

Yeronga Priority Development Area Development Charges and Offset Plan (DCOP) and Infrastructure Planning Background Report (IPBR)

Submissions Report July 2022



The Department of State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning improves productivity and quality of life in Queensland by leading economic strategy, industry development, infrastructure and planning, for the benefit of all.

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, July 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 Queensland 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.statedevelopment.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 4002.

1 William Street Brisbane Qld 4000 (Australia)

Phone: 13 QGOV (13 7468)

Email: edq@dsdmip.qld.gov.au

Web: <https://www.statedevelopment.qld.gov.au/economic-development-qld>

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 | Submitter interest in the PDA | 7 |
| 4 | Summary of merits of submissions relating to DCOP and IPBR..... | 8 |
| 4.1 | Draft DCOP and IPRB Submissions..... | 8 |

1 Introduction

The Yeronga PDA was declared by regulation on 10 August 2018. The PDA development scheme came into effect on 9 July 2019.

The DCOP assists the MEDQ in exercising the powers relating to infrastructure contributions matters in the PDA under section 10(1)(f) and section 85 of the *Economic Development Act 2012* (ED Act). Once approved, the documents will set policy for the Yeronga PDA regarding development charges, trunk infrastructure plans, schedules of work, offset arrangements and refunds to support the development provided by the PDA Development Scheme.

The IPBR establishes technical details and desired standards of service for the trunk infrastructure identified in the DCOP.

The proposed Yeronga Priority Development Area (PDA) draft Development Charges and Offset Plan (DCOP) was publicly notified for 30 business days from Monday 14 March to 5:00pm on Tuesday 26 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 Yeronga 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 Yeronga PDA draft DCOP took place between Monday 14 March to 5:00pm on Tuesday 26 April 2022. During the public notification period the following community engagement initiatives were implemented:

- A Department of State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning (DSDILGP) 'Have Your Say' (HYS) webpage for the [Yeronga 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 Yeronga PDA draft DCOP.
- Information on the Yeronga PDA page on the DSDILGP website
- Public notice advertisement on the [DSDILGP Yeronga PDA](#) web page
- Online public notice advertisements in The Courier Mail
 - Page Views: 145
 - Visitors: 43
 - Downloaded at least a document: 25
 - Visited Multiple Project Pages: 17
 - Visited at least one Page: 43
 - Visited Facebook: 1

Library downloads

| Downloads |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 6 downloads of the draft Development Charges and Offset Plan (DCOP)• 3 downloads of the FAQs• 0 downloads of the Community newsletter #1• 1 downloads of the draft Infrastructure Planning Background Report (IPBR)• 2 downloads of the <i>How to make a submission</i> fact sheet. |

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 classified by number and section relevant to the DCOP/IPBR. |
| Summarising submission issues | <p>Each submission was read, and the different matters raised were entered into the submissions database under headings based on the sections of the DCOP/IPBR.</p> <p>Each submission often covered several topics; therefore, allowance was made for the same or similar comments being raised in several submissions. This included receipt of multiple submissions with similar views on a topic or submissions having different views on the same topic. For this reason, comments across submissions on topics were identified and these comments were summarised under common headings based on the sections of the DCOP/IPBR in the submissions report.</p> |
| Evaluation and | Once all comments were summarised, they were assessed, and responses |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| responses to issues | <p>were prepared.</p> <p>Potential changes to the DCOP/IPBR 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 DCOP/IPBR changes were made based on the sections of the DCOP/IPBR rather than on a submission-by-submission basis.</p> |
| Submissions 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 DCOP/IPBR 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 DCOP/IPBR amendment were submitted to the MEDQ for review and approval.</p> |
| Publishing and notification of DCOP/IPBR. | <p>As soon as practicable after the MEDQ approved the DCOP, the MEDQ published the DCOP and IPBR.</p> |

3 Overview of submissions

3.1 Submission numbers

A total of 3 submissions were received by EDQ, 2 during the public notification period and 1 additional submission after the public notification period ended.

3.2 Submission method

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

Table 2: Breakdown of submissions by submission method

| Method of submission | Number of submissions received |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Post | 0 |
| Email | 3 |
| Online submission | 0 |
| Total submissions | 3 |

3.3 Submitter interest in the PDA

A breakdown of the submissions by interest is outlined in Table 4 below.

Table 3: Breakdown of submissions by interested party

| Type of submitter | Number of submissions received |
|----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Resident | 1 |
| Business, Public-sector entities and other organisations | 2 |
| Total submissions | 3 |

4 Summary of merits of submissions relating to DCOP and IPBR

4.1 Draft DCOP and IPRB Submissions

| Matter # | Summary of issue/comment | Response |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| DCOP Submissions | | |
| | General | |
| | Clarify in the DCOP, which entity will be responsible for conditioning the non-trunk water network required to ensure firefighting capacity within the Yeronga PDA. | No change The purpose of the DCOP is to outline policy related to trunk infrastructure funding and provision. EDQ supports the establishment of clear operational arrangements for infrastructure conditioning. However, the DCOP is not considered the appropriate location for this operational information. |
| | The DCOP/IPBR does not address the wider impacts on networks generated by the PDA growth | No change Agree. EDQ will continue to work with other service providers to address these impacts. |
| 2 | Preliminary | |
| | Section 2.5 - Concerns about upgrading bikeways that are shared pathways in Yeronga Memorial Park in order to link to arterial Ipswich Rd. There are insufficient details regarding this presented to the public that might impact on the heritage values of the park | No change The Yeronga DCOP allocates funding to support and proposed upgrades to Honour Ave to achieve a better pedestrian/cyclist outcome. However, the design and delivery of these upgrades will be undertaken by Brisbane City Council (BCC). These comments will be provided to BCC. |
| 3 | Development Charges | |
| | Align the DCOP Development Charges to Brisbane City Council/Urban Utilities Charges or the prescribed amount contained within Schedule 16 of the Planning Regulation 2017. | Change to Section 3.2. (Section 2.2 in final DCOP) DCOP charges for 2022/23 use Brisbane Infrastructure Charges Resolution (No. 10) 2021 as a basis and are indexed using the methodology prescribed in the <i>Planning Act 2016</i> . |
| | Recommend delineating between the residential and non-residential material change of use tables. | Change to Section 3.2. (Section 2.2 in final DCOP) |

| | | |
|----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | New table included to delineate between residential and non-residential material change of use tables. |
| | Section 3.6 – The current drafting indicates that EDQ will enter into infrastructure agreements (IAs) to delay charges for the PDA for not-for-profit groups. This is not reducing or waiving charges, meaning that the full charge is still payable, but only when an event in (i), (ii) or (iii) occurs. This is also not time bound, meaning that charges will potentially become payable many years in the future. When a PDA ceases and events have not occurred in relation to the IA, other parties are likely to administer the IA's | <p>No change.</p> <p>This is a matter that would be addressed on a case-by-case circumstance and only where qualifying not-for-profit or charitable organisations propose to establish within the PDA.</p> <p>EDQ will consult with relevant parties at the time of drafting an infrastructure agreement under section 2.6. The deferral of charges under 2.6 are enacted through an infrastructure agreement.</p> |
| 5 | Indexation | |
| | The method for indexing infrastructure charges will result in a disparity between the indexation of levied charges within the PDA and those levied outside the PDA. Recommend using the methodology in the Planning Act. | <p>Change to Section 5 (Section 4 in Final DCOP)</p> <p>DCOP charges for 2022/23 use Brisbane Infrastructure Charges Resolution (No. 10) 2021 as a basis and are indexed using the methodology prescribed in the <i>Planning Act 2016</i>.</p> |
| 6 | Schedule of works | |
| | It is recommended that traffic signals at the Park Road/Villa Street intersection be installed. | <p>Change to Section 6.1 (Section 5.1 in the Final DCOP)</p> <p>Inclusion of a contribution towards a Park Road/Villa Street intersection.</p> |
| | Widen the existing footpath on the western side of Oakwood Street (Yeronga State High School frontage) to a minimum 3m wide shared path | <p>No Change</p> <p>This upgrade is considered non-trunk and is therefore not included in the DCOP.</p> |
| | Provide advisory bicycle lanes on Christensen Street and widen the existing footpath on the northern side to a minimum of 1.8m. | <p>Change to Section 6.1 (Section 5.1 in the Final DCOP)</p> <p>Inclusion of a contribution towards Christensen Street works.</p> |
| | Provide advisory bicycle lanes on Lake Street and widen the existing footpath on the eastern side (opposite Yeronga railway station) to a minimum of 1.8m. | <p>Change to Section 6.1 (Section 5.1 in the Final DCOP)</p> <p>Inclusion of a contribution towards Lake Street works</p> |
| | Upgrade Honour Avenue to improve active transport safety and accessibility. | <p>Change to Section 6.1 (Section 5.1 in the Final DCOP)</p> <p>Inclusion of a contribution towards Honour Avenue works</p> |

| | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Minor/editorial changes | |
| | Section 1 Year in date reference is missing a digit from page 10. | Update to Section 2 (Section 1 in Final DCOP) Updated to include missing digit. |
| | Section 3 - There is a reference in the credits section of the document to 2.4.1. There is no Section 2.4.1 in this version of the DCOP. Assuming it is meant to refer to 3.4.1. | Change to Section 3.4 (Section 2.4 in Final DCOP) Numbering updated. |
| | Section 4 - 3.5.1 Claiming an offset sub-heading is under section 4.5 (assuming it is meant to be 4.5.1). | Change to section 4 (Section 3 in Final DCOP) Numbering updated. |
| | Section 6, Table 5 caption states: "Schedule of future trunk infrastructure works - Water" This is inconsistent with the rest of the document, which refers to the "Water Supply" network. | Update to section 6, Table 5 (Section 5, Table 5 in Final DCOP) Update table to read "Water Supply" |
| | Section 5, Table 6 - To update the infrastructure type to either "Community facility – land only", or "Land for community facility". | Update to section 6, Table 5 (Section 5, Table 5 in Final DCOP) Amended the infrastructure type to "Community facility – land only" |
| IPBR Submissions | | |
| 1 | Background | |
| | Incorrect reference to section 5 as the DSS section. | Change to section 1 Numbering updated. |
| 2 | Growth Projections | |
| | Based on Source for Parks and community facilities network column: "Rates calculated using an occupancy rate of 1.79 persons per dwelling". However, the value shown for Attached/Semi-Detached Dwellings is 1.75. | Change to Section 3 Change to update source reference to 1.75 persons per dwelling. |
| | There is misalignment between the Equivalent Population (EP) assumptions in the draft IPBR and those developed by other public sector entities. It is requested the IPBR EP rates be changed to align with the rates developed by other public sector entities. | No change The EP rates in the IPBR are based on the most recent information with regards to likely development in the area. Furthermore, the water and sewer planning which supports the PDA has capacity to service a greater level of EPs and can therefore service the level of EP projection anticipated |
| 5 | Infrastructure Planning | |

| | | |
|----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Table in this section is for all infrastructure networks, not just parks and community facilities. It is recommended to separate Table 5 into its own separate section to remove confusion. | No Change The table header and content clearly shows the tables purpose. |
| | The table identifies an "On-site stormwater quality solution" as non-trunk infrastructure. It is recommended the asset to be designed in accordance with Council's standards listed in City Plan 2014 (Stormwater code, Infrastructure Design Planning Scheme Policy) and Council's standard drawings to ensure the asset is suitable upon on and off-maintenance. | No change To be dealt with through the development assessment process. |
| 6 | Infrastructure costs | |
| | It is recommended to amend table 6 to refer to identify if there are any works costing in the public parks and land for community facilities section. | Change to 6.3, table 6 Identifying that there are no works costs for public parks and community facilities. |
| | Minor/editorial changes | |
| | Recommend amending "parks and community facilities" to "public parks and land for community facilities", which is reflective of the Minister's Guidelines and Rules. | Updated throughout Document. EDQ can fund community facilities land and works. To ensure consistency across PDAs and retain this flexibility, the term "parks and community facilities" will be used. |
| | Page 9 - Amend "Desired standard of service" to "Desired standards of service". | Change to page 9 Amend "Desired standard of service" to "Desired standards of service". |
| | DN125PE pipework for service connections is generally too small to support builder owner/occupier obligations under the Queensland Development Code UU states for 20 L/s+ internal firefighting systems a nominal bore of DN150 is much more standard practice in building hydraulic design. | No change Sizing of non-trunk works will be regulated through conditions on development approvals. |