

Woolloongabba UDA Development Scheme

Submissions Report

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

November 2010



Contents Page

Summary of Key Amendments to Proposed Woolloongabba UDA Development Scheme	2
Brief Summary of Submissions and Key Issues Raised	4
Summary of Submissions – Woolloongabba Proposed Development Scheme (PDS)	5
GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE DEVELOPMENT SCHEME	5
COMMENTS ON URBAN DESIGN, BUILT FORM AND HEIGHT	5
COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED LANDMARK BUILDINGS AND ARCHITECTURAL MERIT GENERALLY	7
COMMENTS ON THE MIX OF USES	7
COMMENTS ON COMMUNITY INTEGRATION AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING	9
COMMENTS ON PUBLIC REALM, OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION	10
COMMENTS ON TRAFFIC IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MAJOR ROAD CHANGES	11
COMMENTS ON INTERNAL STREET NETWORK AND PARKING	13
COMMENTS ON PUBLIC TRANSPORT	15
COMMENTS ON PEDESTRIAN, CYCLING AND END-OF-TRIP FACILITIES	15
GENERAL COMMENTS ON TRAFFIC, PUBLIC TRANSPORT AND ACTIVE TRANSPORT	18
COMMENTS ON INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING AND DELIVERY	20
COMMENTS ON STAGING AND TIMING OF DEVELOPMENT	22
COMMENTS PERTAINING TO THE MORRISON HOTEL	23
COMMENTS ON MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES	24
List of amendments	27

Summary of Key Amendments to Proposed Woolloongabba UDA Development Scheme

Amendments affecting building height
Change to the building height in Precinct 2: Central reducing the height limit from 40 storeys to 30 storeys in response to issues regarding height. And consequential amendments to the 'Illustrative sections' to reflect the 30 storey height limit. (Amendment 46).
Amendments affecting the Mix of Uses
Changes to the Vision section to further reinforce flexibility in the number of new dwellings to be provided in the UDA given the large number of constraints that limit development flexibility (Amendment 2).
Amendments affecting the Form of Development
Changes to terminology in the text and tables (mainly using the expression 'upper levels' instead of 'tower') to minimise perception that slender, tall towers are the only acceptable building form within the UDA. (Amendments 14, 44)
Amendments affecting the Transport Infrastructure
Changes to acknowledge that the major transport proposals may be subject to change in response to the findings of more detailed traffic modelling, planning and design work which will be undertaken by the Department of Transport and Main Roads in cooperation with Brisbane City Council as part of an integrated transport study for the Woolloongabba UDA and environs. (Amendments 4, 63)
Amendments to UDA-wide criteria for the Public Realm
Changes to incorporate design criteria for the public realm in response to several design issues raised in submissions. (Amendment 12)
Amendments to UDA-wide criteria for Urban Design and Sustainability
Changes to include requirements for communal open space and recreation. (Amendment 18)
Amendments to strengthen Heritage Protection
Changes to improve the recognition and protection of the heritage values of the Morrison Hotel. (Amendments 19, 39, 40)
Amendments in relation to Temporary Car Parking
Changes to clarify the intention and enable parts of the site to be used for temporary car parking. (Amendments 24, 33)
Amendments to the Transport Investigation Area
Change to extend the boundary of the Transport Investigation Area to include all land that may be required for construction of the Cross River Rail project. (Amendment 25)
Amendments to UDA-wide criteria for Noise
Changes to strengthen management of noise impacts from Gabba stadium and transport corridors. (Amendments 26, 27)
Amendments to the Mixed Use Zone level of assessment table
Changes to avoid the need for UDA development applications for straightforward changes of use within the Mixed Use zone. (Amendment 29)
Amendments to the Tables setting out Precinct Development Parameters
Various amendments to provide development parameters (maximum podium heights and building setbacks) for a number of street and plaza frontages that were omitted in the PDS, and to include a 'catch all' requirement for building frontages not

elsewhere included. (Amendments 17, 45, 52, 59)

Amendments to acknowledge possible future pedestrian bridge

Changes to Map 3 Movement and Circulation Plan and Precinct 3 Urban Form Plan and text to identify the preferred location of possible pedestrian bridge link to the Gabba stadium across Main Street. (Amendments 54, 56)

Amendments to Infrastructure Plan

Add childcare facilities and multi-purpose indoor sports and recreation facility to infrastructure proposals. (Amendment 66)

Amendments to Implementation Strategy

Add a commitment to prepare a community development strategy. (Amendment 69)

General editorial comments

A range of general editorial amendments to improve readability, correct anomalies and improve clarity.

Brief Summary of Submissions and Key Issues Raised

Key Issue	Response
<p>Various concerns in relation to the transport infrastructure proposals including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The PDS does not acknowledge that the major road network proposals are subject to further investigation including detailed traffic modelling, planning and design; The PDS does not acknowledge that BCC is a major stakeholder (especially in relation to the bulk of the external road network for which it has direct responsibility); The Transport Investigation Area should be expanded to include all of the area that may be required for the construction of the major transport infrastructure (including Cross River Rail): Local traffic and accessibility impacts. 	<p>Changes to acknowledge that the major transport proposals may be subject to change in response to the findings of more detailed traffic modelling, planning and design work which will be undertaken by the Department of Transport and Main Roads in cooperation with Brisbane City Council as part of an integrated transport study for the Woolloongabba UDA and environs. (Amendments 4, 63)</p> <p>Change to extend the boundary of the Transport Investigation Area to include all land that may be required for construction of the Cross River Rail project. (Amendment 25)</p>
<p>Strong concern that the PDS does not sufficiently direct the development of the UDA as a city-wide employment node and community hub. Concern that merely specifying a minimum of 2,000 new dwellings may allow market forces to develop the site predominantly for residential purposes.</p>	<p>The ULDA is of the view that the development scheme should not be prescriptive in specifying either the number of new dwellings to be provided within the UDA or a qualification of non-residential uses. The ULDA's preference is to retain a degree of flexibility in regards to the future land use mix in view of the large number of constraints that limit development flexibility (e.g. major road changes, and delivery of the Cross River Rail and public transport interchange). Further, the ULDA proposes to amend the current wording in the Vision section from 'a minimum of' to 'in the order of' 2000 new dwellings to further reinforce flexibility (Amendment 2).</p> <p>Also propose to remove references to maximum floor space in the Built Form precinct outcomes as they provide no practical benefit or guidance for development proponents or development assessment purposes, and may artificially limit development flexibility. (Amendments 41, 48, 58)</p>
<p>Proposed maximum building height of up to 40 storeys is too high. Submissions propose a range of alternative maximum building heights ranging from 30 storeys to 6 storeys. Some submissions are concerned that the scale of development will compete with the CBD and/or are inconsistent with existing development in the locality, will detrimentally impact visual amenity.</p> <p>Do not support building heights greater than 30 storeys close to transport node and 20 storeys on periphery. Believes these heights would be consistent with planning for City Frame and expectations of local residents.</p>	<p>After consideration of the issues raised regarding height, the ULDA proposes to reduce the height limit in Precinct 2 from 40 storeys to 30 storeys.</p> <p>Consequential amendments will be made to the illustrative sections to reflect the 30 storey height limit. (Amendment 46)</p>
<p>Concern that the PDS does not include crossings of Main Street (possibly grade separated) to facilitate safe crowd movements, and include a site design requirement for routes between the public transport node and Gabba stadium to address movement, gathering points, road crossings, interaction with outdoor dining etc.</p> <p>Specific support for a grade separated crossing of Main Street linking the UDA to the podium level of the Gabba stadium.</p>	<p>Include specific amendments as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pedestrian access requirements will be investigated in detail as part of the proposed Transport Investigation to be conducted by DTMR in cooperation with BCC. Identify and preserve a possible pedestrian bridge link across Main Street to the Gabba stadium (Amendments 9, 54, 56)

Summary of Submissions – Woolloongabba Proposed Development Scheme (PDS)

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE DEVELOPMENT SCHEME			
1	General support for redevelopment and revitalisation of area.	Noted	N
2	Concern that the PDS does not include sufficient flexibility to accommodate significant changes if required (e.g. traffic and transport and trunk infrastructure), and that some elements of the scheme (such as the movement and circulation outcomes) are presented with substantial detail based on the preliminary investigations undertaken to date. Propose that the development scheme should include a caveat or specific provision to identify that certain elements may change as a result of further detailed investigations and planning.	There are uncertainties in relation to major traffic and transport infrastructure proposals which are intended to be resolved through a specific transport study to be undertaken by DTMR in cooperation with BCC and other key stakeholders. Preliminary investigations indicate that the site can be provided with all other trunk infrastructure. The uncertainties in relation to proposed changes to the external road network should be acknowledged and addressed in the development scheme.	Y See amendments 4, 63
3	Concern about the lack of detailed development parameters (e.g. development codes and referencing of supporting documents that specify levels of service etc) and over-reliance on market forces and development assessment to deliver outcomes. Proposes that the development scheme should place greater emphasis on delivery of specific land use and built form outcomes for the site, particularly at the precinct level, and that the ULDA must support this by actively facilitating delivery.	The PDS is considered to provide an appropriate balance between prescription and flexibility. However, additional design guidance in relation to podium heights and building setbacks is provided for a number of streets and plazas that were overlooked in the PDS.	Y See amendments 45, 52, 59
4	The Implementation Strategy provides insufficient detail about the strategies and mechanisms that will be used. Propose that the Implementation Strategy is made consistent with those in other development schemes and recognise the need for bold leadership, collaboration and partnership, creativity and innovation etc, and include capacity for the development scheme to accommodate changes to market conditions or in response to technical investigations.	The Implementation Strategy has been streamlined from that used in previous documents to remove a number of generic statements that have been found to have no benefit or use in practice, and to focus on specific implementation mechanisms that are relevant to the delivery of the Woolloongabba UDA.	N
COMMENTS ON URBAN DESIGN, BUILT FORM AND HEIGHT			
5	Proposed maximum building heights of up to 40 storeys is too high. Submissions propose a range of alternative maximum building heights ranging from 30 storeys to 6 storeys. Some submissions are concerned that the scale of development will compete with the CBD and/or are inconsistent with existing development in the locality, will detrimentally	After consideration of the issues raised regarding height, the ULDA proposes to reduce the height limit in Precinct 2 from 40 storeys to 30 storeys. Consequential amendments will be made to the Illustrative sections to reflect the 30 storey height limit.	Y See amendment 46

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y=yes / N=no
	<p>impact visual amenity.</p> <p>Do not support building heights greater than 30 storeys close to transport node and 20 storeys on periphery. Believes these heights would be consistent with planning for City Frame and expectations of local residents.</p>		
6	<p>Concern about impacts of proposed development on solar access of adjoining residents, particularly the character housing area south of Stanley Street around Merton Road.</p>	<p>Shadow analysis undertaken by the ULDA's urban design consultants indicates that there will be minimal overshadowing impacts on existing dwellings in the vicinity of the site. Even in mid-winter (22 June) the analysis indicates that only 5 dwellings are overshadowed at 9am. These would receive direct sunlight by around 10am and would remain unaffected by overshadowing from the UDA for the rest of the day.</p>	N
7	<p>Concerned about a perceived discrepancy between the PDS which showed 14 buildings of between 15 and 40 storeys and the "Illustrative Layout" which showed 17 towers of such heights.</p>	<p>The Urban Form plans included in the PDS show building footprints, some of which can accommodate more than one tower. The Illustrative Layout was prepared for information purposes to show the type of development that could occur under the proposed development scheme. The Illustrative Layout does not form part of the development scheme.</p> <p>The illustrative sections will be amended to reflect a 30 storey height limit where it applies.</p>	N
8	<p>Concern that the PDS unduly emphasises the tall tower form of development which combined with internal street layout and setback requirements prejudices the site's capacity to accommodate a large institutional use. Proposes that UDA-wide and precinct development criteria provide general built form principles (e.g. "mixed use buildings of various forms and heights") rather than constraining outcome to towers, and that the illustrative sections demonstrate other built form possibilities than just towers.</p>	<p>The PDS aims to encourage maximum densities in this highly accessible, inner city location to achieve optimum TOD outcomes. This can be achieved through towers up to the maximum building height. The built form requirements do not preclude other forms of development provided building setbacks, maximum heights and other requirements (e.g. privacy etc) are achieved.</p> <p>However, there are numerous references to 'towers' throughout the PDS that could lead to a perception that tall slender towers are the only form of development that would be acceptable. Propose to amend text in various places to refer to 'upper levels' rather than 'towers'. However it is not proposed to amend the illustrative sections in this regard as these do present the preferred nature of development. Also section 3.2.3 (iv) makes it clear that the illustrative sections are not UDA development requirements.</p>	Y See amendments 14, 44

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y=yes / N=no
9	<p>Concern that the PDS does not adequately protect the heritage significance of the Morrison hotel which is included in the City Plan Heritage Register, or nearby State heritage listed buildings opposite the site in Stanley Street. Proposes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Morrison hotel be identified as a Heritage Place on map 7 • Inclusion of a specific outcome to protect and sympathetically manage the interface with the Morrison hotel and nearby heritage properties in Stanley Street • Add a statement in the UDA wide criteria requiring development to 'protect, respect and complement places of heritage and cultural significance within and surrounding the area'. 	<p>General agreement that the heritage protection of the Morrison hotel should be strengthened. Proposed response is to make the following amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change legend on map 7 to 'Heritage place' from 'Heritage significance' • Agreed in relation to Morrison Hotel only. Other heritage places are not within the UDA and are separated from it by Stanley Street. The PDS already specifies maximum 3 storey podium height and 10 metre upper-level setbacks to Stanley Street to complement the existing heritage buildings opposite in Stanley Street. • Agreed in relation to Morrison Hotel. Add heritage values criterion to s3.3.3 UDA-wide criteria 'Urban design and sustainability' and specific setback requirement to s3.6.2 Precinct outcomes for Precinct 1. 	<p style="text-align: center;">Y See amendments 19, 39, 40</p>
COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED LANDMARK BUILDINGS AND ARCHITECTURAL MERIT GENERALLY			
10	<p>Proposal for 5 landmark buildings within a 10 hectare site is too many and will lead to confusion.</p>	<p>Landmark buildings are proposed at key locations and are intended to be characterised by a particularly high standard of design. The major roads surrounding the site in conjunction with the Pacific Motorway create a number of important corners and vistas that are suitable for landmark buildings.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">N</p>
11	<p>Supports proposed landmark building on Main/Stanley Streets corner.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">N</p>
12	<p>Considers there is an unacceptable risk that large buildings of the scale proposed will be of poor quality with no or limited architectural merit. Quotes recent Clem7 ventilation shaft and illustrative material used for consultation purposes on the proposed development scheme to support contention.</p>	<p>ULDA is determined to provide leadership in design quality. It will achieve this through a number of means including development assessment, role as master developer of the site and use of its Design Review Panel to provide advice on the design merits of each major development proposal.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">N</p>
COMMENTS ON THE MIX OF USES			
13	<p>Considers the emphasis on residential development is inappropriate and will simply funnel more people into an already</p>	<p>The proposed development scheme provides for mixed use development on the site comprising predominantly</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">N</p>

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
	overcrowded CBD, proposes that a major regional shopping hub that draws people away from the CBD would be more suitable.	commercial and residential land uses which will make optimum use of high public transport accessibility. Some convenience and other limited retail and recreation/entertainment activities are proposed. However a major retail centre is not supported as it would be likely to attract excessive numbers of vehicle movements into the area and require extensive car parking.	
14	<p>Strong concern that the PDS does not sufficiently direct the development of the UDA as a city-wide employment node and community hub. Concern that specifying a minimum of 2,000 new dwellings may allow market forces to develop the site predominantly for residential purposes. Proposes several changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nominating preferred or priority uses for each precinct • Nominating a minimum development yield (proposes 75% of total land use) for non-residential uses • Nominate a maximum GFA for retail, specify that these should be for local support use (supermarket up to 2500m2 acceptable), and make department stores, discount department stores, display and sales and bulky goods prohibited uses in the level of assessment table for the Mixed use zone. • Clarify the expected percentage of community uses, and include references to community hub and cultural facility (mentioned in the Infrastructure Plan) in the development scheme. • Add a caveat stating that anticipated development yields may be subject to change in response to further technical investigations. 	<p>Agree with principle of ensuring a mixed use outcome which is already described in the Vision and other elements of the PDS. Appreciate concern that market forces may result in excessive proportion of residential development on the site to the detriment of this overall objective.</p> <p>However, do not support specifying minimum yields or expected percentages for various land uses, or of prohibiting larger scale retail uses as this will unnecessarily limit flexibility to respond to future development proposals. For example, larger scale retail uses may be acceptable in the future provided the other PDS requirements in relation to urban form, access and parking etc are achieved.</p> <p>The approach of nominating preferred uses for individual precincts was used for the Bowen Hills Development Scheme and has been found unhelpful in responding to changing market conditions such as the impacts of the GFC.</p> <p>The ULDA is of the view that the development scheme should not be prescriptive in specifying either the number of new dwellings to be provided within the UDA or a qualification of non-residential uses. The ULDA's preference is to retain a degree of flexibility in regards to the future land use mix in view of the large number of constraints that limit development flexibility (e.g. major road changes, and delivery of the Cross River Rail and public transport interchange). Further, the ULDA proposes to amend the current wording in the Vision section from 'a minimum of' to 'in the order of' 2000 new dwellings to further reinforce flexibility.</p> <p>Remove references to maximum floor space in the Built Form precinct outcomes as they provide no practical benefit or guidance for development proponents or development assessment purposes.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Y</p> <p style="text-align: center;">See amendments 2, 41, 48, 58</p>

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y=yes / N=no
15	PDS needs to retain flexibility to accommodate large scale employment attractors such as research and development institutions. Proposes that ULDA should emphasise intent to facilitate these forms of land use, and PDS should include a caveat that elements of the PDS are subject to change to facilitate development of a strategic nature that has been identified as a priority outcome for the area.	<p>The PDS does not constrain the use of the site for these purposes. For example, a proponent could propose integrated development of 2 or more sites (or Indicative Building Footprints as shown on the Urban Form Plans). However to clarify, propose to amend text in the Vision section to refer to 'employment' rather than 'office' development.</p> <p>Also note that pursuant to s3.2.5 of the PDS, development does not need to comply with the UDA development requirements to be considered consistent with the land use plan.</p> <p>However it is agreed that additional flexibility should be provided in the Mixed Use Zone level of assessment table to facilitate changes of use that do not involve building work without the need for a UDA development application.</p>	<p>Y</p> <p>See amendments 2, 29</p>
COMMENTS ON COMMUNITY INTEGRATION AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING			
16	Concern that residential development will attract transient, young residents with associated noise, vandalism and other social problems.	The PDS states (section 3.3.4 (a)) "all residential development...must deliver housing choice to suit a variety of households ... by offering universal design and a variety in size configuration, cost, adaptability and tenure". This provision is specifically aimed at achieving a diverse residential community so that there should not be a preponderance of young people or any other demographic sector.	N
17	Population density is too high and could result in ghetto like environment, particularly as area is popular with students who cram into apartments.	The site is appropriate for high density development due to inner-city location and high public and active transport accessibility. Also see response to comment 16 in relation to achieving a mix of households.	N
18	Concern that affordable housing may not remain affordable over medium-long term due to market forces in inner-city areas. Notes that the concept of affordable housing is not defined in the ULDA Act.	The ULDA has a range of mechanisms for maintaining the affordability of housing. These were outlined in section 3.3.4 (c) of the PDS and include formal agreements with a registered community housing organisation, covenants on title, and shared equity arrangements. Include a reference to the definition of affordable housing in the ULDA's Affordable Housing Strategy.	<p>Y</p> <p>See amendment 20</p>
19	PDS should clarify types, sizes and locations of preferred community facilities. Notes that the Implementation Plan specifies multi-purpose community hub and cultural centre in Precinct 2 and proposes these should be	Agreed, some additional guidance in relation to preferred location of community facilities would assist future detailed planning and design activities. Propose to provide additional information in the Land	<p>Y</p> <p>See amendments</p>

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
	reflected in the Precinct 2 Land use outcomes and nominally on the Urban Form Plan.	use elements of the Precinct outcomes for Precincts 2 and 3 and the Infrastructure Plan.	47, 57, 66
20	Amend the Implementation section to include an action to prepare a community development strategy. This should be in place before the first development application.	Agreed. This would be a desirable step towards achieving a well-integrated community. Include action in Implementation Strategy.	Y See amendment 69
21	Concern that events at Gabba stadium and outdoor activities within the UDA (markets, outdoor dining etc) could have significant impacts on amenity. The PDS should include provisions requiring management of adverse impacts from these activities through the development of comprehensive event management plans or specific design responses. Implementation Plan may be the appropriate location for such a provision.	<p>Relevant BCC local laws continue to apply in the UDA. However, it is agreed that the impacts of markets and similar activities should be appropriately controlled.</p> <p>Therefore it is proposed to amend the assessment table for the Civic and Open Space zone to make “markets” permissible development (other non-defined events are already permissible uses by default) which will enable them to be controlled through the development assessment process.</p>	Y See amendment 32
COMMENTS ON PUBLIC REALM, OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION			
22	Supports provision of park and open space.	Noted.	N
23	Suggests that there is a need for multi-purpose sports and recreation facilities within the development to serve the community.	Further investigation commissioned by the ULDA supports the inclusion of a district scale multi-purpose indoor sports and recreation facility on the site and using innovative approaches to maximise communal recreation opportunities on the site (e.g. green roofs, active use of podium roof spaces).	Y See amendments 18, 66
24	Additional green space should be provided.	The PDS provides an appropriate balance between traditional green space and development given the UDA’s high accessibility and inner-city location. However the PDS will be amended to include provision of a multi-use sports and recreation facility and other innovative open space and recreation opportunities as per response to Comment 23.	Y See amendments 18, 51, 57, 66
25	Concern that the PDS will not facilitate creation of sub-tropical boulevards along Vulture and Main Streets which are identified in the draft Kangaroo Point South Urban Renewal Strategy as having active frontages at a human scale. This applies particularly to Main Street. Proposes that Vulture and Main Street frontages be identified as primary active frontages as per internal streets and Stanley Street frontage.	ULDA’s market advice is that there will be insufficient demand for retail and other active land uses to activate all ground level building frontages within the UDA. The primary active frontages have been located to maximise activation of key pedestrian routes and spaces. The PDS also requires buildings on ‘other frontages’ to address the street and emphasise building entrances.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y=yes / N=no
26	Include a reference to the draft Brisbane Streetscapes Design Manual as the preferred standard for streetscape creation.	Reference to “relevant aspects” of the Guidelines to be included.	Y See amendment 12
27	Lack of reference to planting and landscaping (especially shade provision) in the sub-tropical design UDA-wide criteria.	Amend the PDS to include design guidelines for the public realm in the UDA-wide criteria to address this and other issues raised in submissions.	Y See amendment 12, 50
28	<p>PDS should identify opportunities for and require deep in-ground planting. Notes that the scheme’s use of underground car parking below open space and streets may prejudice this outcome. Proposes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the development scheme requires such areas to be identified as part of the public realm design process (and an acknowledgement that basement car parking must be precluded beneath such zones) • That the PDS adopts the BCC target of 50% natural shade cover to paths in the UDA-wide criteria. 	Amend the PDS to include design guidelines for the public realm in the UDA-wide criteria to address this and other issues raised in submissions. However the guidance is not prescriptive in relation to matters such as precluding car parking in certain locations as this will unnecessarily reduce the design flexibility required to address the wide range of activities that need to be accommodated on the site (i.e. public transport interchange, underground car parking, infrastructure services and public realm).	Y See amendment 12, 50
29	The PDS should include requirements for the provision of public art or the creation of public art spaces. This requirement should be included in any infrastructure charges plan.	Amend the PDS to include design guidelines for the public realm in the UDA-wide criteria to address this and other issues raised in submissions.	Y See amendment 12
30	PDS should mention the need to provide suitable lighting to the public realm to provide safe pedestrian environments.	Amend the PDS to include design guidelines for the public realm in the UDA-wide criteria to address this and other issues raised in submissions.	Y See amendment 12
31	PDS should clarify how the proposed plaza in Precinct 1 will link with Allen Street in view of topographic characteristics of Allen Street.	This comment presumably is concerned that Allen Street is fairly steep in this location. The interface with Allen Street is a detailed design issue and does not need specific attention in the development scheme.	N
COMMENTS ON TRAFFIC IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MAJOR ROAD CHANGES			
32	Concerned with impact on sustainability of lifestyle resulting from proposed increase in population and associated traffic on surrounding road network.	The site is appropriate for high density development due to inner-city location and high public and active transport accessibility.	N
33	Existing traffic lights on northbound freeway off ramp to Stanley Street are missing. If removed this will make egress form Trinity Lane very difficult.	These traffic lights were inadvertently left off the Major Road Changes display map (which does not form part of the PDS). There is no intention to remove these traffic lights and no amendment is	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
		required to the PDS.	
34	<p>Concerned that combination of removing southbound freeway access ramp from Stanley Street and provision of freeway access from River Terrace/Leopard Street via contra-flow lane in Vulture Street will result in significant additional traffic using River Terrace to detriment of Kangaroo Point amenity and would be inconsistent with draft Kangaroo Point South Renewal Strategy. Concern that future traffic reductions on River Terrace will become impossible if it is only access to motorway south bound from Story Bridge and other points north. Suggests other options for consideration.</p>	<p>The relocation of the southbound access ramp is required to free up parts of the UDA required for construction of the public transport interchange and other development as identified in the PDS. The other major road changes referred to in the submission (i.e. contra flow lane on Vulture Street and southbound access to the motorway from Stanley Street) are not integral to the development scheme and will be considered as part of the integrated traffic and transport study of the UDA and environs to be undertaken by DTMR In cooperation with BCC.</p> <p>Proposed to amend the PDS by the addition of text in section 3.3.1 Movement and circulation to clarify this approach.</p>	<p>Y See amendments 4, 63</p>
35	<p>No treatments are shown for Vulture, Stanley or Main Streets. Vulture and Stanley should be returned to 2-way traffic with separated bike path and better footpaths. Main Street should be reduced to 2 traffic lanes in each direction with improved pedestrian emphasis.</p>	<p>Consideration of changes to the arterial road network beyond those directly related to the development of the UDA is beyond the scope and authority of the ULDA. Future planning and design of these streets will be considered as part of an integrated traffic and transport study to be undertaken by DTMR in cooperation with BCC.</p>	<p>N</p>
36	<p>Street 7 (southbound) – retain existing southbound on-ramp as is. Relocate southbound off ramp to exit to Stanley Street (which should be returned to 2-way).</p> <p>Street 7 (northbound) – provide a dedicated bus lane on freeway to relieve conflict between buses exiting busway and cars accessing motorway.</p>	<p>Proposed changes to the freeway ramps are required to free up parts of the site for development and to address certain existing traffic issues. Future planning and design of these streets will be considered as part of an integrated traffic and transport study to be undertaken by DTMR in cooperation with BCC.</p>	<p>N</p>
37	<p>Concerned with proposed closure of northbound Pacific Motorway ramp access for traffic travelling eastwards along Stanley Street. Concerns include reduced accessibility and potential impacts on Woolloongabba Hill from traffic rat running through this area.</p>	<p>This proposed change to the external road network will be investigated in detail as part of the proposed Transport Investigation to be conducted by DTMR in cooperation with BCC. Section 3.3.1 Movement and circulation should include an explanation of this and note that these proposals may be subject to change.</p>	<p>Y See amendments 4, 63</p>
38	<p>Concerned about likely impacts on accessibility for Woolloongabba Hill residents of proposed closure of Merton Road link to Stanley Street.</p>	<p>The road closure proposed in the PDS relates to the small section of Merton Road north of Stanley Street within the UDA. The main part of Merton Road south of Stanley Street (which provides access to Woolloongabba Hill) is not included within the UDA and will be unaffected.</p>	<p>N</p>

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
39	Concern that existing traffic network in the vicinity of the site is very complex and any future changes must be managed in a cautious, incremental manner with plenty of time to review impacts.	The proposed changes to the external road network will be investigated in detail as part of the proposed Transport Investigation to be conducted by DTMR in cooperation with BCC. Section 3.3.1 Movement and circulation should include an explanation of this and note that these proposals may be subject to change.	Y See amendments 4, 63
40	Supports the proposed deviation of southbound traffic from Leopard Street to the M3 but does not support removal of direct access to Stanley Street from Leopard Street because this will reduce accessibility to areas on Stanley Street west of the M3 overpass.	This proposed change to the external road network will be investigated in detail as part of the proposed Transport Investigation to be conducted by DTMR in cooperation with BCC. Section 3.3.1 Movement and circulation should include an explanation of this and note that these proposals may be subject to change.	Y See amendments 4, 63
41	Concerned that traffic proposals will increase traffic noise as a result of rat running through suburban streets and increase in traffic movements at the proposed new southbound motorway on ramp which is close to the existing motorway 'cutting' that acts as a megaphone and projects noise to Woolloongabba Hill.	The arterial roads in the vicinity of the site are already very heavily trafficked and it is unlikely that the proposed road changes will result in a material increase in traffic noise from the arterial roads. The proposed changes to the external road network will be investigated in detail as part of the proposed Transport Investigation to be conducted by DTMR in cooperation with BCC. This study will also consider potential impacts of any changes including a potential increase in rat running.	Y See amendments 4, 63
42	Concern that proposed road changes should be tested against existing and future network capacity, and that any changes should not adversely impact the Mater/Queensland Children's Hospital precinct or South Bank including any proposals to mitigate the existing traffic problems at the Grey and Melbourne Streets intersection.	The proposed changes to the external road network will be investigated in detail as part of the proposed Transport Investigation to be conducted by DTMR in cooperation with BCC. Section 3.3.1 Movement and circulation should include an explanation of this and note that these proposals may be subject to change.	Y See amendments 4, 63
43	The impact of the proposed road network proposals on the external road network has not been properly investigated. Notes that a detailed transport investigation is proposed, and suggests that a caveat be added to the effect that the transport network proposals identified in the PDS are subject to change based on the outcomes of this detailed transport investigation.	Agree that this uncertainty and relationship to the detailed transport investigation should be specifically recognised in the development scheme.	Y See amendments 4, 63
COMMENTS ON INTERNAL STREET NETWORK AND PARKING			
44	Concerned that that the proposed maximum levels of car parking (including the proposal that only 75% of dwellings have a parking space) are inadequate, and will create detrimental impacts on local streets and availability of visitor parking. The PDS should	The UDA has very good public and active transport accessibility and the development scheme embodies TOD principles, including reduced levels of car parking. The maximum car parking rates proposed are consistent with those	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
	outline reasons why car parking rates are lower than City Plan standards, and that the proposed transport investigation should undertake quantitative analysis to assess impact on demand for on-street parking surrounding the UDA.	recommended in the Queensland Government's Transit Oriented Development Guide for an Urban TOD precinct.	
45	<p>Number of specific suggestions in relation to internal street network:</p> <p>Street 1 – should be reduced from 4 to 2 lanes with on-street parking and narrowed considerably.</p> <p>Street 4 – questions if required, seems to create a small unuseable area surrounded by roads.</p>	<p>Detailed responses as follows:</p> <p>Street 1 is described (section 3.3.1) as 2 lane with on street parking during off-peak. 4 lane width is required for on-street parking and service vehicle etc parking.</p> <p>Street 4 is required for internal circulation and to allow egress form the western part of Precinct 2 as the two legs of Street 5 both provide only one way ingress from Stanley Street and Leopard Street.</p>	N
46	Car parking should be provided for residential uses only and at reduced rates of 0.25 and 0.5 per dwelling in view of proximity to major transit hub.	The PDS specifies maximum car parking ratios based on the Queensland Government's Transit Oriented Development Guide for an Urban TOD precinct, and states that development with minimal car parking is encouraged. This approach provides the flexibility for lower levels of car parking to be provided if appropriate.	N
47	PDS should include specific provisions recognising the need for priority parking spaces for people with limited mobility.	This is a detailed design matter where we expect that the current guidelines such as AS 2890.1 which relates to off street carparks generally and AS2890.6 for disabled parking would apply. Include reference that design of car parking areas should achieve best practice including any relevant Australian Standards.	Y See amendment 23
48	Proposes inclusion of a pair of bus stops (i.e. one in each direction) at an appropriate location along Street 1 to accommodate local feeder bus services.	The PDS does not preclude kerb-side bus stops on Street 1. The requirement for surface level bus stops within the UDA will be investigated in detail as part of the proposed Transport Investigation to be conducted by DTMR in cooperation with BCC.	N
49	Concern that Street 2 is identified as a major connector to the public transport hub for Gabba events but does not align with existing crossings on Main Street.	Street 2 has been positioned to align with the northern end of the small park opposite in Main Street to allow pedestrians to flow across Main Street in the event Main Street is closed after major events at the Gabba stadium.	N
50	Amend the description of Street 5 to identify the need for pedestrian and cyclist movements across Vulture Street and Stanley	The description of Street 5 in s3.3.1 already refers to 'pedestrian and cyclist access to the public transport interchange' and inclusion of a "3m wide	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
	Street intersections.	cycleway". In addition the proposed dimensions of the cycleway and footpaths are shown in Figure 2. Detailed changes to specific intersections will be considered in detail as part of the proposed Transport Investigation to be conducted by DTMR in cooperation with BCC.	
51	Suggests that the target speed limits for Streets 1, 2 and 3/3a be reduced from 40kph to 30kph to reduce the risk of serious injury/death for pedestrians.	The 40kph target speed applies only to the higher order streets within the UDA (i.e. Streets, 1, 2 and 3). Lower order internal streets such as Streets 4 and 5 already have lower target speeds of 15kph. The generally accepted target speed for residential street design is 40km/h. Actual design speeds are more appropriately determined at the detailed design stage where other factors such as shared spaces can be considered.	N
COMMENTS ON PUBLIC TRANSPORT			
52	Supports proposed public transport interchange which will help alleviate pressures and safety concerns at the Cultural Centre bus station.	Noted.	N
53	Insufficient examination has been conducted of the transit facility (in the context of the broader road network) and of the design and operational requirements of the busway station component of the public transport interchange (e.g. open air busways have significant capacity/design benefits). Proposes inclusion of a caveat that the transport network proposals and some urban design outcomes may change in response to outcomes of further detailed investigations. Submission also provides additional detailed commentary about the bus network planning task which is relevant to the proposed detailed transport investigation.	Section 3.3.5 Transport infrastructure and map 4 identify a Transport Investigation Area and states that "the detailed nature of development within the TIA is contingent on the resolution of these major transport proposals".	N
54	PDS should specifically state that BCC will be involved in the planning and design of the public transport interchange to ensure Council's interests in the local transport network are maintained.	The proposed major transport interchange will be investigated in detail as part of the proposed Transport Investigation to be conducted by DTMR in cooperation with BCC. Propose to amend s3.3.5 and infrastructure Plan to make it clear that the Transport Investigation will be undertaken in cooperation with BCC and other major stakeholders.	Yes See amendments 22, 63
COMMENTS ON PEDESTRIAN, CYCLING AND END-OF-TRIP FACILITIES			
55	Strong support for proposed cycle infrastructure but raises several detailed	Support noted, responses to individual issues as follows:	Y See

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
	<p>issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development scheme does not clearly identify extension of Stanley Street cycleway from Allen Street to Annerley Road intersection. 2. Road crossings at key intersections need improvement to allow efficient cycle use 3. Cycleways should be extended to east to link with existing facilities 4. Bikeways should be as wide as possible even if linking to sub-standard facilities 5. On-road bike lane on Stanley Street between Main and Allen Streets should be retained 6. Site should integrate with the City Cycle scheme. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed extension is outside the boundary of the UDA but is listed in the Infrastructure Plan and noted on Map 3 Movement and Circulation. No amendment required. 2. These major intersections are outside the boundary of the UDA. Changes to signalised intersections will be considered as part of the integrated transport investigation to be undertaken by DTMR in cooperation with BCC. No amendment required. 3. The proposed development scheme includes cycle links to the main existing cycle facilities in the vicinity of the site (i.e. South East Freeway Cycleway and to the west to existing on-road cycle lanes). There are no significant existing cycle facilities to the east. These links will need to be considered as part of future planning for cycle facilities in this location. No amendment required. 4. Stanley Street link is 4.5m wide and main north-south link (along Street 5) is 3m wide. These are adequate for cycle demands for the foreseeable future. No amendment required. 5. This is outside the UDA. The proposed development scheme includes an off-road cycleway on northern side of Stanley Street. Retention of link on southern side is a matter for BCC. No amendment required. 6. The proposed development scheme includes extensive areas of street parking and plaza spaces that would be suitable City Cycle stations. This will need to be considered at the detailed design stage of the project. However the requirement will be noted in the development scheme. 	<p>amendment 5</p>
56	<p>Considers that elevated pedestrian walkway/s should be provided over Main Street to the Gabba stadium to improve pedestrian access</p>	<p>DTMR have advised (see issue 57 below) that the assessment of the need for a grade separated pedestrian bridge over</p>	<p>Y See</p>

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y=yes / N=no
	and safety and limit impacts on the surrounding arterial road network.	Main Street will be included in the scope of work for the detailed traffic and transport study. In view of this future investigation it is proposed that the development scheme note this proposed investigation and identify the preferred location and nature of any such future link in the UDA.	amendment 56
57	DTMR advise that the assessment of the need for a grade separated pedestrian bridge over Main Street will be included in the scope of work for the detailed traffic and transport study.	See response to issue 56 above.	Y See amendment 56
58	Street 1 should include a dedicated and separate bike lane.	The northern end of Street 1 does not provide an opportunity for direct cycle linkages to the north. For this reason the main north-south cycle link is provided along Street 5 to provide a direct connection along River Terrace to the Kangaroo Point cliffs and beyond.	N
59	Map 3 Circulation and Movement Plan identifies Jacob Lane (behind the Morrison hotel) as Street 6. However there is no discussion describing the design criteria for Jacob Lane as there is for the lane between Main Street and Street 1 which is also identified as Street 6. Proposes that Jacob Lane should also be identified as 10m wide to provide for service access to the Morrison hotel.	Agreed that Jacob Lane should be acknowledged and described in the development scheme. Proposed to amend Map 3 to renumber Jacob Lane to 6a (with the lane between Main Street and Street 1 as Street 6b) and include a description of Jacob Lane (or its replacement access way) in section 3.3.1 Movement and circulation.	Y See amendments 8, 11
60	Owns land opposite the site on corner of Vulture and Main Streets and suggests discussion about linking the two sites with a pedestrian underpass.	One of the key urban design principles that underpin the PDS is the desire to ensure a safe, attractive and busy pedestrian environment at ground level. This would be undermined if grade separated pedestrian crossings were provided. In addition provision of such facilities is very expensive and could not be supported on a cost-benefit basis.	N
61	Suggests ULDA should work with BCC to ensure footpath and cycleway improvements are implemented across adjoining areas such as the Mater/QCH precinct.	The PDS includes extensive pedestrian and footpath works within the UDA and links to external networks including the South East Freeway Bikeway and on-street bike facilities in Annerley Road/Stanley Street. The ULDA is not responsible for improvements that are not required as a result of the proposed development but will continue to work constructively with BCC on this and other matters. It would not be appropriate to include further specific infrastructure improvement works in the development scheme.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y=yes / N=no
62	Include crossings of Main Street (possibly grade separated) to facilitate safe crowd movements, and include a site design requirement for routes between pt node and Gabba stadium to address movement, gathering points, road crossings, interaction with outdoor dining etc.	The PDS includes specific design guidance for routes between the stadium and the public transport interchange (e.g. see descriptions of Streets 2 and 4 in s3.3.1). Detailed treatment of Main Street crossings will be investigated in detail as part of the proposed Transport Investigation to be conducted by DTMR in cooperation with BCC.	N
63	The PDS does not include reference to the potential for grade separated pedestrian crossings for large pedestrian flows (not just for special events) across Vulture, Main and Stanley Streets. States that the Woolloongabba UDA Traffic and Transport Masterplan – Final Report makes reference to provision of grade separated pedestrian facilities across Main Street but this is not referenced in the PDS. Proposes the PDS state that while grade-separated crossings are not supported by ULDA, the requirement for such infrastructure needs to be assessed as part of the proposed Transport Investigation.	The proposal for grade separated pedestrian crossings for non-event purposes is not supported (see response to comment 60 above). However it is proposed to include an amendment which will preserve the option for a possible future grade-separated pedestrian crossing across main Street to the Gabba stadium in response to other comments. Pedestrian access requirements will be investigated in detail as part of the proposed Transport Investigation to be conducted by DTMR in cooperation with BCC. It is not appropriate to include the specifications for this study in the development scheme.	Y See amendment 56
64	Concern about the deliverability of the proposal in the PDS to extend cycleway beyond the UDA boundary to link with the existing on-road cycle lanes at the Stanley Street/Annerley Road intersection. This may require use of existing BCC road space. Proposes reference to need to need to continue investigations into methods for delivering cyclist facilities beyond the site boundary instead.	Agree that this can only be achieved will the cooperation and assistance of BCC. Propose this be acknowledged in amendments to Map 3, section 3.3.1 and the Infrastructure Plan.	Y See amendments 9, 67
65	Suggests that Section 3.3.1 could include reference to potential to incorporate facilities to expand BCC's bike hire scheme within the UDA.	Agreed, include appropriate recognition of Council's CityCycle scheme.	Y See amendment 5
GENERAL COMMENTS ON TRAFFIC, PUBLIC TRANSPORT AND ACTIVE TRANSPORT			
66	Section 2.2 Vision and 3.3.1 Movement and circulation – PDS needs to clearly identify what measures would be implemented to “prioritise walking, cycling and public transport use over the private car” especially given that there is to be no net loss of road capacity on the BCC road network.	Both sections of the PDS clearly describe how this is to be achieved. For example, under the heading “A transit oriented community” the vision states “This will be achieved through the provision of high quality pedestrian and cyclist facilities within the site....relatively low levels of on-site car parking will be permitted...the land use pattern promotes a mix of high density uses and activities that will minimise ... trips outside the local area... and ensure maximum accessibility to and	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y=yes / N=no
		use of the ... public transport infrastructure.”	
67	Proposes a collaborative investigation including consultation with key stakeholders (e.g. Events Queensland, Police, Brisbane Transport) of charter bus patronage and services for large events at the Gabba stadium.	This is not a matter for the development scheme of the ULDA, but could be undertaken as a separate exercise sponsored by one or more of the key stakeholders.	N
68	Concern that existing busway station and network is not referred to in text or on map 2 (Structure Plan) or other maps. Proposes that PDS should demonstrate how new transport infrastructure replaces/links to existing busway infrastructure.	The existing bus station is identified on Map 1. It would not be appropriate to identify it on Map 2 which shows the proposed development intentions for the site. However the existing bus station and its eventual replacement by the proposed bus-rail interchange should be noted in s2.1 Location which describes the existing major characteristics of the UDA.	Y See amendment 1
69	Map 3 should show the Main Street/Stanley Street intersection as a 'Key Intersection'.	Agree. The Main/Vulture streets intersection should also be identified as a key intersection.	Y See amendment 7
70	Map 3 shows a link to the existing bus layby area but no description of the layby area is provided.	Such a description is not relevant or useful to the PDS which is a forward looking document.	N
71	Proposes inclusion of bus tops at strategic locations along Vulture and Stanley Streets near signalised pedestrian crossings but opposite the UDA development to accommodate bus services that do not enter the lower level busway station.	Bus access requirements will be investigated in detail as part of the proposed Transport Investigation to be conducted by DTMR in cooperation with BCC. It would not be appropriate to include these specific requirements in the development scheme at this stage, and the proposed locations are outside the UDA.	N
72	Section 3.3.5 – should delete references to light rail as no light rail proposed within UDA.	Agree. Remove references to light rail in s3.3.5.	Y See amendment 21
73	Section 3.3.5 – PDS should include comment that detailed transport infrastructure plans will aim to minimise adverse impacts on public transport corridors and facilitate improved service levels for the local area and services utilising the interchange.	While it is agreed that these outcomes are desirable, it would not be appropriate to include them in the development scheme. They would be more appropriate in the brief for the detailed transport investigation.	N
74	Section 3.3.5 – PDS should specifically state that the detailed transport investigation will be undertaken between November 2010 and May 2011, and that BCC will be integral to the investigation.	It is not appropriate to specify timelines for a separate, albeit related study in the development scheme. However it is agreed that BCC's involvement in the transport investigation should be	Y See amendments 22, 63

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y=yes / N=no
		acknowledged.	
75	Section 3.3.5 – PDS states that ‘development within the Transport Infrastructure Area (TIA) must demonstrate that it will not adversely affect... the proposed transport infrastructure within the TIA’. However the TIA excludes the surrounding arterial roads so will not be effective.	The TIA has been identified for development assessment purposes to ensure that development within the UDA does not compromise transport infrastructure on the site. It is not possible or desirable to extend the TIA to include areas outside the UDA.	N
76	Show the proposed cycling facilities on the Urban Form Plans for each precinct (Maps 7, 8 and 9).	Cycle facilities are shown on Map 3 which shows the complete cycle network. Inclusion on the urban form plans would make the plans cluttered and difficult to interpret.	N
77	<p>Concern that the second paragraph of section 3.3.5(b) Transport Investigation Area requires clarification that not all of the transport infrastructure within the TIA is DTMR’s responsibility.</p> <p>Proposes following alternative text:</p> <p>The Department of Transport and Main Roads is responsible for these major infrastructure proposals (<u>comprising Cross River Rail, modifications to the Woolloongabba Busway and state controlled roads</u>) which require further detailed investigation, consultation, approvals and funding allocations.</p>	Agree that clarification is required.	Y See amendment 21
78	Proposes that the extent of the Transport Investigation Area be expanded to include all of the area between Street 1 and the Pacific Motorway to ensure adequate construction area for delivery of the major transport infrastructure.	Agree, extent of the TIA to be extended.	Y See amendment 25
COMMENTS ON INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING AND DELIVERY			
79	Amend the Infrastructure Plan to include timeframes and introduce State responsibilities for major works such as the freeway ramp changes near the Morrison hotel. Concern that the Infrastructure Plan requires these works to be delivered by private developers. Introduction of timeframes would provide certainty for landowners and community.	Responsibility for delivery of major transport infrastructure items has not been determined due to complexities with delivery of Cross River Rail and bus interchange. These matters should be considered as part of the proposed transport investigation by DTMR in cooperation with BCC and other major stakeholders. Specification of timing would be inappropriate as the infrastructure works are linked to overall development timing which is uncertain, and also to the timing of delivery of the major public transport interchange and associated works which are subject to approvals and funding by both State and Commonwealth governments.	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y=yes / N=no
80	The scale of development will require extensive upgrading of infrastructure services which will disrupt existing residents and businesses.	The area around the UDA has also been identified as a major development opportunity in BCC planning documents. In addition there is the proposed Cross River Rail and other major transport initiatives which will all contribute, along with the UDA, to demands for infrastructure upgrading in the vicinity. This is a matter for the responsible infrastructure agencies to implement and manage in accordance with standard operating practices, and is not a matter for the development scheme.	N
81	Concern that local landowners and BCC ratepayers generally will be required to pay a disproportionate amount for long term maintenance of infrastructure required for the development.	The ULDA will ensure that infrastructure is provided to appropriate standards to minimise life-cycle costs, and that developers make appropriate infrastructure contributions. The proposed development will also strengthen the overall rate base of the city. The issue is not a matter for the development scheme.	N
82	The Infrastructure Plan provides insufficient detail about the types and sequencing of required infrastructure works, delivery responsibilities, costs and associated infrastructure charging and cost sharing strategies. Proposes addition of text to the Infrastructure Plan advising that the list of infrastructure requirements is subject to change to reflect outcomes of comprehensive infrastructure planning processes.	Agree that the Infrastructure Plan may be subject to change depending on the results of further more detailed studies. Amend the Infrastructure Plan as suggested.	Y See amendment 63
83	Notes that DTMR is identified as the responsible agency for a number of the proposed infrastructure items. Concern that BCC is "inferred" as the responsible agency for a number of others. Proposes that the PDS should clearly state responsibilities for providing infrastructure.	The nature of and responsibilities for development of the UDA are very complex. For example some of the transport proposals may need to be delivered early to 'free up' parts of the site for development and/or facilitate site access for construction activities associated with the major transport interchange. Also there are a variety of mechanisms that could be used to deliver infrastructure including direct provision by the ULDA or other agency or by developers in accordance with a development approval. In view of this it is considered inappropriate to specify responsibilities in the development scheme. The PDS does not identify BCC as the responsible agency for any infrastructure. Propose to remove reference to DTMR (see comment 88 below).	Y See amendment 64
84	UDA-wide infrastructure section does not mention amending existing signals at Main/Stanley Streets intersection to provide better pedestrian connectivity or the potential	Section 4.2 UDA-wide Transport infrastructure specifies amending the existing signals at Main/Stanley intersection. This will need to balance	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
	for grade separation of pedestrian movements.	competing demands for signal time – no benefit in specifying one such demand.	
85	UDA-wide infrastructure section does not mention amending existing signals at Main/Vulture Streets intersection to provide better pedestrian and cyclist connectivity.	Section 4.2 UDA-wide Transport infrastructure specifies amending the existing signals at Main/Vulture intersection. This will need to balance competing demands for signal time – no benefit in specifying one such demand.	N
86	Proposes rewording of first sentence of the third para in section 4.1 Approach to read: As part of implementing this Development Scheme, the ULDA under section 97 (2), part 6 of the Urban Land Development Authority Act 2007, will also work with Brisbane City Council, infrastructure provider agencies and state agencies to prepare an infrastructure charging schedule.	Amend to address issue of cooperative work on infrastructure charging schedule.	Y See amendment 62
87	Proposes rewording of last sentence of the third para in section 4.1 Approach to read ' <u>State infrastructure funding additional to existing agency allocations...</u> '	The existing wording is consistent with that included in other Development Schemes and is considered adequate. It should be inferred that the reference to State infrastructure funding being sought under the normal budget processes relates to any funding requirements over and above relevant existing agency allocations.	N
88	Requests that references to DTMR as the responsible agency for specific infrastructure items listed in the tables in sections 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4 be removed as there are currently no formal project commitments or funding allocations for these works.	References to DTMR in the table will be removed.	Y See amendment 64
89	Suggests more detailed description of the proposed cycleway along Stanley and Allen Streets in the Section 4.3 table, as follows: Improved cycleway and pedestrian access, <u>through the provision of a 4.5 metre wide off-road cycle path</u> along ...	The Stanley Street cycle path is described in more detail in s3.3.1 (as noted in submission), Figure 5; Precinct 2 – Stanley Street Frontage, and in relation to Stanley Street in the section 4.2 table. Do not consider it necessary to provide a full description every time the cycle path is mentioned.	N
COMMENTS ON STAGING AND TIMING OF DEVELOPMENT			
90	Concerns with impact of slowing market on uptake of development.	This is not a matter that can be addressed through the development scheme.	N
91	Project appears to be one large development, should be series of smaller developments in order to proceed.	It is intended that Precincts 1 and 3 will be developed as a series of smaller developments. Delivery approach for Precinct 2 is dependent on further detailed design and evaluation due to complexity of interrelationships with the proposed	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
		public transport infrastructure.	
92	Concerned that likely first stage of development is least connected area of the precinct. Proposed Main Street should be first development frontage.	The Main Street precinct is constrained for early development due to the need for planned and orderly relocation of existing activities on the site. This is a development and delivery issue rather than a development scheme issue.	N
93	PDS should not be implemented until there is a "final and irreversible commitment" to implementation of the proposed railway infrastructure.	The central part of the UDA is constrained from development until the major transport infrastructure is delivered. It would not be appropriate to delay development of the whole site.	N
94	PDS should include an indicative staging plan, supported by an infrastructure plan.	Development staging is complex and subject to a wide range of external factors including relocation of existing tenants, proposed major road works, delivery of the proposed major public transport interchange and market conditions. In view of this it is not considered feasible or desirable to include more detail on staging and implementation.	N
COMMENTS PERTAINING TO THE MORRISON HOTEL			
95	Proposes that the Morrison Hotel be involved in ongoing discussions to ensure that access is maintained and the hotel is able to continue trading during construction works.	This is not a matter for the development scheme. The ULDA and its development partners including DTMR will liaise with the owners of the Morrison hotel and other affected landowners to ensure development is undertaken with the minimum practicable disruption. Also see responses to immediately following issues raised by same submitter which should address these concerns adequately.	N
96	Morrison Hotel currently has access to approx 40 parking spaces either on own land or along Merton Road. Concerned that loss of these spaces will impact on trading conditions and proposes the development scheme should allow for demolition of former liquor barn behind hotel and use for temporary surface car park. Long-term parking could be satisfied by basement parking under the Morrison Hotel or allocation of parking spaces within the adjoining development.	The PDS does not preclude the use of parts of the site for temporary parking purposes. However the potential for at-grade temporary car parking will be specifically acknowledged in an amendment to sections 3.3.6 (a) and 3.4.2.	Y See amendments 24, 33
97	Allen Street Precinct section 3.6.2 (a) states that redevelopment may require closure of Jacob Lane which provides service access to the hotel. Section should make it clear that service access to hotel must be maintained.	Agreed, this will be clarified in amendments to sections 3.3.1 and 3.6.2.	Y See amendment 11
98	Allen Street Precinct section 3.6.2 (b) states that there may be an opportunity for some	The draft development scheme describes this possible development as follows:	Y

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
	<p>additional development to occur on the western side of the Morrison Hotel. This should be clarified by inclusion of an 'Indicative Building Footprint' with proviso that extent of footprint is dependent on finalisation of road network changes and extent of land that may become available.</p>	<p>“with the relocation of the bus lane there may be an opportunity for some low-key complementary development on the western side of the hotel”.</p> <p>In view of the uncertainties associated with the final design of road works in this location which will determine the extent of additional land, if any, that may become available for development, this statement is potentially misleading and should be deleted.</p>	<p>See amendment 39</p>
COMMENTS ON MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES			
99	<p>Noise levels and light impacts associated with Gabba events should be considered.</p> <p>Submission 32 proposes addition of new second para in section 3.3.7(e) as follows:</p> <p>Development is to ameliorate the noise associated with public transport facilities and spectators at the Gabba Cricket Grounds to maintain the health and wellbeing of residents.</p>	<p>Strengthened noise amelioration guidance is desirable. Include proposed amendment to s3.3.7(e).</p>	<p>Y See amendment 26</p>
100	<p>Suggests a more appropriate use of the site would be for an entertainment facility similar to Festival Hall.</p>	<p>The proposed mixed use development is consistent with existing planning intentions for the area as expressed in the SEQ Regional Plan, draft River City Blue Print and the draft Kangaroo Point South Renewal Strategy which identifies the site's opportunity to “ deliver a truly urban and mixed use outcome that stitches ... Kangaroo Point South Renewal Area to the ... Woolloongabba Central area”.</p>	<p>N</p>
101	<p>Concern that noise impacts from surrounding major roads will require will require double glazing and excessive use of air conditioners.</p> <p>Submission 32 proposes the addition of following sentence and footnotes to s3.3.7(e) to ensure noise impacts of transport corridors are addressed.</p> <p><i>Noise sensitive uses located within a transport noise corridor* must comply with best practice acoustic standards.**</i></p> <p><i>* as defined in Section 246Z of the Building Act 1975</i></p> <p><i>** Refer to Environmental Protection (Noise) Policy 2008; Queensland Development code: mandatory Part 4.4 – Buildings in a Transport Noise corridor and the Department of Transport and Main Road's Road Traffic Noise Management: Code of Practice.</i></p>	<p>Amend (section 3.3.7 (e)) to include new guidance as proposed.</p>	<p>Y See amendment 27</p>

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y=yes / N=no
102	Development should address all road frontages (including major roads) to provide casual observation and improve pedestrian safety.	The requirements for development to address primary active frontages apply only at ground level. Upper levels of development do address all major roads and will provide surveillance in accordance with CPTED principles which are specifically called up in section 3.3.3(c) of the PDS.	N
103	Owns land opposite the site on corner of Vulture and Main Streets and suggests this site may be suitable to accommodate government activities to be relocated from the Landcentre.	This is not a matter for the development scheme.	N
104	Concern that ULDA is both developer and assessor of development applications. Proposes creation of 2 bodies with representation of local residents and businesses and independent professionals respectively to work with the ULDA.	ULDA complies with its statutory obligations and maintains a strict separation between its development and planning assessment activities. In any case this is not a matter for the development scheme.	N
105	Proposed development has the potential to bring increased social problems (e.g. crime, drug use and prostitution) and will require a highly visible and intensive police presence in the locality.	The PDS includes a number of requirements that will assist with the creation of a safe environment (e.g. mixed use community, diverse households, CPTED principles including overlooking of streets and public spaces). Allocation of police resources is not a matter for the development scheme.	N
106	Suggests that reference in section 2 Strategic Context of the proposed development scheme that the site "will boast one of the highest levels of accessibility in the city" is incorrect because the system of one-way streets in the locality often requires circuitous routes.	The accessibility of the site is derived from the existing and proposed public transport and active transport services, not just by private motor vehicle. Taking all transport modes into consideration, it is considered undeniable that the site will have one of the highest levels of accessibility in the city.	N
107	Suggests that the definition of 'storey' in Schedule 2 should specify a maximum height.	ULDA does not want to diminish design flexibility by specifying a maximum storey height. However there is potential to tighten up the definition by making it clear that, for the purposes of the definition, a mezzanine is a storey.	Y See amendment 72
108	Suggests that section 2 Strategic Context includes a statement that an Event Management Plan for the Gabba stadium should be developed with TMR, TTA, ULDA and BCC to ensure that the UDA can function as a mixed-use community whilst enabling adequate facilities for public transport on event days.	Public transport and access requirements for major events at the stadium will be considered as part of the proposed integrated transport study to be led by DTMR. It is agreed that it would be desirable for a new Gabba events management plan to be developed to reflect the changed transport and land use environment and ULDA would be happy to participate. However this is a matter for Stadiums Queensland, and it would be inappropriate for the development scheme	N

Issue #	Issue/Comment	Response	Amendment Y-yes / N-no
		to include any commitments in this regard.	

List of amendments

Note: Proposed changes to text are shown in italics.

Amendment	Nature of amendment	Reason
2 STRATEGIC CONTEXT		
1	<p>Page 2, 2.1 Location</p> <p>Paragraph 4 – Insert the following text after the words “Pacific Motorway”: <i>and the existing busway and Woolloongabba bus station (which will ultimately be replaced by the proposed rail-bus interchange).</i></p>	To acknowledge an existing significant land use on the site and its relationship to the proposed development.
2	<p>Page 3, 2.2 Vision</p> <p>Column 3, para 3 – Amend the word ‘office’ in the first sentence to “<i>and employment uses with supporting ...</i>”. Insert new sentence after the words “much of the day”: Also consequential amendment to last para on p3: Replace the words ‘a minimum of’ with ‘in the order of’.</p>	To allow for further flexibility regarding the future land use mix.
3	<p>Page 4, 2.3 Structure Plan</p> <p>Delete the final para of column 1, and replace with: <i>A central core of parkland and urban plaza areas providing gathering places and accommodating a range of community and recreational activities.</i></p>	Replace reference to “predominantly residential uses” which is inconsistent with the changes proposed in amendment 2.
3 LAND USE PLAN		
4	<p>Page 7, 3.3.1 Movement and circulation (UDA-wide criteria)</p> <p>Insert following new para after para 2: <i>The proposed alterations to the external road network shown on Map 3 (and identified in the Infrastructure Plan) may be modified in response to the findings of more detailed traffic modelling, planning and design work which will be undertaken by the Department of Transport and Main Roads in cooperation with Brisbane City Council as part of an integrated transport study for the Woolloongabba UDA and environs. Any such alterations should maintain the integrity of the movement and circulation principles and concepts that underpin the development scheme. Development within the UDA will be required to be consistent with any approved plans for the external road network.</i></p>	To clarify that the proposed major road changes are subject to further detailed investigation and may be subject to change.
5	<p>Page 7, 3.3.1 Movement and circulation (UDA-wide criteria)</p> <p>Column 3, para 3</p> <p>Add the following text at the end of dot point one: <i>and facilities to link with Brisbane City Council’s CityCycle scheme</i></p>	To ensure these requirements are considered as part of the detailed planning and design process.
6	<p>Page 7, 3.3.1 Movement and circulation (UDA-wide criteria)</p> <p>Column 3, para 1 – Insert the following after the words ‘two-way’: <i>, 3 metre wide, ...</i></p>	To provide additional information about the nature of the cycleway proposed.

Amendment	Nature of amendment	Reason
7	<p>Page 8, 3.3.1 Movement and circulation (UDA-wide criteria)</p> <p>Map 3: Woolloongabba UDA Movement and Circulation Plan</p> <p>Show the Main Street/Vulture Street and Main Street/Stanley Street intersections as Key Intersections.</p>	<p>Acknowledge these intersections as important intersections requiring changes to facilitate access to the UDA.</p>
8	<p>Page 8, 3.3.1 Movement and circulation (UDA-wide criteria)</p> <p>Map 3: Woolloongabba UDA Movement and Circulation Plan</p> <p>Change Street 6 behind the Morrison Hotel to Street 6a, and Street 6 between Street 1 and Main Street to Street 6b.</p> <p>Also consequential amendment to Figure 2 (page 9): renumbering of Street 6 to Street 6b.</p>	<p>To facilitate introduction of a description of the requirements of Street 6a in a subsequent amendment.</p>
9	<p>Page 8, 3.3.1 Movement and circulation (UDA-wide criteria)</p> <p>Map 3: Woolloongabba UDA Movement and Circulation Plan</p> <p>Add the following text in brackets after the notation "Cycle link to Annerley Road/Stanley Street": <i>(In cooperation with BCC)</i></p> <p>Amend Map and legend to show <i>Potential Pedestrian Bridge Link</i> along the northern side of Street 2.</p>	<p>To acknowledge that this extension of the cycle link will be on council controlled land and will require the cooperation of BCC.</p> <p>To provide information about preferred link within the UDA to possible future grade-separated pedestrian link across Main Street.</p>
10	<p>Page 9, 3.3.1 Movement and circulation (UDA-wide criteria)</p> <p>Para 3 – Delete the word "residential" in the first line.</p>	<p>To make it clear that there is no presumption in favour of predominantly residential development in this location (consistent with the approach outlined in amendment 2)</p>
11	<p>Page 10, 3.3.1 Movement and circulation (UDA-wide criteria)</p> <p>Amend heading Street 6 to Streets 6a and 6b, and amend existing references to Street 6 to Street 6b.</p> <p>Insert following new first para:</p> <p><i>Street 6a is Jacob Lane which provides access to the Morrison Hotel and adjoining privately owned land to the north. The redevelopment of the area around the Morrison Hotel may require Jacob lane to be closed and a new access to the development to be created. This will be addressed as part of the detailed design for the new development. However it will be important to ensure that service access to the Morrison Hotel is maintained both during and after construction.</i></p>	<p>To clarify requirements in relation to maintaining access to the Morrison Hotel.</p>

<p>12</p>	<p>Page 10, 3.3.2 Public Realm (UDA-wide criteria)</p> <p>Insert a new sub-heading “(a) <i>Intent</i>” immediately after heading 3.3.2 Public realm.</p> <p>Add the following new sub-heading and text at the end of section 3.3.2:</p> <p><i>(b) Design guidelines</i></p> <p><i>The high density, mixed use nature of the UDA and its role facilitating access to the major public transport interchange at the heart of the development mean that the design of the public realm will need to consider and resolve a number of important design objectives.</i></p> <p><i>There is a wide variety of public realm spaces within the UDA. The design of each space should reflect its unique character and opportunities within an overall public realm design strategy. The overarching public realm design objectives for the UDA are outlined below. Wherever practicable, the design of the public realm should also comply with relevant aspects of Brisbane City Council’s Streetscape Design Guidelines.</i></p> <p><i>Provide a memorable gateway</i></p> <p><i>The development will be defined by its role as a major transport interchange and mixed use centre. The central park and plaza areas should create an attractive point of arrival and station threshold, where people can make the easy transition between the site and the public transport interchange.</i></p> <p><i>Gateway spaces provide opportunities to meet and greet people upon arrival and departure. This includes providing enough space for queuing and marshalling on busy game days.</i></p> <p><i>Provide a Public and Private Face</i></p> <p><i>Specific parts of the public realm will need to respond to high volumes of use at different times. These parts of the public realm will need to provide clear, safe and direct routes to the public transport interchange, and be robust in the choice of materials and street furniture.</i></p> <p><i>Plaza spaces within the UDA need to create an environment that provides a more personal scale and is able to generate a sense of neighbourhood and identity, which allows residents to feel ownership of the area.</i></p> <p><i>Use a Locally Distinctive and Limited Design Palette</i></p> <p><i>Create a limited palette of materials which draws upon the history, character and features of Woolloongabba.</i></p> <p><i>Determine a ‘base palette’, that unites the entire site, and within that base palette introduce ‘accent’ elements to provide local identity and interest.</i></p> <p><i>Planting and shade</i></p> <p><i>Streets and public spaces should be shaded to make walking comfortable year round. Opportunities for deep planting for large shade trees will be encouraged wherever practicable throughout the site.</i></p> <p><i>Street trees are to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Provide shade and comfort to pedestrian paths and plazas creating a continuous canopy of trees or awnings over footpaths along key pedestrian routes. Wherever practicable pedestrian walkways should be provided with a minimum of 50% natural shade cover;</i> • <i>Introduce colour and variety to the public domain by the use of flowering trees;</i> • <i>Comprise species that are sufficiently hardy to flourish in the difficult conditions which will frequently be above underground structures;</i> • <i>Be of a scale and form that suits their location and complements the proposed building setbacks, street types and footpath widths.</i> 	<p>To provide additional design guidance that addresses a number of specific queries and comments received about the public realm aspects of the PDS.</p>
-----------	---	---

	<p><i>Lighting</i></p> <p><i>Lighting within the public realm should create an inviting night time character and provide wayfinding and safety on the ground plane. Lighting should be subtle and diffuse through the use of smaller scale light poles along pedestrian paths and streets providing down lighting. Up lighting of trees and other features should be located and designed to reduce light spill impacts on residential units.</i></p> <p><i>Public Art</i></p> <p><i>Public art should be provided to enrich the visual appearance and civic identity of the UDA. Artworks and art spaces should be integrated into the public realm and include elements that reflect the area's cultural diversity and heritage.</i></p> <p><i>Preferred locations for artworks and art spaces should be areas where people gather, such as street corners, building entries, plazas and parks.</i></p> <p><i>Where the ULDA requires a contribution for public artwork as part of development, applicants are to show any proposed artwork on streetscape works plans. The preferred nature and location of the artwork will be determined in conjunction with ULDA development officers to ensure its appropriate integration with other elements of the public realm.</i></p>	
13	<p>Page 11, 3.3.3 Urban design and sustainability (UDA-wide criteria)</p> <p>Move section 3.3.3 (b) Sub-tropical design to a sub-heading under (c) Building form.</p>	The criteria included in the Sub-tropical design section relate to building design and would be more appropriately located in this section.
14	<p>Page 11, 3.3.3 Urban design and sustainability (UDA-wide criteria), section (c) (ii) Visual and acoustic privacy</p> <p>Change references to towers to "upper levels"</p>	To minimise perception that slender, tall towers are the only acceptable building form within the UDA.
15	<p>Page 12, 3.3.3 Urban design and sustainability (UDA-wide criteria)</p> <p>Add the following sentence to the end of the first para under (iii) Ground level design and detail:</p> <p><i>To achieve this, ground floors should have a minimum floor to ceiling height of 3.5 metres.</i></p>	Provides a specific requirement to ensure flexibility of use of ground floor areas consistent with the good practice guidance in the Transit oriented development guide (7.1 Adaptability).
16	<p>Page 12, 3.3.3 Urban design and sustainability (UDA-wide criteria)</p> <p>Move sections (f) Private open space / balconies and (g) Lighting to a sub-headings under (c) Building form.</p> <p>Delete sub-heading Balconies and associated text.</p>	<p>The criteria included in sections (f) and (g) relate to building design and would be more appropriately located in this section.</p> <p>Avoids repetition of material in relocated section (f) Private open space / balconies</p>
17	<p>Page 12, 3.3.3 Urban design and sustainability (UDA-wide criteria)</p> <p>Insert following new sub-heading and text before sub-heading Other frontages:</p> <p><i>Frontages to Pacific Motorway</i></p> <p><i>Buildings adjacent to the Pacific Motorway (including access ramps) should have a minimum setback of 6 metres. Setback areas should be appropriately landscaped and may include service access or similar facilities. These setback areas do not form part of the public realm so building frontages to the Pacific Motorway may be suitable for a range of uses including car parking on lower levels. Buildings should be designed to provide an attractive and interesting appearance from the motorway. Several of the buildings adjacent to the motorway have been identified as landmark buildings in recognition of their visually prominent locations.</i></p>	To provide additional design guidance for buildings fronting the Pacific Motorway that was not addressed in the PDS.

18	<p>Page 12, 3.3.3 Urban design and sustainability (UDA-wide criteria)</p> <p>Insert the following new sub-heading and text at the end of 3.3.3(c) Building form:</p> <p><i>(ix) Communal open space and recreation</i></p> <p><i>Development proposals are encouraged to include communal open space and recreation areas and facilities. These areas should provide safe, comfortable and functional recreation opportunities and, at a minimum, include basic facilities such as seating, shade and wind protection (either structures or planting) and flexible spaces suitable for a range of recreation activities. Innovative treatments, such as green roofs or green walls, that contribute to the attractiveness of these spaces are encouraged.</i></p>	<p>Responds to the need to provide a range of open space and recreation opportunities within the UDA.</p>
19	<p>Page 13, 3.3.3 Urban design and sustainability (UDA-wide criteria)</p> <p>Insert the following new heading and text after (e) Landmark buildings (which will be renumbered to (d) as a result of other amendments to this section as described above):</p> <p><i>(e) Heritage values</i></p> <p><i>The Morrison Hotel is identified as a Heritage Place (see Map 7). The Morrison Hotel building must be preserved and new development within the UDA must protect, respect and complement its heritage values. The built form outcomes for Precinct 1 specify a minimum setback from the Morrison Hotel along the Stanley Street frontage.</i></p>	<p>To provide specific protection for the heritage values of the Morrison hotel.</p>
20	<p>Page 13, 3.3.4(a) Housing diversity (UDA-wide criteria)</p> <p>Column 3, para 2 – Insert the following footnote:</p> <p><i>Refer to the ULDA's Affordable Housing Strategy for the definition of affordable housing.</i></p>	<p>To aid understanding and interpretation of the development scheme.</p>
21	<p>Page 14, 3.3.5 Transport Infrastructure (UDA-wide criteria)</p> <p>Delete references to 'light rail' in first para under (a) Transport Corridors/Clem7 Tunnel</p> <p>Column 4, para 2 – Add following text (in italics) to first sentence:</p> <p><i>Transport infrastructure proposals (comprising Cross River Rail, modifications to the Woolloongabba Busway and state controlled roads) ...</i></p>	<p>To remove inappropriate reference to 'light rail' (which is not proposed for the site), and to clarify the extent of DTMR's responsibilities.</p>
22	<p>Page 14, 3.3.5 (b) Transport Investigation Area (UDA-wide criteria)</p> <p>Column 4, para 2 – Add following sentence to end of para:</p> <p><i>DTMR will undertake these investigations in cooperation with Brisbane City Council and other key stakeholders.</i></p>	<p>To clarify that BCC is intended to be involved in the transport investigation.</p>
23	<p>Page 15, 3.3.6 (a) Car parking and service areas</p> <p>Add to end of last para:</p> <p><i>, and should be designed to achieve best practice including compliance with relevant Australian Standards.</i></p>	<p>To ensure car parking areas are appropriately designed to address such matters as disabled parking requirements.</p>
24	<p>Page 15, 3.3.6 (a) Car parking and service areas</p> <p>Insert new final para:</p> <p><i>Parts of the site may be used to provide temporary car parking to facilitate construction activities on the site or to accommodate higher levels of parking demand from development prior to the delivery of the major public transport interchange. Temporary car parks should have a maximum duration of 4 years.</i></p>	<p>To make it clear that parts of the site may be used for temporary car parking prior to development.</p>

25	<p>Page 15, Map 4</p> <p>Expand the extent of the Transport Investigation Area to include all of the land within the UDA between the Pacific Motorway and Street 1.</p>	To ensure adequate area for construction activities associated with the proposed public transport interchange is protected from inappropriate development.
26	<p>Page 16, 3.3.7(e), General noise requirements</p> <p>Add following sentence to end of para 2:</p> <p><i>In particular, development is to ameliorate the noise associated with major events at the Gabba stadium (e.g. public transport, crowd noise) to maintain the health and wellbeing of residents.</i></p>	To strengthen noise mitigation requirements.
27	<p>Page 16, 3.3.7(e), General noise requirements</p> <p>Add following para and footnote after para 2:</p> <p><i>Noise sensitive uses located within a transport noise corridor (as defined in Section 246Z of the Building Act 1975) must comply with best practice acoustic standards.**</i></p> <p><i>** Refer to Environmental Protection (Noise) Policy 2008; Queensland Development code: mandatory Part 4.4 – Buildings in a Transport Noise Corridor and the Department of Transport and Main Road's Road Traffic Noise Management: Code of Practice.</i></p>	To strengthen noise mitigation requirements.
28	<p>Page 17, 3.4 Zone provisions</p> <p>Map 5: Woolloongabba UDA Zoning Plan</p> <p>Move the UDA boundaries designation to the edge of the UDA.</p>	To correct misrepresentation of UDA boundary that appears to include parts of Vulture, Main and Stanley Streets.
29	<p>Page 18, 3.4.1 Mixed Use Zone Intent</p> <p>Table 1: Mixed Use Zone level of assessment table</p> <p>Add the following to Column 2 (UDA self assessable development):</p> <p><i>Material change of use for a commercial; residential; retail; service, community or other; sport, recreation and entertainment; or tourism use where:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Not involving building work, and</i> • <i>The use is not specified in Column 3B.</i> 	To avoid the need for UDA development applications for straightforward changes of use within the Mixed Use zone.
30	<p>Page 18, 3.4.1 Mixed Use Zone Intent</p> <p>Table 1: Mixed Use Zone level of assessment table</p> <p>Delete the following from Column 2 (UDA self assessable development):</p> <p><i>Operational work in accordance with the agreed standards as stated in a UDA development approval.</i></p>	Not required as these types of operational work are specified as UDA exempt development in Schedule 1.
31	<p>Page 19, 3.4.2 Civic and Open Space Zone Intent</p> <p>Table 2: Civic and Open Space Zone level of assessment table</p> <p>Delete the following from Column 2 (UDA self assessable development):</p> <p><i>Operational work in accordance with the agreed standards as stated in a UDA development approval.</i></p>	Not required as these types of operational work are specified as UDA exempt development in Schedule 1.
32	<p>Page 19, 3.4.2 Civic and Open Space Zone Intent</p> <p>Table 2: Civic and Open Space Zone level of assessment table</p> <p>Move the use 'market' from Column 2 (UDA self assessable development) to Column 3A (UDA Permissible Development)</p>	To allow the impacts of market activities (parking, noise, waste management, hours of operation etc) to be managed through the development assessment process.

33	<p>Page 19, 3.4.2 Civic and Open Space Zone Intent</p> <p>Table 2: Civic and Open Space Zone level of assessment table</p> <p>Add the text in italics to the description of car park in Column 3A (UDA permissible Development)</p> <p><i>Car park (where located wholly below the surface or where the car park is a temporary use for a period not exceeding 4 years and does not involve a permanent building or other structure)</i></p>	To provide flexibility to allow parts of the Civic and Open Space Zone to be used for temporary car parking associated with construction activities or to meet demand for car parking prior to delivery of the major transport infrastructure on the site.
34	<p>Page 21, Map 7: Precinct 1 Urban Form Plan</p> <p>Legend – change “Heritage Significance” to ‘<i>Heritage Place</i>’</p>	To ensure consistency with text elsewhere in the PDS.
35	<p>Page 22, 3.6.1 Precinct intent</p> <p>Column 1, para 2</p> <p>Insert the words “<i>health related</i>” in front of “community facilities”.</p>	To clarify intent that Precinct 1 is the preferred location for health related facilities, and other community facilities would be best located in Precincts 2 or 3.
36	<p>Page 22, 3.6.2 (a) Precinct 1 Outcomes - Movement</p> <p>Column 1, para 4</p> <p>Add the words “<i>The preferred location for</i>” at the beginning of the para.</p>	To provide flexibility to allow alternative access arrangements if found necessary at the detailed design stage.
37	<p>Page 22, 3.6.2 (a) Precinct 1 Outcomes - Movement</p> <p>Column 2, para 1</p> <p>Add the following sentence before the last sentence commencing “the main pedestrian access...”</p> <p><i>Jacob Lane provides service access to the Morrison Hotel and any development proposal must ensure that this access is maintained.</i></p>	To ensure service access to the Morrison Hotel is protected.
38	<p>Page 22, 3.6.2 (b) Precinct 1 Outcomes – Land use</p> <p>Add new first para as follows:</p> <p><i>Precinct 1 is expected to accommodate primarily residential and employment activities with a focus on uses linked to the adjoining major health precinct. Existing uses within the UDA that intend to remain on the site may also be accommodated in Precinct 1 to facilitate the redevelopment of other parts of the UDA.</i></p>	To clarify land use intentions for Precinct 1.
39	<p>Page 22, 3.6.2 (b) Precinct 1 Outcomes – Land use</p> <p>Column 3, para 2</p> <p>Amend the first sentence to read:</p> <p><i>The heritage listed Morrison Hotel will be retained, and is expected to have limited further development potential in view of its heritage values.</i></p> <p>Delete the final sentence referring to possible ‘complementary development on the western side of the hotel’.</p>	To strengthen the protection of the heritage listed Morrison Hotel, and remove a reference to possible development which is uncertain until detailed road design is completed in this location.
40	<p>Page 22, 3.6.2 (c) Precinct 1 Outcomes – Built form</p> <p>Column 4, para 2</p> <p>Add the following sentence at the end of the para:</p> <p><i>In addition the proposed new building fronting Stanley Street will be required to provide a minimum 20 metre setback from the eastern façade of the Morrison Hotel to ensure a suitable setting for this heritage place.</i></p>	To strengthen the protection of the heritage listed Morrison Hotel.

41	<p>Page 22, 3.6.2 (c) Precinct 1 Outcomes – Built form</p> <p>Column 4, para 3 (re maximum floor space)</p> <p>Delete this para.</p>	<p>This provision does not provide any useful information for development design or development assessment.</p>
42	<p>Page 22, 3.6.2 (d) Precinct 1 Outcomes – Public realm</p> <p>Column 4, para 7</p> <p>Add the following additional text at the end of this para:</p> <p><i>The requirement for a 20 metre minimum setback east of the Morrison Hotel will ensure this plaza is spacious and flexible space.</i></p>	<p>Additional information to provide design guidance for the plaza and ensure consistency with the setback to the Morrison Hotel proposed for heritage protection purposes.</p>
43	<p>Page 23, 3.6.2 (d) Precinct 1 Outcomes – Public realm</p> <p>Column 1, add new para after paragraph 1:</p> <p><i>Both plazas should be designed to incorporate shade trees and public seating.</i></p>	<p>To provide additional design guidance for the plazas.</p>
44	<p>Page 23, Table 3: Precinct 1 Development Parameters</p> <p>Page 29, Table 4: Precinct 2 Development Parameters</p> <p>Page 36, Table 5: Precinct 3 Development Parameters</p> <p>Change all references to 'Tower' in tables to '<i>Upper levels</i>'</p>	<p>To minimise perception that slender, tall towers are the only acceptable building form within the UDA.</p>
45	<p>Page 23, Table 3: Precinct 1 Development Parameters</p> <p>Add the following additional development parameters information:</p> <p><u>Pacific Motorway</u> Podium – 6.0 metres Upper levels – 6.0 metres</p> <p><u>Central Plaza (northern frontage)</u> Podium (max 3 storeys) – 0.0 metres Upper levels – 10.0 metres</p> <p><u>Central Plaza (southern frontage)</u> Podium (max 3 storeys) – 0.0 metres Upper levels – 0.0 metres</p> <p><u>Southern Plaza (eastern frontage)</u> Podium (max 3 storeys) – 0.0 metres Upper levels – 0.0 metres</p> <p><u>All other frontages</u> Podium (max 3 storeys) – 0.0 metres Tower – 0.0 metres</p>	<p>To provide development parameters for all key building frontages within the precinct, and to provide a 'catch all' requirement for any frontages that may have been overlooked.</p>
46	<p>Page 28 Map 8: Precinct 2 –Urban Form Plan</p> <p>Replace reference to 40 with 30 as the maximum height (storeys)</p> <p>Consequential amendments:</p> <p>Pages 27, 32, 33, 34, 35, and 40 Illustrative Sections to reflect a 30 storey height limit.</p> <p>Page 27, 3.7.2(b) Precinct 2 Outcomes – Land Use</p> <p>Add the following text to the first sentence under this heading:</p> <p><i>...with commercial and residential predominating on upper levels.</i></p>	<p>To address issues relating to building height.</p> <p>To clarify preferred uses at upper building levels and complement existing guidance for ground level uses.</p>

47	<p>Page 27, 3.7.2(b) Precinct 2 Outcomes – Land Use</p> <p>Add the following as para 2.</p> <p><i>Proximity to the public transport interchange means that Precinct 2 is also suitable for recreational, cultural and community facilities that could potentially serve a wide catchment. Examples of these facilities include a community centre, theatres and rehearsal/performance spaces and child care facilities.</i></p>	To provide additional guidance on the preferred location of community facilities within the UDA.
48	<p>Page 27, 3.7.2(c) Precinct 2 Outcomes – Built form</p> <p>Column 4, para 4 (re maximum floor space)</p> <p>Delete this para.</p>	This provision does not provide any useful information for development design or development assessment.
49	<p>Page 28, 3.7.2(c) Precinct 2 Outcomes – Built form</p> <p>Column 1, para 1</p> <p>Add following sentence to end of para:</p> <p><i>Setbacks at ground floor level will also be encouraged to provide spaces for outdoor dining and other activities without interfering with pedestrian movements along the Stanley Street footpath.</i></p>	To clarify the intended ground floor design treatment along Stanley Street.
50	<p>Page 28, 3.7.2(d) Precinct 2 Outcomes – Public realm</p> <p>Replace existing para 2 with:</p> <p><i>This space is intended to provide a variety of recreational opportunities and experiences as well as access between the public transport interchange and other areas within and beyond the UDA. Soft landscape elements, including lawn and large shade trees, should be incorporated to define a range of spaces and pathways around and through the park.</i></p> <p><i>As the park will be located above underground car parking and possibly also public transport infrastructure, the design will need to create opportunities for planting and irrigation including storage of a suitable quantity of stormwater for watering and maintenance purposes.</i></p>	To provide additional design guidance for the urban park.
51	<p>Page 28, 3.7.2(d) Precinct 2 Outcomes – Public realm</p> <p>Add the following as new final para:</p> <p><i>The western end of the plaza space adjoining the motorway provides an opportunity for active recreational facilities such as a skate park and courts for ball games.</i></p>	To provide additional design guidance and ensure the UDA is provided with active recreational facilities.
52	<p>Page 28, Table 4: Precinct 2 Development Parameters</p> <p>Add following additional development parameters:</p> <p><u>Pacific Motorway</u> Podium – 6.0 metres Upper levels – 6.0 metres</p> <p><u>Street 1</u> Podium (max 3 storeys) – Upper levels – 0.0 metres</p> <p><u>Street 5</u> Podium (max 3 storeys) – Tower – 10 metres</p> <p><u>Western Plaza (northern frontage)</u> Podium (max 3 storeys) – 0.0 metres Upper levels – 10.0 metres</p> <p><u>All other frontages</u> Podium (max 3 storeys) – 0.0 metres Tower – 0.0 metres</p>	To provide development parameters for all key building frontages within the precinct, and to provide a 'catch all' requirement for any frontages that may have been overlooked.

53	<p>Page 32, Figure 8: Precinct 2 Illustrative Section C</p> <p>Amend section to show Vulture Street at 12m AHD (i.e. 3m below Stanley Street rather than at same height).</p>	<p>To improve accuracy of information in the PDS. Note that s3.2.3(iv) makes it clear that the Illustrative Sections are for information only and are not UDA development requirements for development assessment purposes.</p>
54	<p>Page 34, Map 9: Precinct 3 Urban Form Plan</p> <p>Show 'Preferred Link to Possible Pedestrian Bridge' on Map along northern alignment of Street 2, and add to legend.</p>	<p>To provide information about preferred link within the UDA to possible future grade-separated pedestrian bridge across Main Street.</p>
55	<p>Page 35, 3.8.2(a) Precinct 3 Outcomes - Movement</p> <p>Column 2, para 2</p> <p>Delete first sentence.</p>	<p>This information is not movement related, and is inappropriately located. See amendment 57 for new section on Land use.</p>
56	<p>Page 35, 3.8.2(a) Precinct 3 Outcomes - Movement</p> <p>Add following sub-heading and text at end of (a) Movement:</p> <p><u>Potential pedestrian bridge link</u></p> <p><i>The most appropriate means of providing for safe and convenient pedestrian access between the Gabba stadium and the proposed public transport interchange in the UDA will be considered in an integrated transport investigation to be undertaken by DTMR in conjunction with Brisbane City Council, the ULDA, Stadiums Queensland and other key stakeholders.</i></p> <p><i>The potential to provide a grade-separated pedestrian bridge across Main Street will be examined in this investigation.</i></p> <p><i>Provision is made in the Movement and Circulation Plan (refer Map 3) and the Urban Form Plan for Precinct 3 (refer Map 9) for a grade-separated pedestrian bridge across Main Street so that its attributes and impacts can be appropriately assessed and addressed in the integrated transport investigation.</i></p> <p><i>The location identified for the pedestrian bridge would enable direct access for pedestrians crossing Main Street to the UDA's central open space and the public transport interchange. The walkway would be sized and configured to facilitate safe crowd movement. It would also be designed to ensure that, should it be incorporated in a building, the ground level of the building could be suitably activated.</i></p>	<p>To provide information about preferred link within the UDA to possible future grade-separated pedestrian link across Main Street.</p>
57	<p>Page 35, 3.8.2 Precinct 3 Outcomes</p> <p>Insert following new heading and text immediately after the Movement section (and amend numbering of following section headings accordingly):</p> <p><i>(b) Land use</i></p> <p><i>Retail, community and cultural activities should be located at ground level along the identified primary active frontages, with commercial and residential uses predominating at upper levels.</i></p> <p><i>This precinct would also be a suitable location for community facilities such as the proposed indoor sport and recreation centre.</i></p>	<p>To provide additional guidance on the preferred land uses in Precinct 3.</p>
58	<p>Page 35, 3.8.2(b) Precinct 3 Outcomes – Built form</p> <p>Delete third para in this section relating to maximum floor space.</p>	<p>This provision does not provide any useful information for development design or development assessment.</p>

59	<p>Page 36, Table 5: Precinct 3 Development Parameters</p> <p>Amend maximum podium height for Vulture Street to 4 storeys.</p> <p>Amend maximum podium height for Main Street to 4 storeys.</p> <p>Add following additional development parameters:</p> <p><u>All other frontages</u> Podium (max 3 storeys) – 0.0 metres Upper levels – 0.0 metres</p>	<p>Vulture Street amendment is to correct an error and make the requirement consistent with Precincts 1 and 2.</p> <p>Main Street amendment is to provide additional design flexibility to deal with level changes along Main Street.</p> <p>To provide a 'catch all' requirement for any frontages that may have been overlooked.</p>
60	<p>Page 37, Figure 10: Precinct 3 east-west illustrative section.</p> <p>Amend section to reflect Main Street in this location is at approx 7.5 AHD (i.e. below nominal internal plaza level of 14m AHD).</p>	<p>To improve accuracy of information in the PDS. Note that s3.2.3(iv) makes it clear that the Illustrative Sections are for information only and are not UDA development requirements for development assessment purposes.</p>
61	<p>Page 38, Figure 11: Precinct 3 north-south illustrative section</p> <p>Amend section to reflect that Street 2 will be lower due to slope down to Main Street which in this location is at approx 7.5 AHD.</p>	<p>To improve accuracy of information in the PDS. Note that s3.2.3(iv) makes it clear that the Illustrative Sections are for information only and are not UDA development requirements for development assessment purposes.</p>
<h4>4 INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN</h4>		
62	<p>Page 39, 4.1 implementation Plan – Approach</p> <p>Replace the first sentence of the third para in section 4.1 with the following sentence:</p> <p><i>As part of implementing this Development Scheme, the ULDA under section 97 (2), part 6 of the Urban Land Development Authority Act 2007, will also work with Brisbane City Council, infrastructure provider agencies and state agencies to prepare an infrastructure charging schedule.</i></p>	<p>To clarify proposed cooperative working relationships.</p>
63	<p>Page 39, 4.1 implementation Plan – Approach</p> <p>Add following text to last para:</p> <p><i>These infrastructure requirements reflect current understanding. However, further more detailed infrastructure investigations, including the proposed traffic and transport investigation to be undertaken by DTMR in cooperation with BCC, will be undertaken, and the infrastructure requirements and delivery responsibilities may be amended to reflect the outcomes of these investigations.</i></p>	<p>To acknowledge that infrastructure requirements and responsibilities may change as a result of more detailed future investigations.</p>
64	<p>Page 39, 40, 41, Tables in sections 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4</p> <p>Delete all references in tables to DTMR as responsible agency for delivery of specific infrastructure items.</p>	<p>To acknowledge DTMR advice that these are not currently committed projects with budget allocations for implementation.</p>
65	<p>Page 39, 4.2 UDA-wide infrastructure - Transport</p> <p>Add the following beneath Stanley Street:</p> <p><i>Main Street – Road widening to accommodate intersection works at Vulture and Stanley Streets and to contribute to Brisbane City Council's 'sub-tropical boulevard' strategy as outlined in the draft Kangaroo Point South Renewal Strategy.</i></p>	<p>To incorporate a significant infrastructure proposal omitted from the PDS.</p>

66	<p>Page 40, 4.2 UDA-wide infrastructure – community facilities</p> <p>Add the following community facilities to this section of the table:</p> <p><i>Childcare facilities.</i></p> <p><i>A multi-purpose indoor sports and recreation facility. This facility should be integrated into the lower levels of a larger development in Precinct 2 or Precinct 3, and make effective use of podium and/or roof top spaces for outdoor recreation. There may be some efficiency advantages in co-locating with the proposed community hub.</i></p> <p><i>Innovative, land efficient and flexible sport and recreation opportunities.</i></p>	To incorporate significant infrastructure proposals omitted from the PDS.
67	<p>Page 40, 4.3 Precinct 1 Allen Street – Pedestrian/cycle infrastructure</p> <p>Amend last infrastructure element to read:</p> <p><i>In collaboration with BCC, investigate options for linking the proposed Stanley Street cycleway beyond the UDA boundary to the Annerley Road intersection. If feasible ULDA to deliver.</i></p>	To recognise that this infrastructure proposal must be delivered in collaboration with BCC and on BCC controlled land.
5 IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY		
68	<p>Page 43, 5.1 Implementation Table</p> <p>Add the following under Provision of infrastructure:</p> <p><i>Working with BCC, State agencies and other key stakeholders to deliver the community infrastructure identified in the development scheme.</i></p>	To clarify proposed collaborative working relationship with BCC and other stakeholders.
69	<p>Page 43, 5.1 Implementation Table</p> <p>Add the following under Community engagement:</p> <p><i>A community development strategy prepared by the ULDA in collaboration with key stakeholders including BCC and local community organisations.</i></p>	To ensure appropriate measures are identified and implemented to create a diverse, sustainable community.
6 SCHEDULES		
70	<p>Page 45, Schedule 1: Exempt development – Operational work</p> <p>Amend the second element of operational work listed to read:</p> <p><i>Carrying out operational work in accordance with a UDA development approval.</i></p>	To extend the definition to include operational work associated with other forms of development than just material change of use (e.g. reconfiguring a lot).
71	<p>Page 46, Schedule 1: Exempt development – Operational work</p> <p>Add the following at the end of the operational work section of the table:</p> <p><i>Placing an advertising device on premises.</i></p>	To avoid the need for proponents to make a UDA development application for this activity which would duplicate approval required under a BCC local law.
72	<p>Page 51, Schedule 2 Definitions, Administrative definitions</p> <p>Delete “(ii) a mezzanine” and replace with following new sentence at end of definition:</p> <p><i>For the purposes of this definition a mezzanine is a storey.</i></p>	To clarify the intent of the definition.