detailed analysis of the likely quantity, size and location of non-state facilities that may ultimately develop in the area.</p>
Sect 2.6 - Reduction of Ultimate Dwelling Yield for Additional Infrastructure Assets	54.	It is requested that an updated catchment map is provided which spatially reflects the updated growth projections for the Ripley Valley PDA, noting that the reduced projections are being applied to the 2066 ultimate development.	<p>No change</p> <p>The demographic analysis provides a spatial representation of the growth across the time horizons and is intended to be updated every 5 years.</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>Request EDQ to provide a revised ultimate development projection that includes both municipal and state land reductions. Currently the IPBR only factors in the additional State community facilities. Or EDQ to confirm otherwise.</p> <p>Aligning to DoE's DSS may see infrastructure requirements within the Ripley Valley PDA decrease.</p>	<p>The revised ultimate development projection does not impact on the delivery of municipal or state land.</p>
Development Sequencing Plan and PIA - Inclusion in IPBR and/or DCOP	55.	<p>a) Recommend EDQ review the Development Sequencing Plan Figure 15-14 in the Development Scheme taking into account all relevant approvals issues over last 10 years</p> <p>b) Recommend include Development Sequencing Plan in IPBR and not Development Scheme</p> <p>c) EDQ to consider including a "Priority Infrastructure Area" similar to LGIP under the Planning Act which could identify 10-15 years of serviced land to prioritise investment, aligned with the sequencing plan</p> <p>d) Data in the IPBR can be utilised to prepare an updated Sequencing Plan and PIA. Include a series of maps illustrating time horizons, PIA 2021-2036 and indicative development sequencing strategy</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>a) Not in scope of the DCOP</p> <p>b) To be considered in 5 yearly updates</p> <p>c) It is not proposed to establish a priority infrastructure area or similar in the DCOP</p> <p>d) Noted</p>
Section 3.1.2 - CAU Methodology	56.	<p>a) Note no cost allocation for community uses on assumption that all community uses do not pay, which is not correct as only State uses are exempt</p> <p>b) Private community uses (i.e., private schools) would pay charges</p> <p>c) Suggest there needs to be an allocation to non-State community uses</p>	<p>a) No CAU's have been assumed for the Community Use category.</p> <p>Although there will be some instances where community uses will be subject to a charge (e.g., private schools), we have no indication of what the extent of these uses will be. As a conservative approach (as far as expected revenue is concerned), it has been assumed that the majority of community uses will have no charge, and that any revenue from chargeable community uses is likely to be negligible.</p> <p>Given that the Ultimate projected GFA for Community use is</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
			only 63,200m ² , it is also a fair assumption that any future private schools will be located on land currently designated for other purposes (centre, residential areas, etc.), and in these cases our assumptions account for some level of revenue being recovered for development of the land.
Section 4.4 - Transport	57.	<p>a) Table 19 - DSS Road Requirements</p> <p>i) Traffic volume for a 2 lane (undivided) urban arterial road should be 7,500-20,000 vpd rather than 19,000-23,500vpd in the draft DCOP as this will be confusing and likely create difficulty in application</p> <p>ii) Traffic volume range for a 4 lane (median divided) urban arterial road should be 20,000-40,000vpd</p> <p>b) Intersection DSS - Support Desired Standard of service (DSS) Degree of Saturation (DoS) thresholds for the three intersection types, recommended that Priority Controlled Intersection should also consider Level of Service (LOS) performance standards in terms of worst movements delays, with a DSS threshold of LOS D for worst movements delays</p>	<p>a) The Urban Arterial thresholds are well researched and approximate the ranges used by Jacobs and Aurecon to model the PDA. The thresholds for urban arterial 2 lane (undivided) road have been modified to reflect a sequential reading of the table commencing at 7,500vpd.</p> <p>b) Noted. This is how the modelling was undertaken however the words are absent from the report so will include.</p>
Section 4.6 - Parks and Open Space	58.	<p>a) Table 4.6.1 - Recommend higher level parks have a set population quantity and not a range (i.e., not 1/10,000-15,000 persons)</p> <p>b) Request clarification as to why provision rate and actual planned quantities do not align (i.e., Guideline provision rate at 1/1,000-1,500 persons, DCOP 1/2,000 persons approx.)</p> <p>c) Clarify notation regarding civic parks in district centres and how this aims to achieve prescribed provision rates</p> <p>d) Clarify which population benchmark is used for the indicative sequencing of open space</p> <p>e) Desktop analysis found the DCOP required park numbers slightly mismatches with the benchmarking i.e., additional sport and recreation land on top of DCOP</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>a) Set population quantity for park hierarchy to be reviewed though may form part of review for Guideline 12</p> <p>b) Park provision has been considered in relation to accessibility provisions and the population density in the catchment</p> <p>c) No change to notation proposed</p> <p>d) Refer to Section 5.6 of IPBR</p> <p>e) Noted</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		published numbers	
Section 4.7 - Community Facilities	59.	<p>a) Table 4.7.1 - Relevant department should be encouraged to maximise GFA via multistorey development with a smaller land take to assist with creating the compact urban form expected within key centres</p> <p>b) Table 4.7.2 - Draft DCOP references ICC LGIP DSS. The ICC LGIP DSS is currently under review and is likely to change in the near future. An update to the DCOP once the new LGIP is available would be welcomed</p> <p>c) Urban Living Zone centres hierarchy as noted in ED Guideline no 11 is not relevant for this PDA</p> <p>d) Request Guideline 11 be updated to consider co-location with open space to provide guidance for developers</p> <p>e) Request specific accessibility/location criteria for community facilities be included in Table 4.7.1</p>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) Update to provisions to occur at the 5 yearly update of the DCOP</p> <p>c) Noted</p> <p>d) Noted. Not in scope of the DCOP</p> <p>e) Section 5.7 of IPBR to be reviewed</p>
Section 4.7 - Community Facilities	60.	<p>DoE notes "Table 4.7.1 DSS for State provided facilities" underpin the assumptions for infrastructure requirements for the DCOP framework. DoE understands that this table aligns with EDQ PDA Guideline 11 – Community Facilities (2015). DoE supports this approach to determine infrastructure requirements in the DCOP. DoE will consider alternative land size requirements on a case-by-case basis and will continue to master-plan new schools with larger peak enrolment sizes.</p> <p>DoE requests the following actions in relation to the DSS:</p> <p>a) DoE requests removal of Footnote 4 which state "Department of Education advice" and replaced with the following statement: "As per the DoE New School Site Selection Guideline, or as otherwise specified in the latest version of this guideline. It is requested that this footnote relates to both state primary and state</p>	<p>a) Footnote 4 to be replaced with "As per the Dept of Education New School Site Selection Guideline, or as otherwise specified in the latest version of this guideline"</p> <p>b) School enrolment sizes to be amended to current DoE School design objectives</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>secondary schools.</p> <p>b) DoE requests removal of GFA requirements, school sizing requirements and land sizing requirements and replaced with the clause “as per DoE site selection guidelines”</p> <p><u>DoE School Sizing Requirements</u></p> <p>DoE notes the school sizing requirements set by EDQ PDA Guideline 11 – Community Facilities (2015). This includes providing state primary schools with an enrolment size of 625 students and a state secondary school with an enrolment size of 1,500 students.</p> <p>Current design objectives for DoE allow the following master-planning requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - State primary schools are master-planned to allow for a peak enrolment of 1,100 students and a stable enrolment size of 700-900 students. - State secondary schools are master-planned with a peak enrolment size of 1,800 student and a stable enrolment size of 1,500-1,800 students. 	
Section 5.4.1 - Cross Sections	61.	<p>a) Median width - Recommend median width is reduced to 5.0m with additional width included between face of kerb and in verge cycle track to increase the offset from street lighting and landscaping to vehicles and cycle track users</p> <p>b) Interim 2 lane / Ultimate 4 lane arterial & trunk connectors - there are concerns with the proposed reduction in the clearance between the face of kerb and in verge cycle track to 1.5m and the resulting limited offset from street lighting and landscaping to vehicles and cycle track users. The operation of the 3.0m cycle track ultimately as a wide one-way cycle track is also of concern, as it is likely that cyclists will continue to use the wider 3.0m cycle track as a bi-directional facility in the</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>a) The referenced cross sections include a median width of 5-6m which is inclusive of the suggested 5m median width as well as flexibly offering tolerance up to 6m if required for transitioning when inclusive of a median turning lane and/or with super-elevated curvature.</p> <p>b) For the same reasoning as above, EDQ will consider option 1 only for consistency of cycle track width.</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>ultimate 4 lane arrangement, particular given the differing cycle track width in each verge. Council have prepared two possible alternate typical cross sections to address these issues. Whilst the alternate cross section has been marked up on the DCOP arterial road cross section, they equally apply to trunk connector roads.</p> <p>i) Option 1 - Reduced median width from 6.0m to 5.0m. Increased clearance between face of kerb and cycle track to 2.25m. Construction of 1.5m pedestrian pathway and 3.0m bi-direction cycle track with initial / interim 2 lane construction. Construction of 3.0m shared pathway in other verge as part of ultimate / 4 lane construction, with retention of the initial 3.0m bi-directional cycle track (refer image below). It is noted that this option is similar to the outcome proposed as part of the Barrams Road construction by Stockland.</p> <p>ii) Option 2 - Reduced median width from 6.0m to 5.0m. Increased clearance between face of kerb and cycle track to 2.0m. Construction of 1.5m pedestrian pathway and 2.5m bi-direction cycle track with initial / interim 2 lane construction. Construction of 1.5m pedestrian pathway and 2.5m one-way cycle track in other verge as part of ultimate / 4 lane construction, with conversion of the initial 2.5m bi-directional cycle track to a 2.5m one-way cycle track</p>	
Section 5.4.1 - Cross Sections	62.	Figures 5.10 and 5.11 are currently illegible	Figures to be reimaged for clarity
Section 5.4.2 - Intersections	63.	Table 2 - Trunk Intersection requirements and staging - It is unclear from this table what additional works are included within each stage of the upgrade	<p>No change</p> <p>This table was only ever meant to be a high-level summary for context. Greater detail is available in the SOW.</p>
Section 5.5.1 - Active Transport	64.	Not clear where staging approach is expected to occur and whether full allowed in SOW. Clarify whether staged approach to cycleway construction is for Ripley Road only and included in the SOW.	<p>No change</p> <p>Where the Active Transport is within the road cross section, its staging aligns with the road staging which is included within the SOW e.g., Ripley Road Section. Alternatively, the</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
			off-road paths are singularly staged as included within the SOW.
Section 5.5.1 - Stage Cycle Infrastructure Cross Sections	65.	<p>a) Refer to comments to Section 5.4.1. It is suggested that the option to reallocate a portion of the interim 3.0m bi-directional cycle track to pedestrian use under the ultimate 4 lane scenario is unlikely to be practical given the separator kerb that sits between the pedestrian pathway and cycle track and the different construction materials (i.e., asphalt cycle track and concrete pedestrian pathway).</p> <p>b) Error with Figure 5-1 (bottom of page 27). Assumed should be Figure 5-13</p> <p>c) Recommend further analysis of potential active transport deficiencies in the existing network to identify if further investment can be undertaken to meet the DSS for the whole PDA.</p>	<p>a) Noted. Outcome has been successfully trialled across several sites including Aura</p> <p>b) Noted. Amendment to be provided</p> <p>c) The intent is to progressively update the model as observations are used to better inform the modelling over time.</p>
Section 5.6 - Parks and Open Space	66.	<p>a) Linear Park widths - Proposed widths of linear parks rehab and revegetation are inconsistent with Council's Waterway Health strategy</p> <p>b) Linear park widths - Proposed widths of linear parks areas do not align with the current Council LGIP minimum widths</p> <p>i) Local Linear - DCOP (up to 20m - 10m either side of waterway/corridor), LGIP - minimum 15m width each side</p> <p>ii) Major Linear - DCOP (up to 30m - 15m either side of waterway/corridor), LGIP - minimum 30m width each side</p>	No change proposed to linear park width in IPBR
Section 5.7 - Community Facilities - Local	67.	Request the timeframes and locations of local community facilities be reviewed to reflect what is achievable, particularly to be delivered by 2026 and 2031	Location of local community facilities to be reviewed cognisant of comments provided in submission. The timing of delivery of local community facilities to be addressed prior to the next review.

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
Section 6.3.2 Unit Rate Benchmarking	68.	Request to advise when unit rate benchmarking assessment occurred and whether feedback had regard to the current shift in the property market and significant increase in infrastructure costs	No change The consolidation and calculation of land valuations and construction rates occurred between June to October 2021. Rates received had a currency of up to 24mths prior. Rate increases experienced as of May 2022 will for most instances be absorbed by the nominated contingencies, however EDQ will monitor via tenders and provisional offsets received.
Section 6.3.4 - Transport and Pathways	69.	Unit rates - Consider developer provided unit rates are generally lower than State or Local government rates and therefore significant risk that the costs estimates could underestimate the actual construction cost for standalone infrastructure projects	No change Significant effort was invested in calculating the median of rates provided by State, Local and Broader Development Industry. Contingencies were discussed and agreed.
Table 6.3.4.1 - Road Rates Table	70.	Rates for the various 4Lu/4LBu works appears to be full road cost rather than upgrade costs only. Note SOW model rates appear correct b) Review table and update as required	Road Rates table for 4lu/4LBu to be reviewed
Section 6.3.5 - Parks and Open Space and Local Community Facilities	71.	a) Landowners agreed to remove the offsets for revegetation works on basis of EDQ providing a revegetation specification / standard for these works - EDQ to provide revegetation standard for corridor parks in DCOP or IPBR b) There is no scheduling of civil servicing and earthworks - recommend including schedule of allowances for civil servicing and 2m cut/fill for all parks c) 1m cut/fill for local community facilities inadequate - recommend clause amended to allow for bulk earthworks of 2m cut/fill d) Combined 12 month maintenance and establishment period be amended to reflect approval conditions and to read "A minimum of 12 months maintenance and 12 weeks establishment period or as per development	a) This seems to be a crossover comment from the Greater Flagstone DCOP b) Cut/fill allowances to be reviewed and order of magnitude determined c) An increase in cut/fill allowances for local community facilities is not supported d) Establishment and Maintenance period to remain as a combined 12 months which offsetable. No change to the IPBR is proposed e) Length of road has been allowed for in cost build-up based upon general lot configuration. No change to the IPBR is proposed

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>conditions, is included for all parks and open space"</p> <p>e) Odd that the length of offsetable road should be set by the site area rather than the actual length of road frontage provided. Amend or clarify that the length of offsetable road (half) is equal to the actual road length provided as per DA approval</p>	
Section 6.3.5 - Parks and Open Space and Local Community Facilities	72.	<p>a) Have environmental base costs be considered for proposed park locations (i.e., POS194, POS195, POS057) - location may require significant environmental assessment such as EPBC. Have these costs been included in the cost build-up</p> <p>b) Spelling error - point 9 on page 38. telephony to be amended to telephone Appendix C Various comments/questions regarding Appendix C - Open Space embellishments table</p> <p>i) What embellishment and land area assessments were utilised. Is there an embellishment cost breakdown?</p> <p>ii) Clause 6.3.5 - Does rehabilitation costs for linear and riparian include 18 months costs</p> <p>iii) Shade structures should be part of Neighbourhood Recreation Parks (shade provision for the young)</p> <p>iv) Rubbish bins should be included in Town Centre Plazas</p> <p>v) Toilets to be included in the Town centre plaza (or provided by commercial in close proximity to plaza)</p> <p>vi) Turf seeding not supported for sports parks - requires turf</p> <p>vii) Linear parks should include fencing (trail bike/fauna)</p> <p>viii) Service connections should be provided for Town Centre Plazas</p>	<p>a) Environmental assessment costs generally not included in cost build ups.</p> <p>b) Noted</p> <p>b)i) Embellishment costs build up utilised to establish costs for each open space facility</p> <p>ii) Establishment and Maintenance of open space including linear and riparian areas is 12 months in total</p> <p>iii) Note shelter included in the embellishments. Review of embellishments to be considered</p> <p>iv) Review of embellishments to be considered - rubbish bins</p> <p>v) Review of embellishments to be considered - toilet installation or reliant upon commercial in vicinity</p> <p>vi) Review of embellishments to be considered - turf vs turf seeding</p> <p>vii) Review of embellishments to be considered</p> <p>viii) Review of embellishments to be considered - service connections</p> <p>ix) Review of embellishments to be considered - Wi-Fi connectivity</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		ix) Wi-Fi required for public provision (part of innovation)	
Section 6.3.6 - State Government Facilities	73.	Length of offsetable road for a secondary school appears inadequate. Request offsetable neighbourhood access road be reviewed	No change Length of road has been allowed for in cost build-up based upon general lot configuration. No change to the IPBR is proposed
Section 6.4.1 Determination of Establishment Costs	74.	The following phrasing includes more information than is required and may invite attempts to exploit the intent: “For State community facilities identified as ‘additional’ within the DCOP mapping and Schedule of Works (i.e. those facilities in excess of the facilities identified in the Ripley Valley Infrastructure Charging Offset Plan, June 2020, or where relocated to a different landholding)” DoE requests that alternative wording be used to describe which sites will be acquired through a commercial agreement. The following wording is suggested: “For State community facilities identified as ‘additional’ within the DCOP mapping and Schedule of Works”.	Several additional schools have been identified in the mapping and SOW. In addition, there are several schools that have been relocated to different landholdings that previously identified. This does not refer to schools that are relocated within existing landholdings. The proposed change is not supported. Consider a definition of landholding be included in the IPBR to clarify intent
Section 6.4.1 - Allowances for Land Variation Costs	75.	Minor amendment requested to dot point four in 6.4.1 (as bolded): “For State community facilities identified as ‘additional’ within the DCOP mapping and Schedule of Works (i.e., those facilities in excess of the facilities identified in the Ripley Valley Infrastructure Charging Offset Plan, June 2020, or where relocated to a different landholding) - The relevant State agency may enter into a commercial agreement with the land-owner to acquire the ‘additional’ land (including relocated sites as identified above) - For an additional school site, the land is provided in accordance with the Department of Education’s New School Site Selection Guideline or as otherwise agreed between the Department of Education, EDQ and the	Grammatical changes 'State agency may enter into a commercial agreement' to be considered for inclusion in clause. Additional sub clause noted. Not proposed to include as not related to Section. The additional footnote restates convention in the PDA where MEDQ has sole responsibility for the infrastructure planning of the PDA. Not proposed to include the footnote in the section.

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>Applicant;</p> <p>- Where the agreement results in a land value exceeding the DCOP value, the relevant State agency is responsible for funding through normal budgetary processes, providing any difference in value to the land-owner through the agreement.”</p> <p>DoE also requests inclusion of a footnote relating to the word “may” first dot point stating, “The Department of Education, through Economic Development Queensland, has sole discretion to determine network requirements relating to need, timing, land size and other matters relating to an identified future state school, as per the provisions detailed in PDA Guideline 11 – Community Facilities (2015) and New School Site Selection Guidelines (2021) (as amended from time to time).”</p>	
Section 6.4.1 - Allowances for Land Variation Costs - Land Value rates for Commercial Acquisition	76.	<p>Submission notes that Table 6.4.1.1 sets Land valuation allowances for the category “Greater than Q100 (at current market rate)” at \$100.00 per m2. It is unclear whether this rate is intended to be applied to valuations other than local parks. It is requested that a clarifying statement is included which clearly limits the applicability of this valuation rate.</p> <p>DoE requests that this line item be amended to remove reference to a dollar value and replaced with “market rate” as given date (e.g., DCOP adoption)</p>	Not applicable to state community facilities
Section 6.4.1 - Allowances for Land Variation Costs	77.	<p>a) Request how current market rate for new parks and open space network planning requirements not previously identified have been factored into the DCOP financial modelling</p> <p>b) Request to provide guidance on the assessment of market rate requests for new parks and open space not previously identified</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>a) and b) Current market rate is utilised as a base line amount for inclusion in the financial model. The acquisition or negotiation for purchase of properties for additional open space is to occur on a case-by-case basis (i.e., purchase may be less or greater than base line amount)</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
Section 6.6 - Contingencies	78.	Contingency rates for roads, bridges/culverts considered too low and would not be consistent with State estimating parameters for works which have no design. Request road and bridges/culverts contingency rate be increased to 20%	No change Considerable investigation has occurred in relation to work unit base rates. Contingencies are not proposed to be increased. No change to IPBR
Section 6.6 - Contingencies	79.	a) Contingency rates for roads, bridges/culverts considered too low to cover current unknown and unmeasured items and risks b) The SOW roadworks contingency allowance of 15% for roads and intersections and 20% for pathways, bridges and culverts vary from Section 6.6 c) DTMR would typically apply a contingency of 50-70% for projects of a similar nature	a) and b) Considerable investigation has occurred in relation to work unit base rates. Contingencies are not proposed to be increased. No change to IPBR Section 6.6 and SOW to be reviewed for consistency c) Noted
Section 7 - DCOP Infrastructure	80.	a) Table 7.1 - requested the definition of trunk roads be amended to note that the 7,500 vehicle per day threshold considers the ultimate forecast daily traffic volumes, and that a number of road links may carrying greater than 7,500 vehicles per day under interim road network scenarios, until alternate supporting road links are constructed. b) This statement; 'Arterial and connector roads with cross-sections consistent with those in section 5.4.1 of this document where also identified within the transport model as carrying greater than 7,500 vehicle trips per day', is not consistent with section 4.4. For clarity, it is recommended that the references are changed to "Trunk connector/sub-arterial, and arterial" c) Suggested that the criteria used to determine creditable intersections is currently too broad and will result in almost all development access intersections onto DCOP trunk roads being considered as creditable. d) An additional 3 intersections have been identified that appear to meet the criteria based on current application.	a) - d) The 7,500vpd similarly applies to interim as identified. Should a circumstance not be identified then EDQ will consider including on a case-by-case basis e) consideration to include implementation works in the infrastructure criteria table f) correction in linear parks to occur

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>It is therefore suggested that further additional intersections are likely with future more detailed development planning.</p> <p>i) Fischer Road / CLAG development access</p> <p>ii) Binnies Road / Daley Road intersection</p> <p>iii) Binnies Road / AV Jennings access (east of Deebling Creek).</p> <p>e) Implementation Works - Suggest this section is updated to include reference to Implementation Works as per the current IFFCOA</p> <p>f) Spelling Error - spelling error in the Infrastructure Criteria Column for Linear Parks. More specifically 'lo' is to be removed.</p>	
Section 7.18 - Technical Report	81.	RLB Opinion of Cost was utilised for the interim and ultimate planning horizons, no cost breakdown information provided. Request detail information behind cost assumptions including cost calculation for reference is provided	RLB opinion of cost used to inform and build cost unit rates in conjunction with industry rates, Urban Utilities and EDQ rates
Section 8 - Financial Modelling inputs and assumptions	82.	Request a copy of the DCOP financial Model to understand and ascertain projections for charges revenue for collected and retained infrastructure charges for municipal, sub regional, implementation and catalyst charges	The financial Model is a propriety model and will not be distributed. The outputs of the financial model have been provided to key stakeholders
Section 8.2 - Delivery Timing for Financial Model	83.	Further clarification is requested of the variance between financial modelling and infrastructure delivery	The proposed infrastructure delivery informed by the development industry is considered to be optimistic. For the purposes of the financial model a more realistic financial impact of the delivery of infrastructure has been considered
Section 8.3.1 - Municipal charge - Catalyst component	84.	<p>a) Has a strategic analysis been undertaken to considered whether a sufficient amount of catalyst funding has been contributed to the Ripley Valley PDA, and whether the catalyst charge is sufficient.</p> <p>b) Noting that the current Catalyst loan facility has been</p>	<p>a) A review of infrastructure delivery and facilitation of development occurs on a regular basis</p> <p>b) Not in scope for the DCOP</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		exhausted for the Ripley Valley PDA, it is requested that EDQ make a reference to this in the DCOP and also advise that EDQ may explore future opportunity for additional Catalyst funding in order to unlock critical enabling infrastructure.	
Section 9 - Infrastructure Cost Summaries	85.	It is requested that EDQ amend this section having regard to all comments provided.	Noted
General	86.	<p>a) IPBR Format and Index - Request a more comprehensive index to the overall document given its size</p> <p>b) Language - Several locations in IPBR "creditable" are used instead of "offsetable". Suggest "offsetable" is maintained for consistency</p> <p>c) Charges Calculation - IPBR does not provide any information on how the charges are calculated and the comparison of the gross charges (net of DCF factors) against the gross value of the infrastructure. Request inclusion in the IPBR that provides this information</p> <p>d) Error references - Correct error references in the document</p> <p>e) Technical Report Appendix D - Section 3 Water Supply - request to provide detailed technical data for review and comment prior to locking in the mapping and SOW so developers fully understand the required HL & LL zones and the staging of the municipal networks</p>	<p>a) IPBR and links to separate appendices to be included on the website</p> <p>b) Review language for consistency</p> <p>c) No further action</p> <p>d) Review for consistency</p> <p>e) Access to the editable model will not be provided</p>
Appendix C	87.	<p>a) Suggest the following should be included as offsetable embellishments for Open Space and Community Facilities:</p> <p>i) Shade structures in neighbourhood recreation parks or sports parks over play equipment - considering the hot environment</p>	a) i) to iii) Review of list of embellishments to respond to submission comments regarding shade structure in neighbourhood parks, electric BBQ at sports fields and provide a footnote regarding point iii)

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		ii) Electric BBQ included at all sports fields iii) The continue assumption that developers can swap out the basketball half court in neighbourhood recreation parks for other fitness type elements of same value iv) Include irrigation for watering of trees to promote shade in district and regional order recreation parks	
Appendix C	88.	a) Suggest the following should be included as offsetable embellishments for Open Space and Community Facilities: i) Request seating areas, paths and spectator viewing areas be included for recreation and sports parks ii) Request to include shade structures in recreation and sports parks iii) Request inclusion of irrigation in district and major recreation parks iv) Request shade structures in neighbourhood parks as a safety issue v) Toilets should be included in the Town Centre Plazas (or provided close by commercial operations)	a) i), ii), iv) Review of list of embellishments to respond to submission comments regarding seating areas and spectator viewing areas for sports parks only, shade structure in recreation and sports parks, shade structure in neighbourhood parks a) iii) Not included in embellishments a) v) Noted
4.9 Schedule Of Works (SOW)			
Network - All	89.	a) Contingency - Methodology has changed and is now calculated on the total value of the works contribution and the owner's costs. Major change that adds unnecessary costs and EDQ agreed in 2021 to change back to only calculating on the works costs b) Request revert the contingency calculation to not including owners' costs in the contingency	No change a) and b) Contingency calculation consistent with contemporary project management practice and existing DCOPs. No amendment to the DCOP required
Roads - All	90.	a) Road widths not shown in SOW although there is a column for it. Needed for land take confirmation b) Request road widths to be shown in SOW	a) and b) Information to be considered in SOW where appropriate

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
Roads - RO22B	91.	a) SOW includes 4L+B. Interim to be 4L b) Include additional interim upgrade to 4L	a) and b) Information to be included in SOW
Bridges and Culverts - All	92.	a) Structure widths not shown in SOW although there is a column for it. Needed to confirm intended deck area b) Request widths to be shown in SOW	a) and b) Information to be considered in SOW where appropriate
Water	93.	a) Ripley Road - Missing asset south side of Highway. Request asset be included in SOW and mapping b) Ripley Road / Providence Parade - Works to relocate interim trunk asset (original catalyst works). Request asset be included in SOW	a) and b) Costs for relocation of water main to ultimate location to be included in Mapping and SOW
Sewer	94.	Rates in SOW do not match IPBR for some of the larger gravity mains. Request rates be corrected	IPBR and SOW to be reviewed for consistency
Parks - Land Rates	95.	a) Land Valuation - Inconsistency with land valuation rates for new parks. Request SOW provide a consistent approach to land values and reduce overall costs b) Linear Parks - SOW does not include linear park lengths and one linear park widths does not align with IPBR. request to include linear park length and correct linear park widths	a) New parks are to be commercially acquired at a higher land valuation rate b) Linear Park lengths to be reviewed and updated where required.
General	96.	a) SOW does not reflect approved provisional offsets and constructed works. Requested to update SOW to align to provisional offsets and constructed works b) DCOP Mapping is inconsistent with existing development approvals and current development applications c) Request direction how development industry can be compelled to deliver additional or modified trunk infrastructure notwithstanding the inconsistencies with the existing context plans, IMP's and OSS's d) Request guidance in DCOP as to what constitutes a development approval and whether contexts plans, Imp's	a) & b) Infrastructure Network Planning is June 2020. IMP's current as of June 2020 were utilised. Updates to infrastructure planning networks to occur every 5 years. Inclusion of provisional costings will be assessed on a case-by-case basis. c) Development Industry is required to update context plans, IMPs and OSSs as per conditions of approval to be consistent with infrastructure and land use planning d) IMPS, OSSs and Context plan should be updated to reflect latest infrastructure and land use planning

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		and Oss's need to be updated to reflect the DCOP	
Sub Regional	97.	Water - IPBR indicates apportionment of PDA/Non-PDA for eastern reservoir unresolved with UU. Request finalisation of apportionment and amendment to SOW	Apportionment finalised for eastern reservoir and sub regional watermain. PDA is responsible for all costs
General	98.	<p>a) Request EDQ provide excel version of the SOW for council records and usability</p> <p>b) Request EDQ provide further information to ensure common understanding on the intent of the nominated construction timeframes (i.e., are they high level, level of expectation that they will be delivered by EDQ/Council in the timeframes if not delivered by a developer)</p> <p>c) Request consistent approach for land acquisition rates (i.e., either \$/m2 or \$/ha not both)</p> <p>d) Ensure Existing Asset IDs reflect both ICOP/DCOP IDs for consistency</p> <p>e) to improve SOW readability ensure headers appear on each page</p> <p>f) Request EDQ have regard to all comments provided due to flow on effect to the SOW</p> <p>g) EDQ to provide more guidance on decision making for the 0.5ha and 1.0ha neighbourhood parks. Council is supportive of mix and request update to the guideline to set the criteria for each park size</p> <p>h) Provide guidance on the cross usage between neighbourhood rec park and the higher-level facilities</p> <p>i) Some recently offset items not listed in existing assets</p>	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) The timing for the delivery of infrastructure is driven by demand</p> <p>c) Variation in land acquisition rates results from existing assets or new assets. No change proposed to documentation</p> <p>d) Discrepancy between ICOP and DCOP networks. Asset IDs reflecting both ICOP/DCOP not to be included in SOW</p> <p>e) Noted</p> <p>f) Noted</p> <p>g) Guideline may be amended following DCOP commencement. Ongoing support to be provided to MEDQ delegate</p> <p>h) Beyond scope of the DCOP</p> <p>i) Offsets for the DCOP mapping and SOW taken up to June 2020. 5 yearly updates of the DCOP to include relevant updated offsets</p>
Sewer	99.	<p>a) Allow contingency for trenchless methods and environmental factors (i.e., EPBC approvals)</p> <p>b) GM059 will need to avoid the 50m buffer to address existing environmental buffers and is not exempt from requiring federal approval if impacting vegetation that</p>	<p>a) Tunnelling factor included where appropriate in SOW</p> <p>b) Noted.</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		supports EPBC listed matters	
Transport	100.	<p>a) Request various transport elements be displayed separately similar to ICOP (i.e., Roads / Intersections / Bridges and Culverts / Pathways)</p> <p>b) Request EDQ include an Asset Name (e.g., road Name / Bridge name) in SOW as added column</p> <p>c) ORP05 - clarify difference between timing of construction to financial model timing</p> <p>d) Clarify whether land cost should be included for Off Road Paths</p> <p>e) Request construction timings in SOW be reviewed to ensure it aligns with current planning / delivery expectations</p> <p>f) SOW does not align with IPBR staging and SIDRA layouts. Intersection staging in SOW to be updated to reflect the upgrades and timing included in the SIDRA assessment</p> <p>g) ORP01 represents off road shared pathway. SOW has at 2.5m though some sections have been constructed as a 4m wide shared pathway. Request SOW be amended.</p> <p>h) Planned reserve width to be added to SOW as per table in Appendix B of the IPBR</p>	<p>a) SOW formatting to be reviewed</p> <p>b) Inclusion of Asset Name in an additional column to be considered</p> <p>c) and e) The proposed infrastructure delivery informed by the development industry is considered to be optimistic. For the purposes of the financial model a more realistic financial impact of the delivery of infrastructure has been considered</p> <p>d) Land cost to be included for off road paths</p> <p>f) The Sidra layouts within Appendix D of the IPBR align with the technical report. Policy and judgement were used to "push and pull" of the staging and hence timing of several assets which assisted in the "smoothing" of their financial consequence</p> <p>g) Approx. 200m of northern part of ORP04 appears to be existing. Costs for works included in district park offset. Part construction of asset is not to be mapped, SOW amendment to be considered for final DCOP</p> <p>h) Reserve width additional to SOW to be considered</p>
Parks and Open Space	101.	<p>a) Large number of parks to be acquired by 2026-31 and not required until 2041. Sequencing delays not considerate of growth, staging and delivery</p> <p>b) Parks in vicinity of Bundamba Creek and urban core, suggested sequencing, roles and responsibilities be amended to more accurately reflect SOW and timing</p> <p>c) Requested Asset Name and relevant Park Name, Estate Name be included in SOW</p> <p>d) POS051 - council currently liaising with Stockland to</p>	<p>a) The timing for the delivery of infrastructure is driven by demand. 5 yearly updates of DCOP and SOW will refine the infrastructure delivery timeframes</p> <p>b) Comment is unclear. Refer to a) above</p> <p>c) Inclusion of Asset Name in an additional column to be considered</p> <p>d) Noted</p> <p>e) POS052 to be relocated to original ICOP location and</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>bring forward delivery</p> <p>e) POS052 - SOW requires 7.5ha and allotment size only 6.3ha. Some land available on adjoining allotments though constrained. May be inaccessible due to proximity to bridge</p> <p>f) Ironbark Park POS063 Stage 1 delivered. Council liaising with Stockland to bring forward delivery</p> <p>g) POS010 - SOW requires 5ha but site only 3.929ha. Some land available on adjoining allotments though constrained. May be inaccessible due to proximity to bridge</p> <p>h) Approx. 100ha of public park may not be able to be realised. Land to the east of the Urban core provides significant opportunity to accommodate this deficiency and recommended EDQ explore this opportunity further</p> <p>i) The entire lots accommodating future POS064 and POS058 have been acquired and requested acquisition costs be attributed to land cost for the regional sports and district sports facilities</p>	<p>retained as 7.5 hectares</p> <p>f) Noted</p> <p>g) POS010 is whole of site location. No change to DCOP mapping or SOW.</p> <p>h) EDQ generally utilised the 20yr ARI flood levels. Extent of impact on sport and recreation parks appears exaggerated. Review of site locations conducted following receipt of comments. Changes made where required.</p> <p>i) Noted. Acquisition costs to be allocated in SOW in accordance with land cost in the SOW.</p>
Community Facilities - Local	102.	<p>a) General comment - has EDQ benchmarked provision of local community facilities against DSS population projections</p> <p>b) CF001 - timing reasonable though not aligned to community expectations</p> <p>c) CF002 - Timing reasonable. Size 0.5ha smaller than IMP. EDQ should consider negotiating GFA within a Sekisui building to provide early delivery</p> <p>d) CF003 - Not identified in Context Plan though likely required. Ming reasonable though difficult to achieve without approval</p> <p>e) CF004 - Not identified in current pre-Da approval.</p>	<p>a) Local community facilities were generally benchmarked against the DSS. No detailed reviewed of the distribution of local community facilities was undertaken</p> <p>b) Noted</p> <p>c) Noted. Size to be in accordance with DCOP. Local community facilities are the responsibility of Ipswich City Council</p> <p>d) Context Plan to be amended to reflect previous ICOP and DCOP infrastructure planning. Note no development application lodged over site.</p> <p>e) Noted. CF004 to be relocated and may be identified within the Sekisui House context plan area as one of the</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>Timing unlikely, recommend removal or relocation</p> <p>f) CF005 - Recommend 2026-31 timing</p> <p>g) CF006 - recommend 2031-41 timing</p> <p>h) CF007 - Not in context plan. Need to determine if required based on lower densities</p> <p>i) CF008 - Likely dedication before 2031 though construction timing unknown</p> <p>j) CF009 - Not in context plan and unlikely to be delivered. recommend removal or relocation</p> <p>k) CF010 - Not in context plan and unlikely to be delivered. recommend removal or relocation</p> <p>l) CF011 - Timing reasonable</p> <p>m) CF012 - Not in context plan. Unsure of delivery. Subject to current application</p> <p>n) CF013 - Approved in context plan at 1.5ha though DCOP requires 2ha. Timing may be pushed forward. Stockland in discussions with council regarding conversion of existing sales / community centre</p> <p>o) CF014 - Timing is reasonable</p> <p>p) Request Asset type be changed to 'Land for Community Facilities' as current label potentially misleading. Recommended that EDQ to include footnote to refer to facility buildings being planned/delivered separately from the DCOP by Council</p> <p>q) Recommended EDQ include the Asset Name e.g., Community Facility Name and Estate name where relevant in the SOW as an additional column</p> <p>r) Major discrepancies between DCOP and Guideline 11 in terms of sizes of community facilities. recommended EDQ rectify the discrepancies</p>	<p>required local community facilities</p> <p>f) Noted timing recommended as 2026-2031</p> <p>g) Noted timing recommended as 2031-2041</p> <p>h) Noted. the location of the Local Community Facility CF007 was identified in Ipswich City Council Planning Scheme and transcribed into the Ripley Valley PDA Development Scheme (PDA DS). The assessment of the Context Plan did not identify the local community facility. The context plan and community facility IMP to be amended to reflect the PDA DS.</p> <p>i) Time horizon for delivery to be amended to 2026-2031</p> <p>j) Noted. the location of the Local Community Facility CF009 was identified in Ipswich City Council Planning Scheme and transcribed into the Ripley Valley PDA Development Scheme (PDA DS). The assessment of the Context Plan did not identify the local community facility. CF009 may be identified within the Sekisui House context plan area as one of the required local community facilities</p> <p>k) Noted. the location of the Local Community Facility CF010 was identified in Ipswich City Council Planning Scheme and transcribed into the Ripley Valley PDA Development Scheme (PDA DS). The assessment of the Context Plan did not identify the local community facility. CF010 may be identified within the Sekisui House context plan area as one of the required local community facilities</p> <p>l) Noted</p> <p>m) CF012 to be included in the amended context plan as per PDA DS, ICOP and proposed DCOP</p> <p>n) CF013 to be reduced in area to 1.5ha in accordance with Context Plan approval and IMP. Conversion of existing sales centre to a local community facility noted. DCOP not proposed to be amended to reflect local community facility</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		s) Central library is approx. the same as a Town Centre library but rates of land are off. DCOP and context plan requires 3ha, but guideline would only require 0.65ha for 135,000 persons. Recommend discrepancies are rectified	provision. District Community Facility required to be provided. o) Noted p) Noted. Asset type alteration to be considered q) Inclusion of Community Facility Name and Estate in an additional column to be considered r) and s) DCOP takes precedent over practice notes and guidelines. It is anticipated there will be updates to several guidelines following completion of the DCOP
Community Facilities - Local	103.	a) CF013 included in SOW as a 2ha site however, the approved Community Facilities Infrastructure Masterplan dated September 2013 has the site ranging in size from 0.6ha to 1.5ha b) Discussions being held with ICC regarding potential transfer of the existing Providence Centre at the end of the project as the district community centre c) Request Cop be amended to reflect maximum size of CF013 as 1.5ha in accordance with approved IMP	a) to c) CF013 to be reduced in area to 1.5ha in accordance with Context Plan approval and IMP. Conversion of existing sales centre to a local community facility noted. DCOP not proposed to be amended to reflect local community facility provision. District Community Facility required to be provided.
Community Facilities - State	104.	a) Recommended EDQ include the Asset Name e.g., Community Facility Name and Estate name where relevant in the SOW as an additional column b) Request Asset type be changed to 'Land for Community Facilities' as current label potentially misleading. Recommended that EDQ to include footnote to refer to facility buildings being planned/delivered separately from the DCOP by relevant State Agency	No change a) Inclusion of Community Facility Name and Estate in an additional column to be considered b) Noted. Asset type alteration to be considered
Community Facilities - State	105.	a) HCC002 identified in SOW as a 3.2ha site b) Executed Satellite Hospital IA has the site area as 2.7ha c) Request SOW be updated	a) to c) - SOW and costings to be amended to reflect updated area and costs

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
Establishment Costs of School sites	106.	<p>It is requested that EDQ provide:</p> <p>a) further information on how the works unit rate was calculated in the draft DCOP; and</p> <p>b) justification in support of the reduction to the contingency allowance, having regard to industry standards for master planned infrastructure.</p> <p>The trunk infrastructure identified in the Draft Ripley Valley DCOP is typically the subject of master planning only. For this reason, the level of knowledge of risks is low and the amount of contingency that should be applied to mitigate risk should be higher. A contingency allowance of 25% for master planned infrastructure is not considered excessive when compared with industry standards (often 30-40% for master planning). A reduction of the contingency allowance to 10% is not justified and may make the delivery of serviced school sites by developers more difficult.</p> <p>It is unclear why the works unit rate for primary schools has increased at a different rate to that used for secondary schools. It is also unclear how the works unit rate was recalculated or escalated from the previous rate. In this regard, the small increase does not appear to have kept pace of inflation</p>	<p>a) and b) considerable work has been conducted in regard the unit rate assessment. Works unit rates are a result of use of a range of cost build ups from cost assessor, industry rates, Urban Utilities and EDQ</p>
Sub Regional Infrastructure (SR)	107.	<p>a) Recommended EDQ include the Asset Name e.g., Road Name, Sewerage Treatment Plan, Water Asset Name where relevant in the SOW as an additional column</p> <p>b) Requested EDQ provide information of cost build-up of transport projects included in the SR Infrastructure Networks as the costs differ from the 2016 LGIP. Additional information required in SOW to describe scope of works for each project</p> <p>c) Additional key links are required to service Ripley</p>	<p>a) Noted. Mapping amendment to be considered for final DCOP</p> <p>b) Cost build up for sub regional transport projects carried over from indexed ICOP amounts</p> <p>c) Noted. No proposed change to mapping or SOW</p> <p>d) - f) Additional roads and other assets not proposed to be included in the Sub Regional DCOP mapping or SOW</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>Town centre and developments within the south eastern extents of the PDA</p> <p>d) Strongly recommended to include Ripley Swanbank Road between Ripley Town Centre and Mount Juillerat Drive as a sub-regional road project</p> <p>e) Strongly recommended the extension of the SEA Road from Centenary Highway to Ripley Swanbank Road be included as sub regional infrastructure</p> <p>f) Strongly recommended Ripley Road be changed to sub regional infrastructure and funded through additional catalyst infrastructure funding</p>	
4.10 Mapping			
General	108.	<p>Request provision of GIS data for the draft DCOP trunk infrastructure Plans for the PDA Additional Reference Material Layers</p> <p>a) Recommend EDQ provide additional reference material/layers to DCOP Mapping. For example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suburb Names: Ripley, South Ripley, Deebling Heights, Swanbank, Flinders View, White Rock • Major road names e.g., Ripley Road (inside and outside the PDA), Wensley Road/Fischer Road, Binnies Road, Centenary Highway, Cunningham Highway • Major transport corridors – Springfield to Yamanto Rail Corridor – inside and outside the PDA • Waterway names e.g., Deebling Creek • Key centre locations and names (similar to Development Scheme Appendix 2 – Figure 15-2 e.g., inside the PDA and outside the PDA • Ripley Town Centre (Sekisui) 	DCOP Mapping to be reviewed and include relevant additional references where appropriate

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providence Centre • Other known PDA Centres (shown on approved Context Plans) • Deebing Heights • Yamanto • Existing Community Facilities (temporary) • Existing Community Facilities – State School Names • Proposed Health Centre Names (Known) • Hierarchy of existing parks / existing park names 	
General	109.	<p>a) POS350 replaced POS042 (ICOP). Significant length of linear park reduced. Request extent of linear park be reinstated to original extent</p> <p>b) Translation of Regional Park and Garden POS068 extent has been lost and is no longer clear. Requested mapping be altered to show full extent. Revegetation appears to override the regional park and Garden</p> <p>c) POS066 regional Sports Facility appears to be located on Ecco land (i.e., west of Bundamba Creek). request mapping be altered to reflect correct location</p>	<p>a) POS350 reflective of linear park to the railway corridor. POS350 may be extended to the western boundary of Lot 1 SP326583 to provide pedestrian access to the proposed Catholic P-12 school (Lot193 S151860)</p> <p>b) Regional Park and Garden symbol on the mapping indicates location. Of the approx. 18.3 hectares contained from the centre line of the creek and including part of lots Pt Lot 20 SP311865, Pt Lot 101 SP322432 and Lot 2003 SP311845, approximately 10.5 hectares is subject to revegetation and rehabilitation which is offsetable and takes precedent. Condition in the approved context plan requires 50m revegetation from the top of bank as opposed to the property boundary. Mapping and SOW to be reflective of approved conditions relating to the Regional Park and Garden only. The remaining approximate 8 hectares may be developed as part of the Regional Park and Garden. Embellishments and land value are to be proportional of the cost in the SOW. The Developer may choose to increase the allotment sizes to ensure a larger Regional Park and Garden is provided.</p> <p>c) POS066 symbol is clearly located on land to the east of Bundamba Creek.</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
Open Space	110.	<p>a) OS Network contains number of sites which are unfeasible for various park types</p> <p>b) GIS based spatial analysis should be undertaken and provided to determine adequacy</p> <p>c) Accessibility catchment mapping to be conducted and provided to determine adequacy</p> <p>d) Recommended neighbourhood recreation park and existing parks be included in DCOP maps to understand distribution</p> <p>e) Separate spatial map differentiating the parks among approved / existing / under process / future be provided</p> <p>f) Number of parks including 12 sport and 5 recreation parks are below Q20 and plenty overlap with the adopted flood regulation line. EDQ to provide what level of current flood analysis has been relied upon to inform site selection</p> <p>g) Preliminary assessment indicates as much as 100Ha (approx.) of public park may be unable to be realised within the PDA boundary</p> <p>h) Request land east of Urban Core (outside PDA boundary) be considered and further explored to accommodate open space</p> <p>i) Recommend map description be amended to "Ripley Valley DCOP Parks"</p> <p>k) POS002 - District recreation park not identified on existing approved context plan. Recommended EDQ consider relocating park elsewhere to ensure development can proceed as planned</p> <p>l) POS195 - District Recreation Park not identified on existing approved context plan. Concerns with environmental constraints</p>	<p>a) Review of site locations conducted following receipt of comments. Changes made where required.</p> <p>b) Mapping identified utilising catchment-based parameters. Review of site locations conducted following receipt of comments. Changes made where required.</p> <p>c) Accessibility catchment parameters utilised in general determination of location and access</p> <p>d) Neighbourhood parks not to be included in mapping as significant land areas not subject to RAL approvals</p> <p>e) The DCOP is a strategic network planning document. ICC as delegate may seek to provide operational mapping for the PDA</p> <p>f) EDQ generally utilised the 20yr ARI flood levels. Extent of impact on sport and recreation parks appears exaggerated. Review of site locations conducted following receipt of comments. Changes made where required.</p> <p>g) Review of site locations conducted following receipt of comments. Changes made where required.</p> <p>h) Extension of the PDA is not in the scope of the DCOP</p> <p>i) Noted. Mapping amendment to be considered for final DCOP</p> <p>k) Noted. The location of POS002 to be reviewed</p> <p>l) No change proposed to DCOP mapping</p> <p>m) POS194 located in crown reserve. ICOP had both a district sports park and district recreation park proposed for the allotment. Propose to locate a major recreation area in the crown reserve. No change to DCOP mapping proposed</p> <p>n) Location for district sports park to be relocated to area identified in the Sekisui House Context Plan adjoining Ripley Road. The facility is an additional facility to previous</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>m) POS194 - District Sports park identified on existing approved context plan. Major Recreation Park now proposed requiring additional 2.5ha. Site highly constrained with environmental significance and the cost and difficulty of establishing the park is believed to have been underestimated.</p> <p>n) POS049 - District Sports park not identified on existing approved context plan. Recommend facility be relocated to where POS067 is currently shown</p> <p>o) POS008 - District Recreation Park not identified on existing approved context plan. Area within higher density residential zone surrounding the SUCW and could have significant impacts on how centre developed and loss of higher density development in area</p> <p>p) POS067 - Regional Sport Park not identified on existing approved context plan. 15ha sportsground unlikely to be accommodated owing to size and geometry of proposed location, impacts on adjacent primary school and limitations of transport corridors. Recommended site converted to District Sports to replace POS049</p> <p>q) POS003 - District Recreation Park not identified on existing context plan</p> <p>r) POS012 - District Recreation Park not identified on existing context plan. Likely to be included in IMP as included in ICOP. Location likely to be further south of proposed state schools</p> <p>s) POS051 - District Sports park likely to be brought forward in timing and delivery</p> <p>t) POS052 - District Sports park identified on existing approved context plan requiring 5ha. DCOP requires additional 2.5ha. Facility adjoining conservation and road network and should be relocated from current position</p>	<p>infrastructure planning.</p> <p>o) Location for district recreation park considered appropriate for the catchment. No change to DCOP mapping proposed</p> <p>p) Location for regional sports park considered appropriate for the catchment. Facility may require shaping/terracing to address some slope issues. Access via realigned Bryant's Road and adjacent state community facility. No change to DCOP mapping proposed</p> <p>q) POS003 identified in ICOP and partially constructed. Subsequent extension to existing facility to the south to occur</p> <p>r) Noted. The Context Plan approved in 2020 did not consider the existing POS012 District Recreation Park in the ICOP. EDQ considers a District Recreation Park should still occur in the vicinity and consider planning/investigate utilising the local park/drainage areas in the context plan as a possible linkage to the Regional Sports Ground</p> <p>s) Noted. Construction timeframe 2026-31. No change proposed to DCOP</p> <p>t) POS052 to be relocated to original ICOP location and to remain at 7.5 hectares</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
Open Space Cont'd	111.	<p>u) POS068 - site has 3ha of slope constrained land and unlikely to achieve 10ha major recreation park - not likely to achieve DSS or Guideline 12</p> <p>v) POS069 - Town Plaza Centre reduced in size to 0.5ha from 1.5ha</p> <p>w) POS059 and POS066 - may not be in suitable location to the east of the Ripley Town Centre. Recommended PDA boundary be extended to the east to facilitate broader investigation of suitable land to provide the 2 parks and address the shortfall on open space for Ripley and Ipswich public park network</p> <p>x) POS300-308 - Linear park Environmental - unclear if entirety of two major riparian corridors in PDA included, particularly to the south</p> <p>y) POS351 and POS353 - Linear Parks - noted as reconstructed waterways benefiting Providence through managing stormwater</p> <p>z) POS009 - identified on approved context plan with land requirement of 4ha. DCOP requires 5ha and may be difficult to achieve with existing RAL approvals</p> <p>aa) POS192 - suboptimal location due to lack of accessibility in catchment. recommend relocate to more central location</p> <p>ab) POS198 - suboptimal location - heavily constrained. Recommend relocation to where POS064 is currently shown</p> <p>ac) POS064 - 15ha sportsground unlikely to be accommodated owing to flooding of site. Recommend site converted to District Sports to replace POS198</p> <p>ad) POS062 - Regional Sports Park unlikely to be accommodated in this location due to shape, topography</p>	<p>u) POS068 is Regional Park and Garden. Rehabilitation and Revegetation on Bundamba Creek to occur complimentary to the establishment of the Regional Park and Garden which may constrain types of plantings within the facility or additional land may be provided by Developer should conflict occur</p> <p>v) Noted.</p> <p>w) POS059 and POS066 subject to Infrastructure Agreement between Investa (AVID) and Ipswich City Council. No change to DCOP required. Expansion of PDA to the east is beyond the scope of the DCOP</p> <p>x) Mapping satisfactorily indicates extent of offsetable rehabilitation and revegetation. No change to DCOP mapping proposed</p> <p>y) Noted. Generally, in accordance with ICOP mapping</p> <p>z) Noted. Application 7566/2017/MAPDA/A has total of 9ha for district recreation. Allotment size is 5.8ha. Sufficient area to locate 5ha district recreation park. No change to DCOP mapping required</p> <p>aa) Access via ultimate 4 lane Ripley Road. No change to DCOP mapping required</p> <p>ab) Location has not altered from ICOP. No change to DCOP mapping required.</p> <p>ac) Site purchased by council for regional sports facility. No change to DCOP mapping required.</p> <p>ad) Development approval requires the provision of a 10ha regional sports facility on the land.</p> <p>ae) Condition 23 of Approval 5840/2019/MAPDA does not require the provision of a District Sports Park in the Context</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>and hydraulic issues. Recommend site downgraded and balance of site relocated to alternative location</p> <p>ae) District Sports park shown on existing approved context plan 5840/2019/MAPDA is missing. EDQ to clarify why park no longer required.</p> <p>af) Unclear why some riparian corridors have been included as linear park while others have not, or finish/start randomly</p> <p>ag) Naming conventions (existing vs future) for linear parks are inconsistent (i.e., some cases used in areas that are rehab, drainage reserve, ecological corridor)</p> <p>ah) District Recreation (ICOP POS005 and POS006) now shown on DCOP as existing park and line items removed from SOW. POS006 either re-used or relocated to where POS008 was. POS005 and POS006 have remaining credits to be given (i.e., constructed but not dedicated to council). Provisional offset already provided</p> <p>ai) General support for mix of neighbourhood parks. Slope may be an issue for the larger parks. Concern there may be greater expectation that stormwater detention/retention will occur in public parks as this is permitted under the guideline</p> <p>aj) Request that differentiation between local and major linear parks on the mapping to be provided.</p> <p>ak) Recommend Lucas Creek riparian corridor extends to PDA boundary</p> <p>al) Council assessment indicates 100ha (approx.) of public park may be unable to be realised. consider extending PDA boundary to east to provide a regional open space area to cater for potential shortfall and be a point of difference to the PDA</p> <p>am) Railway Reference - recommended to amend</p>	<p>Plan approval conditions. Context Plan mapping identifies district sports park on lands not owned by Sekisui House. District Sports Park not previously included in infrastructure network mapping in the ICOP. Consideration given to relocate POS049 to area adjacent Ripley Road</p> <p>af) Linear parks to provide accessibility throughout the PDA. Rehabilitation or riparian corridors may still be conditioned though not part of the DCOP</p> <p>ag) Naming Conventions to be reviewed prior to finalisation of DCOP and amended where required</p> <p>ah) Noted.</p> <p>ai) Maintain existing policy in relation to stormwater detention/retention in public parks</p> <p>aj) Description of linear parks to be read in conjunction with IPBR</p> <p>ak) Not proposed to extend linear park to PDA boundary al) Extension of PDA boundary to the east not in scope of DCOP</p> <p>am) Noted. Mapping amendment to be considered for final DCOP</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		reference to "Future Railway"	
Open Space	112.	<p>a) POS001 - Mapping not aligned to endorsed IMP (location) - agreed to be removed due to site conditions - replaced by POS196</p> <p>b) POS196 additional to ICOP</p> <p>c) POS012 - additional to ICOP</p> <p>d) POS356 -linear park removed on Lucas Creek</p> <p>e) POS003 - minor relocation required</p> <p>f) POS002 - additional and not in accordance with endorsed IMP and should be removed</p> <p>g) POS067 - additional regional sports facility and retained POS066</p>	<p>a) Note the overland flow where POS001 to be located. POS001 to be relocated to adjacent POS196 at a reduced size of 2hectares. POS001 to be integrated with POS196</p> <p>b) Noted</p> <p>c) POS012 identified in ICOP though not included in recent context plan approval</p> <p>d) POS356 extended further than ICOP mapping.</p> <p>e) POS003 partially constructed and to extend the southwest</p> <p>f) POS002 proposed to service the northeast area of the PDA. Original consideration to replace the extent of linear park (POS030) in ICOP as a District Recreation Park. POS002/POS003 catchments overlap, and the area can be adequately serviced from POS003</p> <p>g) Noted</p>
Open Space - Local linear park	113.	<p>a) Object to location of local linear parks POS311 and POS302 on eastern boundary of Lot 178 - Fischer Road</p> <p>b) Lot 235 SL6897 does not form part of the PDA (lot located on eastern side of Bundamba Creek)</p>	<p>a) and b) - POS311 and POS302 is located outside of PDA on eastern side of Bundamba Creek. The rehabilitation, revegetation and major linear provides a continuity along Bundamba Creek from the PDA heading downstream. The works are located outside the PDA and may be separately conditioned should development occur over the allotments in the future</p>
Transport Roads	114.	<p>a) RO01 & 60% of RO48 existing</p> <p>b) 50% of RO02 existing</p> <p>c) McGuire road - >7,500vpd - include as offsetable</p> <p>d) Reinstate trunk connection from Ripley Road to Fischer Road</p> <p>e) Add mapping reference to "CW"</p> <p>f) RO22B is a 4 lane + bus ultimate grade separated</p>	<p>a) and b) Several assets have been constructed post June 2020. Consideration to be given to include known constructed assets in existing infrastructure mapping</p> <p>c) EDQ sought advice from Jacobs who have confirmed that the Monterey Road/Maguire St T-intersection whilst just over 7,500vpd only does so give the southern connection is modelled further south than actual given recent approval. Consequently, more direct East West movements will lessen the flow through the above intersection. Currently</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		configuration. Request interim 4 lane (without bus) at grade upgrade. Include on mapping	<p>intersection included as trunk but not Maguire St.</p> <p>d) Fischer Road included in the DCOP as an ultimate 4 lane. No further response required</p> <p>e) Not sure what CW stands for</p> <p>f) RO22B to be reinstated in mapping and SOW</p>
Transport Intersections	115.	<p>a) Request 4-way intersection for school at RI053A/B</p> <p>b) Request to relocate RI032A/B further north as endorsed in IMP</p> <p>c) RI048 incorrect in SOW - Traffic lights and not priority controlled (as endorsed in provisional offset)</p>	<p>a) RI053 to be upgraded to a four-way staged intersection to service the future primary and secondary schools.</p> <p>b) RI032A/B to be located north to approved location for Trigona Drive/Monterea Road connection</p> <p>c) RI048 provisional offset approved. SOW to be updated.</p>
Transport Bridges and Culverts	116.	<p>a) RB001 is existing</p> <p>b) RC002A is existing</p> <p>c) Culvert required on RO48 as shown in ICOP</p> <p>d) RC034 is not complete</p> <p>e) RC023A & RC023B to be relocated further west onto apex (sag) of SEA</p> <p>f) RC027 to be relocated further north to align with waterway</p>	<p>a) and b) Several assets have been constructed post June 2020. Consideration to be given to include known constructed assets in existing infrastructure mapping</p> <p>c) Reinstate RC048 from ICOP</p> <p>d) Ultimate culvert to be included</p> <p>e) Updated location supported</p> <p>f) Updated location supported</p>
Transport Road Network	117.	<p>Requested EDQ have regard to the following comments/mark ups</p> <p>a) Map Description - suggest renamed to "Ripley Valley DCOP Trunk Roads"</p> <p>b) R001 - Binnies Road be identified as existing, shift node between R001 and R048 east to Daley Road to align with extent of works</p> <p>c) R003 - be straightened to match approved functional layouts (90 degree corner)</p> <p>d) R003 - if offsets have been given to McHale for a</p>	<p>a) Noted. However naming convention to remain i.e., all included assets are trunk</p> <p>b) and p) - Nodes to remain</p> <p>c) R003 corner to be amended on the mapping</p> <p>d) Only Provisional Assets approved prior to 30 June 2021 included as existing</p> <p>e) Noted.</p> <p>f) Deemed to be included within contingency</p> <p>g) Include and label R044 from the ICOP</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>section of Montereia Road - road should be identified as existing</p> <p>e) R007 - recommend green line relocated to eastern side of Ripley Road</p> <p>f) R007A-r - identify appropriate allowances for additional safety works on service road</p> <p>g) R007 - project R044 from ICOP should be included</p> <p>h) R011 - EDQ to clarify 2 lane construction of Fischer Road by Sekisui House qualifies for interim construction. If so, remove green dashed line from map</p> <p>i) R013 & R047 - Interim 2 lane road appears to be constructed</p> <p>j) R021 - EDQ to clarify if link includes cost of Highway overpass and if not amend the line accordingly</p> <p>k) R055 - Amend map to ensure sufficient allowance for future construction requirement. Providence parade only constructed to Botany Drive and not further east</p> <p>l) R046 - label moved to better align with road segment</p> <p>m) R048 - provisional offset endorsed, but Actual offset not claimed. Asset not shown on mapping. EDQ requested to confirm if in financial model</p> <p>n) R056 - EDQ to clarify if link requires 4 lanes or only 2 lanes</p> <p>o) Strongly request to include Ripley / Swanbank Road as sub regional infrastructure</p> <p>p) Road nodes requested to be removed from mapping</p> <p>q) EDQ to clarify 2 Lane + Transit Roads. Assume transit only applies to 4 lane roads</p> <p>r) Temporary road construction on western end of Providence Parade. No allowance appears to have been</p>	<p>h) 450m of Fischer Road has been constructed to 2 lane interims. Mapping to be amended to remove green dotted line from transport network mapping</p> <p>i) Several assets have been constructed post June 2020. Consideration to be given to include known constructed assets in existing infrastructure mapping</p> <p>j) Any assets / overpasses within State Controlled Roads are not included within the DCOP</p> <p>k) Comment Noted. Mapping of R055 provides link to Barrams Road</p> <p>l) R046 label to be relocated for improve alignment with road</p> <p>m) Only Provisional Assets approved prior to 30 June 2021 included as existing. RO48 provisional included in SOW</p> <p>n) Modelling indicates ultimate 4 lanes which is included within the SOW</p> <p>o) Ripley Road / Swanbank Road not to be included as sub regional infrastructure</p> <p>q) Transit Lanes only applies to 4 lane roads</p> <p>r) Only staged works are included within the DCOP, except where specifically provisioned</p> <p>s) Noted</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		made in SOW. Requested SOW be amended to include additional costs s) Railway Reference - recommended to amend reference to "Future Railway"	
Transport Intersections Mapping	118.	Requested EDQ have regard to the following comments/mark ups a) Map Description - suggest renamed to "Trunk Intersections" b) Recommend including Binnies Road / Daley Road intersection c) Recommend including Binnies Road / AV Jennings intersection d) Recommend to identifying Grampian Drive as a trunk connector e) Recommend including connecting road south of Grampian Drive in McHale land as trunk connector f) Recommend including intersection on Fischer Road as part of CLAG development g) Recommend including future intersection with Greenview Avenue / SEA Road h) RI032 - relocate node further north to be consistent with approved IMP i) RI041 - Relocate intersection south of rail corridor to align with approved context plan j) RI012 - EDQ give consideration that ultimate intersection may trigger upgrades to Providence Bridge over Bundamba Creek k) Railway reference be amended to "Future Railway"	a) and k) Noted. Naming convention to remain i.e. All included assets are trunk b) This intersection did not meet the modelling requirement to be included as trunk c) This intersection did not meet the modelling requirement to be included as trunk d) Modelling suggests Grampian Drive remain as urban arterial in the DCOP Road Hierarchy e) Modelling suggests this road remain a neighbourhood connector f) As of 30 June 2021, current approved volumes do not support including this intersection as trunk g) Modelling does not support the inclusion of these intersections as trunk h) RI032 to be relocated to approved location i) Intersection to be relocated to align with approved context plan j) Agreed in principle however equally the intersection could be truncated to avoid which is the preference
Transport	119.	Requested EDQ have regard to the following	a) and e) Noted. However naming convention to remain i.e.,

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
Bridges and Culverts Mapping		<p>comments/mark up</p> <p>a) Map description - suggest renamed to "Trunk Bridges and Culverts"</p> <p>b) RC034 - rename as RC034B as appears trunk culvert works may already have been completed at this location</p> <p>c) RC019 - Recommended culvert location be checked as it appears north of extent of the trunk road project</p> <p>d) Cumner Road - Recommended EDQ have regard that Cumner Road design includes major culverts</p> <p>e) Railway reference be amended to "Future Railway"</p>	<p>all included assets are trunk</p> <p>b) Culvert works completed for 2 lanes. Ripley Road ultimate to be 4LBu.</p> <p>c) Culvert location to be moved slightly south</p> <p>d) Noted. Construction of Cumner Road currently occurring. Culverts to be included in network mapping</p>
Transport Off-road Map	120.	<p>Requested EDQ have regard to the following comments/mark up</p> <p>a) Map description - suggest renamed to "Trunk Off Road Shared Paths"</p> <p>b) recommended Off Road Nodes be removed from mapping</p> <p>c) ORP07 - EDQ to have regard to Fraser's proposal which crosses Deebing Creek via a road bridge avoiding area of cultural significance</p> <p>d) ORP09 - recommend path extend west to Watsons Road rather than terminate at Bundamba Creek</p> <p>e) ORP01 - Suggest shard pathway connect back to Fischer Road via northern verge of Nevis Street as further extension along Bundamba Creek corridor uncertain</p> <p>f) Existing pathways - shown on mapping as existing assets</p> <p>g) Binnies Road - regional cycle connection be extended east to in the existing Binnies Road reserve to connect with Ripley Road</p>	<p>a) Noted. However naming convention to remain i.e. all included assets are trunk</p> <p>b) Nodes generally to be retained to provide consistency with SOW</p> <p>c) Noted. However, until approved will remain as shown</p> <p>d) ORP09 may be extended to provide linkage to local road network on the western side of Bundamba Creek.</p> <p>e) May be appropriate to connect ORP01 to Fischer Road along the Nevis Road frontage</p> <p>f) Approx. 200m of northern part of ORP04 appears to be existing. Mapping amendment to be considered for final DCOP</p> <p>g) Consider inclusion of bike path and crossing from Daleys Road to eastern boundary of Ripley Valley State School (Note: realigned road design from state school east to Ripley Road on new alignment has bikeway located on southern verge</p> <p>h) Noted</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		h) Railway reference be amended to "Future Railway"	
Water	121.	<p>a) WM010 is existing</p> <p>b) Request inclusion of funding in SOW for the lowering of existing 450mm main between Centenary Hwy and S/W Reservoirs</p> <p>c) Include water booster on Grampian Drive for Botanica as per endorsed masterplanning</p> <p>d) WM080 is existing</p> <p>e) Providence - Network assets not as constructed or endorsed - other network suggestions including missing trunk main west of water booster and HL connection to Providence East WM113</p> <p>f) Sekisui - Network not as mapped in masterplanning</p> <p>g) Near WM058 - require relocation for ultimate network</p> <p>h) Nominal line between HZ & LLZ near SUCE water booster unlikely to be utilised</p> <p>i) Interim development in South Ripley likely to require connectivity of network between WM106 and WM141</p> <p>j) Connection to SUCE water booster via HL or LL. Note HL would require additional main and UU has no clear strategy on servicing sequencing</p>	<p>a) Only Assets constructed prior to 30 June 2020 to be included as existing.</p> <p>b) Any vertical realignment of the 450mm main will be included within the design and construction of the 600mm main given their common horizontal alignment</p> <p>c) and j) Upgrading from ICOP to DCOP provided the opportunity to revisit the prior network planning. Following more thorough proprietary software modelling, EDQ has collaborated with all stakeholders to arrive at a more beneficial technical and financial solution. Rather than whole of network, several changes have been and continue to be made respectful of prior approvals, in this case eliminated the need for the prior proposed booster pump station.</p> <p>d) WM080 is a constructed asset (funded as part of catalyst infrastructure fund infrastructure agreement - signed 2013). Asset is 355mm water main. Asset is located on mapping as grey line. No change to mapping required</p> <p>e) Information of constructed or approved mains prior to 30 June 2020 received from UU</p> <p>f) Information of constructed or approved mains prior to 30 June 2020 received from UU</p> <p>g) Only Provisional Assets approved prior to 30 June 2021 included as existing</p> <p>h) Mapping to more clearly identify if the line represents a main for delineates between pressure zones</p> <p>i) and j) EDQ propose changing the connected network so that WM141 and WM106 connect directly into the Water Booster Pump Station</p>
Water	122.	a) Recommend map description amended to "Trunk Water Supply"	a) Noted. However naming convention to remain i.e., all included assets are trunk

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		b) Railway reference be amended to "Future Railway"	b) Agreed
Sewer	123.	<p>a) GM013 is existing</p> <p>b) GM009 is existing</p> <p>c) GM048 is existing</p> <p>d) Deebling Creek sewer - trench in schedules though works require tunnelling below Mission site and increased rate</p> <p>e) Request extension of sewer branch from GM057 to McHale property</p> <p>f) W&S reporting provides no detail around southwestern Bundamba Creek catchment. Possible 300mm connection, pipe bridges (LIP has pipes identified)</p> <p>g) Request to extend GM062 further east to Coleman Road</p> <p>h) Proposed interim SPS on Coleman Road to service AT&L and broader catchment</p> <p>i) Proposed interim sewer DN315 along Coleman Road servicing AT&L and broader catchment</p> <p>j) Stantec design for sewer extension to link GM075 with White Rock to the east (supported by RV077 as well)</p> <p>k) Sekisui House - SGM049 (ICOP) omitted and mapping not aligned to current planning</p> <p>l) missing sewer link between Ripley Road and Hayfields through Ripley Village</p>	<p>a) b) and c) Only assets approved prior to 30 June 2020 included as existing.</p> <p>d) Design yet to be finalised or approved pending alignment and the necessity for microtunneling</p> <p>e) Sewer main modelled but less than trunk</p> <p>f) Sewer main modelled but less than trunk</p> <p>g) Sewer main modelled but less than trunk</p> <p>h) and i) The proposed interim solution does not catalyse enough of the surrounding development to be offsetable unless part of staged works. EDQ will consider business case.</p> <p>j) Only assets approved prior to 30 June 2021 included</p> <p>k) The sewer network to be realigned to provide a more efficient network outcome. GM051 to be removed from SOW and Mapping. Extend GM046 south to CHE and turn west along CHE</p> <p>l) Noted. Mapping and SOW to be updated</p>
Sewer	124.	<p>a) Recommend map description amended to "Trunk Sewerage"</p> <p>b) Railway reference be amended to "Future Railway"</p>	<p>a) Noted. However naming convention to remain i.e., all included assets are trunk b) Agreed</p>
Local Community Facilities	125.	<p>a) CF011 - refer to endorsed context plan for location</p> <p>b) SOW includes CF013 as 2ha. Endorsed IMP has</p>	<p>a) CF011 location to be amended to the eastern side of Coleman Road generally in accordance with the approved</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>range of 0.6-1.5ha. Correct SOW</p> <p>c) Existing Providence Centre proposed to be added as a community centre</p> <p>d) Council have added two new community facilities (0.4ha each). Additional facilities costs should not be borne by developers and not included in DCOP. Land take implications</p>	<p>context plan (red square)</p> <p>b) CF013 to be reduced in area to 1.5ha in accordance with Context Plan approval and IMP. Conversion of existing sales centre to a local community facility noted. DCOP not proposed to be amended to reflect local community facility provision. District Community Facility required to be provided.</p> <p>c) Information noted. DCOP mapping to remain unaltered and may be amended at the next update following confirmation from council of acceptance of establishment of local community facility</p> <p>d) The current Sekisui House Context Plan approval (5840/2019/MAPDA/A) requires the provision of a citywide facility (3ha) and a district facility (2ha). In addition, the Context Plan approval requires the provision of 5 x 0.4ha local community facilities to be provided. The ICOP mapping has not had these local community facilities identified and subsequently not offsetable infrastructure. It is considered appropriate to local the 5 local community facilities on the DCOP mapping</p>
Local Community Facilities	126.	Local Community Facility CF011 appears to overlap with SS006.	CF011 is shown in an indicative whole of site location.
Local Community Facilities	127.	<p>a) CF001 & CF002 - Current Sekisui House context plan has several smaller local community facilities. Community Facility IMP to be updated and possible consolidation of local community facilities into a singular location</p> <p>b) CF003 - District Facility not identified on existing context plan however likely to be required based on population</p> <p>c) CF004 - Local facility (N/E of Grampian Drive/Centenary Highway) unlikely to be achieved owing to historic approvals over AV Jennings. Recommend site</p>	<p>a) The current Sekisui House Context Plan approval (5840/2019/MAPDA/A) requires the provision of a citywide facility (3ha) and a district facility (2ha). In addition, the Context Plan approval requires the provision of 5 x 0.4ha local community facilities to be provided. The ICOP mapping has not had these local community facilities identified and subsequently not offsetable infrastructure. It is considered appropriate to include 2 local community facilities on the DCOP mapping</p> <p>b) Noted. Community Facilities IMP should be updated to reflect the infrastructure network planning</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>be relocated</p> <p>d) CF007 - Local Facility not identified on existing approved context plan. EDQ requested to advise how it was determined that facility was required</p> <p>e) CF009 - Local Facility not identified on existing approved context plan. Need for facility considered as part of recent context plan and determined facility not required as population serviced by CF008 & CF003. Recommend facility is removed</p> <p>f) CF010 - Local Facility not identified on existing approved RAL. Recommend facility is removed/relocated</p> <p>g) CF012 - Local Facility not identified on existing approved context plan. EDQ requested to advise how facility can be delivered in light of new application lodged</p> <p>h) CF013 - District Facility shown on existing approved context plan at 1.5ha (DCOP requires 2ha). Stockland seeking to convert existing sales centre to a local community facility thereby providing for early delivery and negating need for a land dedication</p> <p>i) Railway reference to be amended to "Future Railway"</p>	<p>c) CF004 may be identified within the Sekisui House context plan area as one of the required local community facilities</p> <p>d) Noted. the location of the Local Community Facility CF007 was identified in Ipswich City Council Planning Scheme and transcribed into the Ripley Valley PDA Development Scheme (PDA DS). The assessment of the Context Plan did not identify the local community facility. The context plan and community facility IMP to be amended to reflect the PDA DS.</p> <p>e) Noted. the location of the Local Community Facility CF009 was identified in Ipswich City Council Planning Scheme and transcribed into the Ripley Valley PDA Development Scheme (PDA DS). The assessment of the Context Plan did not identify the local community facility. CF009 may be identified within the Sekisui House context plan area as one of the required local community facilities</p> <p>f) Noted. The location of the Local Community Facility CF010 was identified in Ipswich City Council Planning Scheme and transcribed into the Ripley Valley PDA Development Scheme (PDA DS). The assessment of the Context Plan did not identify the local community facility. CF010 may be deleted from the Mapping and SOW</p> <p>g) CF012 to be included in the amended context plan as per PDA DS, ICOP and proposed DCOP</p> <p>h) CF013 to be reduced in area to 1.5ha in accordance with Context Plan approval and IMP. Conversion of existing sales centre to a local community facility noted. DCOP not proposed to be amended to reflect local community facility provision. District Community Facility required to be provided.</p> <p>i) Noted. Mapping amendment to be considered for final DCOP</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
State Community Facilities	128.	P003 - Stockland have confirmation from QPS - local police station not required	Noted. QPS provided confirmation that the PDA is to be serviced by one District Police facility P001.DCOP mapping and SOW to be amended accordingly
State Community Facilities	129.	PS002 and SS002 - Schools to be relocated to original locations as per MCU, Context Plan and OSS endorsements	<p>School locations to be as per MCU approval and consistent with ICOP mapping. Further discussions to be held between EDQ, DoE, ICC and Developer to finalise a location for the schools.</p> <p>DoE does not support the re-instatement of the dots as requested by the developer. The current location of the dots aligns with the department's current understanding of the undermining risks and site suitability over the development site. MCU Development Permit 34/2015/MAPDA/B contains a context plan and establishes the uses over the site. MEDQ is not able to require an applicant to amend an existing approval.</p> <p>Department of Education may seek alternative locations for schools as part of a commercial negotiation with a landowner</p>
State Community Facilities	130.	<p>a) Confirm location of existing RV Rural Fire Brigade is ideally located and would be supported by QFES as alternative to FR002 pending confirmation that:</p> <p>i) the site area can be increased to 6000m2</p> <p>ii) considers future road widening requirements for Ripley Road and mitigates any existing or future prevention of a right turn (heading north)</p> <p>iii) land tenure to be changed to freehold and transferred to QFES</p> <p>iv) increased site area considerate of proximity to Bundamba Creek</p> <p>v) site area above 1 in 500-year ARI flooding / 0.2 AEP</p>	<p>a) i) to vi) Investigation of the site has identified limitations in terms of flood immunity (0.2% AEP), though site can be built up and access restrictions (all points turning) due to proximity to Providence Parade / Ripley Road signalised intersection. The access restrictions are considered not able to be resolved. Further discussions to be held with QFES regarding existing FR002 or an alternative location which provides satisfactory access for response times.</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		vi) Direct access to 150mm (sufficient) or 200mm (ideal) water mains is available for sufficient hydrant pressure	
State Community Facilities	131.	FR002 has been mapped in SUCE village centre. Request FR002 be relocated to the eastern side of the SEA Road adjacent to Barrams Road as below	Location of FR002 to be adjacent SEA Road and Barrams Road. QFES confirmed on 11 May 2022 support for proposed FR002 location with the same caveats regarding area, land tenure, water access and flood immunity
State Community Facilities	132.	<p>a) Objection to the location of PS004 on the property</p> <p>b) Consider the heritage and history of the land as land held in same family since 1893, strong family ties and is used for community organisations such as Scouts, Girl Guides and church groups</p> <p>c) Indigenous Heritage present - 300yr old quinine trees with footsteps carved in them by aboriginals to use for climbing to collect the berries</p> <p>d) Restriction of access to remainder of the farm outside the PDA</p> <p>e) Ecological Values - native fauna present including koalas, sugar gliders, possums, kangaroos and other marsupials. Potential impacts on Koala Habitat Area in respect to EPBC Act</p> <p>f) Restriction of access to camping area utilised since 1920's</p> <p>g) Contradiction with ICOP mapping and Development Scheme</p> <p>h) No clarity of exact location for the proposed school on the site</p> <p>i) More suitable locations elsewhere in the PDA</p> <p>j) Contravention of the Queensland School Site Selection Guide - Road Infrastructure and Transport, bushfire risk, ecological flora and fauna</p> <p>k) School is proposed to be located in close proximity to</p>	<p>Issues identified in the submissions were raised with the Dept of Education:</p> <p>a) The property identified for location of primary school with an approximate delivery time of 2041 – 2066</p> <p>b) This location was selected as the area to the north and north-west of the state primary school shown as PS006 (identified in the original ICOP) will contain more than 6,000 dwellings on full development.</p> <p>c) The additional primary school site is essential to service this area.</p> <p>d) The Department of Education understands that the 'dot' on the draft DCOP mapping, which identifies location of the state primary school, represents a requirement which applies to that lot generally (i.e., 'Whole of Site') rather than a fixed, specific location.</p> <p>e) The final location of the state primary school will be subject to discussions with the landowner, detailed review of site particulars and a statutory assessment by EDQ against relevant matters (e.g., heritage and environmental matters).</p> <p>f) DoE supports further engagement with Mr. John and Mr Eric Scott and EDQ to identify the part of their land most suitable to provide a fit-for-purpose and well-located state primary school.</p> <p>g) Due to existing land use rights, current development approvals, and the need for a balanced school network, there is limited capacity to relocate the state primary school</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		the buffer areas associated with the TLPI - Waste Activities. Potential impacts upon the health and wellbeing of students could be compromised by the constant odours emitted by industry	(PS004) to another parcel of land in the area. h) Majority of school sites in Ripley Valley do not meet the site selection criteria in the lands raw state and require earthworks to achieve suitable pads and benching.
State Community Facilities	133.	<p>a) - Subject to State Agency Acquisition - Clarify if this means that some items will not be provided if acquisition does not / cannot occur</p> <p>b) AMB002 - additional facility not contained in approved context plan</p> <p>c) PS002 and SS002 - identified in different locations to the existing approved context plan. Recommend schools be relocated back to area identified in context plan</p> <p>d) SS003 - Not identified on existing approved context plan. Located in urban core in a high-density residential area. May provide significant impact on dwelling yield</p> <p>e) PS008 - Not identified on existing approved context plan. Originally area planned for 30dw/ha</p> <p>f) PS005 - Not identified on existing approved context plan. Originally area planned for 20-35dw/ha</p> <p>g) P002 - Not identified on existing approved context plan. Generally, in SUCW. No concerns</p> <p>h) P003 - Further discussion being held between developer and QPS regarding need for facility</p> <p>i) HCC001 - Not identified on existing approved context plan. Generally, in SUCW</p> <p>j) HCC003 - Not identified on existing approved context plan. Originally area planned for 20-35dw/ha</p> <p>k) PS010 - Not identified on existing approved context plan. Several constraints to be addressed (i.e., flooding, slope)</p>	<p>a) Additional state community facilities have been identified and mapped in accordance with state agency advice and are subject to negotiation and acquisition by the agency at the time required for the service to be provided to the community</p> <p>b) Noted. Additional state community facility subject to negotiation and acquisition by the agency</p> <p>c) DoE does not support the re-instatement of the dots as requested by the developer. The current location of the dots aligns with the department's current understanding of the undermining risks and site suitability over the development site. MCU Development Permit 34/2015/MAPDA/B contains a context plan and establishes the uses over the site. MEDQ cannot require an applicant to amend an existing approval. Department of Education may seek alternative locations for schools as part of a commercial negotiation with a landowner. School locations to be as per MCU approval and consistent with ICOP mapping.</p> <p>d) Additional facility to service the catchment in the area. Additional state community facility subject to negotiation and acquisition by the agency</p> <p>e) Additional facility to service the catchment in the area. Additional state community facility subject to negotiation and acquisition by the agency</p> <p>f) Additional facility to service the catchment in the area. Additional state community facility subject to negotiation and acquisition by the agency</p> <p>g) Included in ICOP. Confirmation from QPS that P002 not</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>l) FR002 - Not identified on existing approved context plan. Reduction in Town Centre Plaza may offset 0.6ha requirement. Ongoing discussions with the developer to occur</p> <p>m) SS004a and SS004b - Facilities unlikely to be achieved due to existing approvals over the land. Current application amendment only seeks a primary school on site</p> <p>n) Railway reference to be amended to "Future Railway"</p>	<p>required. DCOP mapping and SOW to be amended</p> <p>h) Confirmation from QPS that P003 not required. DCOP mapping and SOW to be amended</p> <p>i) Included in ICOP. No change to DCOP mapping</p> <p>j) Additional facility to service the catchment in the area. Additional state community facility subject to negotiation and acquisition by the agency</p> <p>k) Additional facility to service the catchment in the area. Additional state community facility subject to negotiation and acquisition by the agency</p> <p>l) Additional facility to service the catchment in the area. Additional state community facility subject to negotiation and acquisition by the agency. Site identified adjacent SEA Road and Barrams Road for facility</p> <p>m) Amended facility to service the catchment in the area. The additional land (up to 5ha) for the state community facility subject to negotiation and acquisition by the agency</p> <p>n) Noted. Mapping amendment to be considered for final DCOP</p>
State Community Facilities DCOP Mapping	134.	<p>There is no identification between the network maps EDQ to include title block for all maps with numbering/ or equivalent.</p> <p>Community Facilities - State</p> <p>There is no identification showing the network map as 'Map 8'. EDQ to include title block on maps to enable referencing. EDQ to incorporate "state school - indicative only" into the legend of the DCOP network map and also the within the DCOP provisions.</p> <p>Include comment on network map and DCOP provisions stating that timing of state schools is indicative only.</p>	<p>Noted. Mapping amendment to be considered for final DCOP SOW identifies time horizons for the delivery of state community facilities and are subject to the 5 yearly reviews of the DCOP. Not proposed to include additional statements on the mapping</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
Sub Regional Infrastructure Mapping	135.	<p>a) Include Ripley Road / Swanbank Link Road in sub regional infrastructure mapping</p> <p>b) Include Ripley Road / Swanbank Link Road connection to SEA in sub regional infrastructure (presumed this includes overpass over Centenary Highway to link SEA to Ripley Road / Swanbank Link Road) mapping</p> <p>c) Include Ripley Road in sub-regional infrastructure mapping</p> <p>d) Include Regional Park option east of Urban Core in sub-regional infrastructure mapping</p> <p>e) Railway Reference - mapping to include alignment of Future Railway to the east of the PDA to provide context to the Ripley Road / Swanbank Link Road and connection to SEA Road</p>	<p>a) Additional road not proposed to be included in the Sub Regional DCOP mapping or SOW</p> <p>b) Additional road and overpass over Centenary Highway not proposed to be included in the Sub Regional DCOP mapping or SOW</p> <p>c) Sub regional infrastructure is located outside the PDA. Ripley Road is local infrastructure.</p> <p>d) Amendment to the PDA boundary is beyond the scope of the DCOP</p> <p>e) Noted. Mapping amendment to be considered for final DCOP</p>
4.11 Development Charges and Offset Plan (DCOP)			
Sect 1.4 - Purpose	136.	<p>a) Consider rewording to include Public Transport, State Infrastructure and Implementation Works in Purpose</p> <p>b) Recommend EDQ broaden reference to include programs and strategies as point of difference under ED Act for development charges in PDAs</p>	<p>a) Consider inclusion of reference to implementation works may be appropriate as subclause iv. within the Purpose.</p> <p>Public transport broadly is included under the transport network and State community facilities is included under the community facilities network. No proposed change to the DCOP required.</p> <p>b) Reference the inclusion of strategies and programs that development charges contribute.</p>
Relationship between DCOP and IPBR	137.	<p>Request that EDQ amend the Draft Ripley Valley DCOP and IPBR to ensure that all rules applicable to the calculation of infrastructure charges, offsets, refunds and alternative compensation for contributions (e.g., additional and relocated schools) be located in the DCOP.</p> <p>It is noted however that particular rules applicable to the</p>	<p>Comments noted. The DCOP provides the policy settings while the IPBR provides the supporting implementation information to guide the applicant. The integration of the DCOP and IPBR to be reviewed prior to the final DCOP</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>implementation of the DCOP are included in the IPBR instead of the DCOP. For example, see Section 3.3 of the DCOP.</p> <p>The use of the IPBR in this manner detracts from the DCOP being the location of the implementation 'rules' and is likely to result in confusion for those administering and using the documents.</p>	
Formatting / Wording	138.	<p>a) Section 2.1 (Delayed charges) - mention of Column 2 but no mention of which Table.</p> <p>b) Section 3.2(ii)(b, c and d) - Infrastructure works - Cost estimate. Use of 'and' and full stops on each item on the list (a to d) is confusing.</p> <p>c) Section 3.2 – Duplicate section reference (e.g., there are 2 x 3.2(i), 2x 3.2(ii))</p> <p>d) EDQ instrument does not appear to be a defined term but is used throughout the DCOP.</p> <p>e) IPBR Technical Report – 10.5.2 – footnote '14' is incorrectly formatted.</p>	a) to e) DCOP document to be reviewed for formatting prior to final DCOP
Sect 1.5 - Transitional Provisions	139.	<p>a) Clarification of what constitutes a 'development approval'. If development approval does not include a context Plan, IMP or OSS requested to be made clear to avoid future arguments with developers over inconsistencies between DCOP mapping and approved context plans, IMPs or OSSs</p> <p>b) Guidance is requested on impact DCOP has on existing Context Plans, IMPs and OSSs and do they need to be updated</p> <p>c) Grammatical error - 24 months of after the adoption</p> <p>d) Clarification of Superseded EDQ Instrument on approvals</p> <p>e) Clarification regarding the levying of charges under</p>	<p>a) and b) Infrastructure planning for the PDA remains dynamic and will change over time. The expectation is that applicants should update context plans, IMPs and OSSs on a regular basis to be consistent with the projected infrastructure planning and outcomes for the entire PDA.</p> <p>c) DCOP to be reviewed for any grammatical errors</p> <p>d) Superseded EDQ Instrument provisions to be reviewed</p> <p>e) Levying of charges provisions to be reviewed</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		IFF or current DCOP	
Sect 1.5 Transitional Provisions	140.	<p>a) The interpretation of the wording below is unclear. "Development approval was made under superseded instrument." Recommend changing the word "made" to "issued"</p> <p>b) It is unclear how to interpret the paragraph "The development approval contained conditions for the payment of charges under the superseded instrument." Recommend alternative wording "contains" to reflect circumstance where a development approval is substantially changed and potentially involving the removal of these historical provisions</p> <p>c) Use of the phrase 'superseded instrument' (not a defined term) and 'superseded EDQ instrument' (this is a defined term) appear to be interchangeable. Recommend review of the use of terminology.</p>	a) to c) Comments regarding grammatical nuances and defined terms to be reviewed and amended where required.
Charge Categories	141.	Recommended that EDQ confirm that use types under each charge category align to the equivalent in the Planning regulation for consistency	<p>No change</p> <p>Noted. Generally, the categories are similar to the Planning Regulation with provision for undefined uses to be assessed on a case-by-case basis. No further response required.</p>
Sect 2.2 - Development Charge Types - Local Charge	142.	<p>a) Consider amalgamating Sect 2.2 and Sect 2.3 for simplicity</p> <p>b) Municipal Charge - Refer separately to LG infrastructure and state public transport</p> <p>c) Municipal Charge - Catalyst - State instances where cross crediting and offsetting is not permitted (i.e., similar to Sect 2.1.8 in the ICOP)</p> <p>d) Municipal Charge - PT Charge - Confirm State will continue with PT services after expiry of Agreement</p> <p>e) State Charge - refer to State Government in section and include what type of facilities are funded</p>	<p>a) Sect 2.2 and 2.3 to remain separated</p> <p>b) No change to description proposed</p> <p>c) Cross crediting clause to be included in DCOP. Section 3.4 in ICOP has description associated with cross crediting. Stipulate cross crediting does not apply to catalyst or public transport charges (Section 2.1.8 of ICOP)</p> <p>d) Beyond the scope of the DCOP</p> <p>e) No change to description proposed</p> <p>f) Sub regional infrastructure identified in SOW. Consideration to include description e.g., water, sewer and roads. Consider identifying the apportionment of charges</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		f) Sub Regional Charges - Include what type of sub regional infrastructure is funded and policy position on apportionment between Council roads and UU water and sewer	between council sub regional roads and Urban Utilities water and sewer (similar to ICOP)
Sect 2.3 Development Charge Types – Other Charges	143.	Include Special Infrastructure Levy in Section 2.3 rather than separate section	No change SIL section to remain separate
Sect 2.4 - Development Charge Rates	144.	a) Consider whether Warehouse should have a lower charge rate the Low impact Industry b) Request EDQ to advise whether a strategic analysis has been undertaken to consider if sufficient catalyst funding has been contributed to the PDA (i.e., is catalyst charge sufficient) c) In absence of a strategic analysis EDQ is requested to provide additional catalyst funding for projects (i.e., Ripley Road, Ripley-Swanbank link road, SEA Overbridge) fund a regional park option and/or included additional projects as sub regional and increase sub regional charges	a) Warehouse charge to be reviewed b) Infrastructure that catalyses development in the PDA is reviewed on a periodic basis c) Comment noted and is beyond the scope of the DCOP
Sect 2.4 - Non-residential Development Charge Rates	145.	Inordinate increase in non-residential charge rates. Request that the charging for non-residential be reviewed and potentially reduced.	In order to retain consistency in infrastructure charges applied under former charging frameworks, the DCOP has established a Cost Apportionment Unit (CAU) as a basis for the equitable distribution of infrastructure cost across the varying residential and non-residential use types.
Sect 2.8 - Calculating the Development Charge	146.	a) Clause does not account for unused offsets that will reduce the Charge payable b) Add clarification that the charge payable can be reduced by unused infrastructure offsets	a) DCOP document to be amended to reflect unused offsets b) DCOP document to be amended to reflect clarification
Interim Uses	147.	Clarify policy position on Interim Uses in DCOP	Where interim use occurs, the use is exempt from infrastructure charges
Sect 2.9 – Development Exempt from Development Charges	148.	Current Planning Policy requires that a development approval is obtained to allow for the shared use of school facilities by the community (use definition “Community	Use of existing state school facilities for temporary shared uses to be considered as exempt from infrastructure

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		Facility”) under the Development Scheme. There is also a significant infrastructure charge component under the DCOP (for Community Facility) to allow for this to occur. DoE requests that EDQ consider including a provision to exempt the use of existing state school facilities from attracting infrastructure charges.	charges. Where a permanent shared use is proposed infrastructure charges should still apply.
Sect 2.10 - Delayed Development Charges	149.	a) Consider changing the term to "deferred development charges" as per reference in Para 1 of section b) Clarify in DCOP if 50% reduction applies equally across all the charge types c) Amend formatting of footnote 7 in paragraph and reference to Section 6.2 in the footnote	a) Consistency in terminology to be applied, whether 'deferred' or 'delayed' b) 50% deferral of infrastructure charges, capped amount, is applicable to Charitable Organisations as per the Charities Act 2013 for all charge types c) Formatting to be reviewed
Sect 2.13 - Special Infrastructure Levy	150.	Clarification and guidance on the use of the SIL is requested	No change The SIL is contained in the <i>Economic Development Act 2012</i> . EDQ currently not utilising SIL for infrastructure funding in DCOP
Sect 2.13 - Special Infrastructure Levy	151.	Request clause be removed from DCOP as not required.	No change Clause 116B of ED Act SIL required to be identified in DCOP. EDQ currently not utilising SIL for infrastructure funding in DCOP
Sect 3 - Infrastructure Offsets and Refunds	152.	a) clarification requested on cross crediting (what can and cannot be cross credited) b) clarification on what is not offsetable	a) Cross crediting clause to be included in DCOP b) DCOP and IPBR are written in the positive and describe what infrastructure is offsetable. Where infrastructure is not mentioned in the DCOP and IPBR it is not offsetable
Sect 3.1 - Implementation Works	153.	Clarification of process for offset claims inclusive of partnerships arrangements	No change Implementation works offsets process to be included in offset guideline
Sect 3.1 - Timing of Offsets	154.	a) Timing of offsets is not to be tied to the DCF timing for infrastructure and can be offset when on maintenance is achieved	a) Where transport, water and sewer infrastructure are brought forward as a desire rather than by necessity, it is considered that offsets should be delayed until the needed

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		b) Request process to be confirmed in DCOP document	provided asset achieves 90% of Degree of Saturation (DoS) b) Policy approach to be documented (either DCOP or IPBR)
Sect 3.1 - Project Owners Costs	155.	a) It is now current practice that owners' costs final offset is automatically offset at 13% of the construction costs without requiring evidence b) Request process to be confirmed in DCOP document	a) Evidence of owner's costs to be provided in for offset assessment and included in Offset Assessment Guideline b) Contained in the Offset Assessment Guideline
Sect 3.2 - Infrastructure Works	156.	a) Clarification if 2% Admin costs are / are not offsetable. If applicant can claim EDQ requested to provide reasoning b) Clarification requested in regards relocation of Services to ultimate alignment as it is considered most developers will be unable to relocate utility services to the ultimate alignment due to impacts on privately owned properties c) Request EDQ to confirm service relocation allowances are adequate to cover extent of works required (i.e., Ripley Road) d) Request EDQ to clarify why the decommissioning, removal and rehabilitation of infrastructure would not be considered offsetable e) Request EDQ review DCOP mapping and remove any intersection that will likely have a negative impact upon the efficiency and performance of the trunk road network and ensure the intersections are not offsetable	No change a) 2% Administration costs to be paid upon lodgement of final offset and the applicant may claim the costs as offsetable. Similar process currently utilised for implementation charges. Note external assessment of offsets is also currently offset and would form part of the 2% Administration costs b) staged relocation of services not to be offsetable. Where ultimate service relocation occurs, works are to be offsetable c) Service relocations have been factored into the works unit rates d) The intent is to encourage the improved optimisation of the initial staged interim works. Not offsetable unless forming part of the ultimate outcome e) Full mesoscopic and microscopic modelling was undertaken across the network to agree the most efficient and timely staged intersection delivery
Sect 3.2 - Infrastructure Works Contribution - Cost Estimate	157.	a) Temporary and Sacrificial Works - Where required for the delivery of trunk infrastructure to make works safe or provide a more cost-effective solution, the temporary and/or sacrificial works should be offsetable. These works should not impact the overall costs as the costs will be minor and easily covered in the contingencies b) Amend the wording as follows: ii. carrying out	No change a) Interim works in accordance with EDQ Guidelines where part of the ultimate design or provide a more cost-effective solution are intended to be offsetable b) No further amendments required to the wording of the DCOP

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		temporary or sacrificial infrastructure works unless it is required for the delivery of the infrastructure and/or can be demonstrated to provide a more cost effective or safer solution to the delivery of staged infrastructure	
Sect 3.2 - Infrastructure Works Contribution - Cost Estimate	158.	<p>a) Relocation of Utilities - IPBR does not contain sufficient detail to determine whether or not relocations are required. If relocations of services are required for the functional and safe delivery of infrastructure, these costs must be offsetable. Clause should be clearer</p> <p>b) Amend clause - <i>iii. - relocation of identified and unidentified utilities, unless required to deliver the infrastructure</i></p>	<p>No change</p> <p>a) and b) Where relocations form part of the ultimate design, the works are intended to be offsetable</p>
Sect 3.2 - Infrastructure Works Contribution - Cost Estimate	159.	<p>a) Decommissioning of Infrastructure - If decommissioning, removal and rehabilitation of any infrastructure required for the functional and safe delivery of infrastructure, then these costs must be offsetable</p> <p>b) Amend the wording as follows: <i>v. decommissioning, removal and rehabilitation of infrastructure, unless required to deliver the infrastructure</i></p>	<p>No change</p> <p>a) Decommissioning of temporary infrastructure not part of an agreed works contribution is not considered to be offsetable</p> <p>b) Noted</p>
Sect 3.2 - Infrastructure Works Contribution - Cost Estimate	160.	<p>a) Maintenance of Infrastructure Asset where Conditioned - If maintenance is a necessary part of delivering trunk infrastructure, then it should be 100% offsetable like any other element of the infrastructure delivery.</p> <p>b) Amend clause as follows: <i>xvi - a cost of maintaining an infrastructure beyond that required by development conditions</i></p>	<p>No change</p> <p>a) Maintenance unless identified within in the IPBR for infrastructure will not be offset.</p> <p>b) Noted</p>
Sect 3.3 - Infrastructure Land Contribution – Cost Estimate	161.	Suggest section be reworded	Cost Estimate section wording to be reviewed
Sect 3.4 - Implementation Works	162.	a) Implementation Works - The delivery of an implementation strategy and annual monitoring reports is an integral part of the implementation delivery and has	a) and b) Implementation strategy and annual monitoring reports to be considered offsetable

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
Contribution - Cost Estimate		<p>been approved as offsetable</p> <p>b) Request clause is deleted</p>	
Sect 3.4 - Implementation Works Contribution - Cost Estimate	163.	<p>a) Suggest EDQ include references to PN15 similar to current ICOP</p> <p>b) Suggest EDQ review PN15 to identify if any further guidance can be provided for applicants in relation to Implementation Works, Implementation plans, and their relationship to the DCOP, development Scheme, IPBR, IMP's OS's, Context Plans, and Annual Monitoring reports</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>a) Reference to Practice Note 15 to be considered for inclusion in the IPBR</p> <p>b) Practice Note to be reviewed following adoption of DCOP and amended where required</p>
Sect 3.5 - Provisional Offset Claim	164.	<p>a) Provisional offset claim is required only where applicant seeks to vary scope, timing or cost of infrastructure. Clause appears to limit the ability to make a provisional offset claim</p> <p>b) Currency period of 2 years for a Provisional offset is too short and request a currency period of 5 years to align with the cohort review timing</p> <p>c) MEDQ will not accept and apply an approved provisional offset claim against Development charges which are levied upon a PDA development approval. Unsure as to what this means and the intent of the clause. Recommend rewording of the clause</p>	<p>a) The provisional offset process has only been intended to gain certainty where infrastructure scope or cost have varied from the current ICOP. The requirements to submit a provisional are broad enough to cover most variations against the DCOP (scope, timing or costs). Intent of the provision is to ensure where the proposed infrastructure is at or less than the infrastructure value in the SOW a provisional should not need to be submitted. Where the applicant proposes to vary scope, timing or exceed the DCOP value (following confirmation by tender) a provisional offset application is recommended to be lodged for assessment.</p> <p>b) No further amendments required to the wording of the DCOP</p> <p>c) Clause to be reviewed</p>
Section 3.5 – Offset Requirements	165.	<p>Request EDQ to amend the Draft Ripley Valley DCOP to include the following clause:</p> <p>“A provisional offset claim for a land contribution that is a State school site will be assessed against the requirements of PDA Guideline 11 – Community facilities and the New School Site Selection Guidelines 2021 (as amended from time to time).”</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>The Ripley Valley PDA in its natural state does not have many if any sites that conform to Department of Education's schools site selection criteria. The mapping has provided for whole of site locations though have considered best information available including infrastructure networks and proximity planning. The inclusion for a provisional offset for land which predates any works on the site to comply with the</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		To ensure that applicants provide school sites which comply with DoE's site selection criteria, this section of the DCOP would ideally make clear that the availability of an offset is dependent on an applicant meeting the school site selection criteria.	school site selection criteria is not supported
General DCOP Document Review Comments Sect 3.6 - Final Offset Claim	166.	a) remove the requirement for a bond for staged works and offset accruals from subclause b) b) Reword clause in relation to maximum infrastructure offset that may be claimed	a) Final offsets are only to be provided for completed works. No further amendments required to the wording of the DCOP b) Consideration of the phrasing of the clause
Sect 3.7 - Trunk Infrastructure (TI) Refunds Sect 3.8 - Entitlement to a Refund Sect 3.9 - Determining a Request for a Refund	167.	a) Request EDQ amend DCOP to provide further guidance as to what information would be required to assist in deciding a request for a refund and also what would be a standard / reasonable timeframe in which to issue a refund b) Suggested EDQ prepare a policy position that is similar to Council's AICR in order to provide certainty to both the applicant and council when a refund should apply and the payment triggers	No change a) Additional information for refund process contained in the Offset Assessment Guideline b) Section 3.8 provides adequate guidance on the entitlement to a refund
Sect 3.7 - Trunk Infrastructure Refunds	168.	request replacing the word "may" with "would" and provide clarifications, if need be, on situations where a Trunk Infrastructure refund would not occur	No change No further amendments required to the wording of the DCOP
Sect 3.8 - Entitlement to a Refund	169.	In the presentation by EDQ, it was advised that the DCF would provide more certainty on refunds. Provide refunds in a timely manner. Suggest clause be reworded.	No change Refunds will still be provided when EDQ has available funds.
Sect 4 - Trunk Infrastructure maps	170.	Suggest providing a link to the maps	Link to be provided to the infrastructure mapping on EDQ website following commencement of the DCOP
Sect 4.1 - Timings Featured in DCOP SOW	171.	Sect 4.1 - Timings Featured in DCOP SOW a) DoE requests a footnote or clause in the DCOP to ensure that "the actual timing of the land dedication will be based on a demand threshold being reached as determined by the Department of Education." b) DoE requests that the featured timings remain	a) and b) 5 yearly reviews of DCOP will guide the delivery of state community infrastructure. Timings in the DCOP are flexible based upon projected growth patterns. Dept of Education can of its own volition seek to acquire land ahead of time

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		indicative only and subject to further discussion between the developer/ landowner, EDQ and DoE.	
Sect 4.7 - Desired Standards of Service	172.	DoE notes that there is no clear linkage between the DCOP and IPBR and how the DSS would be applied/ take effect. EDQ to reference requirement of Desired Standard of Service (Table 4.7.1 DSS for State provided facilities) in DCOP, or demonstrate how this linkage takes effect	No change The intention is for all discussion on the DSS is to be situated in the IPBR/Appendix D with the planning application of the DSS to sit within the relevant guidelines
Sect 5 - Definitions	173.	a) Local Charge - Recommended definition refers to the costs for the implementation strategies and delivery of programs to deliver Implementation Works as outlined in PN15 b) Value Capture Charge Area refers to Sect 2.3 however not contained in the document. Recommend definition be removed	a) Definition of local charge to be reviewed to consider implementation works, strategies and delivery of programs b) Value Capture Charge Area definition to be removed
General	174.	a) Transfer of Final Offsets - desirable to allow the transfer of final offsets between projects as may reduce the need for refunds. EDQ consider incorporating advice that final offsets can be transferred across projects with EDQ approval b) Indexation of Unused Credits - DCOP and previous documents are silent on the indexation of unused offsets (credits). DCOP clarify that unused offsets (credits) are indexed annually in line with charges indexation c) TMR Works - Clarify TMR assets are not funded through the IFF and funded by TMR through normal budgetary process and that developers should not be held responsible or conditioned to provide TMR infrastructure d) 2% Final Offset Approval Fee - Clarify that the 2% final offset approval fee is capped at 2% for all approval authorities e) Offsets may exceed DCOP amounts - clarify where	a) This is not supported as part of standard practice, may be considered on a case-by-case basis. No further amendments required to the wording of the DCOP b) DCOP document to be updated c) Clearly stated in DCOP that only infrastructure identified in the DCOP is funded by the municipal/state charge d) 2% Administration Fee applies to final offsets and includes external consultant offset assessments. An offset application lodgement fee to the MEDQ delegate may still apply for provisional offset applications e) Offsets are to be granted in the event of a variation to infrastructure costs where a provisional offset approval has been granted f) Wording to be incorporated to include cross crediting of municipal charges. No cross between municipal and other charges g) Where there is an alternative network layout this can be

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>actual costs to deliver infrastructure exceeds DCOP SOW then the actual cost will be accepted for a final offset</p> <p>f) Cross Crediting - Reinstate wording that confirms acceptance of cross crediting costs with certain charges types</p> <p>g) Alternative Network Layouts - Reinstate or maintain an alternative network layouts clause in DCOP document</p> <p>h) Mapping of Existing Assets - Include Asset IDs for existing assets on infrastructure maps</p>	<p>addressed as part of the 5 yearly updates and can be catered for a part of a provisional offset</p> <p>h) Support inclusion in mapping of Asset IDs for existing assets</p>
Value Capture Charge Area	175.	Request to remove Greater Flagstone Value Capture Charge Area Map	Mapping to be removed from DCOP documentation
4.12 DCOP Technical Reports - Appendix D			
Section 2.3 - Demographic Analysis - Comparison of Forecasts	176.	<p>a) Recommend report and comparative analysis include a greater focus on the near-term forecasts for 2026 and 2031 and make note of actual figures for 2021. Applicable to Tables 2-2 to 2-7, 2-10, 2-11</p> <p>b) Recommend EDQ undertake a further review of DCOP projections as soon as reasonable to align to ICC's LGIP base data and projections which utilise a more sophisticated modelling tool and analysis than previously available</p> <p>c) Expected Dwellings - Was data received from Sekisui House and if not why.</p> <p>d) Noted a number of figures are now outdated and should be updated accordingly (Attachments A1 and A2)</p> <p>e) Table 2-5 Dwelling Forecasts appears to use approved/proposed lots as opposed to dwelling titles and should be amended, though acknowledge PODs do not require multi residential lots to be developed exclusively of this purpose</p> <p>f) Sekisui house is expected to provide 6,285 dwellings</p>	<p>a) to g) Demographics analysis is a long-term view taken at a point in time. The dwelling yield analysis considered a top-down bottom up approach and engaged with the Developer cohort to determine a realistic and aspirational dwelling yield for the first 10 years to 2031. The identified dwelling forecasts appear to generally correlate to the actual dwelling provision over the course of the last two years.</p> <p>h) to k) Comments noted. No further response to be provided</p> <p>j) The spatial 'bottom-up' analysis that was undertaken to test the SGS ultimate dwelling projections, found that the dwelling targets were achievable, and included removal of land for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open space • Local, and state community facilities (as identified at the time of assessment) • Urban centre requirements

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>and not 12,012 as identified in the demographic analysis</p> <p>g) The Other category for dwellings is to accommodate 13,860 dwellings and is an over estimation. Suggest figure may be 5,800 dwellings</p> <p>h) Density targets for earlier applications have not always been achieved due to differences in density calculation methodology</p> <p>i) Reduction in dwelling yield does not take into account additional land for State Community Facilities, open Space, non-government schools</p> <p>j) Indicative mapping prepared by council indicates the PDA is only likely to achieve 34,500 dwellings</p> <p>k) Page 5 - suggest this paragraph be amended to 2046 instead of 2066</p>	<p>The requirement to consider the additional state community facility land was identified after this assessment had been undertaken, which is why this was specifically identified as a separate reduction in section 2.6 of the IPBR.</p> <p>The only item raised by the submitter that was not removed was non-government schools, and while these may be located in residential zone areas, they will still place demand on the network, and be subject to development charges, which will reduce any potential impact in such a scenario. This is potentially an item that can be reviewed and considered as part of future updates to the DCOP but will require more detailed analysis of the likely quantity, size and location of non-state facilities that may ultimately develop in the area.</p>
Section 2.3.3 - Employment	177.	Unclear why Ripley Valley has half the employment of Greater Flagstone for similar populations and clarification is requested	<p>No change</p> <p>Ripley Valley employment generating activities are located adjacent to the PDA.</p>
Section 2.4 - Implications on Water and Sewer Modelling	178.	<p>a) Request further clarification regarding the significant differences between Urban Utilities projections and other projections</p> <p>b) Recommend mapping in Figure 2-8 Ripley Valley Timing of development be expanded into a series of maps that illustrate time periods, a Priority Infrastructure Area (PIA) and indicative development sequencing strategy</p>	<p>a) Water and sewer projections include residential and non-residential development</p> <p>b) Consider whether to include development horizons in separate mapping in the Technical Report. A PIA is not supported for the PDA</p>
Section 3.8 - Sub regional Water Supply Strategy	179.	Clarification is required as it appears the proposed water strategy may conflict with existing EPBC approvals.	<p>No change</p> <p>Comment related to water network in Section 3.14</p>
Section 3.14 – Adopted Water Network	180.	Clarification is required as it appears the proposed water network may conflict with existing EPBC approvals.	<p>No change</p> <p>Additional approvals may be required prior to construction being commenced.</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
Section 3.16 - Cost Apportionment	181.	Request early engagement regarding apportionment of costs for municipal and sub-regional infrastructure particularly the distribution between EDQ, Council and Urban Utilities	Consider inclusion of cost apportionment breakdown in IPBR
Section 5.1 - Reference Standards	182.	<p>a) Reference to 'Ipswich City Council Planning Scheme – Sub Regional Detention Basin locations map (2013)' which is not part of the current and operational Ipswich Planning Scheme. The regional approach for stormwater and basins is a product of the original Integrated Water Management approach in the 2007 study.</p> <p>b) Why is stormwater identified in the plans?</p> <p>c) Request reference to '1% AEP flood' or '100-year ARI flood' should be replaced with 'AFRL (Adopted Flood Regulation Level)' to align with the current Ipswich Planning Scheme Overlay 5.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>a) and b) - A regional stormwater analysis was conducted as part of the background information and technical reporting for the DCOP. Regional stormwater outcomes are not included as offsetable infrastructure under the DCOP</p> <p>c) At the time of production this was EDQ's chosen terminology across PDA's so for consistency will be maintaining.</p>
Section 5.2 - Previous Reports and Developer IMPs	183.	Request Developer Areas, IMPs and Context Plans are brought up to date. Refer to information recently supplied to EDQ.	<p>No change</p> <p>IMPs and Context Plans are generally relevant to June 2020. Some minor amendments may occur though expected next update to occur either as part of a soft update or the 5 yearly review of the DCOP</p>
Section 5.7.1 - Background Information	184.	Refer to comments for Section 5.1	Refer to Item 7
Section 5.7.3 Phase 2 - Preliminary Sizing of Potential Sub Regional Infrastructure	185.	Recommend EDQ undertake a review of planning approaches to floodplain management to align with contemporary requirements of the State Planning Policy and align with Council's Integrated Catchment Plan and Fit-For- Purpose Natural Hazard Risk assessments. This can be used to inform updated constraints mapping to inform developable area for the PDA and for other planning and assessment processes.	<p>No change</p> <p>A regional stormwater analysis was conducted as part of the background information and technical reporting for the DCOP. Regional stormwater outcomes are not included as offsetable infrastructure under the DCOP. Phase 2 not envisaged as stormwater does not form part of the DCOP charges</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
Section 6 - Integrated Water Management	186.	<p>a) It is noted that this is the only section of the DCOP supporting material that makes reference to Covid. More specifically it states “With the challenges faced in the last year, Australian awareness of climate, heat waves, floods, droughts and bushfires is at an all-time high. This awareness, coupled with the significantly different ways that we have been living our lives during Covid, is leading to some fundamental shifts in the concept of homes, how homes are constructed and how people view their neighbourhoods and cities.”</p> <p>b) It is requested that EDQ advise why Covid has been considered in this context but not in any other (i.e., dwelling yield forecasts, population growth rates, employment forecasts and increase in infrastructure costs).</p>	<p>a) and b) The Ripley Valley PDA project time horizon is planned to 2066. Depending on growth, this time horizon may be extended and will be addressed during the 5 yearly updates. The demographic analysis comparison appears to indicate similarities between the estimated growth and the impacts of Covid on growth rates. In considering the base works unit rates, the rates have been taken from a median arrangement in 2021 and are to be tested in market conditions. The increase in infrastructure costs will be reviewed during the 5 yearly updates and it is inappropriate to react to what may be a short-term variance over the life of the project.</p>
Section 6.5 Innovation by Design	187.	It is requested that EDQ remove references to ‘Logan City Council’ and the ‘Cedar Grove Treatment plant’ as these are not relevant to the Ripley Valley PDA.	References to be amended but content as examples of innovation by design to remain.
Section 6.5.10 - Flood Resilient Building Design and Flood Preparedness	188.	QRA Guideline “Flood Resilient Building Guidance for Queensland Homes” should be referenced	<p>No change</p> <p>Consider referencing the guideline</p>
Section 6.5.16 - Stormwater Offsets and Water Quality Credit Programs	189.	As the Ripley PDA is a greenfield development, stormwater quality should be met at the point source. Should offsets be considered for smaller sites where meeting WSUD is difficult, it would need to be an existing regional solution within the same local catchment and have demonstrated capacity to show it can treat the additional area.	<p>No change</p> <p>A regional stormwater analysis was conducted as part of the background information and technical reporting for the DCOP. Regional stormwater outcomes are not included as offsettable infrastructure under the DCOP</p>
Section 7.1 - Transport Introduction	190.	It is requested that EDQ amend the first sentence of the first paragraph as it does not make sense. It is assumed that some words are missing	Section 7.1 to be reviewed and amended where required

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
Section 7.11 - Intersection Requirements and Staging	191.	<p>a) The report notes that “Staged pedestrian crossing was provided where excessive crossing distances exist” within the SIDRA intersection assessment. Whilst the option of a staged pedestrian crossing is not preferred, it is acknowledged that it may be necessary for some very large intersections. However, there are concerns that the proposed intersection layouts do not include sufficient centre median islands widths to safely store pedestrians or cyclist as part of a staged pedestrian crossing</p> <p>b) Council expect that a minimum centre median island width of 4.0m would be required to safely store pedestrians and cyclists on major arterial roads should a staged pedestrian crossings be required.</p> <p>c) The report notes that “The turning volumes used for the SIDRA analysis were taken from the Jacobs’ Aimsun transport model for each horizon”. Council’s review of the SIDRA intersection analysis has identified an issue with the forecast intersection traffic volumes. It appears that the volumes used to inform the SIDRA modelling are the “Assigned” traffic volumes from the Aimsun traffic model and may not represent the full “Demand” traffic volumes due to network and intersection capacity constraints. These constraints may be at the intersection in question or may stem from intersections upstream or downstream of the intersection in question. There are concerns that this issue may lead to an underestimation of the intersection volumes and potentially result in an intersection layout with insufficient capacity.</p> <p>d) Council’s review has identified that this issue appears to be more prevalent in the interim year network scenarios where there is a relatively immature road network with limited alternate routes, however it also appears to be an issue (albeit reduced) in for key intersection in the ultimate network scenario, particularly those in proximity to the highway interchanges. Council</p>	<p>a) and b) A industry accepted allowance has been made for the safe storage of pedestrians within the median. If a larger median is required, then EDQ would consider if other alternates had been exhausted such as adjusting the signal timeframes</p> <p>c) Jacobs have provided an addendum to explain how they arrived at the "Assigned" volumes by repeat network testing predominantly along Ripley Road catchment to ensure an acceptable DOS and LOS was achieved without significant difference to the "Actual" volumes</p> <p>d) Comment noted.</p> <p>e) Comment noted.</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>officers have developed a process to determine the full “Demand” traffic volumes, which has been discussed and agree with EDQ and Jacobs and propose to utilise these full “Demand” traffic volumes to inform future traffic assessments within the PDA. This full “Demand” traffic volumes will differ from the intersection volumes included in the DCOP supporting material and may create concerns or confusion for developers.</p> <p>e) It is requested that EDQ include further commentary within the DCOP supporting material to address this issue and to provide clear guidance on the traffic volumes (interim and ultimate) that are to be used to inform future traffic impact assessment within the PDA.</p>	
Section 7.12 - Corridor Requirements and Staging	192.	<p>Requested the following cross sections included in Table 7-8 Summary of Ripley valley PDA Trunk Mid Block Requirements and Staging be checked against approved and constructed cross sections</p> <p>a) General comment – The total corridor width included in the table for interim (Stage A) projects is misleading, with no verge widths included for one side of the road. Whilst it is generally understood that only one verge will be constructed within the interim (Stage A) construction work, an allowance is still required for the opposite verge to ensure that services, earthworks, table drains, etc are contained within the road reserve.</p> <p>b) Project R001 & R048 – The cross section described does not reflect the works that have been constructed on Binnies Road (Grampian Drive to Daley Road).</p> <p>c) Project R002 – The cross section described does not reflect the works that have been constructed on Tempo Drive by AV Jennings or conditioned on the McHales development (Binnies Road to Montereia Road). The cross section also appears to be missing the 1.5m pedestrian pathway from one verge.</p>	<p>a) All interim roads will be constructed in their ultimate location. Similarly, all services will be constructed in along their ultimate alignments even if in the ultimate verge.</p> <p>b) to g) All cross sections were developed with extensive reference to known approvals and would resemble or transition to the ultimate cross sections. All new approvals will be in accordance with the DCOP cross sections.</p> <p>h) and i) Technical reports to be reviewed and amended where required</p> <p>j) Noted for inclusion</p> <p>k) Noted for correction</p> <p>l) Incorrect refer Road Hierarchy and SOW</p> <p>m) Correct however it will remain a Trunk Connector</p> <p>n) All cross sections were developed with extensive reference to known approvals and would resemble or transition to the ultimate cross sections. All new approvals will be in accordance with the DCOP cross sections.</p> <p>o) This is a non-standard cross section refer SOW</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>d) Project R003 - The cross section appears to be missing the 1.5m pedestrian pathway from one verge and there is an error with the total reserve width.</p> <p>e) Projects R004B, R007B, R010B - Ripley Road (Cunningham Highway to Fischer Road) – Ripley Road planning has determine that Ripley Road will include 2.5m bi-directional cycle tracks within both (6.5m) verges, whilst the cross section described included one-way 2.0m cycle tracks within a 6m verge.</p> <p>f) Project R011B – Fischer Road (Monterea Road to Ripley Road), the cross section described requires a 33m reserve, however the reserve width secure from the Sekisui House and Satterley developments to the north of Ripley Road is only 25m.</p> <p>g) Projects R012B, R013B, R047B - Ripley Road (Fischer Road to Centenary Highway) –This section of Ripley Road will require retrofit from on road cycle lanes to separated cycle tracks similar to the section of Ripley Road to the north of Fischer Road (i.e. 2.5m bi-directional cycle tracks within both (6.5m) verges), however the cross section includes a typical in verge one-way 2.0m cycle tracks within a 6m verges.</p> <p>h) Project R014A & R014B – These projects are included in table 7-8, but are not included on the trunk infrastructure plans or within the schedule of works.</p> <p>i) Project R021B – Missing 1m clearance for second verge, which will increase the total reserve width to 40m.</p> <p>j) Project R022B – Missing from table 7-8.</p> <p>k) Project R023A & R023B – Project included in table 7-8 but is not included on trunk infrastructure plans of schedule of works.</p> <p>l) Projects R043A, R0431A-1, R043B, R043B-1 – Grampian Drive (Binnies Road to Winland Drive) should be classified as a trunk connector road, not an arterial.</p> <p>m) Project R046B & R052B – Grampian Drive south of</p>	<p>p) Noted for correction</p> <p>q) Noted for correction. Refer Jacobs report for modelling substantiation</p> <p>r) Noted for correction</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>Centenary Highway is shown as 4 lanes in Table 7-8, on the trunk infrastructure plans and in the schedule of works, however, is it understood that is has been agreed between EDQ and Stockland to reduce the cross section for this section of Grampian Drive to a median divided 2 lane road south of Winland Drive.</p> <p>n) Project R051B – Barrams Road (SEA Road to Cumner Road) – The cross section described in Table 7-8 does not reflect the functional layouts for Barrams Road prepared by Stockland.</p> <p>o) Projects R053 & R054 – There is an error in the cross section in Table 7-8. The total corridor width should be 24m.</p> <p>p) Project R055 – Missing from Table 7-8.</p> <p>q) Project R056A & R056B – Missing from Table 7-8. EDQ are requested to confirm that the forecast traffic volumes for this link warrant 4 lanes.</p> <p>r) Project R057 – Missing from Table 7-8."</p>	
Section 7.15 - Road and Interchange Design	193.	Request update the reference from Flagstone to Ripley Valley	Noted for correction
Section 7.16 - Opinion of Cost of Adopted Interim and Ultimate Planning Horizons	194.	Whilst it is generally understood that the blended unit rates applied within the DCOP are lower than the RLB rates, it is not possible to determine the percentage reductions that have been applied.	RLB's rates were not used as baseline rates, rather included within a cohort or reference rates
Section 8 - Active Transport	195.	a) The active transport network provisions included within the DCOP are generally supported, however there does not appear to be a specific consideration to increase levels of active transport infrastructure in proximity to key trips generators or attractors. It is noted that reference is made to the Ripley Valley PDA Active Transport Plan Draft Report - prepared by ARUP in February 2019, however this report does not currently appear to be	<p>a) EDQ is supportive of a well serviced AT network.</p> <p>b) Noted for inclusion</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>available. Whilst this report may have only been progressed to a draft format, it is suggested that the inclusion of the report and the identified active transport network as an appendix within DCOP supporting material would be beneficial</p> <p>b) It is suggested that additional commentary is included within the DCOP to reinforce the importance of considering trip attractor, generators and topography when selecting active transport network provisions, including the acknowledgement the major trip generators and attractor (e.g. schools, railway stations, major shopping centres) could require the provision of additional active transport provisions above and beyond the typical cross section included in the DCOP and EDQ Street and Movement Network Guideline.</p>	
Section 8.10 - Network Development	196.	Off road shared paths to be located in most appropriate area (preferred option is land already cleared and impacts on fauna and lighting disturbance considered)	Comment Noted. Consideration of additional wording to be provided in the section
Section 9.10 Adopted Sequencing and Geographical Analysis	197.	Consider that there are deficiencies in the Ripley PDA and DCOP, which suggests Council's LGIP, and existing networks will need to compensate for lack of service levels in the PDA	No change Comment Noted.
Section 9.11 - Adopted Network Table 9-5 Adopted Parks Under DCOP	198.	<p>a) Table represent a net reduction of 40.5ha though considered approx. 100ha of public parks not able to be achieved or meet DSS in proposed location due to site constraints or insufficient land area</p> <p>b) Table suggests additional 232ha added for environmental/rehab/biodiversity. Clarification as to how area calculated is requested</p> <p>c) Linear Park areas largely derived from flood and drainage capacity. Clarification requested how this can be calculated in open space due to flood extent and not comply with DSS calculations</p> <p>d) "Quantity of Area" and "Land area comparison Area"</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>a) Comment noted. Mapping identified utilising catchment-based parameters. Review of site locations conducted following receipt of comments. Changes made where required</p> <p>b) Calculation utilise on rate for the length of the linear parks</p> <p>c) Refer to linear park diagram</p> <p>d) Comments noted</p>

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		<p>appear to be calculated using min land area of ICOP and max land area of DCOP which does not appear to show correct values with majority of land area already locked in. Example:</p> <p>i) District Recreation Park – will not total 22ha alone, and majority of district parks are locked in or on very constrained land</p> <p>ii) Regional Sport Park is same as District Recreation Park and 2 losses would be more than the proposed 10ha</p> <p>iii) District Sports Park land area comparison appears over inflated with loss of 2 parks with an increase of 14ha. Majority of District sports parks land are locked in at the lower provision and others are on constrained land so actual provision would be a loss.</p> <p>iv) Similar for Neighbourhood Recreation Parks when majority are locked in at 0.5ha or lower and loss of 42 parks has an increase of 4.5ha does not appear consistent with the figures and approved land areas.</p> <p>v) If figures are then based on park per population it would appear park provision will not meet the intended requirements of the DCOP.</p>	
Sect 10.5.2 - Site Selection Criteria	199.	Appears to be a missing footnote reference relating to Footnote 13	Noted. Section 10.5.2 to be reviewed regarding footnote
Sect 10.7 Innovation be Design	200.	Request to insert footnote relating to word “vertical models” in Land Efficiencies Dot Point 2 to state: “vertical state primary and secondary schools will only be considered on a case-by-case basis and confirmed through a master-planning process”.	Noted for review of Section 10.7 regarding footnote
Sect 10.7 - Colocation and Shared use	201.	DoE notes Section 10.7.2 Guiding Principles and requests inclusion of the following footnote: Insert footnote relating to “state high schools and primary	No change Noted for review of Section 10.7.2 regarding footnote

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
Community Facilities		<p>schools” in Co-Location Dot Point 1 to state, “Due to operational reasons, it is not the preferred approach for DoE to provide P-12 campus models, with focus and intention to continue providing separate schools or to current policy”.</p> <p>DoE notes the considerations relating to the built form of community facilities, including collocation and shared use outcomes.</p>	
Sect 10.11 - Estimate timings for Delivery of Schools	202.	DoE requests a footnote or clause to Table 10-5 Adopted Network to ensure that “the actual timing of the land dedication will be based on a demand threshold being reached as determined by the Department of Education.”	DCOP is to be review on a 5 yearly basis. Footnote not proposed to be included
Section 10.12 - Adopted Community Facilities Networks	203.	<p>a) Co-Location Principles - Requested the inclusion of co-location principles or outcomes that can help guide the review/setting and co-location of local and state facilities, where synergies, purpose and opportunities exist, specifically in the community facility network</p> <p>b) Table 10-7 Community Facilities Proposed infrastructure - page numbering issue from this point forward (i.e., page 209 should be 214)</p>	<p>a) Consider co-location principles to be included in the local/state community facilities networks.</p> <p>b) Noted. Page numbering to be reviewed</p>
Section 11.5.13 - Distributed Storage and Smart Systems	204.	Update reference from Flagstone to Ripley Valley if relevant to local context.	Section 11.5.13 to be reviewed regarding whether Ripley Valley applies in this instance
Appendix A - SIDRA Intersection Layouts - Figure 6-20	205.	Inconsistency between intersection timings and upgrades between Figure 6-20 and within SIDRA assessment do not match SOW or trunk infrastructure plans	Appendix A - Figure 6-20 to be reviewed and amended where required
Appendix A - SIDRA intersection assessment - Staged Pedestrian crossings	206.	<p>a) Given the long-term nature of the project, intersection operating with a DoS of less than 1.0 will likely be considered acceptable and potentially common practise</p> <p>b) As noted in the comments for Section 7.11- Intersection Requirements and Staging (above), the proposed intersection layouts do not include sufficient</p>	a) and b) Section to be reviewed and amended where required

Submission reference	#	Summary of Issue	Response
		centre median islands widths to safely storage pedestrians or cyclist as part of a staged pedestrian crossing. If staged pedestrian crossing is not physically possible, the results of some intersection assessments may overestimate the intersection capacity and underrepresent the level of queuing and delay.	
Appendix A - SIDRA intersection assessment	207.	The SIDRA intersection results have not been provided for intersection RI048 – RI058.	Section to be reviewed and amended where required
General / Formatting	208.	<p>a) Page referencing - Page referencing and hot clicking links do not work</p> <p>b) 10.11 (Adopted network) page 273 has incorrect formatting</p> <p>c) Sect 10.5.2 - Site Selection Criteria - The term DSS13 is unclear and should be expanded on (i.e., is this referencing PDA Guideline 11 -Community Facilities (2015)?)</p>	Formatting to be reviewed and a) to c) amended where required

Contact Us

Contact Economic Development Queensland by:

Email: edq@dsdilgp.qld.gov.au

Phone: (07) 3452 7880

Post: Economic Development Queensland
Department of State Development,
Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning
GPO Box 2202
Brisbane Queensland 4001 Australia