

## **Fitzgibbon UDA Development Scheme**

# **Submissions Report**

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

**April 2009**



**urban land  
development  
authority**

# Contents Page

<b>Summary of Extent of Amendments to Proposed Fitzgibbon Development Scheme (DS)</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Brief Summary of Key Issues raised in the submissions received</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Summary of Submissions – Fitzgibbon Proposed Development Scheme</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>SUPPORT COMMENTS ON THE DEVELOPMENT SCHEME</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS ON DEVELOPMENT SCHEME</b>	<b>7</b>
• General planning comments	7
• Community infrastructure	8
• Parks and Recreational facilities	8
• General comments	9
<b>DRAFTING MATTERS</b>	<b>11</b>
• Assessment tables	12
• Consideration in principle	13
• Public consultation	14
• UDA Wide Criteria	14
• Precincts	14
• Definitions	14
• Editorial matters	15
• Mapping, Tables and Figures	15
<b>SOCIAL PLANNING MATTERS</b>	<b>16</b>
• Affordable housing	17
<b>TRANSPORT</b>	<b>19</b>
• Road network	20
• Beams Road	21
• Roghan Road	21
• Telegraph Road	22
• North-South Connector Road	22
• Traffic volumes and impacts	23
• Rail corridor	23
• Public transport	23
• Park and ride facility	24
• Proposed Northern Busway	25
• Pedestrian and Cycle network and facilities	27
• Car parking	27
<b>ENVIRONMENT AND OPEN SPACE</b>	<b>29</b>
• Noise, Air and Water	31
• Flooding and stormwater	32
• Contaminated land	32
• Acid Sulfate Soils	34
• Bushfire	34
• Sustainable housing	34

<b>PRECINCT 1</b>	<b>35</b>
• Building heights and densities	35
• Sub-precinct 1(a)	35
• Sub-precinct 1(c)	37
• Sub-precinct 1(d)	37
• Sub-precinct 1(e)	37
• Sub-precinct 1(f)	37
<b>PRECINCTS 2-6</b>	<b>39</b>
• Building heights and densities	39
• Precinct 3	39
• Precinct 5	40
• Precinct 6	40
<b>PRECINCTS 7-9</b>	<b>41</b>
• Precinct 7	41
• Sub-precinct 7(a)	41
• Precinct 8-9	41
<b>MISCELLANEOUS</b>	<b>43</b>
• Implementation Strategy	43
• Infrastructure Plan	44
• Beams Road	45
• Urban Open Space and conservation outcomes	45
• General comments	46
<b>ATTACHMENT A</b>	<b>47</b>

## Summary of Extent of Amendments to Proposed Fitzgibbon Development Scheme (DS)

<b>Changes to Precinct Structure</b>	
<b>Submitted Development Scheme (DS) (April 2009)</b>	<b>Publicly notified Development Scheme (DS) (Feb 2009)</b>
<b>Precinct 1 &amp; Sub-precinct 1(a)</b> which is a consolidation of previous Sub-Precinct 1(a) and 1(d). Sub-Precincts 1(b) and 1(c) have been deleted.	Precinct 1 - Sub-precinct 1(a) to (f)
<b>Precinct 2</b>	Sub-precinct 1(e)
<b>Precinct 3</b>	Sub-precinct 1(f)
<b>Precinct 4</b>	Precincts 2 to 5 and Part of Precinct 7
<b>Precinct 5</b>	Precinct 6
<b>Precinct 6</b>	Remainder of Precinct 7
<b>Precinct 7</b>	Precinct 8
<b>Precinct 8</b>	Precinct 9
<b>Amendments affecting Precinct 1 (QUT Carseldine land)</b>	
Previous maximum building heights of 8 storeys with some limited 10 storey buildings amended to a mixture of maximum 3, 5 and 8 storey building heights.	
<b>Amendments affecting Precinct 2 (Kelly's Wreckers site)</b>	
Part of the Mixed Use Development zone has been reduced in height from a maximum of 8 storeys to a maximum of 5 storeys. Site cover within the Residential zone has been increased.	
<b>Amendments affecting Precinct 3 (Clock Corner shopping centre, existing residential, park and ride land, existing park)</b>	
Previous maximum building height of 5 storeys has been limited to a maximum of 3 storeys within 10 metres of the Balcara Avenue boundary.	
<b>Amendments affecting Precinct 4 (Department of Housing land)</b>	
The minimum building height between the public transport corridor and the lower density residential development to the north of the Precinct has been reduced from 3 storeys to 2 storeys. Amendments to clarify the intent to limit the scale of development within the proposed local neighbourhood centre on the northern side of Roghan Road. A maximum building height of 2 storeys is also now specified within this area.	
<b>Environmental related amendments</b>	
Renaming the Conservation zone to Bushland and Open Space zone. Providing more details on required wildlife crossings. Requiring the provision of a Fitzgibbon Bushland Management Plan to be prepared by the ULDA. Introducing a Boundary Interface Investigation Area requirement for specified parts of Precincts 1 and 4.	
<b>Mapping related amendments</b>	
Cosmetic alterations to most maps to enhance readability. Introducing new maps to more clearly depict transport elements (new Map 3), building heights (new Map 4) and densities (new Map 5).	
<b>Operational improvement amendments</b>	
Changes to the Level of Assessment Tables to default non-specified uses to Permissible Development rather than Prohibited Development. Removal of Precinct names (now solely referred to as Precinct numbers) to reduce confusion.	
<b>General editorial amendments</b>	
A range of general editorial amendments to improve readability, correct anomalies and improve clarity. Deleting Summary Table previously contained on p.18. Minor amendments to car parking Table to improve useability.	

## Brief Summary of Key Issues raised in the submissions received

Key Issue	Response
Redevelopment of the QUT land	Redevelopment of part of the QUT land plays a vital role in the implementation of the Government's transit oriented development objectives to increase the intensity of residential development, particularly affordable housing around existing and proposed transport infrastructure. The existing buildings are to be retained for education purposes and the existing playing fields are to be redeveloped for Mixed Use Purposes as well as a new publicly available sporting facility. A significant proportion of the existing vegetation is to be retained and Cabbage Tree Creek protected.
Proposed development not in character with surrounding area	This issue is acknowledged but the intensification of development around existing transport infrastructure will result in the achievement of a number of government objectives including transit oriented development and increasing affordable housing. The heights of buildings south of Beams Road have been reduced, in part, to respond to the community's concerns.
Timing and provision of infrastructure	The DS proposes and identifies a number of major infrastructure works to cater for the population increase within the UDA. However not all of these can be funded by infrastructure charges collected from within the UDA alone. Those infrastructure items required to support the development are allocated a delivery timeframe in Table 2 of the Infrastructure Plan. It is not necessary that the DS include specific provisions about major infrastructure that is the responsibility of other agencies. The Infrastructure Plan provides adequate information about the 'in-principle' contributions regime, the further details of which will be addressed after the DS is approved.
Loss of bushlands and green space	The government's intent for the UDA is multi purpose and includes development for affordable housing, other housing and mixed use areas as well as recognising and responding to the area's environmental values. Consequently the area's environmental values have been addressed in the context of these multiple objectives. The ULDA believes it has achieved the desired balance of development and retention of the UDA's significant environmental values. In addition, it should be noted that much of the existing green space north of the Carseldine Railway Station has been identified for development for some time.
Crime and Safety concerns in relation to the provision of affordable housing	In the context as proposed in the Fitzgibbon DS there is no association between affordable housing and increased crime and safety concerns. The increase in residential density in the area will increase public activation of public areas and contribute to crime prevention. Development will be designed with crime prevention and safety as an integral component in the development process.
Inadequate Community Consultation	The community consultation process undertaken by the ULDA exceeded the requirements of the Urban Land Development Authority Act 2007. At the request of Carseldine residents, the ULDA extended consultation and accepted and responded to late submissions. Refer Attachment A for Fitzgibbon UDA Community Consultation Summary.

## Summary of Submissions – Fitzgibbon Proposed Development Scheme

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
<b>SUPPORT COMMENTS ON THE DEVELOPMENT SCHEME</b>			
1	Supportive of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• affordable living in the area and ULDA's involvement;</li> <li>• approach to community consultation;</li> <li>• North South Connector Road;</li> <li>• Beams Road overpass;</li> <li>• Carseldine Urban Village;</li> <li>• Housing Mix;</li> <li>• Neighbourhood Centre;</li> <li>• conservation areas;</li> <li>• the precinct approach to tailor assessment criteria; and</li> <li>• the Vision, Structure Plan and zoning.</li> </ul>	Noted. Whilst aspects of some of these supported items have been amended in the DS (as identified in further components of this Submissions Report) it is considered that they are only minor in nature and hence retain the original intent as contained within the publicly notified copy of the DS.  Refer to specific items discussed within the Submissions Report in regard to amendments to the DS.	
2	Assessment levels for electricity infrastructure contained within Schedule 1 of the DS are supported and should be retained.	Noted. No change proposed.	N
3	The provisions in Precinct 5 and 7 that are designed to minimise the impacts of development upon the existing high voltage power lines and associated corridor are supported.	Noted. No changes have been made to these provisions however the former Precincts 5 and 7 are now incorporated into Precincts 4 and 6.	N
4	The principal that vegetation within precincts identified for development is retained “where possible” is realistic and is supported.	Noted. No change proposed.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS ON DEVELOPMENT SCHEME</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>General planning comments</b></li> </ul>			
5	<p>Inadequate justification/ planning need for the proposed development in this location, i.e. justification for 5 and 8 storey residential and commercial buildings, including need for additional retail activities.</p> <p>Need to control the number of people in the area.</p>	<p>The existing railway station and proposed busway station provide for a level of infrastructure and service that is not consistent with the current level of development in this area. Such infrastructure would support a much higher density of population and increased commercial uses to support the opportunity for a transit oriented development relying upon the combination of density and public transport infrastructure. In response to community concerns the building heights within the Carseldine Urban Village, and other areas near existing communities, have been reduced. Amendments have specifically been made to the heights of building within Precincts 1, 2 and 3 (formerly all within Precinct 1).</p>	Y
6	<p>Need for additional commercial opportunities within the UDA, including within the Wreckers Yard.</p>	<p>Within the entire UDA the DS provides opportunities for commercial uses to occur within the Mixed Use Centre and Mixed Use zones. The amount of commercial opportunities contained within these zones is considered appropriate so as not to adversely impact upon nearby commercial uses outside of the UDA.</p> <p>In relation to the Wreckers Yard, located formerly within Precinct 1(f) and now contained within Precinct 2, the commercial opportunities contained within the DS are considered appropriate. The amount of commercial opportunities allowed for within this Precinct have been determined on the basis of supporting, and not competing with, the mixed use activity centre to be provided within sub-precinct 1(a) and complementing the commercial uses provided within Precinct 3.</p>	Y
7	<p>Do not support additional urban development on Telegraph Road.</p>	<p>There is limited development proposed off Telegraph Road. The Special Purpose zoned transit stop and associated development is intended to be of a scale that does not compete with local business.</p>	N
8	<p>Do not support higher density residential in close proximity to the existing railway line and high voltage power lines</p>	<p>A transit oriented urban activity centre relies on higher densities to be provided in proximity to the existing railway station and proposed busway station. Higher development adjacent to the rail line can more effectively address issues associated with noise than lower density development.</p> <p>Residential development within Precinct 4 (formerly within Precinct 5) is located away from the existing high voltage power lines in accordance with energy supplier standards.</p>	N
9	<p>It is suggested that the intended grid pattern be strengthened particularly the east – west orientation wherever possible to facilitate a building orientation that minimises exposure to the summer sun and maximise passive cooling and cross ventilation.</p>	<p>The DS requires where possible that development take solar orientation into account.</p>	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
10	The Structure and precinct plans do not provide clarity about transport modes and relationship to proposed land uses.	An additional transport map has been included within the DS identifying existing and proposed routes, and modes of transport options throughout the UDA.	Y
11	Need to better resolve how different residential densities and heights can co-exist.	Noted. However this can be adequately addressed at development assessment stage.	N
12	Do not support the building height proposed as it is not in keeping with the character of the area and will have an adverse impact on surrounding residents. Building heights are also not supported due to the associated traffic congestion and loss of amenity through loss of vegetation/green space, particularly around the QUT campus.	<p>The building heights within the Carseldine Urban Village and other areas near existing communities have been reduced in part. Amendments have specifically been made to the heights of building within Precincts 1, 2 and 3 (formerly all contained within Precinct 1). The DS has been amended to include separate height and density maps so as to provide greater clarity for where there are variances of height and density within precincts.</p> <p>Refer also to the "Transport" and "Environment" and "Parks and recreational facilities" sections.</p>	Y
<p>• <b>Community infrastructure</b></p>			
13	Need to provide adequate community infrastructure, including schools, health and emergency services, libraries and post offices to cater for additional population.	<p>The future need for key social infrastructure and services including, schools, emergency services, police etc, will be determined by relevant government entities and can be accommodated at a later stage through other planning processes.</p> <p>Community facilities including child care centres, educational establishments, emergency services, churches etc are supported as preferred land uses within a number of precincts of the UDA.</p>	N
14	Need for a small amount of land (2000m <sup>2</sup> ) for electricity infrastructure in close proximity to the existing sub-precinct 3(a).	Electricity infrastructure, including a substation, is exempt development within the DS. A general reference to the provision of electricity infrastructure within Precinct 4 has been made in the DS (previously Sub-precinct 3(a)). A footnote refers to land requirements and location to be determined in conjunction with service providers.	N
15	Need to create a permeable road network, including within the proposed transport hub, for sufficient access and egress of emergency vehicles. Access should also be provided to common areas such as park lands.	Already provided for in the provisions of the DS. The development of the transport hub will be subject to further detailed planning to consider these matters.	N
<p>• <b>Parks and Recreational facilities</b></p>			
16	Ensure sufficient parks and recreational opportunities within the area are preserved for the existing and new residents, including opportunities for district level facilities, i.e. soccer fields and clubhouses.	<p>Noted. A range of recreational uses and activities readily accessible to the public will be provided within the Civic and Open Space zone identified within Precincts 1, 3 and 6. The DS also requires the provision of a central, visible, and highly accessible park within each neighbourhood within the UDA.</p> <p>In addition, Brisbane City Council is currently undertaking a master planning exercise for Fitzgibbon to ensure the appropriate provision of parks and recreational facilities, including district level facilities. The DS does not preclude these types of uses being undertaken within the new Precinct 6.</p>	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
17	Civic and Open Space Zone - concerns with intent/outcomes, specifically opportunities for formal activities and percentage of area proportioned to physical structures, i.e. club buildings.	Agree. The DS has been amended to ensure the planning outcomes of Brisbane City Council's parklands masterplanning is not restricted or limited by the Civic and Open Space zone within the new Precinct 6.	Y
18	Section 3.7 (Multi-functional role of open space) - outcomes should ensure that adequate land is provided for local public parks which is not unduly compromised by the need for stormwater infrastructure.	The DS currently addresses this matter by stating that adequate sporting and recreational facilities will need to be provided. Park design will take impacts of stormwater management into consideration	N
19	Should refer to Brisbane City Council's "Fitzgibbon Parklands Master Plan" document.	Agree. However as subsequently advised by BCC the "Fitzgibbon Parklands Master Plan" is not a public document and consequently it is inappropriate to refer to this in the DS.	N
<p>• <b>General comments</b></p>			
20	<p>Inadequate consultation, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• inappropriate hours for working people;</li> <li>• did not know of proposed Carseldine development until close to the end of the consultation period (deliberately called "Fitzgibbon UDA" to conceal this fact);</li> <li>• insufficient time to consider proposal;</li> <li>• insufficient briefing sessions and not in a location within Carseldine;</li> <li>• Community Newsletter 3 made no mention of Carseldine;</li> <li>• confusion with BCC's Bracken Ridge District Neighbourhood Plan;</li> <li>• no 3D model of the proposed development; and</li> <li>• newsletters were distributed as a letterbox drop amongst 'junk mail'.</li> </ul> <p>As a result of the inadequate consultation, requests were made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• extend the public consultation period;</li> <li>• comment on the changes ULDA make in finalising the DS;</li> <li>• suspend any further approvals in the Fitzgibbon UDA; and</li> <li>• change name to Fitzgibbon/Carseldine UDA.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. The DS was subject to extensive community consultation in excess of the requirements contained within the ULDA Act 2007.</p> <p>The ULDA organised an additional community information session for Thursday 26 March in response to requests for further information about the proposed DS. This extra community information session was in addition to the extended hours at the ULDA's shopfront at Taigum Centro the previous Thursday evening. Since the shop front opened on 2 February it was visited by more than 1,000 people.</p> <p>To ensure that as many people as possible could have their say, late submissions up until the 31 March were considered.</p> <p>A full list of the community consultation program for Fitzgibbon is at Attachment 1.</p> <p>Within all communication to the community the area has been referred to as the "Fitzgibbon Urban Development Area" as this was the name given to the area upon declaration by the State Government in July 2008. There was no intention to mislead residents outside of the suburb of Fitzgibbon. Refer Attachment A for Fitzgibbon UDA Community Consultation Summary.</p>	N
21	BCC is just grabbing more rateable properties.	Noted. Not relevant to the DS.	N
22	Expectation of no additional urban development within this area.	<p>Expectation of urban development in this area has been raised for some time. Under the previous Brisbane City Council City Plan the majority of the area was contained within the Emerging Communities Area which allows for development in accordance with the City Plan provisions.</p> <p>The declaration of the Fitzgibbon UDA was also well publicised, and the proposed DS was subject to extensive community consultation. Refer Attachment A for Fitzgibbon UDA Community Consultation Summary.</p>	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
23	Lifts in high rise buildings need to be compatible with the operation of a stretcher.	Development will be undertaken in accordance with all relevant building codes.	N
24	Requested the redevelopment of the QUT site to be undertaken separately to the Fitzgibbon area.	State Government declared the Fitzgibbon UDA which includes the QUT campus on 24 July 2008. The boundary for the UDA was set as part of this declaration and cannot be changed as a result of the preparation of the DS.	N
25	Do not support the removal of appeal rights.	Appeal rights are as per the ULDA Act 2007.	N
26	The DS does not avoid the need for any changes to the boundaries of reserve land and lease land to be in accordance with the <i>Land Act 1994</i> .	Nothing in the DS voids these responsibilities.	N
27	<p>The DS does not contain any recognition or actions in relation to identification and management of Aboriginal cultural heritage under the <i>Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2003</i>.</p> <p>It is recommended reference be made to the ACHA and the requirement for an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management Plan within section 5.5 - Ecological Sustainability.</p>	Nothing in the DS avoids the duty of care articulated by the <i>Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2003</i> .	N
28	Development for stages 1-4 approved prior to the approval of the DS.	The development approval for stages 1 - 4 was consistent with the Interim Land Use Plan for the UDA approved by the State Government.	N
29	Need to deliver on new or improved internet broadband services to the area.	The outcomes in relation to this issue are subject to the rollout of the Federal Governments National Broadband Network.	N
30	Concern about construction activities upon home e.g., vibration from pile driving.	Construction activities will be undertaken in accordance with industry standards and ULDA development application conditions.	N
31	Medical centres and other health care services adequate to service future residents should be included as a possible use in the UDA Zones.	Community facilities and services are preferred uses within the Mixed Use and Mixed Use Centre zones and will be provided if warranted by demand.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
<b>DRAFTING MATTERS</b>			
32	Does a multi-functional role of public open space (DS page 10) allow for the provision of housing within park areas? If so additional potential traffic generation should have been factored into the traffic and transport analysis for the DS.	Land uses within park areas are controlled through the zoning of the land. No residential development is proposed within the Bushland and Open Space and Civic and Open Space Zones within the UDA.	N
33	Development approval decisions that are approved contrary to the DS may result in development that is inconsistent with other policy or legislation that have been incorporated into the draft DS. Who will be responsible for investigations and complaints under these other policies and legislation subsequent to the ULDA's decision?	Development applications can not be approved if they are inconsistent with the Land Use Plan (LUP), as this would be contrary to the Act. In exceptional circumstances, elements of the LUP may be relaxed to allow for meritorious or innovative development, but development may not conflict with the structure plan or otherwise compromise the vision for the UDA. This is similar to the provisions in the <i>Integrated Planning Act 1997</i> regarding desired environmental outcomes. Further, in exercising its decision making powers, the ULDA must consider the purposes of the Act, which includes giving effect to ecological sustainability and best practice urban design.	N
34	Design and construction of all buildings should be in accordance with BCC "Subdivision and Development Guidelines".	The DS does refer to BCC's Subdivision and Development Guidelines.	N
35	The rural zone is identified in the structure plan but is not supported by the text.	Agree. Supporting text on the Rural zone will be included in the DS.	Y
36	Structure Plan should be accompanied by summary information indicating the expected population, land use densities and gross floor areas for commercial uses.	Some of this information is too detailed to be included within the Structure Plan however a building height plan and density plan will be included in the DS.	Y
37	Unclear whether drainage or water sensitive urban design measures are proposed as 'water cycle infrastructure' (sections 4&5).	Noted. The intention is for water sensitive urban design features to contribute to minimising water use. These provisions are included in the DS.	N
38	Exemption for "social housing" from infrastructure charging consistent with other DSs.	Noted. Exemption is contained within Schedule 1: Exempt Development and does not need to be repeated within the Land Use Plan component of the DS.	N
39	The Structure Plan and/or DS should clearly communicate that section 371 of the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1994</i> (EP Act) requires that if the owner or occupier of a site becomes aware of a Notifiable Activity (as defined under Schedule 3 of the EP Act) being carried out on this land, or that the land has been affected by a hazardous contaminant, they must within 22 business days after becoming aware the activity is being carried out, or the land has been affected, give notice to the Environmental Protection Agency. Failure to give the required notice, except where notice has already been given, may give rise to an offence under the EP Act.	Noted. The DS does not need to specifically reference this provision under the EP Act as the DS does not void the need to comply these provisions of the EP Act.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
40	Section 3.2.5 should be amended so as to ensure that it is mandatory for all development to be fully compliant with all development requirements. There should be no scope for ULDA to approve development if there is non-compliance.	Noted. To achieve a balance between certainty and flexibility the DS only allows for non compliance with the development criteria when an application provides a superior outcome and overwhelming community benefit. Irrespective of this an application can not compromise the vision for the UDA which includes the structure plan.	N
41	Section 3.8 - Under 'variety, choice and identity' add after points "well-designed public realm". Additional dot point under 'Neighbourhood design' – "The integration of local history and culture of the catchment area into the design of new developments"; Additional dot point under 'street and movement networks' – "Ensure appropriate signage for landmarks and sites of historical importance"; Additional dot points under 'Buildings and Public realm relationships' – " Opportunities for informal and formal play and opportunities to reflect local history, landmarks and culture through public artworks.	Agree. Section 3.8 has been amended to reflect these changes.	Y
42	Clarify how the DS impacts on operational works applications under the <i>Water Act 2000</i> , such as work requiring a Riverine Protection Permit and applications for a water allocation under a Water Resource Plan.	The DS does not impact on the application process under the <i>Water Act 2000</i> for works requiring a Riverine Protection Permit. The ULDA does not propose to undertake any works which will need approval for a water allocation under a Water Resource Plan.	N
<b>• Assessment tables</b>			
43	The level of self assessable development is unclear as there is ambiguity in relation to development that could fall within either column 2 or column 3A depending on whether it is in accordance with an approved sub-precinct plan.	Agree. The Level of Assessment Tables have been amended for clarity.	Y
44	It is unclear what constitutes an "approved sub-precinct plan" as the definition refers to section 4.0 which is the infrastructure plan.	Agree. Amended for clarity.	Y
45	Precincts 1 and 3 include a range of sub-precincts which could lead one to believe that this is the only area where sub precinct plans can be lodged.	Agree. The number of sub-precincts have been reduced, to the Urban Village core, where detailed master planning warrants preparation of a sub-precinct plan.	Y
46	Given that a sub-precinct plan is associated with an approval within the precinct would that approval be for material change of use or simply reconfiguration of a lot?	Agree. The sub-precinct plan is intended to be tied to an application for material change of use or reconfiguration of a lot. The provisions in the DS have been amended to clarify the purpose and operation of sub-precinct plans.	Y
47	Is the sub precinct plan concept similar to the site development plan concept used under the ILUP? The process under the ILUP provides certainty that the subsequent development under the site development plan remains self assessable.	A sub-precinct plan concept is similar to the site development plan concept used under the ILUP. The ILUP and DS are different documents, with the sub-precinct plan used in the DS.	N
48	It needs to be clarified if an approved sub precinct plan can override the level of assessment table or would subsequent material change of use or reconfiguration of a lot remain permissible?	Agree. This has been changed to state that a sub-precinct plan cannot override the level of assessment table.	Y

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
49	Column 2 lists material changes of use for sale office and display home, home based business and house as self assessable development but does not list building work or plumbing and drainage works associated with those uses as being self assessable. This should be clarified.	Agree. Building work, plumbing and drainage works will be self assessable in the Level of Assessment Table.	Y
50	The provision in column 3b that allows for discretion by the ULDA to determine whether development is prohibited or not on the grounds of whether a sub precinct would unreasonably prejudice the opportunities for the development of the remaining area is not supported owing to the uncertainty provided to the applicant.	Agree. The DS has been amended in respect of Precinct 1 and the Level of Assessment Table to include more detail on development expectations in sub-precinct 1(a).	Y
51	It is not clear how advertising devices (temporary or permanent) are intended to be dealt with. If classified as operational works they could be self assessable or potentially they could be caught by the catch all prohibited clause. This should be clarified.	Agree. Advertising devices are now included as Exempt Development in the DS.	Y
52	Material changes proposed are viewed in an insufficient perspective. No consideration in the plan to how permissible development is to be managed within high value conservation surroundings. Removal of high bird and squirrel glider habitat on the east side of QUT to south and west sides highlights the need for consideration of conservation upon permissible development. Suggestion - Permissible development subject to environmental impact (including pedestrian and vehicle volume increases).	Zone boundaries have been determined on the basis of planning studies into the most appropriate land uses for all of the UDA balanced against the need for an appropriate urban development outcome. Areas with highest environmental values have been retained within the Bushland and Open Space zone. Development within the Bushland and Open Space and Civic and Open Space Zones is only in accordance with the intent of these zones, where residential, retail, commercial, industrial and other inappropriate land uses are prohibited.	N
53	The DS should specifically exclude noise polluting activities (e.g. motor vehicle repair shop, loud music shop/liquor outlets, bar or nightclubs) within the Mixed use zones.	The level of assessment tables within the DS limit or prohibit inappropriate industrial, retail and commercial uses within the Mixed Use Centre zone and the Mixed Use zone which would compromise the UDA outcomes and intent of the applicable precincts.	N
54	Does not support the assessment tables defaulting to prohibited. Need to explore the implications of such, i.e. on certain Building Work applications. Prefer if the assessment tables were redrafted to default to either self-assessable or permissible development.	Agree. The Level of Assessment Tables have been amended to default to permissible, where uses are not otherwise listed.	Y
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Consideration in principle</b></li> </ul>			
55	The concept of seeking consideration in principle is supported however that any decision arising from that process is not binding upon the ULDA is questioned. Weight must be given to the consideration in principle decision to any subsequent application.	Noted. The DS states that the ULDA may give such weight as it considers appropriate to the decision in respect of the application for consideration in principle. The CIP process is included in the DS to offer some assurance to developers (particularly of larger sites) that a concept may be supported by the ULDA prior to the formal lodgement of an application.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Public consultation</b></li> </ul>			
56	Discretionary public notification requirements provide no certainty for the applicant. Instead the circumstances when public notification is required should be articulated.	It is considered that sufficient guidance is given in the DS as to the outcomes sought across the UDA, which will apply in relation to the making and assessment of any development proposal. Consequently the notification requirements detailed within the DS are considered appropriate. Section 54 of the <i>Urban Land Development Authority Act 2007</i> provides the minimum notification and submission requirements for development.	N
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>UDA Wide Criteria</b></li> </ul>			
57	The UDA wide requirements for housing diversity imply that all dwellings should be accessible and designed in accordance with universal and sustainable design principles. This is considered to be overly prescriptive and not supportive of achieving affordable housing outcomes.	Agree. The ULDA has referred to universal and sustainable housing design principles in the ULDA Affordable Housing Strategy. The DS has been amended to make this reference clear.	Y
58	Reference to a "suitable standard with all reasonable fixtures, services and appliances" on page 9 is too ambiguous and requires clarification. What standards are to be applied? If this concept is pursued it needs to be considered in the context of housing affordability and clear standards should be articulated.	It is not unreasonable nor onerous to refer to the need for a "suitable standard with all reasonable fixtures, services and appliances". Including these provisions are a "flag" in the event these issues are not being considered at any point in time during the development process.	N
59	It is understood that the <i>Queensland Department of Public Works Smart Sustainable Housing Design Objectives 2008</i> is under review and the DS should not make reference to a document under review.	Noted. The ULDA may reference any publication it considers relevant to assist in achieving the provisions of the ULDA Act. Whilst the <i>Queensland Department of Public Works Smart Sustainable Housing Design Objectives 2008</i> may be under review, it still has relevance. In addition, pursuant to the ULDA Act, the ULDA intends to maintain a register of all relevant publications and reference material. Relevant standards, guidelines and policies will be listed on this register.	N
60	The trigger for a noise report should be clarified	Agree. The development assessment triggers to address noise have been amended so that noise only need be considered for development occurring within 100m of the current rail corridor.	Y
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Precincts</b></li> </ul>			
61	It is recommended that the following be included in the precinct outcomes, "Development adjoining the north south connector road can accommodate home based business and live work opportunities serviced by a rear lane". This will ensure consistency with other precincts.	Agree. Where residential development is proposal along the north south connector road the following provision will be included: "Development adjoining the north south connector road can accommodate home based business and live work opportunities serviced by a rear lane".	Y
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Definitions</b></li> </ul>			
62	The terms conservation and biodiversity should be defined.	Agree. The 'conservation zone' has been amended to 'bushland and open space zone' to more accurately reflect the multi purpose nature of the area. The term biodiversity is retained in a general context.	Y

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
63	The definition of the conservation zone should be the protection, maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity values, ecological mechanisms and ecosystem services occurring within the area. The current definition uses non standard terms and should be clarified, e.g. habitats and communities, and nature based.	Agree. The 'conservation zone' has been amended to 'bushland and open space zone' to more accurately reflect the multi purpose nature of the area.	Y
64	The definition of significant vegetation should include dead vegetation.	The definition of "significant vegetation" already incorporates dead vegetation.	N
65	The definition of significant vegetation states that it is vegetation that maintains biodiversity amongst other things. In combination with the development proposed by the draft DS this is unlikely.	Use of the term "maintains biodiversity" is consistent with the intent of the purpose of the definition.	N
66	The definition for "Park" to incorporate community markets.	"Market" is a separately defined use within Schedule 2 of the DS. It is appropriate for a "Market" to be a permissible land use within the Civic and Open Space and Bushland and Open Space zones.	N
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Editorial matters</b></li> </ul>			
67	Page 34 refers to figure kk which is not included. This needs to be reviewed.	Agree. The DS has been amended accordingly.	Y
68	The paragraph referring to "live work" opportunities on page 37 should be consistent with other precincts and include the word "accommodate". As drafted "live work" along the connector road are mandatory and this is suspected that this is not the intent.	Agree. The DS has been amended accordingly.	Y
69	References to the Environmental Protection Regulation 1998 should refer to the Environmental Protection Regulation 2008.	Agree. The DS has been amended accordingly.	Y
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Mapping, Tables and Figures</b></li> </ul>			
70	Plans need to label old QUT site and Gympie Road	It is considered that the maps within the DS clearly identify the location of the UDA.	N
71	The confusion between Table 3 and Figure 7 regarding the zone for the mixed use area of sub precinct 1(f).	Agree. Table 3 (Summary Table) has been removed and new maps relating to building height and density have been included in the DS to provide greater clarity with regard to heights and densities within the UDA.	Y
72	Table 3 should also include civic and open space as an additional zoning for sub precinct 1(f).	Agree. Table 3 (Summary Table) has been removed and new maps relating to building height and density have been included in the DS to provide further clarity.	Y
73	The legends for the sub precinct plans should include all symbology to prevent confusion if copied separately.	Agree. DS has been amended accordingly	Y

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
<b>SOCIAL PLANNING MATTERS</b>			
74	The DS should require disability access to pathways.	Providing disability access to pathways is a requirement of Australian standards, guidelines and policies including the Building Code of Australia, and the Enviro Development Technical Standards V1.	N
75	Outline how the plan fits in with the current demographics of the area and how it will address the needs of families and the aging population.	The DS requires that all residential development (including residential components of a mixed use development) should deliver housing choice to suit a variety of households including: families, singles, couples, work-at-home occupiers, students, retirees, group accommodation households and people with special needs by offering variety in size, configuration, cost, adaptability, location and tenure. The delivery of community and social infrastructure such as parks and community facilities will help build community networks and provide recreational opportunities for individuals and families. Further community development work will be facilitated outside of the DS.	N
76	Need for further assessment of the social impacts of the development on the local community and interest groups	The proposed development in the UDA has been informed by studies to determine the appropriate level of services and facilities for the additional population as well as to gauge impacts on the local community and interest groups. The DS reflects the outcomes of these studies. Further community development work will be facilitated outside of the DS.	N
77	Need for a "social plan" to ensure "social well being" is addressed and fully addresses the requirements and meaning of ecological sustainability. The "social plan" is to address: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• development of business in the community;</li> <li>• integration of social and ecological requirements through school based traineeships in conservation;</li> <li>• multi-use of scarce land resources e.g. school playing fields;</li> <li>• development of community spirit; and</li> <li>• social wellbeing and community integration of new migrants and minority groups.</li> </ul>	The DS adequately addresses social planning issues. Further social planning and community development activities will be undertaken in association with progressive development within the UDA.	N
78	Demonstrate how a sense of a local community can be created in a high turnover, rental oriented neighbourhood.	Further community development work will be facilitated outside of the DS process. In addition, existing and proposed local community services and facilities such as the proposed neighbourhood centre and urban village will provide places for the community to interact, regardless of whether they are owner-occupiers or renting. The DS is a planning instrument and does not regulate tenure or rental arrangements.	N
79	Social ills – does not have the locational advantages of the Kelvin Grove Urban Village.	The UDA is being developed to support a strong, healthy and sustainable community with good access to public transport (existing rail way station and future busway station), services and facilities.	N
80	Lighting section to reference CPTED principles	CPTED principles are called up by the DS.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
81	Opportunity for the Sandgate and Bracken Ridge Action Group and other community groups to work with key stakeholders to build a responsive and caring community.	Noted. It is intended that where possible, local community groups be involved in future community development work facilitated outside of the DS process.	N
82	Recommends the Vision of the UDA acknowledge the need for high quality community services and learning opportunities, in particular that Carseldine Urban Village is recognised as a child/family friendly community	Noted. A fundamental goal of the DS is "Promoting and maintaining liveable communities - Communities in the Fitzgibbon UDA will be diverse, safe and healthy, have access to services, jobs and learning, foster active local participation and are pleasant places to live, work and visit while enhancing the value of existing neighbourhoods". The intent and outcomes contained within Precinct 1 (Carseldine Urban Village) further express the goals of achieving community diversity.	N
83	The high density housing that fill the lot will create long term social problems.	In the context as proposed in the Fitzgibbon DS there is no association between high density or affordable housing and increased crime and safety concerns. The DS incorporates development requirements to ensure that quality urban design outcomes, good public realms, adequate parks and recreational opportunities are provided for.	N
84	Opportunity to capitalise on the existing facilities within the QUT precinct for community facilities given access to public transport.	Use of the existing buildings within the QUT educational purpose areas will be determined largely by QUT. However sports grounds and other development in the urban village requiring development of part of the existing QUT site will provide significant opportunities for access to community and other services and facilities.	N
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Affordable housing</b></li> </ul>			
85	Proposed future low cost housing is having an impact on people buying property now and therefore having an impact on the Carseldine Realty.	In the context as proposed in the Fitzgibbon DS there is no evidence that supports the claim that the inclusion of affordable housing integrated into mainstream housing developments will have an adverse impact on existing property values.	N
86	<p>Affordable housing and the associated high density living will result in - crime, graffiti, noise, safety concerns within public spaces including pedestrian and cycle ways (Need for increased security and crime prevention strategies); an eyesore and a slum; the destruction of the local character (1 and 2 storey residential dwellings) and quality of life.</p> <p>These implications will have adverse impacts on surrounding property values. What recourse does existing residents have if this occurs, i.e. compensation.</p>	The DS requires that all residential development (including residential components of a mixed use development) should deliver housing choice to suit a variety of households including: families, singles, couples, work-at-home occupiers, students, retirees, group accommodation households and people with special needs by offering variety in size, configuration, cost, adaptability, location and tenure. The provision of affordable housing is an essential component in the mix and choice of housing available in functioning communities. In the context as proposed in the Fitzgibbon DS there is no evidence that supports the claim that the inclusion of a small percentage of affordable housing stock within the UDA will have adverse social impacts or decrease surrounding property values.	N
87	The percentage for affordable housing should outline a maximum as well as a minimum.	A primary purpose of the ULDA Act is to provide for affordable housing. The implementation of the ULDA is a key part of the Queensland Housing Affordability Strategy. The Implementation Strategy in the DS includes measures which will be sought to achieve the most affordable housing probable in the UDA. This	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
		should not be a maximum, rather a minimum as stated in the DS.	
88	Clarification on the percentage of the development which will be allocated to social housing, i.e. 10%.	If the Department of Housing decides to provide for some level of social housing within the UDA the percentage provided would be in accordance with Department of Housing funding programs and policies current at that time.	N
89	Need for a “social plan” to ensure “social well being” is appropriately balanced with achieving good urban design outcomes. For example, there are concerns that if building designs do not incorporate mechanical air conditioning, people will attach air conditioning units to the outside of the building resulting in adverse urban design outcomes and noise complaints.	The DS states that where possible and relevant, all dwellings should be naturally ventilated without the need for mechanical air conditioning and be in accordance with relevant, recognised guidelines. These provisions draw attention to climatic and ventilation conditions that will be taken into account in the design of proposals and assessment of all development applications in the UDA.	N
90	Crucial that communities potentially impacted by the DS are: (a) kept informed throughout the process (particularly in areas with increase in density to 8 storeys which is not common in the area at present); and (b) made aware of potential cumulative impacts of associated infrastructure projects and appropriate measures in place to ensure community concerns are monitored and responded to.	This report provides submitters with the outcomes of the ULDA’s review of submissions received on the DS. Submitters are notified in writing that this document is available for viewing on the ULDA website.	N
91	Department of Communities would like to be informed and have input into the DS (to identify need and opportunity for planning investment to meet future infrastructure requirements).	Department of Communities were informed of the proposed DS, had an opportunity to make a submission on the DS, and this report provides the outcomes of the review of the submissions on the DS.	N
92	Provide more clarity in relation to mechanisms that assist in the delivery of affordable housing such as lawful agreements, transferable title covenants or other regulation to secure agreements between subsequent property owners. A clear position on how market provided affordable housing will operate outside of the ULDA legislative environment is required.	The Affordable Housing Strategy includes reference to implementation of ongoing mechanisms to assist in the delivery of ongoing affordable housing. Investigation in these mechanisms is ongoing. The ULDA has no influence on how affordable housing outside UDAs will be delivered.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
<b>TRANSPORT</b>			
93	<p>Need for the delivery of additional transport infrastructure (new/upgrades) not identified in the DS to relieve traffic congestion prior to development, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• park and ride facilities at the end of Telegraph Road, supported by high density development</li> <li>• improved train and bus services, including additional rail tracks</li> <li>• railway under/over pass on Telegraph Road.</li> <li>• redesign and upgrade of the Lemke roundabout and all roads leading to the roundabout.</li> <li>• upgrade of Norris Road</li> <li>• complete upgrade of Lacey Road</li> <li>• traffic lights at the corner of Mustang Street and Telegraph Road</li> </ul>	<p>Timely delivery of the identified transport infrastructure is a key to the implementation of the DS. This will be subject to further discussions with relevant parties, including State agencies, Council and other stakeholders such as development proponents.</p> <p>Not all transport infrastructure works can be funded by infrastructure charges within the UDA alone. Those infrastructure items directly associated with the UDA are given timings within Table 4 of the Infrastructure Plan. It is not necessary for the DS to specify details about the provision of major infrastructure which is the responsibility of other agencies however the following is to be noted in response to these particular issues. Most of the road upgrades mentioned are the responsibility of BCC to plan for, prioritise and fund.</p> <p>The Park and Ride facilities at the end of Telegraph Road will be provided as part Queensland Transport's delivery of the proposed northern busway. Timing and construction of the northern busway is subject to Queensland Transport investigations and State Government funding. The TransLink Transit Authority (TTA) is working closely with Queensland Rail Limited (QR) to provide additional rollingstock and services on the rail network. The State Government, through the TTA, is spending approximately \$586 million to build 44 new three carriage trains and new stabling facilities. These carriages are being progressively rolled out to 2010.</p> <p>In June 2008 the State Government reinforced their commitment by including \$972 million in the South East Queensland Infrastructure Plan and Program (2008-2026) for 78 three carriage trains. This funding represents the contribution for the balance of the 44 three carriage trains planned, and funding for an additional 58 three carriage trains to be delivered after 2010. Full delivery of the 102 three carriage trains will increase the size of the fleet by almost 70% - or around 23,000 additional seats.</p> <p>Significant improvements to bus services in Brisbane will be delivered through the TransLink Network Plan. As funding becomes available TransLink will adjust existing bus services and introduce new services to ensure residents have access to the TransLink network. The Linkfield/Telegraph Road Overpass is a Brisbane City Council infrastructure initiative of regional significance. As stated within the Infrastructure Plan the funding and timing of delivery is subject, in the first instance, to Brisbane City Council priorities.</p> <p>Potential upgrading of roads and intersections external to the UDA, and not specifically identified within the Infrastructure Plan, shall be considered as development proceeds and development applications are received by the ULDA. Specific transport and traffic impacts of development will be considered and assessed through the development assessment process.</p>	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
94	A new rail station should be built at the end of Telegraph Road instead of a busway station, including the provision of a multi-level car park.	The State Government is not intending to provide for an additional rail station on Telegraph Road. The Department of Transport and Main Roads have advised that this site should be used for a future busway station, park and ride facility and associated small scale mixed use development. Precinct 5 describes the intent and outcomes for this land.	N
95	Traffic modelling is required to determine appropriate cross-sections and intersection treatments.	Traffic modelling has been undertaken to support the DS. Further detailed traffic analysis will be undertaken for specific development applications as they arise through the development assessment process.	N
96	<p>Current traffic infrastructure is inadequate and will be further exacerbated by the proposed development, requiring the timely delivery of the identified key transport infrastructure (new/upgrades) to relieve traffic congestion prior to development, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intersection upgrades at Telegraph Road;</li> <li>• Beams Road overpass and upgrade;</li> <li>• Cycle and pedestrian infrastructure;</li> <li>• Proposed Busway Station;</li> <li>• New Park and Ride facility.</li> </ul> <p>Concerns raised that it is not acceptable for residents that ULDA have no control, influence or interest in other state government department priorities. The ULDA should negotiate more with TransLink and Qld Rail to improve existing services.</p>	<p>Timely delivery of the identified transport infrastructure is a key to the implementation of the DS. This will be subject to further discussions with relevant parties, including State agencies, Council and other stakeholders such as development proponents. The DS proposes and identifies a number of major infrastructure works to cater for the population increase within the UDA. However not all of these can be funded by infrastructure charges collected from within the UDA alone. Those infrastructure items required to support the development are allocated a delivery timeframe in Table 2 of the Infrastructure Plan.</p> <p>It is not necessary that the DS include specific provisions about major infrastructure that is the responsibility of other agencies.</p> <p>The ULDA will continue to undertake a coordination role with respect to major infrastructure associated with the Fitzgibbon UDA. Consequently discussions with Brisbane City Council and relevant State Government Departments/Agencies will continue in order to better inform the Infrastructure Plan and Implementation Strategy in the future.</p>	N
97	Proposal for shuttle buses to link key public transport and neighbourhood shopping centres	This is not included within the DS however, should particular development applications propose the use of shuttle buses this would be considered subject to further discussions with relevant parties.	N
<b>• Road network</b>			
98	Did the transport study take into account the fact users of the current Golf Driving Range utilise the roundabout at Carselgrove and Orchid Avenue	Yes	N
99	The DS does not make reference to the surrounding state-controlled road network or possible impacts upon them.	There is no need to reference the state-controlled road network in the DS. Traffic modelling undertaken to inform the DS does not indicate any impacts of significance on the state-controlled road network.	N
100	Main Roads considers improvements may be necessary to the state-controlled road intersections, Gympie Road/Linkfield Road, Gympie Road/Beams Road and Gateway Motorway/Depot Road and the state-controlled roads Gympie Arterial, Sandgate Sub-Arterial and Gateway Motorway in order to service additional traffic generated by the Fitzgibbon UDA.	Traffic modelling undertaken to inform the DS does not indicate any impacts of significance on the state-controlled road network.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
101	Concerns raised with the proposed road network and implications on the existing local road network through increased traffic, noise and off-street parking.	Traffic modelling has been undertaken to support the DS. The DS reflects the outcomes of these studies.  The DS provides adequate information on the proposed road network through the UDA Wide Development criteria and Precinct intents. In addition, changes have been made to the DS through the incorporation of a "Transport Plan" and a new section on "Transport" within the new Precinct 4 addressing the proposed North-South connector road. Refer also to the ULDA response on "car parking".	Y
102	Why development and Beams Road overpass when the Geebung rail crossing is so dangerous?	The Geebung rail crossing is outside the UDA. It is not the responsibility of the ULDA to undertake any upgrades to this infrastructure.	N
103	Why are there no intersection controls indicated on the Structure/Precinct Plans? Concerns raised with the use of roundabouts	These elements are too detailed to be shown on Structure/Precinct Plans within the DS and will be addressed through the development assessment process.	N
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Beams Road</b></li> </ul>			
104	The proposed Beams Road overpass should be designed and constructed to achieve good urban design outcomes and ensure it does not result in adverse impacts on the public amenity values within Precinct 1.	Agree. The design and delivery of the overpass however will be undertaken by BCC and the State Government.	N
105	Ensure adequate space is provided for the Beams Road overpass and that Balcara and Carselgrove intersections are not compromised.	The ULDA will be guided by BCC as to the specific land requirements for the proposed Beams Road overpass.	N
106	Maximum use of Beams Road for access to transport hub	Access to the proposed busway station and railway station will not be direct as a result of the impacts of the future Beams Road overpass. The street network in the vicinity of the proposed busway station and railway station has been designed with regard to the future Beams Road overpass.	N
107	It is unclear whether traffic will be able to go from Dorville Road to Balcara Av without having to access Beams Road. Concerns of rat-running through this area.	Access to Balcara Avenue from Dorville Road will remain as currently provided, with an additional access route provided by a new public road through Precinct 1.	N
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Roghan Road</b></li> </ul>			
108	Concerns have been raised with regards to the implications on local access road, including impacts of on-street parking, i.e. Odense Street and the need to maintain the current speed limit.	Traffic modelling has been undertaken to support the DS and traffic movement along Roghan Road will not generate unacceptable impacts on the existing street network, including Odense Street. Speed limits within the broader area are not proposed to change. The future North-South Connector Road has been agreed with Brisbane City Council to be speed limited to 50km/hr.  Under the Interim Land use Plan, approval was granted for a residential subdivision within a portion of Precinct 4. Stage 2 of this approved development application, which incorporates 17 allotments, gain vehicle access from Odense Street.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Telegraph Road</b></li> </ul>			
109	Safe and efficient access to Telegraph Road for surrounding residents to the North, for example, through the establishment of an additional access/service road	Noted. BCC are responsible for the design work associated with the Linkfield/Telegraph Road overpass and the provision of access to residences on the northern side of Telegraph Road.	N
110	Incorporation of a quieting agent be included in the final surface to assist in noise reduction	Noted. BCC are responsible for the design work associated with the Linkfield/Telegraph Road overpass and any upgrading of Telegraph Road.	N
111	Additional collector routes may be required through to Telegraph Road	Traffic analysis undertaken in support of the DS demonstrates that the proposed North-South connector road, as identified in the cross section in the DS, is more than adequate to handle future traffic requirements without the need for an additional collector route.	N
112	What implications will the Norris Road/Telegraph Rd have on access to existing shopping centre on Norris Road.	Future detailed design of the intersection will ensure the ongoing functionality of the existing centre. More significant impacts on this centre will arise from BCCs work on designing the Linkfield/Telegraph Road overpass.	N
113	Sufficient land needs to be set for Telegraph road widening.	Telegraph road widening is a BCC initiative. Nothing in the proposed DS prejudices the future road upgrading.	N
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>North-South Connector Road</b></li> </ul>			
114	<p>Concerns raised that there was no justification provided for the road corridor and the adverse impacts on the existing residents through the increase in traffic volume has not been adequately addressed. The submissions received have requested the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>consideration of alternatives as discussed by residents and Community Reference Group;</li> <li>traffic be focused on Telegraph and Beams Roads;</li> <li>incorporation of traffic calming and noise attenuation measures to reduce speed and improve pedestrian and public transport connectivity;</li> <li>road design standards to achieve good outcomes for pedestrian, cycle and public transport movement; and</li> <li>measures to address impacts during construction phase.</li> </ul>	<p>Traffic modelling has been undertaken to support the DS and has guided the works necessary to accommodate the proposed population increase in the UDA. The proposed road will provide a necessary connection for public transport, private vehicle and pedestrian/cycle access whilst Telegraph Road and Beams road will continue to carry the bulk of traffic.</p> <p>The North South connector road is generally in accordance with a route that BCC have previously identified to connect Telegraph Rd, Roghan Rd and Beams Rd as shown in the <i>Brisbane City Plan 2000, Planning Scheme Map 1 of 3 - Area Classifications and Proposed Road Hierarchy to 2011</i>.</p> <p>The DS includes adequate provisions , i.e. through the precinct outcomes and Transport Plan to ensure there are minimal adverse implications on the existing road network and is appropriately designed to achieve the DS planning outcomes.</p> <p>The cross-section of the north south connector road has been modelled, and is considered adequate in terms of accommodating the safety of cyclists, proposed vehicular traffic volumes, design speed and posted speed limits.</p> <p>The DS has been amended to add a note to Figure 7 to state that the detailed design of the north south connector is subject to further detailed design investigations.</p> <p>BCC and ULDA have agreed that the posted speed</p>	Y

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
		limit for this road will be 50km/hr. Implications through the construction phase will be addressed through the conditioning of development applications.	
115	The construction of the proposed North-South connector road will have significant impacts upon environmental values including vegetation of state significance, EPA Referrable Wetlands, wildlife movement, stormwater and hydrology. Should not go through conservation areas; Need to incorporate measures to protect environmental values.	The location of the proposed North-South connector road was chosen as the one that has the least environmental impact of the possible options. Additionally the road is to be constructed such that it adequately manages its impact upon the environmental values.	N
116	Suggest move the connector road to link into the Busway and to Telegraph Road at precinct 6 so that it reduces the volume and length of straight road.	Linking the North-South connector road to Telegraph Road at the Norris Road intersection is considered to be the optimal location for this connection. The connection cannot be moved further west due to the proposed Linkfield/Telegraph Road overpass. The chosen route has the least environmental impacts of the alignment options considered.	N
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Traffic volumes and impacts</b></li> </ul>			
117	What is the estimated traffic volumes of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Balcara Ave and Beams Road Intersection; and</li> <li>Dorville Road.</li> </ul>	Traffic modelling has been undertaken to support the DS and estimated traffic volumes generated by the proposed development will be adequately accommodated through the existing road network and proposed transport improvements, including an intersection upgrade at Balcara Avenue and Beams Road.	N
118	The validity and accuracy of the traffic and transport assessments undertaken to inform the DS are questioned. The DS needs to identify the potential impacts and mitigation measures.	The DS has been supported by traffic modelling undertaken by professional consultants which addressed impacts and mitigation measures for the road and street network in and around the UDA. A professional peer review further supports the adequacy of the traffic analysis undertaken. The DS adequately identifies mitigation measures to be undertaken as part of the Infrastructure Plan and further transport analysis will be undertaken at the development application stage for specific developments.	N
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Rail corridor</b></li> </ul>			
119	Outline within section 3.9 the requirement to protect rail corridor from thrown objects.	Agree. Issues relating to protecting use of the rail corridor from thrown objects will be dealt with at the development application stage.	Y
120	Medium and high rise buildings near rail corridor will need additional noise attenuation measures	The DS has addressed this matter within the "General Noise Requirements" section and will be further addressed at the development assessment stage.	N
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Public transport</b></li> </ul>			
121	Option to maintain current bus route to link into proposed Northern Busway	Nothing in the DS limits current bus routes being able to link into the proposed northern busway in the future.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
122	Enhanced public amenity and address safety concerns associated with the proposed linkages to public transport nodes.	<p>The development requirements within the DS seek to enhance the safety of residents and public transport users. Development is to be undertaken in accordance with principles of crime prevention through environmental design.</p> <p>The local access street adjoining Lavender St and Carselgrove Ave will help to improve connectivity for public transport users and provide safe and convenient access between the railway station, proposed busway station and urban village to the south.</p>	N
123	Need to outline specific high level Public Transport needs of retirement villages. Links to earlier comment to ensure sequencing of development with appropriate infrastructure. Reference should also be made to CPTED principles.	Multi unit development such as retirement villages are permissible in the Residential zone. CPTED principles are to be taken into account as part of the development assessment process.	N
124	<p>Need for new heading – Public Transport which will:</p> <p>(a) outline the percentage of development to be within a walkable catchment of Public Transport;</p> <p>(b) sequencing of development to align with timing of infrastructure; and</p> <p>(a) prescript design standard for bus route roads.</p>	<p>A new heading for Public Transport is not necessary.</p> <p>All developable areas proposed are within a 400m walkable catchment of the primary road network or the future Northern Busway stations. Significant improvements to bus services in Brisbane will be delivered through the TransLink Network Plan. As funding becomes available TransLink will adjust existing bus services and introduce new services to ensure residents have access to the TransLink network. Indicative development timing is identified through the Infrastructure Plan.</p> <p>The cross-section for the north-south connector road has been designed to allow for bus access and provisions have been incorporated into the DS to ensure adequate bus setdown and pick up facilities are provided.</p>	N
<p>• <b>Park and ride facility</b></p>			
125	Need for increased cycle parking facilities.	Agree. The scheme has been amended to include a footnote relating to the provision of End of Trip cycle facilities to clarify the appropriate standards for provision.	Y
126	<p>Concerns raised with the impact of public transport commuter parking on local streets resulting in adverse impacts upon the existing residents.</p> <p>Concerns with the scale of the new park and ride facility and its timing/sequencing of development within the UDA to ensure no adverse implications on existing public transport services/facilities. An additional park and ride facility was recommended on the Fitzgibbon side of the rail line, preferably in precinct 1(e) -Wreckers yard and the establishment of some temporary parking facilities adjacent to the rail station as a short term measure.</p> <p>Concerns with locating the Park and ride facility further away from the public transport stations and</p>	<p>The proposed park and ride area next to the North Coast railway line within the new sub-precinct 1(a) is considered sufficient to cater for demand. It is anticipated that this will be delivered when the Beams Road railway overpass is delivered.</p> <p>There are currently 89 car parking bays at Carseldine station for use by rail commuters. The TransLink Transit Authority are working with Queensland Rail Limited to investigate short term opportunities to improve this facility. Additional improvements will also be made to rail stations further outbound from Carseldine (such as Bald Hills and Strathpine) to intercept commuter trips and ease demand on Carseldine rail station.</p> <p>TransLink support the planning undertaken by the Urban Land Development Authority for Carseldine rail station, particularly the improvements to local access</p>	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
	also safety implications with the access route being under the Beans road overpass.	paths and the planned Northern Busway station at Carseldine. Changes to the existing park and ride facility will be designed to ensure that commuters have efficient access to the rail station with safe crossing points. Parking for disabled customers will continue to be provided at the station entrance.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Proposed Northern Busway</b></li> </ul>			
127	<p>The DS does not outline any timing for its delivery nor how it will be delivered. Its larger contextual link with surrounding suburbs, i.e. Chermiside Shopping Centre, has also not been adequately illustrated.</p> <p>It is also inappropriate to finalise this plan until the final route of the busway has been determined.</p>	<p>The DS adequately reflects the alignment for the Northern Busway supported by the Department of Transport and Main Roads within the Fitzgibbon UDA. Planning for the Northern Busway between Kedron and Bracken Ridge is currently underway by the Department of Transport and Main Roads and a pre-feasibility planning report has identified a corridor of interest generally following Gympie Road north from Kedron.</p> <p>Funding and timing of delivery of the Northern Busway is subject to State Government priorities.</p> <p>A transport plan has now been included within the DS which clarifies the busway's broader context.</p>	N
128	Identify the indicative land requirement for the proposed corridor to assist developers.	The DS ensures sufficient land is set aside for the proposed Northern Busway. It is not possible at this stage to articulate the precise land requirements, which is subject to further detailed design by the Department of Transport and Main Roads.	N
129	Busway - Fig 2, Structure Plan – relocate the proposed busway station to the south of the proposed overpass at Telegraph Road.	Noted. The location of the busway station within Precinct 5 (formerly Precinct 6) is indicative. The development of this site for a busway station will require future masterplanning to be undertaken with the Department of Transport and Main Roads and the exact location for the station will be determined through that process.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
130	Busway linking with Telegraph Road will increase traffic along Telegraph Road making access onto Telegraph Road difficult	<p>Traffic modelling has been undertaken to support the DS and estimated traffic volumes generated by the proposed development will be adequately accommodated through the existing road network and proposed transport improvements.</p> <p>BCC are responsible for the design work associated with the Linkfield/Telegraph Road overpass and the Department of Transport and Main Roads are responsible for the provision of the busway station within Precinct 5 (formerly Precinct 6). Accordingly when masterplanning of Precinct 5 (formerly Precinct 6) occurs the ULDA will work with BCC and DTMR to ensure that development relating to the busway station does not have significant adverse impacts for vehicle movement on Telegraph Road.</p>	N
131	Confirm whether the DS will stop development compromising the future use of the area as a busway stations.	<p>The proposed busway corridor is indicated on maps and referred to in the DS. It is considered that this is sufficient reference to ensure that the future use of this area as a busway station will not be compromised. Further clarity of the proposed uses in this precinct will be noted in the reference to the sites zoning.</p>	N
132	<p>The proposed busway runs through existing areas with established vegetation which provides habitat for birds, and squirrel gliders and other wildlife. Retention of this habitat is vital for survival of the wildlife.</p> <p>The proposed busway through sport and recreational areas will also have adverse impacts on its use.</p>	<p>The proposed location of the busway was chosen to minimise adverse impacts on environmental values. In the former QUT campus all efforts will be made to limit the impact of the road and a fauna crossing point will be provided.</p> <p>The proposed busway will be designed and constructed to support the amenity outcomes proposed within the urban village, including the creation of high quality public places.</p> <p>These matters will also be addressed in more detail during the development and ULDA approval of subsequent sub-precinct planning for the area.</p>	N
133	Justify the community need for a proposed busway. There is already a rail line. Other suggestion that it be limited to between Beams and Telegraph Roads.	<p>Noted. The Northern Busway is an integral part of the Queensland Government's long-term plan to meet the transport needs of Brisbane's growing north side communities. The Northern Busway will connect the Inner Northern Busway at Royal Children's Hospital (Herston) with Bracken Ridge, via Windsor, Lutwyche, Kedron, Chermside and Aspley.</p> <p>The Northern Busway is being delivered in stages, with work on the section from the Royal Children's Hospital via the Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital to Windsor due to be completed in late 2009. The section between Windsor and Kedron will be delivered with Airport Link and is due to be completed in mid-2012.</p> <p>Planning for the Northern Busway between Kedron and Bracken Ridge is currently underway. A pre-feasibility planning report has identified a corridor of interest generally following Gympie Road north from Kedron.</p> <p>The DS adequately represents the concept design for the Northern Busway through the Fitzgibbon UDA which will be a critical link in the busway corridor.</p>	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
<b>• Pedestrian and Cycle network and facilities</b>			
134	Pedestrian and Cycle pathways and End of trip facilities to outline precise design standards within section 3.10.	Agree. The scheme has been amended to include a footnote relating to the provision of End of Trip cycle facilities to clarify the appropriate standards for provision.	Y
135	Within section 3.10 provide further criteria for the provision of end of trip facilities for non-residential uses should be provided such as number, size and type of facilities.	Agree. The scheme has been amended to include a footnote relating to the provision of End of Trip cycle facilities to clarify the appropriate standards for provision.	Y
136	Pedestrian and cyclist links along busway and to rail station/park and ride facility	Provisions of DS to recognise pedestrian and cycle ways in conjunction with proposed busway and to link into proposed busway station and railway station.	N
137	A whole of site pedestrian / cycle network plan should be produced to show where these are located within the UDA and how these are to be connected with surrounding cycleway networks.  All new roads should be accompanied with pedestrian footpaths and cycle paths.	Agree. The major pedestrian and cycle network routes are indicated in the maps and content of the DS. The DS has been amended to include a separate transport related map to reinforce the major pedestrian and cycle network routes through the UDA.	Y
<b>• Car parking</b>			
138	Need for sufficient off-street parking for new residents and commercial/retail activity. Off-street parking will be reduced through the redevelopment of the QUT campus.  Requests every dwelling should have at least one car park as well as provision for visitor parking.	The car parking rates in Table 1 are considered appropriate. There is flexibility within the DS to allow for the most appropriate level of car parking for the development proposed.  As outlined in Table 1, minimum car parking rates have been identified, which outlines that in most circumstances a minimum of 1 space per dwelling unit. The only expectation is for multiple residential development within 400 metres of a railway station or proposed busway station, where the minimum is 0.75 spaces per dwelling unit.  Visitor car parking has been stipulated within Table 1 of the DS and this table has been amended to provide clarity in regards to tandem car parking.	N
139	Car parking rates should refer to a maximum rather than a minimum.	Considerable flexibility has been included in the DS to allow for the most appropriate level of car parking for the development proposed.	N
140	It is suggested that within a suburban transit oriented development precinct a car parking rate of 1 space per 75m <sup>2</sup> is preferred.	Considerable flexibility has been included in the DS to allow for the most appropriate level of car parking for the development proposed.	N
141	Under "House" in Table 1 the current parking wording is confusing and suggest the following "Spaces may be provided in tandem, with a minimum length of 5.0m per space."	Agree. The car parking rates in Table 1 has been amended to provide greater clarity in regards to tandem car parking.	Y
142	Change the car parking rate to "Where site is within 400 metres of a railway station or proposed busway station, a minimum of ..." to accord with standards.	Agree. Change DS to refer to 400 metres as recommended.	Y

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
143	The car parking provisions adjacent to the Fitzgibbon Neighbourhood centre should allow the possibility of chevron parking to allow for opportunities for additional spaces.	Noted. Chevron parking arrangements are subject to detailed design investigations as part of any proposed development in the neighbourhood centre. Considerable flexibility has been included in the DS to allow for the most appropriate level of car parking for the development proposed.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
<b>ENVIRONMENT AND OPEN SPACE</b>			
144	The draft DS is not consistent with ecological sustainable development.	<p><i>The Urban Land Development Authority Act 2007</i> outlines the core functions of the ULDA as being to facilitate, amongst other things, planning principles that give effect to ecological sustainability and best practice urban design. The Act defines ecological sustainability as a balance that integrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• protection of ecological process and natural systems at local, regional, State and wider levels;</li> <li>• economic development; and</li> <li>• maintenance of the cultural, economic, physical and social wellbeing of people and communities.</li> </ul> <p>The DS effectively integrates those matters for which it has a mandate.</p>	N
145	Section 3.11 should state that the general environmental duty is an element of ESD and must be considered before undertaking activities.	The general requirement to have regard to the general environmental duty of care under the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1994</i> is not affected by the creation of the UDA or the draft DS and therefore reference is not considered necessary.	N
146	The effectiveness of the conservation zone to preserve the environmental values of the area is questioned given the proposed multi purpose nature of the conservation zone for "nature based recreation". Edge effects and uncontrolled access will impact upon the preservation of conservation values.	Agree. The intent and language of the area currently identified as the conservation zone has been amended to more appropriately reflect the multi function purpose of the area. It is now the Bushland and Open Space zone. Access will be addressed through the creation of controlled paths and trails. Edge effects are managed as development is to be separated from the bushland with either a road or cycle/pedestrian paths.	Y
147	The DS should demonstrate how it will manage the impacts impact of pets on the native wildlife.	All development is to be separated from the bushland with either a road or cycle/pedestrian paths. The impact of pets on native wildlife was considered and it was decided that given the current levels of development surrounding the area that no further action was warranted.	N
148	Significant concerns about the loss of overall green space within the area.	The government's intent for the area is multi purpose and includes development for affordable housing, other housing and mixed use areas as well as retaining environmental values. The loss of some green space is necessary to achieve these objectives but significant areas have also been retained	N
149	<p>The DS proposes development in areas that contain significant environmental values such as State significant vegetation, wetlands, and habitat for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• locally significant species such as the squirrel glider; and</li> <li>• State significant species such as Powerful Owl, Grey Goshawk &amp; potentially Koalas.</li> </ul> <p>The development will also result in the clearing of remnant vegetation, including of concern and endangered remnant regional ecosystems. These areas must be protected.</p>	The government's intent for the area is multi purpose and includes development for affordable housing, other housing and mixed use areas as well as recognising and responding the area's environmental values. The area's environmental values have been addressed in the context of those multiple objectives. The ULDA believes it has achieved an acceptable balance of development and retention of area's significant environmental values. The DS has retained significant areas of habitat for these species.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
150	The destruction of remnant vegetation on the QUT land is totally unacceptable and represents a u-turn in State Government policy to protect regional ecosystems. The full extent of remnant vegetation on the QUT site should be persevered as a conservation area.	The ULDA was established by the Queensland Government primarily to facilitate the Government's Affordable Housing Strategy. As part of this process the Government decided to reconsider how several important Government policies such as protection of remnant vegetation under the <i>Vegetation Management Act 1999</i> should be addressed. The ULDA believes it has achieved an acceptable balance of development and retention of environmental values.	N
151	The DS should include regulations protecting existing vegetation and open space areas, specifically outlining which trees will be protected in the urban use areas.	The DS states that significant vegetation should be retained where possible and where lost requires the loss to be offset in the bushland areas.	N
152	The DS should include reference to habitat trees as part of the definition of significant vegetation and require that all habitat trees should be protected.	Agree. Where possible habitat trees within development areas will be preserved. The Fitzgibbon Bushland Management Plan will articulate how this is to be achieved. Substantial references to the Fitzgibbon Bushland Management Plan have been made in the DS.	Y
153	<p>There is a lack of clarity on how vegetation offsets are triggered, assessed and secured in relation to vegetation clearing under the proposed DS. To address this NRM recommends the inclusion of an offset section detailing the following provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offsets associated with the clearing of significant vegetation are provided in accordance with the seven principles of the Queensland Government Environmental Offset Policy</li> <li>• The "Offsets" section addresses areas of essential habitat and endangered and of concern regional ecosystems (matters of NRW State interest) across the Fitzgibbon Urban Development Area.</li> </ul> <p>In Section 3.7 Conservation/Open Space Planning and Design on page 10 of the proposed scheme NRW recommends the ULDA further defines the trigger and mechanism for offsetting significant vegetation through habitat improvement in Conservation Areas. The second dot point under the 'Multi-functional role of conservation areas' heading could be amended to read as;  "opportunities for habitat improvement arising from development in other parts of the UDA through the provision of vegetation and habitat offsets to improve the existing remnant vegetation and habitat areas within the existing conservation zone."</p>	<p>The government's intent for the area is multi purpose and includes development and management of the environmental values in the context of that development. The ULDA believes it has achieved an acceptable balance of development and retention of environmental values.</p> <p>The DS has retained the majority of the area's state significant vegetation and seeks to minimise development's impacts on the remaining vegetation and requires offsetting for any losses. The offsetting will be achieved through the development process and the ULDA will prepare the Fitzgibbon Bushland Management Plan to articulate how this is to occur. Substantial references to the Fitzgibbon Bushland Management Plan have been made in the DS.</p> <p>The suggested wording has been adopted.</p>	Y
154	The DS does not adequately address the impacts upon wildlife corridors resulting from development.	The DS has been amended to clarify and emphasise the ecological linkages to the biodiversity corridors outside of the UDA by providing more details on how the proposed ecological linkages will work both within and external to the UDA. The ULDA will prepare the Fitzgibbon Bushland Management Plan to articulate how this will occur.	Y

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
155	The ability to maintain viable populations of wildlife are diminished by the loss of available habitat, interruptions to movement corridors from the new road & busway network, significantly fragments remaining habitat.	The DS has retained much of the core habitat of the area and provided for internal and external wildlife movement corridors to the extent possible given the limits of the UDA. Cooperation with Brisbane City Council is required to ensure effectiveness of measures.	N
156	In particular the proposed 30m north-south fauna corridor proposed in precinct 5 is substantially inadequate to fulfil its intended function. It should be a minimum of 50m and be able to fulfil its function and remain in a undeveloped state. In conjunction with redevelopment of Telegraph Road and power line infrastructure.	The DS has retained the north south fauna corridor at a minimum of 30m. The detailed design of the area may result in an increase to the desired 50m. The Fitzgibbon Bushland Management Plan will provide details about the design and functioning of the corridor.	N
157	The DS does not demonstrate how it will achieve the vision of retaining the area's environmental values. Retention of environmental values is not the same as conservation.	The DS retains the majority of the area's environmental values. For clarification purposes the intent has been reworded to "retention of significant environmental values" to emphasis that not all the area's environmental values are to be retained and the word conservation has been removed to reflect the multi purpose nature of the area.	Y
158	The draft DS should include a map displaying the environmental values of the area to assist future development.	The Implementation Strategy has been modified to state the ULDA will prepare a Fitzgibbon Bushland Management Plan that will amongst other things contain a map displaying the area's environmental values.	Y
159	The DS does not support the significant work being done by the community to protect and restore the ecological values of Cabbage Tree Creek catchment.  In addition, the development of the Carseldine University will have adverse implications on the Cabbage tree Creek Catchment.	The ecological values of Cabbage Tree Creek are being retained with significant areas being left undeveloped and significant investment being made to maintain or improve water quality in the Creek.	N
<p>• <b>Noise, Air and Water</b></p>			
160	The proposed development will result in adverse noise impacts resulting from the increased traffic and development of the Beams Road overpass.  Noise barriers should be erected adjacent to the Beams Rd overpass, the existing Carselgrove Avenue and the proposed Carselgrove Ave extension from Orchid Crescent to the next roundabout to protect existing residents from increased or raised traffic noises.  The DS should provide additional information on the health impacts upon new residents from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increased noise and air pollution from rail and proposed busway traffic; and</li> <li>• increased traffic noise.</li> </ul>	The DS requires these issues to be addressed in accordance with current best practice as specified within the UDA-wide Criteria.  Design work for the Beams Road Railway overpass would be undertaken by Brisbane City Council and the need for the incorporation of noise barriers would be considered by them.	N
161	Currently recognised best practice water management should be identified in the DS. This includes the <i>Environmental Protection Regulation 2008</i> , the <i>Environmental Protection (Water) Policy 1997</i> , the <i>Environmental Protection (Air) Policy 2008</i> and water sensitive urban design.	Agree. The appropriate standards have been referenced.	Y

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
162	While the proposed DS gives limited indication of proposed stormwater quality management in the Carseldine area, there is no apparent integration of the above stormwater quality management into the land use planning for the Carseldine area.	Water management and stormwater management in particular are to be done in accordance with current best practice. Accordingly the proposed development should have minimal adverse impact and potentially improve existing water quality.	N
<p>• <b>Flooding and stormwater</b></p>			
163	The full impact of flood mitigation works associated with the proposed DS is uncertain as information on flood investigations has not been publicly available. Works within the bed and banks of Cabbage Tree Creek (other than upgrading existing culverts) and any redirection or straightening of the watercourse is strongly opposed.	Supporting information for the DS has not been released at this point as discussions are still underway with Brisbane City Council. The flood mitigation strategy is still being finalised in conjunction with Brisbane City Council.	N
164	Future development must ensure a “non-worsening” of flood conditions in the locality.	The proposed development has been planned and designed on the basis of no worsening and improving where possible the extent of flooding whether inside or external to the UDA. The ULDA is working with Brisbane City Council to this effect.	N
165	Flood immunity levels should be in accordance with BCC’s “Subdivision and Development Guidelines”	This is already achieved by the DS.	N
166	Flood mitigation strategies should be resolved prior to the DS being finalised	It is agreed that this is preferable however, the flood mitigation strategy is still being finalised in conjunction with Brisbane City Council as management of the impacts of flooding requires cross jurisdiction agreement. Final resolution of the flood issues are expected to be able to be resolved through the development assessment process.	N
167	The DS should ensure that adequate protection of Cabbage Tree Creek from development may assist with achieving water quality objectives, flood mitigation and maintaining an appropriate hydrological balance at a local and sub-regional level.	There is minimal development occurring within the vegetation areas associated with Cabbage Tree Creek. All development will be consistent with current best practice to achieve water quality objectives.	N
168	A flood immune road connection should be provided between Roghan and Telegraph Roads.	Agree. The North South Connector Road is to be constructed to a 1:100 year flood immunity level as stated within the DS.	N
<p>• <b>Contaminated land</b></p>			
169	The DS does not adequately demonstrate how contaminated land on the Environmental Management Register (EMR) will be managed.	The DS will be amended to make it clear that the management of contaminated land will be consistent with current best practice according to the Environmental protection Agency.	Y
170	Remediation of contaminated land may add significantly to the cost of development. The following lots within the Urban Development Area are included on the EMR but they have not been assessed for their intended use: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lot 1 on RP177978;</li> <li>• Lot 4 on RP77213;</li> <li>• Lot 357 on SL10101;</li> <li>• Lot 1 on RP105309;</li> <li>• Lot 90 on SP122447; and</li> </ul>	No development is being proposed on the majority of these lots. Lot 90 on SP122447 is the current rail line and includes part of the park and ride facilities. Lot 4 on RP80282, the wrecker’s yard, will be assessed as part of any development application. Preliminary assessment for these lots indicates that the level of contamination will not add significantly to the cost of development.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lot 4 on RP80282.</li> </ul>		
171	The draft DS states that development must ensure that all land and groundwater is fit for purpose but does not make it clear who would be responsible for achieving this.	This is to be done by the applicant as part of the development application process.	N
172	It is possible that land or groundwater other than that identified on the EMR may be contaminated. This land should be assessed and remediated in accordance with the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1994</i> and the draft <i>Guidelines for the assessment and Management of Contaminated Land in Queensland 1998</i> .	This will be addressed as part of the development application process.	N
173	<p>To adequately address the potential impact on human health the UDA wide criteria for contaminated land should include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“The following must be undertaken for sites with potential risks that may impact on human health and the environment owing to potential site contamination from past commercial, industrial and agricultural uses on adjacent or nearby sites; impacts from notifiable activities and the adjacent development footprint; and/or land listed on the Environmental Management Register (EMR) or Contaminated Land Register (CLR).</li> <li>A site investigation report, prepared in accordance with the Environmental Protection Act 1994 and the draft Guidelines for the Assessment and Management of Contaminated Land in Queensland (DEH, 1998), must be submitted to the Environmental Protection agency (EPA – Contaminated Land Unit (CLU) showing that the parcel of land is suitable for the intended use which may include a site management plan (SMP).</li> <li>A Third Party Reviewer (TPR) must be appointed under the EPA’s Terms of Reference – Use of a Third Party Reviewer for Assessment and Management of site Contamination dated 15 Feb 2008 where notifiable activities have been carried out on the Fitzgibbon Urban development Area. A TRP acceptable to the EPA must be engaged at all times until a draft Site Management Plan is prepared or the subject land is removed from the EMR.</li> <li>A management plan must be prepared detailing mitigation measures of offsite impacts form nearby or adjacent sites where notifiable activities were previously carried out. This plan must be made available when requested by an authorised person under provisions of the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1994</i>.</li> </ul> <p>Notifiable activities are those listed under Schedule 3 of the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1994</i> and include, for example, land fills, scrap yards and railway yards. A copy of the draft <i>Guidelines for the Assessment and Management</i></p>	The DS will be amended to make it clear that the management of contaminated land will be consistent with current best practice according to the Environmental protection Agency.	Y

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
	<i>of Contaminated Land in Queensland (DEH, 1998)</i> can be located on the EPA website at <a href="http://www.epa.qld.gov.au">www.epa.qld.gov.au</a> "		
174	The DS should clearly communicate the responsibilities of land owners under the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1994</i> regarding activities that involve use of a hazardous contaminant.	Nothing in the DS alters the owner's responsibilities under the EP Act.	N
175	A minimum buffer distance of 200m should be established between landfill areas and development to manage the potential adverse effects from the migration of landfill gas. A lesser distance may be acceptable subject to a risk assessment that considers remedial design and operation measures.	No development is being proposed within 200m of any land fill areas.	N
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Acid Sulfate Soils</b></li> </ul>			
176	NRW recommends that the DS establishes the <i>State Planning Policy 2/02</i> and associated guidelines as the minimum requirement for identification and treatment of acid sulfate soils (ASS).	The DS already requires ASS to be identified and managed in accordance with current best practice in Queensland and refers to the SPP and associated technical manuals as the current best practice.	N
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Bushfire</b></li> </ul>			
177	The DS should ensure that there is sufficient clear separation between development and bushland areas to assist in bushfire control. When considering applications associated with a bushland interface further consultation should be had with officers of the Queensland Fire and Rescue Service.	All dwellings near bushland will be separated from the bushland with either a road or cycle/pedestrian paths. Roads will be used in areas of highest risk within the development.	N
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Sustainable housing</b></li> </ul>			
178	Section 3 would benefit from a detailed explanation of energy ratings and their current relationship to the building codes.	This is not appropriate as these standards will change over time. The energy efficiency of buildings is to be consistent if not better than existing standards.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
<b>PRECINCT 1</b>			
179	The DS should ensure the proposed public transport node creates a primary gateway to the Urban Village, enhanced by good urban design outcomes.	Noted. This has been ensured through the intent and outcomes for Precinct 1.	N
180	The DS should achieve active street frontages and high quality public realms along the Beams Road corridor.	The DS already includes provisions for active street frontages such as a "main street" link through to Beams Road and other requirements for buildings and public realm relationships.	N
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Building heights and densities</b></li> </ul>			
181	<p>Do not support the proposed building heights within this precinct due largely to visual impacts on the character of the area, loss of vegetation and the associated traffic implications.</p> <p>The building heights which were supported by the submitters within this precinct varied, however, predominately a height in keeping with the existing QUT buildings was supported. Variations included "no development" to a maximum of five/six storeys.</p> <p>Concerns were also raised with overshadowing of existing urban areas (i.e. Golden Downs area and Clock Corner) and the playing fields.</p> <p>The DS needs to articulate the densities for development within this precinct.</p>	<p>The building heights within the Carseldine Urban Village and other areas near existing communities have been reduced to a mixture of 3, 5 and 8 storeys. Amendments have been made to the heights of building within Precincts 1, 2 and 3 (formerly all contained within Precinct 1).</p> <p>Development in proximity to existing developed areas have been reduced such as heights adjoining Balcara Avenue within the "Clock Corner" site and along the Beams Road frontage of the QUT site (Precinct 1).</p> <p>The DS has been amended to include separate height and density maps so as to provide greater clarity for where there are variances of height and density within precincts. The maps also provide better clarity as to where heights may be varied in particular instances through the use of shading and referencing to precinct specific outcomes.</p> <p>Redevelopment of part of the QUT land plays a vital role in the implementation of the Government's transit oriented development objectives to increase the intensity of residential development, particularly affordable housing, around existing and proposed transport infrastructure.</p>	Y
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Sub-precinct 1(a)</b> <b>Sub-precinct 1(a) within the publicly notified version of the DS has now been expanded in the submitted DS to incorporate sub-precinct 1(d).</b></li> </ul>			
182	Maintain playing fields within QUT and assessable to the public at no cost	The sporting fields are currently in private ownership and will be relocated and redeveloped for public use.	N
183	Financial compensation for QUT for loss of its land and associated improvements and limitations on the ability to expand its future operations	Financial negotiations between QUT and the State Government will not be reflected in the DS.	N
184	The arrangements for the use of the replacement ovals.	The sporting fields are currently in private ownership and will be relocated and redeveloped for public use.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
185	<p>Maintain use of area as an education precinct. Questioned the ability to develop area given its zoning for educational purposes.</p> <p>Opportunity was also raised for a Police academy.</p>	<p>The existing buildings are to be retained for education purposes and consequently have been zoned Special Purpose to allow for this continued use. Within a UDA the ULDA assumes the planning powers of local government and some state agencies – including assessing and deciding development applications. The ULDA will achieve this through implementation of ULDA policies, standards and guidelines and DSs and in this respect can propose new zonings for areas within a UDA.</p> <p>Possible alternative educational users of the existing buildings are subject to an Expression of Interest process being run by QUT.</p>	N
186	<p>The predominate use should be residential development.</p>	<p>The redevelopment of the Carseldine QUT as a mixed use development Urban Village will capitalise on its close proximity to existing and future public transport corridors. Mixed use development including retail and commercial provides opportunities for the surrounding community to access services through these means, limiting the use of private vehicles.</p> <p>The sub-precinct will support a significant portion of residential development, including a percentage for affordable housing outcomes. The retail component will be limited to ensure the urban village is catering for the local catchment and does not adversely impact on surrounding activity centres.</p>	N
187	<p>Community garden bordering mixed use and conservation areas next to QUT</p>	<p>Noted. This matter can be considered during the required future detailed master planning for sub-precinct 1(a).</p>	N
188	<p>Do not support development east of Balcara St Intersection</p>	<p>Redevelopment of part of the QUT land, Clock Corner shopping centre and the wrecking yard play a vital role in the implementation of the Government's transit oriented development objectives to increase the intensity of residential development, particularly affordable housing, around existing and proposed transport infrastructure.</p>	N
189	<p>Do not support inclusion of the existing child care facility in Precinct 1(a) due to future loss of amenity values associated with the development of the Urban Village. Preferred option is to include existing child care facility in the Carseldine Learning sub-precinct (1(b)) due to locational advantages with the education uses. May also be located in sub-precinct (1(c)) – Conservation Area given existing use in bushland setting. If kept in existing sub-precinct, the amenity and locational advantages are to be maintained.</p>	<p>Child care facilities remain a preferred use within this zone.</p>	N
190	<p>Review traditional 'main street' perspective of south of intersection of Balcara Avenue and Beams road in relation access and egress to transit hub parking from Beams Road</p>	<p>The traditional "main street" perspective being an extension of the Balcara Avenue intersection south is logical as this will be one of the major streets providing a clear link and direct access from within the urban village core to the proposed busway and railway stations to the north.</p>	N
191	<p>The lengthy construction period may have short and long term implications on the viability of the</p>	<p>Noted. No construction is currently proposed on the QUT land. Construction issues would be managed as</p>	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
	child care centre.	part of any development application process.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <b>Sub-precinct 1(c)</b>  <b>Sub-precinct 1(c) within the publicly notified version of the DS has now been deleted in the submitted DS. The area is now included in the balance area of Precinct 1 and is included in the Bushland and Open Space Zone. The land use intent has not changed.</b> </li> </ul>			
192	Dot points 1 and 6 are contradictory and do not represent world class planning as aspired to by the DS.	Agree. This has been amended in the DS to ensure clarity and consistency.	Y
193	Implications of bus and road upgrade on environmental values	The bus and road construction activities are to minimise their impact on environmental values and this will be managed through the development application stage.	N
194	Maintain conservation areas and green links through campus grounds for environmental values/noise controls	The environmental values of the precinct are to be maintained to the extent practicable.	N
195	Despite protection provided by the conservation zone, the proposed development will have a detrimental impact upon the environment. Factors such as shadowing, construction noise, increased usage due to population increase and vegetation removal all will have negative impacts.	The majority of the development within Precinct 1 will be occurring on areas that have already been significantly modified or cleared. Given the Government's affordable housing objectives for the area it is considered that the bushland areas to be retained by the proposal achieves an acceptable balance and will retain the majority of the environmental values of the area.	N
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <b>Sub-precinct 1(d)</b>  <b>Sub-precinct 1(d) within the publicly notified version of the DS has now been included within Sub-precinct 1(a) in the submitted DS.</b> </li> </ul>			
196	The outlook over open space should include reference to the conservation zone to clearly value the values that may be retained in the area.	Agree. The intent of this statement has been addressed by recognising the values of the bushland and open space area.	Y
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <b>Sub-precinct 1(e)</b>  <b>Sub-precinct 1(e) within the publicly notified version of the DS has now been included in Precinct 2 in the submitted DS.</b> </li> </ul>			
197	The predominant land use should be commercial development, supported by an increase in the allowable retail GFA and site coverage (50% to 60%).	Building height in the new Precinct 2 has been reduced in part to 5 stories adjoining part of the Beams Road frontage. However maximum density has been maintained whilst site coverage has been increased.	Y
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <b>Sub-precinct 1(f)</b>  <b>Sub-precinct 1(f) within the publicly notified version of the DS has now been included in Precinct 3 in the submitted DS.</b> </li> </ul>			
198	Concerns with the future of the existing shopping centre (Clock Corner).	The DS provides for substantial redevelopment opportunities.	N
199	Parking at Clock Corner should be retained.	A significant parking area is required in conjunction with any redevelopment of the former Precinct 1(f), now contained within Precinct 3.	N
200	Does not support development as it will have an adverse impact on the role of the area as a transport hub - maintain and enhance area as a car park	Redevelopment of the "Clock Corner" site with increased residential densities and other mixed use opportunities supports the Government's transit oriented development objectives. The DS indicates the broad structure for this location in order for it to function	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
		optimally as a transport hub.	

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
<b>PRECINCTS 2-6</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Building heights and densities</b></li> </ul>			
201	Do not support the proposed building heights within this precinct of up to five storeys. Concerns were also raised with overshadowing of existing urban areas i.e. Jacaranda Gardens.	Maximum building height in the vicinity of Jacaranda Gardens is three storeys. Other provisions regarding the amenity of adjoining residents have been included in the DS.	Y
202	Request to change the building height adjacent to the rail/bus transport corridor to allow buildings up to 5 storeys to provide greater flexibility to financial viability of these areas while remaining consistent with the intent.	The DS supports higher building heights and densities along public transport corridors. New maps relating to building height and density have been included in the DS.	Y
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Precinct 3</b> <b>Precinct 3 within the publicly notified version of the DS has now been consolidated into a larger Precinct 4 in the DS.</b></li> </ul>			
203	Safety concerns (from people and traffic) regarding the children's playground off Roghan Road and Carselgrove Avenue. Discussion between the ULDA and BCC should be undertaken as a matter of priority.	Noted. Operational matter to be addressed separately to the DS.	N
204	The Neighbourhood centre is likely to cause traffic injury or fatality. Suggest review placement of neighbourhood centre to shops.	The neighbourhood centre is subject to further detailed design, where safety and traffic issues will be taken into account.	N
205	Greater flexibility to allow "live work" units and some retail/commercial at ground floor, e.g. a corner shop.	Agree. DS to be reviewed to ensure maximum home-based business and "live work" units, particularly along the north south connector road.	Y
206	<p>With regards to the proposed neighbourhood centre in sub-precinct 3(a) and the proposed neighbourhood centre the provisions for the mixed use centre should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provision of affordable commercial office space for community groups and organisations;</li> <li>provision of opportunities for health care services and child care facilities;</li> <li>provision of a community hub, co locating a range of community services;</li> <li>provision of opportunities to provide recreational facilities that cater for a range of users;</li> <li>support for land transfer to community trust/umbrella organisations;</li> <li>provision of a respite centre for the younger population with a disability; and</li> <li>provision of a place for young people to gain training.</li> </ul>	The mixed use zone of the neighbourhood centre provides for these uses to be developed in the future.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Precinct 5</b> <b>Precinct 5 within the publicly notified version of the DS has now been consolidated into a larger Precinct 4 in the DS.</b></li> </ul>			
207	Further details should be provided regarding the proposed north south squirrel glider corridor in Precinct 5. It should be maintained as natural habitat and not be available for multiple uses such as park.	The DS has been amended to clarify and emphasise the ecological linkages to the biodiversity corridors outside of the UDA by providing more details on how the proposed ecological linkages will work both within and external to the UDA. The ULDA will prepare the Fitzgibbon Bushland Management Plan to articulate how this is to occur.	Y
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Precinct 6</b> <b>Precinct 6 within the publicly notified version of the DS has now been included within Precinct 5 in the DS.</b></li> </ul>			
208	Ensure small scale mixed use development does not compromise the overall outcome of the precinct for PT outcomes. Reference should also be made to CPTED principles	Higher densities are generally allowed throughout the Residential and Mixed Use and Mixed Use Centre zones.	Y
209	TOD development outcomes should be provided for around the busway station at Telegraph Road.	Pedestrian access will be provided from Precinct 5 (formerly Precinct 6) to and from the future Busway station. The timing of delivery of the busway dictate that high density residential development is not appropriate in this location in the near future. The mixed use development will strive to achieve good urban design outcomes.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
<b>PRECINCTS 7-9</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Precinct 7</b> <b>Precinct 7 within the publicly notified version of the DS has now been split between larger Precincts 4 and 6 in the DS.</b></li> </ul>			
210	Precinct 7 should be provided with additional access for public transport and emergency vehicles.	This would require the provision of an additional road link through an ecological corridor. This is not supported.	N
211	The mention of "lakes" in the conservation zone will introduce an environment into the area that is currently not present and may have significant ramifications upon the existing environmental values of the area, contribute to the spread possible contaminants, and adversely impact upon water quality over the long term. The EPA does not support the construction of a lake/lake system in the conservation zone.	Agree. Reference to lakes has been removed. Some minor work associated with WSUD principles may be required in the area.	Y
212	Identify existing bikeway.	Walking tracks and bike paths will be identified in conjunction with Brisbane City Council.	N
213	It is unclear whether the current wording for sub precinct 7(d) and (e) on page 45 allows the development of changing rooms and clubhouse facilities. The wording should be amended to encourage such facilities.	Sport, Recreation and Entertainment Uses have been included as exempt development within Precinct 6 (formerly containing sub-precincts 7(d) and (e)).	Y
214	No development, e.g. construction of stormwater management features, should occur in the conservation zone as this is not compatible with the protection of environmental values.	The outcomes for the Bushland and Open Space Zone stress minimisation of impact upon environmental values arising from construction of stormwater management features.	Y
215	Precinct intent and outcomes are inconsistent with BCC's Fitzgibbon Parklands Master Plan.	The DS has been amended to ensure the planning outcomes of Brisbane City Council's future parklands masterplanning is not restricted or limited by Precinct 6 outcomes. Precinct outcomes support the use of the area for bushland amenity and sporting and recreational open space facilities for the emerging new suburban and urban communities surrounding and within the UDA.	Y
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Sub-precinct 7(a)</b> <b>Sub-precinct 7(a) within the publicly notified version of the DS has now been included within a consolidated Precinct 6 in the final DS.</b></li> </ul>			
216	Needs to reference the implications of the North South Connector Road through this sub precinct	Agreed. The DS requires the construction of this road to minimise the impacts upon environmental values.	Y
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Precinct 8-9</b> <b>Precinct 8-9 within the publicly notified version of the DS have now been amended to Precinct 7 &amp; 8.</b></li> </ul>			
217	Precincts 8 and 9 are likely to be affected by the future upgrading of the Gateway Motorway and the Linkfield Road / Telegraph Road / Depot Road corridor is an important east-west feeder to the Gateway Motorway. The Gateway Motorway North Planning Study is not sufficiently advanced for Main Roads to be able to state the impacts. It	Noted. No change is required to DS.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
	is requested that no changes be made to the DS with respect to these precincts.		

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
<b>MISCELLANEOUS</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Implementation Strategy</b></li> </ul>			
218	It is not clear why the Implementation Strategy affordable housing obligation is being dealt with differently in precincts 2, 3, 4 and 5 and not consistently across the whole of the UDA area.	The affordable housing requirements have been agreed with the State Government and will be retained as proposed.	N
219	Provide specific implementation strategy elements to include an assessment of potential impacts of the development on the health of existing and future residents and measures to reduce such impacts for example: possible mosquito and pest nuisance; noise and air quality issues; dwellings located in the vicinity of high voltage power lines; odour and other nuisance (dust, noise and leachate) arising from existing landfill sites within the UDA; and anticipated problems arising from construction activity such as noise, dust, disposal of construction wastes, water ponding in excavations and trenches giving rise to mosquito breeding.	The DS addressed the majority of these issues consistent with best practice, where appropriate. The majority of these issues are management related issues not development issues.	N
220	Conservation management plan does not explain alternatives to standard Fire Management Plan	The conservation plan has been replaced with the Fitzgibbon Bushland Management Plan. The DS addresses fire management through use of breaks between bushland and development. Breaks will consist of either a road or an open area with another form of public access. More detailed fire management issues will be investigated and contained in the Fitzgibbon Bushland Management Plan.	Y
221	Provide more clarity in relation to mechanisms proposed to ensure delivery and maintenance of "affordable housing"	These matters will be addressed in the ULDA Affordable Housing Strategy.	N
222	Support the development of a detailed community development framework as part of the Implementation Plan to ensure the social and community outcomes are implemented such as local employment and training strategy, school liaison programs and community involvement result in effective place making. Event management can be defined more clearly.	Noted.	N
223	A number of State agencies have requested an ongoing third party role through the ULDA's assessment of development applications	The ULDA may nominate assessing authorities for conditions (this does not need to be set out in the DS as it is allowable under the Act - it could be an administrative procedure).	N
224	Proposed location of the neighbourhood centre in sub-precinct 3(a) involves acquisition of numerous landholdings creating complexity and potential delays in providing a Mixed Use (retail) development to service the targeted population. It is possible the retail centre will not eventuate.	The land is currently under single ownership.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Infrastructure Plan</b></li> </ul>			
225	Expand "Proposed Community Facilities" to incorporate the delivery of civic open spaces, specifically within Sub-Precinct 1(a)	A park is exempt development in Sub-precinct 1(a). Details of the nature of park to be provided in this sub-precinct are subject to detailed master planning and design.	N
226	Include mitigation works on the state-controlled road network	Not required.	N
227	Include upgrades to intersections of Beams Road with Handford, Dorville and Lacey Roads	The traffic analysis conducted for the ULDA (and as provided to Brisbane City Council) indicates no upgrades are required to these intersections.	N
228	Include the Northern Busway	The Northern Busway is to be funded separately.	N
229	Include electricity infrastructure such as substation and power lines.	This infrastructure will not be funded through the DS.	N
230	Subsection 4.2.1 requires the payment of contributions to be made prior to development commencing. This is inconsistent with general practice that requires these payments to be made prior to endorsement of survey plan. It is request that this be amended.	The details of when development contributions may be paid will be determined through conditions of approval and/or a development agreement.	N
231	As the north south connector road clearly provides a wider community function it is requested that the cost of providing the road not be restricted to development in precincts 3, 4 and 5.	Contributions from development outside the UDA to assist in paying for the North South connector road are unlikely.	N
232	As the Lavender Place extension to Carselgrove Avenue clearly provides a wider community function in this case to enable bus services and access to a important piece of community infrastructure, i.e., the integrated rail and bus stations, it is requested that the funding reflect this wider community use.	The ULDA considers there is a strong connection between the infrastructure to be provided and the community to benefit most from its provision within what is (now) Precinct 4.	N
233	Given the current economic uncertainties what are the contingencies or impacts in the uplifting of land values does not occur? Will the State be required to fund additional works?	The details of when development contributions may be paid will be determined through conditions of approval and/or a development agreement at the required time.	N
234	Timing and costs should be provided for the proposed transport infrastructure.	<p>Timely delivery of the identified transport infrastructure is a key to the implementation of the DS. This will be subject to further discussions with relevant parties, including State agencies, Council and other stakeholders such as development proponents.</p> <p>Not all transport infrastructure works can be funded by infrastructure charges within the UDA alone. Those infrastructure items directly associated with the UDA are given timings within Table 2 of the Infrastructure Plan. It is not necessary for the DS to specify details about the provision of major infrastructure which is the responsibility of other agencies.</p>	N
235	Cycle and pedestrian infrastructure should be identified in the Infrastructure Plan with timing and costs and should be a key part of the early infrastructure.	Timely delivery of the identified transport infrastructure is a key to the implementation of the DS. This will be subject to further discussions with relevant parties, including State agencies, Council and other stakeholders such as development proponents.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
		Where directly associated with a development application key early infrastructure items will be dealt with through the development application process and conditioned on development.	
236	The Infrastructure Plan does not identify the anticipated take up of development and hence when road upgrades, public transport and pedestrian/cycle infrastructure will be necessary.	<p>Timely delivery of the identified transport infrastructure is a key to the implementation of the DS. This will be subject to further discussions with relevant parties, including State agencies, Council and other stakeholders such as development proponents.</p> <p>Not all transport infrastructure works can be funded by infrastructure charges within the UDA alone. Those infrastructure items directly associated with the UDA are given timings within Table 2 of the Infrastructure Plan. It is not necessary for the DS to specify details about the provision of major infrastructure which is the responsibility of other agencies</p>	N
237	Inconsistent with BCC's Infill Contributions Planning Scheme Policies and PIPs. Believe that all new infrastructure contributions should be paid directly to BCC.	The ULDA will prepare an Infrastructure Charging Schedule which will be administered in accordance with the <i>ULDA Act 2007</i> .	N
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Beams Road</b></li> </ul>			
238	If funding is required by BCC towards the Beams Road overpass, Council will need to consider this in terms of city wide priorities.	The Beams Road overpass will need to be funded by BCC, the State Government and contributions from future development within Precinct 1.	N
239	While the provision of an overpass over Beams Road is supported the proposal to extract development contributions from developers will encourage them to construct to the maximum height allowed.	The maximum building heights identified within the DS will be supported by the ULDA, subject to compliance with the relevant assessment criteria.	
240	Beams Road overpass needs to be addressed in infrastructure charging Scheme	This will be addressed in detail after the DS is approved. At this stage the DS acknowledges the 'in-principle' contribution regime.	N
241	DS should identify development thresholds or milestones to signify when the busway should be provided	It is not appropriate for the DS to specify details about the provision of major infrastructure which is the responsibility of other agencies. Planning and delivery of Northern Busway is the responsibility of the Department of Transport and Main Roads.	N
242	Linkfield Road /Telegraph Road overpass should be jointly funded by BCC and the State government	The ULDA also maintains the position that future development within the UDA will not be required to contribute to this infrastructure item.	N
243	All future infrastructure works to be in accordance with Council standards	ULDA will continue to negotiate with BCC in relation to detailed standards.	N
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Urban Open Space and conservation outcomes</b></li> </ul>			
244	The Infrastructure Plan does not articulate how the delivery or upgrading of the sporting, recreation and civic open space infrastructure is to be funded, delivered or managed.	The sporting, recreation and civic open space infrastructure will be delivered through the development application process in accordance with the relevant intent and outcomes of the particular Precinct and/or sub-precinct within which it is located.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
245	The DS does not designate whether open space is intended as 'local or district public park infrastructure'. The infrastructure will also need to be 'fit for purpose' and designed to minimise maintenance and life-cycle costs.	The desired future role and function of these facilities will be determined through Brisbane City Council's future parklands masterplanning. ULDA will continue to liaise with BCC in relation to detail design outcomes, where appropriate.	N
246	The infrastructure plan makes no contribution towards open space requirements in Precinct 7.	The infrastructure plan acknowledges that contributions will be required for 'network infrastructure' in accordance with methodologies outlined in the <i>Integrated Planning Act 1997</i> .	N
247	Clarify the cost mechanism for specified habitat linkages.	The majority of the funding for corridor linkages will be associated with conditions upon development applications nearest the required road crossing point. Where this is not sufficient special rates may be charged. The requirements for contributions to maintain or improve wildlife movement corridors will be further articulated in the Fitzgibbon Bushland Management Plan.	N
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>General comments</b></li> </ul>			
248	Clarification is required to articulate who will contribute towards key infrastructure items.	The DS outlines the responsibilities of key infrastructure providers and the role of development contributions in funding infrastructure.	N

## ATTACHMENT A

### Fitzgibbon UDA Community Consultation Summary

Consultation with the Community	
April 2008	ULDA attended FRAG (Fitzgibbon Residents Action Group) meeting to explain the work of the ULDA
July 2008	Website went live with information regarding the UDA Online feedback form Email hotline
4 August 2008	<i>Letter</i> Explained the UDA declaration with map of boundary delivered to 8900 people in and around the UDA
August 2008	ULDA attended FRAG meeting to announce declaration of the UDA
August 2008	ULDA attended FRAG meeting to discuss the UDA and the Development Application for Precinct 1
September 2008	Various Community Groups and Not for Profit organisations to explain UDA, discuss organisation and relevant facilities, services, opportunities and issues regarding the UDA
22 September 2008	<i>Newsletter 1</i> Delivered to 8900 people in and around the UDA Direct mail to 440 groups and individuals Invites people to community information day
11 October 2008	<i>1<sup>st</sup> Community information day – at QUT Carseldine campus</i> Provided attendees with the opportunity to speak face-to-face with planning experts regarding the UDA Approx. 100 people attended
3 November 2008	<i>Newsletter 2</i> Delivered to 8900 people in and around the UDA Direct mail to 440 groups and individuals Invites people to community information day
15 November 2008	<i>2<sup>nd</sup> Community information day – at Aspley State High School</i> Provided attendees with the opportunity to speak face-to-face with planning experts regarding the UDA Approx. 70 people attended Qld Transport officers also on hand to answer questions regarding the future busway
15 November 2008	Community Reference Group Meeting – Inaugural meeting Facilitated by Sinclair Knight Merz (SKM) ULDA attendance
22 November 2008	Community Reference Group Meeting 2 Facilitated by Sinclair Knight Merz (SKM) ULDA attendance
6 December 2008	Community Reference Group Meeting 3 Facilitated by Sinclair Knight Merz (SKM) ULDA attendance
30 January 2009	Gazette Notice published in accordance with s25 (1) (b) of the <i>ULDA Act 2007</i> .
31 January 2009	<i>Newsletter 3</i> Delivered to 8900 people in and around the UDA Direct mail to 440 groups and individuals Informs people about the start of the public notification period on 2 February Invites people to community information day

<b>Consultation with the Community</b>	
31 January 2009	Community Reference Group Meeting 4 Facilitated by Sinclair Knight Merz ULDA attendance
2 February 2009	Proposed Development Scheme published on the ULDA website in accordance with s25 (1) (a) of the <i>ULDA Act 2007</i> . Notice published in the Courier Mail in accordance with s25 (1) (c) of the <i>ULDA Act 2007</i> .
3 February 2009	Opening of the ULDA shopfront at Taigum Centro every Tuesday and Thursday between 9:30 am and 4:30 pm during the public notification period (2 February to 17 March). Proposed Development Scheme on display and planners on hand to answers questions. Development Scheme as well as the Fitzgibbon Development. BCC material also on hand in response to questions about the BCC's Draft Bracken Ridge Neighbourhood Plan.
4 February 2009	Notice published in the Bayside Star and Northside Chronicle advertising the Public Notification Period. This was in addition to the previous notice published on the 2 <sup>nd</sup> Feb in the Courier Mail which met the requirements of s25 (1) (c) of the <i>ULDA Act 2007</i> .
7 February 2009	Community Reference Group Meeting 5 Facilitated by Sinclair Knight Merz ULDA attendance
12 February 2009	ULDA representative attended BCC Community Information session for the Draft Bracken Ridge Neighbourhood Plan and was on hand the answer the public's questions regarding the Fitzgibbon UDA.
14 February 2009	<i>3<sup>rd</sup> Community information day – at Taigum Centro</i> Provided attendees with the opportunity to speak face-to-face with planning experts regarding the proposed Development Scheme Approx. 280 people attended Qld Transport officers also on hand to answer questions regarding the future busway
17 March 2009	Closing date for public submissions to the proposed Development Scheme extended until 31 <sup>st</sup> March to give residents more time to comment on the Scheme. More than 1,000 people visited the shopfront to discuss the proposed.
19 March 2009	Taigum shopfront opened for an extra day 11 am – 7pm to give people a further chance to speak to planners about the proposed Development Scheme. Approx. 70 people attended
26 March	<i>Additional community information session – at the Tavernetta Carseldine</i> Event targeted Carseldine residents and provided them with the opportunity to speak face-to-face with planning experts regarding the proposed Development Scheme Approx. 150 people attended
31 March	Submissions on the proposed Development Scheme close.