

Consultation Report



How to use this document?

This document summarises the issues raised in submissions received by Council in response to the public consultation of the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework), and sets out a response and recommendation in relation to those issues.

If you made a submission to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework), you should have been provided with a unique number for your submission(s) which can be used to locate Council's response to your submission. To locate Council's response to your submission, you can search the document with the Find tool (Ctrl + F for PCs or Command + F for Mac) using your unique submission number.

Need assistance?

- Further support in using this document is available by:
- ♦ contacting Council's City Design Branch on (07) 3810 7990;
 - ♦ emailing strategic@ipswich.qld.gov.au;
 - ♦ visiting the counter at council's Administration Building at 45 Roderick Street, Ipswich during office hours.

Section	Strategic Framework Theme	Submitter Issues	Response	Recommendation to Council	Submitter No.
3.2	Overall Vision				
3.2	Overall Vision	Express concern with the elevation of specific development requirements to the level of the strategic framework, for example, setbacks to waterway corridors and housing density outcomes are included in the proposed framework.	The Strategic Framework uses a range of development standards to provide clarity of intent for the proposed framework, they are not development assessment standards. Where distances and areas are used, these are mostly provided within a range (for example in Table 3.4 – Residential Typologies and Densities, ES3 – 12-22 dwellings per hectare). Where a single figure is used (for example, a stated '400 metre or 5 minute walk' to a bus stop or neighbourhood centre) it is expected that, as with other themes and desirable outcomes in a strategic framework, a level of reasonable interpretation is applied when assessment is made against these requirements.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	292, 355, 364, 368, 485, 487, 488,
3.2	Overall Vision	Express the view that consideration be given to including the centre locations proposed on the future Ipswich to Springfield railway line in item 28 of the vision statement.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the review of the strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	469,
3.3	Valuable Features				
3.3.2	Natural Environment	Request that specific wildlife treatments be utilised to protect natural areas.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the review of the strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	314, 324,
3.3.2	Natural Environment	Suggest that the strategic framework should include additional mapping identifying significant core habitat areas for the Koala.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the review of the strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	438,
3.3.2	Natural Environment	Expressed support for the retention of green corridors identified within the Strategic Framework.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the review of the strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	19,
3.3.2.1 SVFM1	Strategic Greenspace and Links	Express the view that mapping of environmental areas between the Strategic Greenspace areas and Links map, Biodiversity Overlay and Strategic Green Infrastructure is not transparent and does not correlate with areas mapped as MSES under the SPP. More detailed mapping and explanation of the policy is required to address this issue. Areas designated Environmental Management should be included in Housing Areas.	Environmental areas, values and goals identified by the proposed framework are not solely related to State level interests or requirements. Note 3: State and Local Environmental Significance provides a detailed explanation of Matters of Environmental Significance considerations in the proposed framework, outlining the matters that have originated from state mapping and continuing on to identify matters that have been considered and included as a result of Local considerations (including, at the bottom of p12, a description of the process used to validate all local mapping inclusions). Note 4: Green Infrastructure (p.14) explains that 'the areas, links and water features included in Strategic Valuable Features Maps 1 and 2 form part of an overall green infrastructure network that is comprised of both natural areas and features and constructed assets'.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	292, 364, 368, 461, 485, 487, 488,
3.3.2.1 SVFM1	Strategic Greenspace and Links	Express the view that there is no distinction in the mapping between Key Nature Conservation Areas and Environmental Areas and other Environmental Management Areas.	Note 4: Green Infrastructure (p.14) explains that 'the areas, links and water features included in Strategic Valuable Features Maps 1 and 2 form part of an overall green infrastructure network that is comprised of both natural areas and features and constructed assets'. The map is intended as a overarching greenspace and links representation	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	292,
3.3.2.1 SVFM1	Strategic Greenspace and Links	Concern that it is not clear from the document or mapping why areas are included in the Environmental Management designation.	The proposed Environmental Management (EM) designation includes areas that are recognised as having environmental value (either existing or as having the potential to provide future connectivity) and/or in combination with, a potential to provide buffering between uses, or management of a significant constraint issue in a practical and effective manner that offers the best development outcomes for the city as a whole over the projected life of the future scheme.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	364, 485, 487, 488,
3.3.2.1 SVFM1	Strategic Greenspace and Links	Request for edge treatment to wildlife corridors including fencing, reduced speed limits and road design considerations.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the review of the strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	455,
3.3.2.1 SVFM1	Strategic Greenspace and Links	Support for riparian vegetation, or wildlife corridor protection and linkage of wildlife habitat.	The support expressed in the submission is noted.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	407, 455,

Section	Strategic Framework Theme	Submitter Issues	Response	Recommendation to Council	Submitter No.
3.3.2.1 SVFM1	Strategic Greenspace and Links	Express concern that specific land in Purga be omitted from Strategic Valuable Features Map 1 - Strategic Greenspace Areas and Links.	The Strategic Valuable Features Map 1 - Strategic Greenspace Areas and Links and Overlay Map 1 - Biodiversity generally reflects existing vegetation cover and areas of habitat. The local area framework mapping recognises a much broader environmental outcome including the connection (links) between dislocated areas of vegetation.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	389,
3.3.2.1 SVFM1	Strategic Greenspace and Links	Express the view that there should be Strategic Corridor Links designated along significant urban waterways e.g. Woogaroo Creek.	Strategic corridor links include regional cross-border corridors and priority local corridors. The Environmental Management designation has the primary strategic function of separating and buffering land uses and that also contain areas of vegetation and provide connections including in association with road reserves and significant urban waterways e.g. Woogaroo Creek.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	138, 336, 457, 472,
3.3.2.1 SVFM1	Strategic Greenspace and Links	Express the view that there should be Strategic Corridor Links designated surrounding and between the White Rock Spring Mountain Conservation estate and the Mount Goolman Conservation estate.	The designations in and surrounding both the White Rock Spring Mountain Conservation estate and the Mount Goolman Conservation estate reflect the strategic intent to conserve the biodiversity values these include Conservation, and Rural 4 (Special Land Management) (R4) designations which include public and private land holdings. The Strategic Greenspace Areas and Links Map SVFM1 also shows a Strategic Corridor Link connecting the Rock Spring Mountain Conservation estate and the Mount Goolman Conservation estate.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	510,
3.3.2.1 SVFM1	Strategic Greenspace and Links	Express the view that the accuracy of the vegetation mapping on the south side of Coopers Road that the boundaries of the Key Nature Conservation area and Matters of State Significance appear to be more extensive than the current extent of native vegetation on the site.	As of a review of the extent of vegetation coverage shown on digital imagery from 19 July 2019, the boundaries of the Key Nature Conservation area and Matters of State Significance appear to be an accurate representation of the current extent of native vegetation.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	206,
3.3.2.1 SVFM1	Strategic Greenspace and Links	Express concern that land, including the area between the Rick Natrass Environmental Reserve and the Eugene Street Reserve, and along Halletts Road has been omitted from Strategic Valuable Features Map 1 - Strategic Greenspace Areas and Links.	The Strategic Valuable Features Map 1 - Strategic Greenspace Areas and Links and Overlay Map 1 - Biodiversity generally reflects existing vegetation cover and areas of habitat. The local area framework mapping recognises a much broader environmental outcome including the connection (links) between dislocated areas of vegetation.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	96, 414,
3.3.2.1 OV1	Biodiversity	Express concern regarding the use of offset planting to facilitate development.	Environmental outcomes are to be facilitated through the designations, providing a range in lot size, the protection of riparian areas and waterways, identification of biodiversity values, and the proposed use of offset / compensatory planting of native vegetation.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	386, 383,
3.3.2.1 OV1	Biodiversity	Express concern regarding environmental impacts or the removal of natural vegetation and habitat from urban development.	The draft designations were proposed having regard to the natural values and features across the Ipswich local government area with the most significant natural areas to be protected by inclusion in the Conservation designation. Environmental outcomes are also facilitated through the use of lot size, the protection of riparian areas and waterways, identification of biodiversity values, and the proposed use of offset / compensatory planting of native vegetation.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	37, 51, 234, 253, 315, 318, 324, 328, 336, 357, 375, 383, 400, 403, 407, 449, 455,
3.3.2.1 OV1	Biodiversity	Requests greater protection for Koalas.	The Koala is a nationally significant species that is listed as vulnerable and will be protected and conserved through the inclusion of relevant provisions in the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	400, 429,
3.3.2.1 OV1	Biodiversity	Express the view that significant trees should be retained, listed and regulated.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. Vegetation protection provisions exist within Council's local laws or through the use of zonings.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	358,
3.3.2.1 OV1	Biodiversity	Request that specific areas identified as Matters of State Environmental Significance (MSES) as shown on Overlay Map 1 - Biodiversity be conserved in appropriate conservation designation particularly where adjacent waterways.	The proposed designations have regard to natural values (including MSES) and features across the Ipswich local government area with the most significant natural areas to be protected by inclusion in the Conservation (CON) and Environmental Management (EM) designations. However, this needs to be balanced with the need for urban consolidation and new suburban development. Additional measures may also be used to facilitate environmental outcomes including rehabilitation and the use of compensatory planting of native vegetation.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	336, 421,
3.3.2.1 OV1	Biodiversity	Request to remove strategic corridor link from specific property in Pine Mountain and Goolman.	The strategic corridor link contains significant patches of vegetation, opportunities for future offset receival, and provides linkage to larger significant core habitat areas.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	301, 305, 299,
3.3.2.1 OV1	Biodiversity	Concerns regarding the accuracy of Overlay Map OV1 – Biodiversity mapping affecting a specific property, or where properties have registered PMAV's over land.	The overlay mapping be reviewed at the time of planning scheme drafting.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	23, 24, 76, 77, 78, 255, 413,
3.3.2.1 OV2	Watercourses and Designated Wetlands	Express the view that waterways, particularly where already degraded, be able to be modified to replicate their natural form. Concern was also expressed that retaining every stream order 1 identified in Overlay Map 2 - Watercourses and Designated Wetlands, would result in development inefficiencies. Concern was also raised that the indicative buffer (riparian areas) identified were overly prescriptive.	The retention of the waterways in their natural form as shown on shown on Overlay Map 2 - Watercourses and Designated Wetlands is the preferred policy position where practicable. This does not preclude rehabilitation or other works from being considered as noted in the Strategic Framework. The buffer distances are identified as indicative and further detail will be included in the relevant code.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	290, 438,
3.3.2.1 OV2	Watercourses and Designated Wetlands	Request the removal or amendment of the minor waterways as many appear to be in the upper catchments, are not vegetated or do not have a defined bed and bank.	The retention of the waterways in their natural form as shown on shown on Overlay Map 2 - Watercourses and Designated Wetlands is the preferred policy position where practicable. The identified waterways (from minor watercourses to rivers) have consequences for development, flooding or ecological connectivity. Identification of the movement of water allows for early design responses, and minimisation of potential downstream consequences.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	355, 368, 485,
3.3.2.1 OV2	Watercourses and Designated Wetlands	Request to protect creeks and waterways, including through the management of stormwater runoff or rehabilitation.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. Major, medium and minor water courses, designated wetlands and associated riparian areas as shown on Strategic Valuable Features Map 2 - Watercourses and Designated Wetlands are intended to be protected and retained in their natural form where practicable (i.e. as an open, non-piped channel with riparian areas).	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the review of the strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	253, 328, 386,
3.3.2.1 OV2	Watercourses and Designated Wetlands	Request that specific minor waters courses as shown on Overlay Map 2 - Watercourses and Designated Wetlands be consolidated over specific land to reflect development approvals.	The relevant mapping will be reviewed having regard to the information provided, and updated to reflect land development.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to update Overlay Map 2 - Watercourses and Designated Wetlands to reflect the changes in land form as a consequence of land development.	255,
3.3.2.1 OV2	Watercourses and Designated Wetlands	Requests that the Minor Watercourse and Buffer is inappropriate as it does not reflect development approvals, development potential or requests review of the mapping.	The overlay map reflects the current location of watercourses throughout the city. The overlay map may be reviewed as a consequence of the implementation of future development approvals.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	362,
3.3.2.2 SVFM2	Watercourses and Designated Wetlands Mapping	Expresses concern with the potential overlap of council and State government mapping of major and medium watercourses, and wetlands.	The comments are related to matters addressed in the <i>Planning Act 2016</i> , the South East Queensland Regional Plan ' <i>ShapingSEQ</i> ' and the State Planning Policy (SPP). The SPP and ShapingSEQ are statutory instruments which expresses the State government interest, including the conservation of watercourses and designated wetlands which are required to be appropriately integrated into the new planning scheme.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	138, 421,
3.3.3	Cultural Heritage	Express the view that greater consideration be given to the heritage of the city.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted, however measures are proposed to be retained in the new planning scheme, such as the conservation of individual places and character areas, including places and landscapes of value to indigenous Aboriginal people.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	400,
3.3.3	Cultural Heritage	Expresses concern with the potential overlap of council and State government identification of cultural landscapes and individual places of cultural significance.	The comments expressed in the comments are noted and are able to be considered as part of the State government interest review.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	421,
3.3.3.2 OV3B	Places of Cultural Heritage	Expresses concern that the entire lot is identified in the Places of Cultural Heritage Significance Overlay (OV3B), even when the heritage aspect is contained to a small portion of the lot.	Although the Cultural Heritage Places or Local Character Areas have generally been identified in the mapping as whole lots, the associated schedule / provisions will provide additional detail.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the review of the strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	292,
3.3.3.2 OV3B	Places of Cultural Heritage	Expresses the view that heritage rules need to be relaxed to allow removal within 500m of railway stations to provide for redevelopment for higher densities.	Overlay OV3B recognises Identified Local Places of Interest, Places and Areas of State Significance, Individual Places of Local Significance and Local Character Areas. This includes the conservation and appropriate use and adaptive reuse, in situ, of places of cultural heritage significance. Consideration has been given to the appropriate balance of densification and heritage values.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	74,
3.4 Development Constraints					
3.4	General - Development Constraints	Expresses concern regarding the use of land use designations to respond to a constraint, or multiple constraints to mitigate the impacts, rather than assessment of the overlays.	In the proposed framework, zoning of land is identified as one method of managing specific natural hazard risk (such as significant difficult topography). Land use designations were determined using a variety of inputs, including development constraints, and were proposed based on consideration of a broader context of adequate provision of all land types and achievement of the stated goals of the proposed framework for the future development of the city.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	292, 364, 368, 485, 487, 488,
3.4.2.1 OV4A-D	Defence Facilities and Activities	Expresses the view that the Australian Noise Exposure Forecast mapping used needs to be updated.	Council has accessed the latest Australian Noise Exposure Forecast mapping as provided through the State Planning Policy Interactive Mapping System.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	421,
3.4.2.1 OV4A-D	Defence Facilities and Activities	Request that consideration be given to increase the Height Restriction Zone as shown on Overlay Map 4A - Defence Facilities- Height Restriction Zone and Obstruction Clearance Surface from 15m to 20m.	The proposed height restriction reflects the mapping included on the State Planning Policy Interactive Mapping System which has not changed in this location. This matter was also considered as part of the preparation of Implementation Guideline No. 29 - Yamanto Central Planning & Development Guidelines with building heights of over 15m able to be assessed as part of the development assessment process.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	469,
3.4.2.2 OV5	Unexploded Ordnance (UXO)	Expresses the view that the inclusion of the UXO Warnings Required on Overlay Map OV5 - Unexploded Ordinance (UXO) over specific land is not supported.	The proposed overlay map replicates the existing Overlay Map OV7E - Unexploded Ordinance (UXO) Areas mapping as contained in the current planning scheme which is consistent with the inclusion of the area in the slight UXO categorisation on Defence mapping.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	138, 302, 305, 389,
3.4.2.2 OV5	Unexploded Ordnance (UXO)	Expresses the view that specific mapping anomalies where the UXO Clearance Required mapping as shown on Overlay Map OV5 - Unexploded Ordinance (UXO) does not align with new development in Redbank Plains.	Recommend that changes be made to the strategic framework mapping to reflect relevant State clearance advice.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to update Overlay Map OV5 – Unexploded Ordinance (UXO) to reflect State clearance advice.	18,

Section	Strategic Framework Theme	Submitter Issues	Response	Recommendation to Council	Submitter No.
3.4.3.2 OV7	Key Resource Areas (KRAs)	Expresses the view that the: - separation Area surrounding the Key Resource Area (KRA) or Haul Route and Buffer as shown on Overlay Map OV7 - Key Resource Areas (KRAs) is not supported in its current form and is requested to be amended or removed; - Council object to any future proposed extension of Russells Road, Pine Mountain across the river to extract sand and gravel from the flood plain on crown land; or - Council object to any future proposal to extract sand and gravel from the flood plain on crown land at Pine Mountain.	The Separation Area included on Overlay Map OV7 – Key Resource Areas (KRAs) has been incorporated to reflect the State government’s interests expressed in the State Planning Policy (SPP) and supporting mapping included on the SPP Interactive Mapping System. The SPP is a statutory instrument which expresses the State government’s interests in land use planning and development, and is required to be appropriately integrated into the new planning scheme.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework) and the matter be referred to Department of State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning.	303, 305, 389, 413,
3.4.3.2 OV6	Mining Influence Areas	Expresses the view that data supporting Overlay Map OV6 - Mining Influence Areas could be updated to more accurately map past mining activities and incorporate standardised mapping symbology.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. Council undertakes incremental updates to the mining influence areas map to ensure the accuracy and currency of the mapping. Development proposed over properties mapped on Overlay Map OV6 - Mining Influence Areas are usually supported by site specific geotechnical assessments. No further review of the Overlay Map OV6 - Mining Influence Areas is proposed at present however the submission shall be considered in future reviews.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	369,
3.4.3.2 OV6	Mining Influence Areas	Express the view that specific land identified on Overlay Map OV6 – Mining Influence Areas is inaccurate as the submitter indicates they possess conflicting underground mining mapping.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. Overlay Map OV6 – Mining Influence Areas is informed by specialist geotechnical reporting and in the absence of supporting information no further action can be taken for review.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	26,
3.4.4.1 OV8	Bushfire Risk Areas	Expresses the view that there is an error in the legend of the Bushfire Risk Area mapping.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted, and the relevant mapping is to be reviewed.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the review of the strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	368,
3.4.4.1 OV8	Bushfire Risk Areas	Express concern regarding the application and generation of mapping of Bushfire Risk Areas including transitional bushfire risk areas.	Overlay Map 8 - Bushfire Risk Areas integrates and replaces the Bushfire Prone Area (BPA) map generally consistent with the State Planning Policy (SPP) and mapping included on the SPP Interactive Mapping System. The SPP is a statutory instrument which expresses the State government’s interests in land use planning and development, and is required to be appropriately integrated into the new planning scheme. The new planning scheme will include relevant codes and provisions, including in relation to Transitional Bushfire Risk Areas and Potential Bushfire Impact Buffers. The comments expressed in the submission are noted and will be considered when preparing the new planning scheme, including review of the mapping.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme, including review of the overlay mapping in this area.	364, 469, 487, 488,
3.4.4.1 OV8	Bushfire Risk Areas	Request that the Transitional Bushfire Risk Area on specific land in Eden's Crossing be narrowed based on recent Bushfire Assessment reports provided in support of a recent approval.	Overlay Map 8 - Bushfire Risk Areas integrates and replaces the Bushfire Prone Area (BPA) map consistent with the State Planning Policy (SPP) and mapping included on the SPP Interactive Mapping System. The SPP is a statutory instrument which expresses the State government’s interests in land use planning and development, and is required to be appropriately integrated into the new planning scheme. The new planning scheme will include relevant codes and provisions, including in relation to Transitional Bushfire Risk Areas and Potential Bushfire Impact Buffers. The comments expressed in the submission are noted and will be considered when preparing the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme, particularly the codes and provisions relating to transition and buffer areas.	255,
3.4.4.1 OV8	Bushfire Risk Areas	Express concern that superseded mapping has been used as there is no significant vegetation contained on the site or the mapping does not reflect the actual quantum of vegetation in a locality.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted, and the relevant mapping is to be reviewed as the land in question has been modified as a consequence of land development.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to update Overlay Map 9 - Difficult topography to reflect the changes in land form as a consequence of land development where relevant.	134, 206,
3.4.4.2 OV9	Difficult Topography	Request that engineering works be recognised as an option to reduce the slope below 15%.	Methods that minimise slope disturbance on land with a slope of 15% to 21% remains the preferred policy position, however as noted in the draft Strategic Framework this does not preclude the consideration of bulk earthworks that modify land as part of an engineering solution.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	421, 438,
3.4.4.2 OV9	Difficult Topography	Expresses the view that the mapping of areas of difficult topography seems to have significantly increased compared to the current scheme and should not apply in some areas.	Overlay Map 9 - Difficult topography has been updated to more accurately reflect land form using contemporary computer modelling.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	355, 364, 368, 461, 485, 487, 488,
3.4.4.2 OV9	Difficult Topography	Expresses concern at the inclusion of specific land on Overlay Map 9 - Difficult topography or that the land has been modified as a result of approved development.	The land in question has been modified as a consequence of land development.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to update Overlay Map 9 - Difficult topography to reflect the changes in land form as a consequence of land development.	138, 298, 453, 469,
3.4.4.3 OV10	Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths	Expresses concern with the use of terminology including 'probable' and Probable Maximum Flood (PMF).	The term 'probable' is used in floodplain management as "Probable Maximum Flood". That is, the largest flood that could conceivably be expected to occur, usually based on the theoretical maximum level of precipitation in a defined catchment. It is used to define the maximum extent of flood prone land, that is, the floodplain. The State Planning Policy Technical Guidance in meeting the state interest requires schemes to identify the nature, and potential consequences of flooding associated with a range of events rarer than the defined flood event up to and including the PMF event. For the Brisbane and Bremer River floodplains the Brisbane River Catchment Flood Study defines the flood plain (that is PMF) as a 1:100,000 AEP event. This is what has been used in the proposed Overlay Map 10 - Flooding and Major Urban Catchment Flow Paths.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the review of the strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	101, 147, 154, 156, 157, 195, 169, 174, 177, 249, 250, 252, 257, 298, 341, 387, 402, 405, 443, 441, 491, 501,
3.4.4.3 OV10	Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths	Express the view that the existence of Wivenhoe Dam has reduced the risk of flooding and improved dam management would reduce the impact of future events or Wivenhoe Dam was mismanaged and this has overstated the flood impact, being part of the class action currently before the courts.	SEQ Water is responsible for operating the Wivenhoe Dam. The State Government Department of Energy and Water Supply in 2014 investigated operating options for the Wivenhoe and Somerset Dams including consultation and presentation of findings in the Wivenhoe and Somerset Dams Optimisation Study Report and associated Discussion Paper. The Brisbane River Catchment Flood Study and its associated floodplain management provisions provide a comprehensive review of flooding within the overall Brisbane River catchment including considering the effect of flood mitigation structures such as dams in different flood event scenarios. This included the testing of both 'with-dams conditions' and 'no-dams conditions' which included Wivenhoe dam. The flood information used in the proposed OV10 utilises the technical outputs from both studies and is consistent with the recommendations of the SFMP. Any current litigation surrounding the dam management is a matter that will be determined through the relevant judicial processes. The outcomes of this action are uncertain as the matter is yet to be determined.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	105, 107, 124, 147, 158, 165, 184, 195, 207, 208, 210, 211, 212, 226, 238, 239, 242, 248, 270, 257, 319, 321, 338, 387, 403, 405, 440, 441, 491, 501,
3.4.4.3 OV10	Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths	Express the view that the overlay mapping should be based on historic levels from known events and to represent "possible" floods, or the historic levels are enough and a 500mm freeboard as currently required is enough to allow for the possibility of higher floods in the future.	The State Planning Policy (SPP) Flood Hazard Interest requires when making a local planning instrument that Council adopt a catchment based risk management approach to the regulation of development in the floodplain. This includes consideration of events higher and lower than a single event and must include the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF). Further, the Queensland Flood Commission of Inquiry in its recommendations identified that a "focus on the Q100 and one defined event should not continue" and further that reliance on historical flood information is prudent only until a comprehensive flood study of the Brisbane River catchment (including the Bremer River) is completed. The comments in the submissions are noted and will be considered in the drafting of the new scheme, particularly in relation to determining the freeboard for the purposes of regulating development in flood hazard areas.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	19, 42, 65, 105, 106, 107, 135, 156, 157, 162, 164, 165, 167, 169, 210, 212, 213, 238, 239, 257, 266, 270, 332, 333, 387, 403, 405, 441, 448, 459, 491, 501,

Section	Strategic Framework Theme	Submitter Issues	Response	Recommendation to Council	Submitter No.
3.4.4.3 OV10	Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths	Expresses the view that the proposed levels are not "accurate" to a historic level.	<p>Following publication of the findings and recommendations of the Queensland Floods Commission of Inquiry, the state government in collaboration with Ipswich City Council, Brisbane City Council, Somerset Regional Council, Lockyer Valley Regional Council and other stakeholders undertook the Brisbane River Catchment Flood Study (Flood Study) and subsequently prepared the Brisbane River Catchment Strategic Floodplain Management Plan (SFMP). This work is collectively referred to as the Brisbane River Catchment Flood Studies (BRCFS). To account for the variation in flooding that can occur, the Brisbane River Catchment Flood Study produced the most comprehensive and sophisticated flood modelling of its kind undertaken in Australia to produce modelling for 11 flood events ranging from highly likely flood events (1 in 10 AEP) through to extremely unlikely flood events (1 in 100,000 AEP).</p> <p>The hydrologic assessment investigated how combinations of rainfall, dam levels, ground conditions and tide influences could merge to create potential flood events within the floodplain. This assessment considered the entire Brisbane River catchment (including the Lockyer Valley and other regions outside of the Brisbane River floodplain).</p> <p>The hydraulic assessment used the data inputs from the hydrology assessment to model how floodwaters progressed through the Brisbane River floodplain, taking into account terrain characteristics of rivers, creeks and floodplains, and infrastructure such as bridges, stormwater networks, dams and levees. The hydraulic assessment generated flood modelling for the lower Brisbane River downstream of Wivenhoe Dam.</p> <p>Producing modelling and outputs across the large area of the Brisbane River catchment meant that a 30 metre modelling grid and 15 metre output grid were used. This represents a limitation to the scale at which the information can be applied without further refinement, for example to be able to apply it at the individual property level. Consequently, additional flood modelling (referred to as the Ipswich Rivers Flood Study Update (IRFSU)) has been undertaken that both refines the modelling from the BRCFS as well as expanding the modelling to cover the parts of the Bremer River and other watercourses not covered (with the exception of Blacksnake Creek that does not form part of the Bremer River catchment with the existing flood study used to inform Overlay map 10) and which will produce results at a smaller grid. The preliminary outputs from the IRFSU and other local flood studies have been further refined (to 'smooth' the modelled lines) to provide an improved representation of the flood and risk extents at the individual lot level.</p>	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	19, 47, 97, 101, 105, 106, 124, 134, 147, 154, 156, 158, 159, 161, 162, 164, 167, 169, 175, 184, 185, 193, 195, 208, 210, 211, 213, 237, 238, 249, 250, 252, 257, 259, 263, 267, 270, 282, 319, 321, 322, 331, 332, 333, 334, 338, 344, 349, 355, 363, 387, 402, 413, 425, 440, 441, 443, 491, 494, 496, 501,
3.4.4.3 OV10	Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths	Expresses the view that the proposed mapping will result in limitations to building works associated with existing residences.	Section 3.4.4.3 Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths in the draft Strategic Framework provides a broad policy setting which limits the intensification of residential uses within the medium and high risk areas. Further consideration will occur as the detailed provisions of the scheme are drafted as to how the Overlay may manage the risk of flooding to existing houses where building works are proposed.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	248, 441,
3.4.4.3 OV10	Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths	Concern that the proposed levels will affect the style of house that can be built.	Section 3.4.4.3 Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths in the draft Strategic Framework provides a broad policy setting which limits the intensification of residential uses within the medium and high risk areas. Further consideration will occur as the detailed provisions of the scheme are drafted as to how the Overlay may manage the risk of flooding to existing houses where building works are proposed.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	195, 248, 263, 333, 387, 441, 491, 501,
3.4.4.3 OV10	Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths	Suggests the overlay should use a likelihood or a frequency so that residents can understand how often or likely a flood will be or questions how are residents are supposed to gain certainty from mapping that is designed by chance and probability.	The likelihood of different flood events has been considered in the development of the flood overlay and the setting of the Defined Flood Event for the purposes of regulating new development. In addition the Queensland Flood Commission of Inquiry (QCFI) recommendations included requirements for Council's to publish property specific flood information so that the community can better understand their risk of different flood events. Council is currently engaged in the delivery of the Ipswich Integrated Catchment Plan to address, amongst other matters the Queensland Flood Commission of Inquiry.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	207, 341, 405,
3.4.4.3 OV10	Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths	Concern that the new overlay will deter buyers, impact on property values, or will devalue property values by, on average, 25% equating to \$274 million in property loss.	Land valuations are calculated by the Queensland Government Department of Natural Resources and Mines (DNRM) and are broadly based on land sales data within each geographic area. These land valuations are also a component of Council's rates calculations. Council also has no control over market values and is required to ensure all owners and prospective purchasers are informed of development constraints.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	42, 65, 97, 101, 104, 106, 107, 124, 135, 155, 156, 157, 161, 162, 165, 167, 168, 175, 177, 184, 185, 186, 193, 195, 207, 208, 210, 211, 212, 226, 235, 236, 237, 239, 241, 242, 244, 247, 248, 249, 250, 252, 263, 267, 268, 270, 273, 319, 321, 332, 333, 341, 344, 363, 387, 405, 420, 440, 441, 459, 491, 493, 501,
3.4.4.3 OV10	Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths	Expresses the view that there will be potential adverse impacts on how building work is done and will effect development of the area, or that significant land is available in flood affected areas which is suitable for subdivision as suggested is done in other jurisdictions.	The need to make an application and the assessment criteria by which any application would be assessed is to be reviewed as part of the drafting of the new planning scheme provisions. The Statement of Proposals (including Strategic Framework) provides a broad description of likely policy setting including a general provision for no further residential intensification below the Defined Flood Event (DFE). This position is intended to limit additional persons exposed to potential flood hazard.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	99, 118, 169, 184, 195, 241, 235, 249, 250, 252, 263, 321, 349, 387, 402, 441, 443, 491, 493, 501,
3.4.4.3 OV10	Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths	Concern that insurances will be increased due to the new flood mapping or insurers will not insure houses.	Finance and insurance companies undertake their own assessments to determine whether to finance or insure a property and the associated rates and premiums. Council is not involved in these processes. Planning scheme flood regulation provisions are designed for use in relation to land use planning and development matters to regulate future development and should not be used in relation to property insurance.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	42, 101, 104, 106, 107, 124, 134, 135, 154, 161, 162, 165, 167, 168, 169, 175, 177, 184, 185, 186, 193, 195, 207, 210, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 242, 247, 249, 250, 252, 263, 267, 268, 270, 273, 319, 321, 323, 332, 333, 341, 344, 363, 387, 397, 402, 403, 405, 413, 419, 420, 440, 441, 459, 491, 495, 501,
3.4.4.3 OV10	Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths	Concern that the new flood line is different to the Adopted Flood Regulation Line in the current planning scheme.	The current Adopted Flood Regulation Line is based on the greatest of the defined flood levels from the Ipswich Planning Scheme 2006 (1 in 100 Line) and the 1974 and 2011 historical flood lines. In contrast the proposed Defined Flood Event is a modelled event based on a comprehensive flood study of the Brisbane and Bremer Rivers and utilises a 1%AEP event with a Climate Change Factor as a defined flood event across the city.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	155, 236, 349, 412,
3.4.4.3 OV10	Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths	Expresses the view that Council should be investing more strategically in mitigating flood waters rather than just re-zoning or re-mapping the constraint, or that there should be a plan to provide more flood structures such as through the use of Flood Gates to 'flood proof the CBD'.	The Brisbane River Catchment Flood Study and subsequent Strategic Floodplain Management Plan (SFMP) provides a framework for Councils within the Brisbane River Catchment to consider that broader implications for flood plain management across the catchment and across a number of different components of flood risk management, including structural mitigation. Several opportunities have been identified in the SFMP as opportunities for Council to further explore that are consistent with the principals of catchment wide management of the SFMP. These will form part of local assessments in the Ipswich Integrated Catchment Plan.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	52, 129, 212, 242, 247, 257, 341, 399, 448,
3.4.4.3 OV10	Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths	Expresses the view that Council will loose a massive income from rate repayments due to reduction in property values, or that rates should be reduced as a result of the proposed overlay.	Land valuations are calculated by the Queensland Government Department of Natural Resources and Mines (DNRM) and are broadly based on land sales data within each geographic area. These land valuations are also a component of Council's rates calculations.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	106, 162, 212, 236, 239, 344, 405, 441,
3.4.4.3 OV10	Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths	Expresses the view that flood heights are trending lower and have been since the construction of Wivenhoe Dam in 1984.	Whilst historic events are an indicator of future flood potential and are used in the calibration of hydraulic results, contemporary and best-practice flood modelling utilises a statistical analysis of past rainfall to determine each design flood event based on a specific likelihood of its occurrence and not any specific historic event.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	105, 165, 210, 441,

Section	Strategic Framework Theme	Submitter Issues	Response	Recommendation to Council	Submitter No.
3.4.4.3 OV10	Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths	Expresses the view that the use of subjective variables such as climate change and urban development should not be used to justify the large increase in the proposed new defined flood level.	<p>The State Planning Policy framework and State Interest Statement for Natural Hazards requires local planning instruments including planning schemes address, "The risks associated with natural hazards, including the projected impacts of climate change, are avoided or mitigated to protect people and property and enhance the community's resilience to natural hazards."</p> <p>Further the Brisbane River Catchment Flood Study Strategic Floodplain Management Plan concluded that the catchment is particularly sensitive to the effects of climate change and the cumulative impact of filling across the floodplain. These conclusions are evidenced in the Technical Evidence Report accompanying the Strategic Floodplain Management Plan. The defined flood level proposed in the draft overlay utilises the Representative Concentration Pathway (RCP) 8.5 recommended by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change as the likely scenario and future concentrations based on current emissions.</p>	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	102, 105, 212, 235, 420,
3.4.4.3 OV10	Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths	Expresses the view that existing infrastructure is inadequate or not correctly maintained and should be better managed to avoid localised flooding.	In addition to topographical and rain fall information a core function of a hydraulic models inputs includes identification of existing infrastructure particularly trunk drainage structures. The operation of these trunk structures is therefore considered and represented in the flood model outputs that are used in the preparation of overlay mapping.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	238, 323,
3.4.4.3 OV10	Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths	Expresses the view that if the use of Probable Maximum Flood (low to very low risk) is intended to manage only new critical infrastructure, why is it mapped over residential areas and not available separately for the assessment of these uses.	The State Planning Policy Technical Guidance in meeting the state interest requires schemes to identify the nature, and potential consequences of flooding associated with a range of events rarer than the Defined Flood Event (DFE) up to and including the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) event. Whilst it is a decision for the Planning Scheme to determine how PMF is to apply to development, consideration must be given to the effect on community infrastructure and in particular avoid vulnerable uses between the DFE and PMF.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	134, 177, 214, 273,
3.4.4.3 OV10	Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths	Concern that continuing to permit bulk earthworks under the Defined Flood Event (DFE) will create far reaching impacts on properties along the river and downstream, or within the Moderate Risk Area balance cut and fill should be recognised as an exception to the general principle of avoidance for residential uses or for the provision of infrastructure.	<p>The broad policy position proposed in the draft Strategic Framework provides a general presumption of no further earthworks in High Risk areas and only compensatory earthworks are to occur in Moderate Risk areas and generally no further residential intensification below the Defined Flood Event.</p> <p>The Strategic Floodplain Management Plan (SFMP) developed as part of the Brisbane River Catchment Flood Studies (BRDFS) identified the Brisbane and Bremer River catchments are particularly sensitive to the cumulative impacts of filling. An additional body or work is current being prepared to provide further regional analysis on this matter that may further inform future Council policy on filling within the floodplain.</p>	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	19, 60, 259, 292, 349, 391, 438, 485,
3.4.4.3 OV10	Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths	Expresses the view that future development in flood prone regions (Major and Defined Flood Event area) should not be permitted, especially for medium and high density residential, or that additional residential development be prevented in Moderate Risk Areas.	<p>The broad policy position proposed in the draft Strategic Framework provides a general presumption of no further residential exposure in Moderate Risk areas, unless in an identified Special Flood Resilient Precinct. In these identified areas, residential intensification is generally considered tolerable where there is adequate warning time before flooding to allow for evacuation that is designed and constructed to mitigate the likely flood hazard to a tolerable or acceptable level by:</p> <p>(A) enabling the self-evacuation of residents and visitors via established evacuation routes external to the site;</p> <p>(B) the finished floor level of all habitable floor space being above the Defined Flood Level and the additional required freeboard;</p> <p>(C) maintaining existing flood storage, not impeding flood flows into the site and enabling flood waters to recede from the site;</p> <p>(D) incorporating flood resilient design and construction methods for building and structures located below the Defined Flood Level;</p> <p>(E) locating flood sensitive services, connections, utilities (including point of connection), plant and equipment (such as electrical switch-boards, data servers or lift machinery) above the Defined Flood Level and the additional required freeboard or provide protection to prevent water inundation.</p>	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	89, 206, 323, 391,
3.4.4.3 OV10	Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths	Expresses concern that the increase in flood levels above known historic events is arbitrary and there has been no appropriate scientific evidence to support the new delineated strategies.	The proposed flood overlay is principally based on the outputs of the Brisbane River Catchment Flood Study which produced the most comprehensive flood modelling of its kind ever undertaken in Australia. The study analysed and produced modelling for a full range of flood events ranging from highly likely flood events (1 in 10 AEP) through to extremely unlikely flood events (1 in 100,000 AEP). In addition, locally refined modelled outputs have been prepared to define the extents proposed for the overlay. The extents identified in each of these risk categories is the best available information on the impacts of different likelihoods of flooding across the Ipswich Local Government Area taking into account the latest understanding of the regional impacts from the Brisbane River Flood Study and the Ipswich Rivers Flood Studies Update.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	102, 105, 212,
3.4.4.3 OV10	Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths	Expresses concern that the levels adopted should be consistent downstream and reflected in other strategic planning maps.	Submissions varied in their reference both to other localities within Ipswich City, as well as land in adjacent local government authorities and planning instruments. Hydraulic gradient across the catchment, in addition to the complex interactions at the confluence between the Bremer and the Brisbane River mean that a single level or (AHD) is not an accurate representation of the likely behaviour of flood waters during an event. However, the standardisation of a single flood event to derive the extent of the "moderate risk" area provides a consistency in approach across the city that hasn't been available previously. The policy decision as to which defined event, level and what type of development is appropriate is a matter for each local government authority to manage and consider in the context of community tolerability of risk and the bounds of the policy framework set by legislation. The Brisbane River Catchment Flood Study provides some guidance in this regard to achieve regional consistency and further, the State Planning Policy provides the policy framework that local governments must work within which provides a level of technical consistency at the state level.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	154, 186, 193, 207, 214, 239, 259, 267, 344, 412, 441,
3.4.4.3 OV8	Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths	Concern that the flood map should not have been made public until it is finalised, rather than release a "draft" map.	The Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework) is an early step in the process of the drafting the new planning scheme. The consultation was undertaken to seek early feedback on the community's thoughts, concerns and suggestions as a demonstration of transparency and to help shape the final version of the Strategic Framework and inform the future drafting of the new planning scheme. Council has made this information available in order to be transparent and for the purpose of public interest.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	65, 405
3.4.4.3 OV10	Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths	Express the view that the concept of 'flood resilient precincts' for permitting residential development e.g. in North Ipswich is 'foolhardy' and should not be allowed.	Flood Resilient Precincts have also been identified in Overlay Map 10 - Flooding and Major Urban Catchment Flow Paths. Land in these precincts is located within or in proximity to higher order centres and major public transport nodes where higher density residential development would be consistent with achieving appropriate land use outcomes and having regard to the flood risk, evacuation routes and potential to mitigate the risk to a tolerable level through flood resilient design. Flood resilient design, construction and materials can minimise damage caused by flood waters and significantly reduce the time to recover after a flood. Examples include the use of sealable basements, the mix of uses (for example non-residential uses such as car parking, retail or commercial uses on the ground and lower floors with residential units above) and the use of water resistant materials and non-cavity walls. In particular, the mid to high rise development form sought in these precincts provides the opportunity to achieve a flood resilient design response whilst providing a safe vehicular evacuation route.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	391,
3.4.4.3 OV10	Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths	Stated that the specific land has never flooded and is now shown to be at "risk".	The current Adopted Flood Regulation Line is based on the greatest of the defined flood levels from the Ipswich Planning Scheme 2006 (1 in 100 Line) and the 1974 and 2011 historical flood lines. In contrast the proposed Defined Flood Event is a modelled event based on a comprehensive flood study of the Brisbane and Bremer Rivers and utilises a 1%AEP event with a Climate Change Factor. Whilst the current precautionary approach has been appropriate for its time and considered a prudent approach by the Queensland Flood Commission of Inquiry, it was only ever intended to continue until such time as the Brisbane River Catchment Flood Study and associated floodplain management recommendations had been finalised.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	42, 47, 147, 154, 155, 158, 161, 164, 168, 169, 174, 175, 238, 349, 334,
3.4.4.3 OV10	Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths	Expresses the view that the specific land is identified as a low risk but has never flooded, or that in order for flood waters to reach the levels mapped, flooding would be catastrophic and inundate most of Brisbane and Ipswich.	The "Low to Very Low Risk" area or Balance Floodplain includes less likely events up to and including the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) and is used to define the theoretical extent of the floodplain. This is an important consideration in floodplain management and recognises that, although very unlikely, there is a possibility that a larger magnitude event may impact the site. Land identified though in this area may be subject to a variety of events larger than the Defined Flood Event although due to the impact of, and likelihood of one of these events occurring it is considered unnecessary to require additional land use requirements for the majority of development types.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	65, 97, 101, 104, 106, 124, 134, 147, 154, 155, 156, 157, 164, 168, 169, 174, 177, 186, 195, 193, 208, 210, 211, 212, 237, 263, 268, 273, 249, 250, 319, 321, 322, 338, 341, 344, 363, 387, 402, 405, 413, 443, 491, 501,
3.4.4.3 OV10	Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths	Stated that the specific land has never flooded to the level indicated in the overlay map.	The current Adopted Flood Regulation Line is based on the greatest of the defined flood levels from the Ipswich Planning Scheme 2006 (1 in 100 Line) and the 1974 and 2011 historical flood lines. In contrast the proposed Defined Flood Event is a modelled event based on a comprehensive flood study of the Brisbane and Bremer Rivers and utilises a 1%AEP event with a Climate Change Factor. In many instances, individual properties are unlikely to have ever been subject to a flood event resembling levels of the DFE, and where levels may be similar the impact will be different to that of other and possibly neighbouring properties. This recognises that no two floods are the same and reflects a difference in policy direction required of the planning scheme toward a risk based approach.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	2, 102, 105, 106, 117, 135, 154, 157, 158, 159, 162, 164, 165, 167, 175, 184, 210, 213, 237, 238, 244, 262, 267, 270, 405,
3.4.4.3 OV10	Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths	Concern that the proposed flood level is different to the level shown in the property searches at the time that the specific land was purchased or built.	<p>The flood levels used in land use planning and the regulation of development via the planning scheme has changed over time with regulation evolving over time particularly with the introduction of new information and policy.</p> <p>Flood searches reflect information that is relevant at the time the search is undertaken and identifies the flood levels that would be applicable to a development application if it were made at that time. They do not override the statutory planning provisions that apply to a development application if lodged at a subsequent date and those provisions, over time have changed.</p>	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	2, 42, 135, 154, 159, 184, 237, 239, 247, 267, 273, 319, 321, 332, 333, 338, 341, 405, 459,

Section	Strategic Framework Theme	Submitter Issues	Response	Recommendation to Council	Submitter No.
3.4.4.3 OV10	Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths	Concern with the lack of compensation.	<p>The relevant legislation is the <i>Planning Act 2016</i> (Section 29, 30 and 31). An affected owner with an interest in premises may claim compensation at the time an adverse planning change starts to have effect because of the adverse planning change.</p> <p>An adverse planning change is a planning change that reduces the value of an interest in premises. However, planning change (s29(2)) only occurs when the planning scheme is being amended or replaced, or any of the planning scheme policies were amended, replaced or repealed, or a new planning scheme policy was made for the planning scheme.</p> <p>As the Statement of Proposals (including draft Strategic framework) is not a planning change under the Act, there is no deleterious effect to the value of an interest in premises and a claim for compensation under section 31 cannot be made by virtue of section 30.</p>	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	2, 61, 237, 241, 267, 344, 397, 412,
3.4.4.3 OV9	Flooding and Major Urban Stormwater Flowpaths	Concern that the proposed overlay mapping does not reflect the existing development approval.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted and this matter will be reviewed as part of the development of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	206, 342, 367, 469,
3.4.5.2 OV11	Major Transport Infrastructure	Express concern with specific State Road Noise Corridor mapping included on Overlay Map 11 - Major Transport Infrastructure.	<p>The State Road Noise Corridors included on Overlay Map 11 - Major Transport Infrastructure have been incorporated to identify areas of land in the local government area that may be adversely affected by environmental emissions generated by transport infrastructure consistent with the State Planning Policy (SPP) and mapping included on the SPP Interactive Mapping System.</p> <p>The SPP is a statutory instrument which expresses the State government’s interests in land use planning and development, and is required to be appropriately integrated into the new planning scheme.</p>	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	304, 389, 469,
3.4.5.5 OV15	High Pressure Pipelines	Request that further consideration be given regarding the purpose of the overlay and the extent included as shown on Overlay Map 15 - High Pressure Pipelines.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted and this matter will be reviewed as part of the development of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the review of the strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	283,
3.5	Growth Management				
3.5.2	South East Queensland Regional Plan (Shaping SEQ)	Expresses non support for Table 3.4 as a mechanism for achieving the aims of the Regional Plan for promoting higher densities in urban environments.	<p>The draft strategic framework, including the local area frameworks, precinct maps, land use transect, and the residential typologies and densities set out in Table 3.4, were prepared having regard to the valuable features to be conserved, development constraints, and achieving sustainable growth management and infrastructure provision to support the growth and development across the Ipswich local government area.</p> <p>The draft Local Area Frameworks include a range of development options and the Local Area Frameworks and Precincts Maps have a ‘planned’ capacity that is able to accommodate between 156,000 and 201,000 additional dwellings and 430,000 jobs to meet the dwelling benchmarks and employment baselines as set out in the South East Queensland Regional Plan (Shaping SEQ).</p>	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	439,
3.5.2	South East Queensland Regional Plan (Shaping SEQ)	Expressed objection to the planned increase in population for Ipswich.	Council is required to demonstrate alignment with the State Planning Policy and the South East Queensland Regional Plan (Shaping SEQ), including identification of sufficient land for housing to accommodate the dwelling targets in Shaping SEQ.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	264,
3.5.3 SFM1	Sustainable Land Use	Concern was raised about whether there was an overall population plan.	The draft Local Area Frameworks include a range of development options and the Local Area Frameworks and Precincts Maps have a ‘planned’ capacity that is able to accommodate between 156,000 and 201,000 additional dwellings and 430,000 jobs to meet the dwelling benchmarks and employment baselines as set out in the South East Queensland Regional Plan (Shaping SEQ).	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	234,
3.5.3 SFM1	Sustainable Land Use	Express concern regarding small lot development.	The draft strategic framework, including the local area frameworks, precinct maps, land use transect, and the residential typologies and densities set out in Table 3.4, were prepared having regard to the valuable features to be conserved, development constraints, and achieving sustainable growth management and infrastructure provision to support the growth and development across the Ipswich local government area.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	51, 315, 400,
3.5.3 SFM1	Sustainable Land Use	Express the view that high density areas be restricted to areas serviced by rail or major bus services with appropriate infrastructure.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted, however most areas identified for higher density purposes are included in or around centre locations, have or will have higher levels of public transport, or reflect existing development or current zoning.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	264,
3.5.3 SFM1	Sustainable Land Use	Expresses support for sections 3.5.4 and 3.5.5.	The support and comments expressed in the submission are noted.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	320,
3.5.3 SFM1	Sustainable Land Use	Express support for higher density along train lines and in areas that are currently underutilised rather than continued urban expansion and clearing of bushland.	The support and comments expressed in the submission are noted.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	3, 37, 386, 449,
3.5.3 SFM1	Sustainable Land Use	Support was provided for the division of residential areas into 'new suburban' and 'established suburban', particularly in protecting the amenity of existing suburbs.	The support and comments expressed in the submission are noted.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	232,
3.5.4 SFM2	Centres and Employment	Expresses support for the status of Yamanto as a district centre, and requests that further consideration be given to incorporating differentiation between district centres based on function.	The support and comments expressed in the submission are noted.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	469,
3.5.4 SFM2	Centres and Employment	Express concern regarding the prospects, need and trade impacts associated with the potential expansion of an existing local centre on Raceview Street, Raceview.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. The expansion or re-development of an existing local centre will require development assessment, including in relation to centre hierarchy and economic need. Similar provisions are likely to be included in the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the strategic framework and during the drafting of the new planning scheme, particularly in relation to the zoning, centre hierarchy and distribution.	379, 401, 437,
3.5.4 SFM2	Centres and Employment	Express concern regarding the development application for a shopping centre in proximity to Cascade and Raceview Street, Raceview and the impact approval would have on existing centres.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted, however the site has been included in the Medium Density designation (MD1). Further consideration will be required upon determination of the application.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during drafting of the new planning scheme upon determination of the application.	379, 401,
3.5.4 SFM2	Centres and Employment	Express concern regarding the inclusion of a specific local centre to the south of the Cunningham Highway.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted, however the proposed designation reflects an existing development approval over the site.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	378,
3.5.4.1	City of Centres	Express the concern that the nomination of some future centre locations do not appear to be based on economic merit.	The development of new or existing local centres will require development assessment, including the relationship to the centres hierarchy and economic need. The new planning scheme will include relevant codes and provisions that will apply to new development.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	443, 452,
3.5.4.4 SFM3	Waste (including Waste Activity and Buffer Areas)	Express the view that the new planning scheme ensure that landfills, waste recycling industries and other noxious industries do not impact on the environment, residential and other urban areas, consider cumulative impacts from multiple uses, and do not compromise air and water quality in Ipswich.	The new planning scheme will be drafted having regard to appropriate mitigation measures and the separation of incompatible uses, including the preparation of relevant codes and provisions that will apply to new development.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	221, 400,
3.5.4.4 SFM3	Waste (including Waste Activity and Buffer Areas)	Request for better buffer areas between industry and residential areas.	The new planning scheme will be drafted having regard to appropriate mitigation measures and the separation of incompatible uses, including the preparation of relevant codes and provisions that will apply to new development.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	194,
3.5.4.4 SFM3	Waste (including Waste Activity and Buffer Areas)	Express concern regarding the negative perception, non-compliance, social, health and environmental impacts associated with approved industrial, waste, and other noxious industries.	Matters of non-compliance and environmental nuisance resulting from current approvals are regulated and managed under current legislative frameworks, including by State agencies under environmental licences. The new planning scheme will include relevant codes and provisions that will apply to new development.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	221, 315, 329, 400,

Section	Strategic Framework Theme	Submitter Issues	Response	Recommendation to Council	Submitter No.
3.5.4.4 SFM3	Waste (including Waste Activity and Buffer Areas)	Express concern that planning policy permits the use of mining voids for waste management operations particularly within the Ebenezer and Jeebropilly areas.	Existing use rights attributed through development approvals and the like will continue to have effect. The draft Strategic Framework seeks to balance economic interests against social and environmental interests, and seeks to further regulate applications for new or expanded waste activities to protect existing, approved and planned residential and other sensitive receiving uses from adverse impacts including odour, dust, noise, air quality, and amenity (including visual amenity). The new planning scheme will be drafted having regard to the provisions of the State approved Temporary Local Planning Instrument No. 1 of 2018 (Waste Activity Regulation) including the preparation of relevant codes and provisions that will apply to new development.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	19,
3.5.4.4 SFM3	Waste (including Waste Activity and Buffer Areas)	Express concern that the new planning scheme may place limitations or prevent development seeking to change or expand existing waste activities in Buffer Areas which may prevent opportunities for improved outcomes.	The new planning scheme will be drafted having regard to the provisions of the State approved Temporary Local Planning Instrument No. 1 of 2018 (Waste Activity Regulation) including the preparation of relevant codes and provisions that will apply to new development.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	296,
3.5.4.4 SFM3	Waste (including Waste Activity and Buffer Areas)	Express the view that existing waste operations should cease and that future waste, recycling and waste to energy industries not be permitted in New Chum and Swanbank.	The new planning scheme is unable to apply retrospectively to existing lawful development or to make development prohibited, only the State is able to make specific development prohibited. The new planning scheme will be drafted having regard to appropriate mitigation measures and the separation of incompatible land uses, including the preparation of relevant codes and provisions that will apply to new development.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	32, 197,
3.5.4.4 SFM3	Waste (including Waste Activity and Buffer Areas)	Express the view that landfill of mining voids is not rehabilitation and will impact on the environment, groundwater, waterways, air quality, and the landscape.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	221,
3.5.4.4 SFM3	Waste (including Waste Activity and Buffer Areas)	Express the view that waste to energy industries are not renewable, are inefficient in producing energy, have emissions that will impact further than anticipated, and should not be located near urban areas.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	221,
3.5.4.4 SFM3	Waste (including Waste Activity and Buffer Areas)	Express support for the waste strategy as outlined in section 3.5.4.4.	The support expressed in the submission is noted.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	424,
3.5.4.4 SFM3	Waste (including Waste Activity and Buffer Areas)	Express the view that the new planning scheme should align with the Queensland Waste and Resource Recovery Infrastructure Plan and promote rather than limit the establishment of resource recovery uses in the Swanbank industrial area, including organic waste recycling facilities.	The Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework) has been prepared to reflect the State approved Temporary Local Planning Instrument No. 1 of 2018 (Waste Activity Regulation) and seeks to balance economic interests against social and environmental interests, including the protection of existing, approved and planned residential and other sensitive receiving uses from adverse impacts including odour, dust, noise, air quality, and amenity (including visual amenity). The new planning scheme will include relevant codes and provisions that will apply to new development.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	465,
3.5.4.4 SFM3	Waste (including Waste Activity and Buffer Areas)	Request for amendments to expand the Waste Activity Area as shown on Strategic Framework Map 3 - Waste Activity and Buffer Areas over specific land in Swanbank.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted, however the mapping reflects the State approved Temporary Local Planning Instrument No. 1 of 2018 (Waste Activity Regulation). The matter be referred to The Department of State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning for consideration and where appropriate distributed to the relevant State Agency for their consideration and comment.	1. That the submission be referred to The Department of State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning. 2. That the Manager City Design be authorised to consider the advice from DSDMIP in the drafting of the Planning Scheme.	296,
3.5.5 SFM4	Housing (including Housing Areas)	Expresses support for and requests the continuation of auxiliary units.	The support for the continuation of the current planning scheme's auxiliary units is noted and will be considered in the drafting of new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design acknowledge the support for the continuation of auxiliary units as a consideration in the drafting of the new planning scheme.	224,
3.5.5 SFM4	Housing (including Housing Areas)	Expresses support for and requests the continuation of transferrable dwelling entitlements.	The support for the continuation of the current planning scheme's transferrable dwelling entitlements is noted and will be considered in the drafting of new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design acknowledge the support for the continuation of transferrable dwelling entitlements as a consideration in the drafting of the new planning scheme.	258,
3.5.5 SFM4	Housing (including Housing Areas)	Express the view that the new planning scheme should promote infill development while limiting development elsewhere to minimise the built environment footprint and retain bush corridors.	The draft strategic framework, including the local area frameworks, precinct maps, land use transect, and the residential typologies and densities, were prepared having regard to the valuable features to be conserved, development constraints, and achieving sustainable growth management and infrastructure provision to support the growth and development across the Ipswich local government area. Council is required to demonstrate alignment with the State Planning Policy and the South East Queensland Regional Plan 'ShapingSEQ', including identification of sufficient land for housing to accommodate the dwelling targets in ShapingSEQ.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	375,
3.5.5 SFM4	Housing (including Housing Areas)	Expresses objection to high density housing in Collingwood Park, Redbank Plains, Bellbird Park and Augustine Heights.	A mix of land uses are considered to be suitable in these areas, which includes low, medium and high density areas based on a range of factors such as the existing zoning, biodiversity values, development constraints, proximity to centres, and the availability of infrastructure.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	357,
3.5.5 SFM4	Housing (including Housing Areas)	Expresses the view that the dwelling density rates including auxiliary units, may become problematic for future development expectations.	The draft strategic framework, including the local area frameworks, precinct maps, land use transect, and the residential typologies and densities set out in Table 3.4, were prepared having regard to the valuable features to be conserved, development constraints, achieving a diversity of housing forms, sustainable growth management and infrastructure provision to support both the retention and conservation of existing urban character and the growth and development of new urban development across the Ipswich local government area.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	69, 206, 222, 261, 289, 290, 421, 443, 450, 451, 457, 466, 473, 509,
3.5.5 SFM4	Housing (including Housing Areas)	Expresses the view that the Springfield Structure Plan and Ripley Valley Priority Development Plan are no longer formally recognised.	The new Ipswich Planning Scheme (as per the current planning scheme) will not and does not apply to the Ripley Valley Priority Development Area and is planned and administered by Economic Development Queensland under the <i>Economic Development Act 2012</i> . Likewise the undeveloped areas of Local Framework - Area 4 Springfield Estate and Augustine Heights (part) are administered under the Springfield Structure Plan area. Other growth areas including Redbank Plains, Collingwood Park, and Walloon/Thagoona Rosewood provide for development led master planning.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	421, 425, 443, 450, 451, 457,
3.5.5 SFM4	Housing (including Housing Areas)	Expresses the view that there is an inadequate response to the demand for greenfield land.	The South East Queensland Regional Plan 'ShapingSEQ' sets a dwelling supply benchmark of providing an additional 111,700 dwellings (to accommodate an additional 319,900 people) between 2016 and 2041. Land identified in the Local Area Frameworks and Precincts Maps has a 'planned' capacity that is able to accommodate between 156,000 and 201,000 additional dwellings. Providing development opportunities well in excess of the ShapingSEQ projections.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	222, 421, 457,
3.5.5 SFM4	Housing (including Housing Areas)	Request that consideration be given to the appropriate provision and design of affordable housing, with a particular focus on the social consequences. There continues to be a demand and need for larger lots.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. The draft Strategic Framework provides for the allocation of residential designations that support the delivery of affordable housing and provide choice in housing through supporting the development of a diversity of housing types, forms, sizes, densities (including lot sizes) and tenures in appropriate locations.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	467, 476, 480,
3.5.5 SFM4	Housing (including Housing Areas)	Expresses the view that infill development has the potential for disruption of the prevailing urban fabric and the reduction of privacy.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. The draft Strategic Framework provides for a diversity of housing forms and promotes sustainable growth management to support both the retention and conservation of existing urban character and the growth and development of new urban development across the Ipswich local government area. The new planning scheme will include relevant codes and provisions that address matters including privacy.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	209,
3.5.5 SFM4	Housing (including Housing Areas)	Expressed the view that there is a continued need for planning approval of all forms of multiple dwellings against codes that encourage or protect the prevailing amenity and social wellbeing.	Levels of assessment for multiple dwellings will be considered in association with the drafting of future scheme provisions related to housing, parking and reconfiguring of lots.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	467,
3.5.5 SFM4	Housing (including Housing Areas)	Concern that the provision of public (welfare) housing has a negative impact on the area and the residents, with no consultation with the community.	The comments in the submission regarding State government provided public housing are noted, however the comments are related to matters addressed in the <i>Planning Act 2016</i> , subordinate <i>Planning Regulation 2017</i> and the South East Queensland Regional Plan 'Shaping SEQ' that encourage and promote a diversity of housing forms and densities (particularly where well located), and contain the public consultation requirements for public housing development proposed by the State government.	That no change be recommended to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	477,

Section	Strategic Framework Theme	Submitter Issues	Response	Recommendation to Council	Submitter No.
3.5.5 SFM4	Housing (including Housing Areas)	Expresses the view that there is insufficient large lot residential land available throughout the city.	The designation of Large Lot residential developed land generally reflects existing land use. Despite sometimes having access to some urban services the retention of selective large lot residential areas facilitates, encourages and promotes a diversity of housing forms and densities.	That no change be recommended to the Statement of Proposals (including draft Strategic Framework).	457,
3.5.6	Other Significant Land Uses	Expresses the view that Rural areas appear to be reflective of existing planning scheme provisions and not necessarily looking to consider any appetite for updating provisions to better reflect current conditions.	Areas outside of the South East Queensland Regional Plan's (<i>ShapingSEQ</i>) Urban Footprint and not identified as areas designated for future non-rural uses or increased residential density, the regulatory provisions prevent urban and rural residential sprawl in the Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area (RLRPA) and manages other activity, including subdivision, to protect these values. The regulation also serves to protect areas that might be required for accommodating future urban growth beyond the planning horizon of ShapingSEQ. A non-residential urban use would need to show that the proposal has been able to demonstrate an overriding need in the public interest to establish the use. It is noted that there is no guarantee that such an approved use will be able to demonstrate an overriding need to expand or diversify the use in the future or that a similar use could establish overriding need nearby.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	421,
3.6	Infrastructure				
3.6	Infrastructure - General	Express concern regarding the limited information provided on planned infrastructure to support growth.	The overall urban settlement pattern and form, including location, mix of uses and densities of development, have been based on the efficient, co-ordinated, cost effective and equitable provision of supporting infrastructure (existing and planned) that is integrated with and supports the outcomes of the State Planning Policy and the South East Queensland Regional Plan (Shaping SEQ). The Local Government Infrastructure Plan identifies the local trunk infrastructure networks intended to service existing and future urban development (up to ultimate development) based on the current planning scheme.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	264,
3.6.2	Transport	Express the need to review the table in section 3.6.2 (7)(a) to consider multi-modal travel (e.g. cycling, public transport and walking in one trip) and that section 3.6.2 (7)(e) should be expanded to include cycle catchments when considering mix use and density distributions.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. The matter be referred to Council's Infrastructure Strategy Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department for consideration.	1. That the submission be referred to Council's Infrastructure Strategy Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department. 2. That the Manager City Design be authorised to consider the advice from Council's Infrastructure Strategy Branch in the review of the Strategic Framework and the drafting of the new planning scheme.	394,
3.6.2	Transport	Express the view that Table 3.5 - Ipswich Road and Street Hierarchy does not consider cycling in the hierarchy and should be amended.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. The matter be referred to Council's Infrastructure Strategy Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department for consideration.	1. That the submission be referred to Council's Infrastructure Strategy Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department. 2. That the Manager City Design be authorised to consider the advice from Council's Infrastructure Strategy Branch in the review of the Strategic Framework and the drafting of the new planning scheme.	394,
3.6.2	Transport	Express concern regarding road design standards.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. The matter be referred to Council's Infrastructure Strategy Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department for consideration.	1. That the submission be referred to Council's Building and Plumbing Branch of the Planning and Regulatory Services Department for consideration. 2. Recommend no change to the Strategic Framework.	497,
3.6.2.1 SFM5A	Strategic Transport Network	Express concern regarding levels of congestion, traffic impacts including regard to cumulative impacts, the need for network upgrades and improved capacity, or the need for further transport planning, including the provision of parking.	The Local Government Infrastructure Plan identifies the local transport trunk infrastructure network intended to service existing and future urban development (up to ultimate development) based on the current planning scheme. The matter be referred to Council's Infrastructure Strategy Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department for consideration.	1. That the submission be referred to Council's Infrastructure Strategy Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department. 2. That the Manager City Design be authorised to consider the advice from Council's Infrastructure Strategy Branch in the drafting of the new planning scheme.	20, 37, 57, 62, 64, 74, 75, 81, 99, 109, 194, 232, 234, 264, 318, 324, 329, 358, 394, 449, 469, 478, 479, 482,
3.6.2.1 SFM5A	Strategic Transport Network	Express a need for specific traffic management related changes.	The matter be referred to Council's Infrastructure Strategy Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department for consideration.	1. That the submission be referred to Council's Infrastructure Strategy Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department for consideration. 2. Recommend no change to the Strategic Framework.	81, 197, 324, 329,
3.6.2.1 SFM5A	Strategic Transport Network	Express a need for alignment changes to specific links on the Strategic Transport Network Map 5A – Strategic Transport Network.	Strategic Transport Network Map 5A - Strategic Transport Network is indicative and provides information at a strategic, citywide level. The map was not intended to provide detail at an individual property level. Recommend the review and relevant changes be made to update the strategic framework map to improve accuracy.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to review and update where necessary the Strategic Transport Network Map 5A – Strategic Transport Network to improve accuracy.	255, 362, 461, 472, 487, 488,
3.6.2.1 SFM5A	Strategic Transport Network	Concern with the identification of a future road connection across specific land along Ipswich-Boonah Road and requests information about potential compulsory acquisition, timeframes, land use intent and relevant contact details at the Department of Transport and Main Roads.	Strategic Transport Network Map 5A - Strategic Transport Network identifies the indicated connection as a "Future Major Road Link (Arterial and Sub-Arterial Roads)" and has been carried over from Map 4a Transport Network included in Schedule 7 of the current Ipswich Planning Scheme where it is identified as a "Possible Future Major Intersuburban Link (to be further investigated)" and as an "Intersections / Connections (to be further investigated)". The road connection identified relates to Council level road planning and not State government level road planning (i.e. does not relate to road planning by the Department of Transport and Main Roads). Since being included in the current Ipswich Planning Scheme Council has prepared the City of Ipswich Transport Plan (iGO) and the Local Government Infrastructure Plan (which includes the trunk infrastructure road network). Neither iGO or the Local Government Infrastructure Plan identify a need for a connection across the subject land.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to update Strategic Transport Network Map 5A – Strategic Transport Network to be consistent with iGO and the Local Government Infrastructure Plan.	507,
3.6.2.1 SFM5A	Strategic Transport Network	Expresses concern that a specific Existing Major Road Link on Strategic Transport Network Map 5A - Strategic Transport Network does not exist.	Strategic Transport Network Map 5A - Strategic Transport Network is indicative and provides information at a strategic, citywide level. The map was not intended to provide detail at an individual property level. Recommend changes be made to update the strategic framework map to improve accuracy.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to update Strategic Transport Network Map 5A – Strategic Transport Network to improve accuracy.	251,
3.6.2.1 SFM5A	Strategic Transport Network	Express concern regarding the inclusion of specific Future Major Road Links on Strategic Transport Network Map 5A - Strategic Transport Network.	Strategic Transport Network Map 5A - Strategic Transport Network is indicative and provides information at a strategic, citywide level. The map was not intended to provide detail at an individual property level. The Local Government Infrastructure Plan identifies the local transport trunk infrastructure network intended to service existing and future urban development (up to ultimate development) based on the current planning scheme. The matter be referred to Council's Infrastructure Strategy Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department for consideration.	1. That the submission be referred to Council's Infrastructure Strategy Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department. 2. That the Manager City Design be authorised to consider the advice from Council's Infrastructure Strategy Branch in the drafting of the new planning scheme and subsequent local government infrastructure plan.	110, 148,
3.6.2.2 SFM5B	Strategic Active Transport Network	Express the need for specific changes or network upgrades, such as the inclusion or extension of cycle or pedestrian links, or changes to the Strategic Transport Network Map 5B – Strategic Active Transport Network.	The matter be referred to Council's Infrastructure Strategy Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department for consideration.	1. That the submission be referred to Council's Infrastructure Strategy Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department. 2. That the Manager City Design be authorised to consider the advice from Council's Infrastructure Strategy Branch in the drafting of the new planning scheme and subsequent local government infrastructure plan.	64, 80, 123, 388, 448,
3.6.3	Parks and Recreation (including public parks trunk infrastructure network)	Express the view that an increased number of larger and better quality parks are required with equitable distribution.	The Local Government Infrastructure Plan identifies the local public park trunk infrastructure network intended to service existing and future urban development (up to ultimate development) based on the current planning scheme. The matter be referred to the Sport, Recreation and Natural Resources Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department for consideration when preparing the Local Government Infrastructure Plan.	1. That the submission be referred to Council's Sport, Recreation and Natural Resources Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department. 2. That the Manager City Design be authorised to consider the advice from Council's Sport, Recreation and Natural Resources Branch in the drafting of the new planning scheme and subsequent local government infrastructure plan.	400,

Section	Strategic Framework Theme	Submitter Issues	Response	Recommendation to Council	Submitter No.
3.6.3	Parks and Recreation (including public parks trunk infrastructure network)	Express support for the provision of new skate parks in specific locations, particularly to cater for older children.	The provision of skate parks are currently included as an active recreation embellishment option for local parks. The matter be referred to the Sport, Recreation and Natural Resources Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department for consideration.	1. That the submission be referred to Council's Sport, Recreation and Natural Resources Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department. 2. That the Manager City Design be authorised to consider the advice from Council's Sport, Recreation and Natural Resources Branch in the drafting of the new planning scheme and subsequent local government infrastructure plan.	22, 49,
3.6.3	Parks and Recreation (including public parks trunk infrastructure network)	Request for a sports field and open space in Redbank Plains to be included in the Local Government Infrastructure Plan.	The matter be referred to the Sport, Recreation and Natural Resources Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department for consideration when preparing the Local Government Infrastructure Plan.	1. That the submission be referred to Council's Sport, Recreation and Natural Resources Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department. 2. That the Manager City Design be authorised to consider the advice from Council's Sport, Recreation and Natural Resources Branch in the drafting of the new planning scheme and subsequent local government infrastructure plan.	357,
3.6.3	Parks and Recreation (including public parks trunk infrastructure network)	Express concern regarding the mandatory dedication of riparian land free of compensation to Council for public open space.	The Local Government Infrastructure Plan identifies the local public park trunk infrastructure network intended to service existing and future urban development (up to ultimate development) based on the current planning scheme. Infrastructure charges, offsets and refunds are determined in accordance with the Ipswich Adopted Infrastructure Charges Resolution. The matter be referred to the Sport, Recreation and Natural Resources Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department for consideration when preparing the Local Government Infrastructure Plan.	1. That the submission be referred to Council's Sport, Recreation and Natural Resources Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department. 2. That the Manager City Design be authorised to consider the advice from Council's Sport, Recreation and Natural Resources Branch in the drafting of the new planning scheme and subsequent local government infrastructure plan.	287, 409,
3.6.3 SFM6	Strategic Green Infrastructure	Requested the Open Space and Recreation (including Future Parks) area on Strategic Framework Map 6 - Strategic Green Infrastructure be amended to remove approved developable land.	Recommend changes be made to update the strategic framework map to reflect the development approval.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to update Strategic Framework Map 6 - Strategic Green Infrastructure to reflect the development approval.	444,
3.6.4	Social Infrastructure and Community Facilities (including Community Facilities Trunk Infrastructure Network)	Express support for the inclusion of the existing Redbank Plains library in the new planning scheme.	The provision of libraries are identified as a citywide or district level community facility. The matter be referred to the Performance Branch of the Coordination and Performance Department for consideration.	1. That the submission be referred to Council's Performance Branch of the Coordination and Performance Department. 2. That the Manager City Design be authorised to consider the advice from Council's Performance Branch in the drafting of the new planning scheme and subsequent local government infrastructure plan.	326,
3.7.0	Local Area Frameworks				
3.7.0	General - Local Area Frameworks	Express the view that the Local Frameworks provide detailed planning for over thirty areas, many of which seem to have similar character and development outcomes, which seems excessive and complicated, and their inclusion has the potential to result in a disjointed approach to the planning for the city.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	292, 355, 364, 368, 461, 487, 488,
3.7.2	Area 1 Goodna	Expressed support for the preferred Local Area Framework but does not the support options considered in Local Area Framework.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. The new planning scheme will be drafted having regard to the comments raised.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration of the matters raised during the review of the strategic framework provisions (residential densities) and during the drafting of the new planning scheme (zoning).	428, 466,
3.7.2	Area 1 Goodna	The planning scheme provisions and overlay codes should require a risk management response which restricts further development in the area.	The State Planning Policy (SPP) for the management of a range of hazards (e.g. flooding, bushfire, steep land, undermined land, etc.) requires when making a local planning instrument that Council adopt a risk management approach to the regulation of development associated with these hazards.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	146,
3.7.2	Area 1 Goodna	Express the view that there should not be any medium to high density development in Goodna.	A mix of land uses are considered to be suitable in Goodna, which includes low, medium and high density areas based on a range of factors such as the existing zoning, biodiversity values, development constraints, proximity to centres, and the availability of infrastructure and services.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	323,
3.7.2	Area 1 Goodna	Express concern that the designation of land for Environmental Management does not recognise the existing uses and development assessment approvals.	The land in question is currently zoned for a highly specific purpose which recognises that the land is subject to major flood conveyance / high risk. The Environmental Management designation recognises in part the buffering nature of land to separate or manage development constraints, in this situation flooding. The Environmental Management designation does not diminish the existing use rights attributed to the land.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	58,
3.7.3	Area 2 Carole Park	Express concern regarding need and trade impacts associated with the potential for a neighbourhood centre in the Carole Park area.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. The new planning scheme will be drafted having regard to the comments raised.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration of the matters raised during review of the relevant proposed strategic framework provisions (centre hierarchy and distribution) and during drafting of the new planning scheme (zoning).	453,
3.7.4	Area 3 Camira	Concern was raised in relation to specific land in Camira at the northern end of Woodlands Avenue and Preece Lane being included in the Low Density Residential (LL2) designation.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted, however the proposed designation is generally commensurate with the prevailing lots sizes in the area which are typically between 3,000 to 4,000m ² . Further subdivision opportunities would be limited based on the designation and other relevant mapping.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	166,
3.7.4	Area 3 Camira	Request for land east of Hallett Avenue, Camira in the Low Density Residential (LL2) designation to be changed to the Low Density Residential (LL1) designation.	The southern half of the area is serviced with sewerage infrastructure. The proposed designation reflects the current zoning and provides for a transition of larger urban lots adjacent to Woogaroo Creek to smaller suburban lots east of Old Logan Road.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	25,
3.7.4	Area 3 Camira	Expressed that land west of Old Logan Road should not be further subdivided.	The land in question is predominately in the Low Density Residential (LL1 and LL2) designations which provide for lots between 4,000-6,000m ² and 2,000-3,000m ² respectively within the Local Framework. However, in order to achieve the greatest practical use of existing and new sewerage infrastructure, higher residential densities are proposed for specific localities.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	228,
3.7.4	Area 3 Camira	Express the view that the land in the vicinity of Parkwood Avenue designated Low Density Residential (LL1) to be changed to a Medium Density designation to facilitate the extension of sewerage infrastructure.	The land is constrained by the High Pressure Gas Pipeline and associated buffer, and the Medium Watercourse and buffer (valuable features). The distance of the land from centre locations or high frequency public transport does not warrant further densification.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	306,
3.7.4	Area 3 Camira	Expressed concern that specific land in Carole Park would be developed for industrial purposes.	The land has been included in the proposed Conservation (CON) designation in the draft Strategic Framework which extends east to Sandy Creek.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	203,
3.7.4	Area 3 Camira	Expressed that vegetated /treed land west of Centenary Highway be converted to State Forest.	The land has been included in the proposed Conservation (CON) designation in the draft Strategic Framework.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	166,
3.7.5	Area 4 Springfield Estate and Augustine Heights (part)	Express the view that there needs to be a greater diversity in residential density and form.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. The new planning scheme will be drafted to include relevant codes and provisions that will apply to new development, including the consideration of density and form.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	123,
3.7.5	Area 4 Springfield Estate and Augustine Heights (part)	Express the view of the need for the retention of vegetation in new development.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. The new planning scheme will be drafted to include relevant codes and provisions that will apply to new development, including the consideration of the retention of vegetation.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	123,
3.7.5	Area 4 Springfield Estate and Augustine Heights (part)	Expresses objection to Alternate Options 1 and 2 for the area. Requests that the preferred option as publicly notified be adopted or an Alternate Option that preserves more bushland and aligned with State government assessment of areas of environmental significance.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	455,

Section	Strategic Framework Theme	Submitter Issues	Response	Recommendation to Council	Submitter No.
3.7.5	Area 4 Springfield Estate and Augustine Heights (part)	Expresses the view that 'Greater Springfield' is part of the solution to accommodating future growth in a sustainable manner and operates under a bespoke statutory integrated planning and infrastructure framework that forms part of the Ipswich Planning Scheme which provides certainty for ongoing investment and confidence to businesses, the submissions request that the existing Springfield Structure Plan and the associated infrastructure framework be transitioned without effect in its entirety into the new Ipswich Planning Scheme so as to preserve the current intent, status and practice.	<p>The Springfield Structure Plan carries forward the provisions of a Development Control Plan prepared under the <i>Local Government (Planning and Environment Act) 1990</i>, and which sets out the master planning and development assessment framework for land included in Springfield Structure Plan area. Whilst the Springfield Structure Plan was included in the Ipswich Planning Scheme in 2002 and sought to align the Springfield Structure Plan with the planning legislation at the time, the Springfield Structure Plan retains a different development application process to that which applies to the rest of the Ipswich Local Government Area. The Springfield Structure Plan has also been amended through the prescribed statutory planning scheme amendments process (e.g. to update and contemporise the land use outcomes for the town centre and to amend and improve use definitions).</p> <p>The provisions in the Springfield Structure Plan operate in conjunction with a number of Infrastructure Agreements including notably the Springfield Infrastructure Agreement 1998 (the SIA) and the Springfield Town Centre Infrastructure Agreement 2015 (the STCIA). Notwithstanding, it is noted that clause 229 in the SIA provides that once a residential lot is created the successors in title are no longer bound to perform the obligations of the SIA so long as it remains a residential lot (i.e. the further regulation of development, for example a home business undertaken in a residential lot, is not subject to the provisions of the SIA). Conversely, should an application be made that changes the use of the land from a residential lot the provisions of the SIA can be applied irrespective of whether the lot is within the Springfield Structure Plan or not.</p> <p>Whilst recognising the need to ensure the appropriate continued operation of the provisions of the Springfield Structure Plan in the effective, efficient and cost effective delivery of development and supporting infrastructure, there is also a need to consider the most effective and efficient way of regulating further development into the future. This includes where possible and appropriate, bringing developed land within the wider development assessment framework that applies to the rest of the Ipswich Local Government Area and Queensland more generally. Currently the making of a planning application would require a knowledge of a different development assessment framework set out in the Springfield Structure Plan.</p> <p>In consideration of the above, the removal of the developed residential lots from the Springfield Structure Plan (where also located within the area covered by the SIA) would allow for the appropriate application of the Queensland planning legislation and development assessment framework to those lots whilst also not undermining the delivery of supporting infrastructure pursuant to the SIA.</p>	Recommend that the Manager City Design be requested to amend the Springfield Structure Plan provisions and maps to remove the developed residential lots within the area of the Springfield Infrastructure Agreement, and to apply the general provisions of the new Ipswich Planning Scheme to those lots.	21, 293, 411, 422, 471,
3.7.5	Area 4 Springfield Estate and Augustine Heights (part)	<p>Requests that the Springfield Structure Plan (SPP) be transitioned in its entirety into the new Ipswich planning scheme without modification and should continue to apply without fetter or limitation, as maintaining the SPP is absolutely critical to maintaining the integrity of the "Greater Springfield" master plan, ensuring orderly planning outcomes and consistency with the infrastructure obligations assumed under the Springfield Infrastructure Agreement 1998 and other similar agreements entered into for development of 'Greater Springfield'. In making the assertion /request the following matters / issues are relied upon:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. proposed changes are contrary to the SPP and are unlawful unless agreed between Springfield City Group and Council or determined using the Alternative Dispute Resolution provisions in Section 11 of the SPP 2. proposed changes are unlawful as they are contrary to the planning legislation as it has been clear from the various planning Acts (since the <i>Local Government (Planning and Environment) Act 1990</i>) that Parliament's intention has been, and continue to be, to preserve development control plans and their important function, regardless of any new rules for the production of planning schemes. 3. the proposals will cause unnecessary uncertainty and may take away rights of 'Greater Springfield' developers and may lead to compensation claims against Council. Examples of potential issues include existing approvals under the SPP not being protected under the planning Act, the Town Centre Concept Plan ceasing to have effect thereby destroying certainty for the areas future development. 4. the proposal will destroy the planning and infrastructure linkage as the Springfield Infrastructure Agreement is premised on the existence of the Springfield Structure Plan and its master planning process. Without the SPP it is asserted that any future obligations on the master developer would no longer exist (with a without prejudice note in respect to the master developer's rights to pursue Council in respect to its obligations under the SIA). 5. the proposal is inappropriate because it does not take into the specific and unique planning and development needs of 'Greater Springfield'. 	<p>The Springfield Structure Plan carries forward the provisions of a Development Control Plan prepared under the <i>Local Government (Planning and Environment Act) 1990</i>, and which sets out the master planning and development assessment framework for land included in Springfield Structure Plan area. Whilst the Springfield Structure Plan was included in the Ipswich Planning Scheme in 2002 and sought to align the Springfield Structure Plan with the planning legislation at the time, the Springfield Structure Plan retains a different development application process to that which applies to the rest of the Ipswich Local Government Area. The Springfield Structure Plan has also been amended through the prescribed statutory planning scheme amendments process (e.g. to update and contemporise the land use outcomes for the town centre and to amend and improve use definitions) on a number of occasions and in line with the provisions of the SPP - in particular notification to Springfield Land Corporation about the amendments to allow a submission to be made has been undertaken.</p> <p>The provisions in the Springfield Structure Plan operate in conjunction with a number of Infrastructure Agreements including notably the Springfield Infrastructure Agreement 1998 (the SIA) and the Springfield Town Centre Infrastructure Agreement (the STCIA). Notwithstanding, it is noted that clause 229 in the SIA provides that once a residential lot is created the successors in title are no longer bound to perform the obligations so long as it remains a residential lot (i.e. the further regulation of development, for example a home business undertaken in a residential lot, is not subject to the provisions of the SIA). Conversely, should an application be made that changes the use of the land from a residential lot the provisions of the SIA can be applied irrespective of whether the lot is within the Springfield Structure Plan or not.</p> <p>Whilst recognising the need to ensure the appropriate continued operation of the provisions of the Springfield Structure Plan in the effective, efficient and cost effective delivery of development and supporting infrastructure, there is also a need to consider the most effective and efficient way of regulating further development into the future. This includes where possible and appropriate, bringing developed land within the wider development assessment framework that applies to the rest of the Ipswich Local Government Area and Queensland more generally. Currently the making of a planning application would require a knowledge of a different development assessment framework set out in the Springfield Structure Plan.</p> <p>In consideration of the above, the removal of the developed residential lots from the Springfield Structure Plan (where also located within the area covered by the SIA) would allow for the appropriate application of the Queensland planning legislation and development assessment framework to those lots whilst also not undermining the delivery of supporting infrastructure pursuant to the SIA.</p>	Recommend that the Manager City Design be requested to amend the Springfield Structure Plan provisions and maps to remove the developed residential lots within the area of the Springfield Infrastructure Agreement, and to apply the general provisions of the new Ipswich Planning Scheme to those lots.	284,
3.7.5	Area 4 Springfield Estate and Augustine Heights (part)	<p>Expresses serious concerns with how it is planned to treat the area currently covered by the Springfield Structure Plan (SSP) (particularly in the absence to any references to the SSP in the Statement of Proposals) and area covered by the Spring Mountain Precinct Plan and requests that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The SSP be completely transitioned into any new Ipswich Planning Scheme citing that it creates development entitlements linked to obligations in the Infrastructure Agreement (IA) (and specifically that the IA is called up in the SSP and in the absence of SSP the developer of Springfield would not have entered into the IA), underpins the commerce of the project, provides certainty to the developer, community and Council and that there could be unintended consequences and costly negative impacts that only become apparent afterwards; and 2. The Spring Mountain Precinct Plan continue its operation and status in an unfettered manner citing concerns about the status of the approved Precinct Plan which took significant time and resources to prepare and gain approval for, is unjust, will remove the certainty for investment decisions and will have unintended consequences. Examples are cited where the Precinct mapping included in the Draft Strategic Framework are inconsistent with those provided for under the Springfield Structure Plan and under the Spring Mountain Precinct Plan approval. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The provisions in the Springfield Structure Plan operate in conjunction with a number of Infrastructure Agreements including notably the Springfield Infrastructure Agreement 1998 (the SIA) and the Springfield Town Centre Infrastructure Agreement 2015 (the STCIA). Notwithstanding, it is noted that clause 229 in the SIA provides that once a residential lot is created the successors in title in title that the provisions of the SIA are no longer bound to perform the obligations so long as it remains a residential lot (i.e. the further regulation of development, for example a home business undertaken in a residential lot, is not subject to the provisions of the SIA). Conversely, should an application be made that changes the use of the land from a residential lot the provisions of the SIA can be applied irrespective of whether the lot is within the Springfield Structure Plan or not. Whilst recognising the need to ensure the appropriate continued operation of the provisions of the Springfield Structure Plan in the effective, efficient and cost effective delivery of development and supporting infrastructure, there is also a need to consider the most effective and efficient way of regulating further development into the future. This includes where possible and appropriate, bringing developed land within the wider development assessment framework that applies to the rest of the Ipswich Local Government Area and Queensland more generally. Currently the making of a planning application would require a knowledge of a different development assessment framework set out in the Springfield Structure Plan. In consideration of the above, the removal of the developed residential lots from the Springfield Structure Plan (where also located within the area covered by the SIA) would allow for the appropriate application of the Queensland planning legislation and development assessment framework to those lots whilst also not undermining the delivery of supporting infrastructure pursuant to the SIA. 2. Any changes to the Springfield Structure Plan would not apply retrospectively to an extant planning approval. Notwithstanding, it is recognised that there is a 'hierarchy of approvals' that need to be maintained until land is developed. Accordingly, it is not proposed to remove any land other than developed residential lots from the SSP (refer to 1. above) and it is not intended to apply the Precinct mapping included in the draft Strategic Framework to the area covered by the SSP. 	Recommend that the Manager City Design be requested to amend the Springfield Structure Plan provisions and maps to remove the developed residential lots within the area of the Springfield Infrastructure Agreement, and to apply the general provisions of the new Ipswich Planning Scheme to those lots.	289,
3.7.5	Area 4 Springfield Estate and Augustine Heights (part)	<p>Requests that the constraints mapping including vegetated corridors be completely excised from the area of the Spring Mountain Precinct Plan citing that these matters are dealt with under the SSP and clarified in greater detail in the existing Precinct Plan approval and particularly that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the difficult topography mapping is overly constraining in the context of bulk earth works to be undertaken with similar concerns with respect to the mapping of scenic and visual amenity, b. in relation to the Bushfire mapping that not all of Spring Mountain is located within the Transition Bushfire Area and that the balance of the area is included in the Bushfire Impact Buffer and which has implications for the development of housing. 	<p>The mapping of constraints provides information about the characteristics of land that need to be considered in assessing development. The mapping can be for information purposes and/or used for regulatory purposes, generally, through the adoption of an associated code. Council's existing process is that once a constraint has been removed, for example, a steep slope has been modified through bulk earthworks, the constraints map is amended to reflect the works that have been undertaken. Additionally, the bushfire risk and vegetation overlays are adjusted to reflect the extent of approvals for development and the clearing of vegetation. The existing approach balances the need to properly inform development assessment whilst not overlay constraining the development of land, but does rely on the updating of the mapping.</p> <p>It is noted that the overlay maps in the current planning scheme in many instances include the Springfield Structure Plan area and have been effectively applied through the regulatory framework that is established in the SSP. For consistency it is considered that all overlay maps should include land in the Springfield Structure Plan area, however, a review should also be undertaken of the current works that have been carried out and approvals granted for vegetation clearing, and the mapping amended to reflect where constraints on the land have been removed or are modified. Further consideration should also be given in drafting the associated overlay codes to ensuring that they operate effectively and efficiently relative to the regulatory framework established in the Springfield Structure Plan.</p> <p>It is further noted that the Scenic and Visual Amenity mapping is intended to be included as a Strategic Framework map rather than a development constraints overlay map, and provides information at the whole of local government area scale rather than being applied through a regulatory code. In particular it further emphasises the multiple values that hills, escarpment areas, significant waterways and extents of natural vegetation have. Notwithstanding, the map should be reviewed and amended in combination with the review and amendment of the development constraints map and particularly to reflect where natural features are removed or significantly modified.</p>	Recommend that following review and amendment to appropriately reflect works undertaken and development approvals, the strategic scenic and visual amenity and the overlay maps are shown for land located within the Springfield Structure Plan area.	289,

Section	Strategic Framework Theme	Submitter Issues	Response	Recommendation to Council	Submitter No.
3.7.5	Area 4 Springfield Estate and Augustine Heights (part)	Supports the planning intent for Springfield Central contained within Section 3.7.5 of the Statement of Proposals for Springfield Central but notes that the effective achievement of the planning intent will be dependant on the framing of the detailed provisions of the new planning scheme in a form that is clear, easily understood and consistent with contemporary planning instruments. Notes that the new planning scheme is an opportunity to take forward the vision and intent from the existing Springfield Structure Plan and Town Centre Concept Plan in a form that improves certainty and removes the inconsistencies and unnecessary complexity of the current planning scheme documents by including in contemporary planning provisions rather than having to interpret sometimes confusing provisions based on superseded Planning Acts from more than 25 years ago. However, it is stated it is important to recognise and continue the infrastructure framework contained in the Springfield Infrastructure Agreement and Springfield Town Centre Infrastructure Agreement.	<p>The Springfield Structure Plan carries forward the provisions of a Development Control Plan prepared under the <i>Local Government (Planning and Environment Act) 1990</i>, and which sets out the master planning and development assessment framework for land included in Springfield Structure Plan area. Whilst the Springfield Structure Plan was included in the Ipswich Planning Scheme in 2002 and sought to align the Springfield Structure Plan with the planning legislation at the time, the Springfield Structure Plan retains a different development application process to that which applies to the rest of the Ipswich Local Government Area.</p> <p>Development in Springfield Central (the Springfield Town Centre) is primarily assessed against the provisions of the Town Centre Concept Plan (TCCP) within the Springfield Structure Plan, with infrastructure delivery provided for under the Springfield Town Centre Infrastructure Agreement 2015 (STCIA). Substantial amendments / updates were also made to the TCCP in 2015 at the time the STCIA was entered into.</p> <p>Whilst noting that it is desirable for development in the Ipswich Local Government Area to be regulated under a single planning framework to assist in understanding and certainty, given the recent amendments to the TCCP and the execution for the STCIA, it would be premature to 'roll back' the Springfield Structure Plan provisions as they relate to the Springfield Town Centre at this time.</p>	Recommend that Springfield Structure Plan is maintained in its entirety without change for land within the area of the Springfield Town Centre (i.e. the land within the area of the Springfield Town Centre Concept Plan).	436,
3.7.5	Area 4 Springfield Estate and Augustine Heights (part)	Request for specific land in Springfield be identified with a unique property name.	As a planning scheme has a life in excess of ten years the identification of land by specific ownership or use is generally avoided as amending the planning scheme due to a change in ownership or use is a detailed and expensive process.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	298,
3.7.5	Area 4 Springfield Estate and Augustine Heights (part)	Express concern that there is inconsistency in the application of the identification of Key Nature Conservation Areas and Environmental Management Areas over undeveloped areas as shown on Overlay Map 1 - Biodiversity.	<p>Overlay Map 1 - Biodiversity describes land with biodiversity values and where these lands are likely to retain these values into the foreseeable future. Development processes in Area 4 Springfield Estate and Augustine Heights (part) require the submission and approval of Precinct Plans and the submission and approval more detailed Area Development Plans.</p> <p>In order that the Strategic Framework remained as contemporary as possible, where detailed Area Development Plans have been lodged and the overall intent of development can reasonable justify that current biodiversity values would not be retained, Overlay Map 1 - Biodiversity reflected this development prospect. Where detailed development approvals or formal commitments have not been achieved and where existing biodiversity values may have impacts on the overall development outcomes the existing biodiversity features have been shown on the Overlay Map 1 - Biodiversity.</p>	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	433, 457,
3.7.5	Area 4 Springfield Estate and Augustine Heights (part)	Request for specific land in Area 4 Springfield Estate and Augustine Heights (part) in the New Suburban (NS2) designation to be included in the New Suburban (NS1) designation.	Development processes in Area 4 Springfield Estate and Augustine Heights (part) require the submission and approval of Precinct Plans and the submission and approval more detailed Area Development Plans. In order that the Strategic Framework remained as contemporary as possible, where detailed Area Development Plans have been lodged and the overall intent of development can reasonable justify the proposed development prospect, urban expansion land is included in the New Suburban 1 (NS1) designation. Where detailed development approvals or formal commitments have not been achieved and resolution of development constraints and infrastructure networks are not achieved, urban expansion land is included in the New Suburban 2 (NS2). The submission of a development application that effectively resolves development constraints may achieve NS1 densities over part or all of a site.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	433,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Expresses support to retain and improve buffer zoning to assist in the retention of native animals and vegetation.	The support expressed in the submission is noted.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	171,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Express the view that the undeveloped land bounded by Eugene, Fiona Streets, Devon Drive and Woogaroo Creek be included as a nature reserve or wildlife corridor, including linkage to Happy Jack Gully.	The majority of the land is privately owned, is currently identified for urban purposes, and is subject to a development application.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the new planning scheme upon determination of the appeal.	96, 358, 386, 429,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Express the view that residential development of Redbank Plains over the past 10 years has resulted in a range of impacts, including the loss of bushland.	A mix of land uses are considered to be suitable in Redbank Plains, which includes low, medium and high density areas based on a range of factors such as the existing zoning, biodiversity values, development constraints, proximity to centres, and the availability of infrastructure and services.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	75,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Express the view that Bellbird Park does not have the infrastructure to support medium or high density housing.	A mix of land uses are considered to be suitable in Bellbird Park, which includes low, medium and high density areas based on a range of factors such as the existing zoning, biodiversity values, development constraints, proximity to centres, and the availability of infrastructure and services.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	15,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Request that further development of large lots in Bellbird Park be stopped.	A mix of land uses are considered to be suitable in Bellbird Park, which includes low, medium and high density areas based on a range of factors such as the existing zoning, biodiversity values, development constraints, proximity to centres, and the availability of infrastructure and services.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	152,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Express the view that retaining larger lots in Bellbird Park provides choice, preferring a 600m ² average lot size ranging to larger lots on steep land.	A mix of land uses are considered to be suitable in Bellbird Park, which includes low, medium and high density areas based on a range of factors such as the existing zoning, biodiversity values, development constraints, proximity to centres, and the availability of infrastructure and services.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	434,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Concern was raised that the development application over specific land in Bellbird Park currently in appeal proposes lot sizes that are inconsistent with the current planning scheme and proposed section 3.7.6.4 (4)(b).	The comments expressed in the submission are noted.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the new planning scheme upon determination of the appeal.	20,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Expressed support for sections 3.7.6.4 (3)(b)(vi)(B) and (3)(b)(viii)(A & B) to preserve the existing nature of Bellbird Park.	The support expressed in the submission for the preferred precinct designation is noted.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	232,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Expressed concern for the inclusion of land to the north of the high school near Happy Jack Gully to be used for townhouses and duplexes, with lots of 450m ² preferred.	The area identified has existing development approvals with lot sizes that are generally consistent with the proposed designation.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	232,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Expressed support for sections 3.7.6.4 (4)(a) and (b) if that area of Bellbird Park is to be developed, including the use of sensitive development techniques to optimise tree retention.	The support expressed in the submission for the preferred precinct designation is noted.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	15, 232, 386,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Express the view that development has changed water flows, including in Happy Jack Gully and the effect of these changes need to be considered by new development.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted, however this matter is a function of the development assessment process relevant at the time of application.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	358,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Support the development of lots averaging 700m ² on Surrey Road and Fiona Street towards Goodna.	The area identified is predominately large lot in nature and the development constraints of slope and biodiversity limit development options for smaller lots.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	68,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Expresses general support for higher densities as outlined in section 3.7.6.4 (3)(b)(iv).	The support expressed in the submission for the preferred precinct designation is noted.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	232,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Concern with the potential bushfire risk posed by vegetation on steep slopes in part of Bellbird Park.	The new planning scheme will include provisions that relate to bushfire risk and the development of steep land.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	68,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Support the proposed lot sizes in Brennan Street to Harris Street.	The support expressed in the submission is noted.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	217,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Request that specific land in Bellbird Park be included in low density residential (10-15 dwellings) rather than the New Suburban (NS1) designation.	The area identified has existing development approvals with lot sizes that are generally consistent with the proposed designation.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	233,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	The Redbank Plains Library should be identified in section 3.7.6.5 (5) as a key element of the social infrastructure and community facilities network.	<p>The provision of libraries are identified as a citywide or district level community facility.</p> <p>The matter be referred to the Performance Branch of the Coordination and Performance Department for consideration.</p>	<p>1. That the submission be referred to Council's Performance Branch of the Coordination and Performance Department.</p> <p>2. That the Manager City Design be authorised to consider the advice from Council's Performance Branch in the drafting of the new planning scheme and subsequent local government infrastructure plan.</p>	384,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Request that the area bound by Redbank Plains Road, South Street, West Street and Centre Street, Redbank Plains in the Medium Density (MD2) designation be included in the Medium Density (MD3) or High Density (HD1) designations.	The proposed designation reflects the current zoning, existing development and public transport availability.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	73,

Section	Strategic Framework Theme	Submitter Issues	Response	Recommendation to Council	Submitter No.
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Support proposed lot sizes between 600-700m ² for areas around Jones Road.	The support for the proposed designation is noted.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme.	358,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Concern with development that increases densities on smaller lots, such as auxiliary units and duplexes and expressed the need for standard requirements for buildings, such as wider eaves and greater distance between houses.	The comments expressed in the submission in relation to density are noted and the new planning scheme will be drafted having regard to the comments raised. Building requirements are regulated and administered by the Queensland Building and Construction Commission under the <i>Building Act 1975</i> .	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the new planning scheme.	358,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Express concern with the development of 300m ² blocks in low density areas which result in the loss of habitat, such as in Harris Street, Oak Street and Jones Road.	A mix of land uses and lot sizes are considered to be suitable in Bellbird Park, which includes both larger lots and small lots based on a range of factors such as the existing zoning, biodiversity values, development constraints, proximity to centres, and the availability of infrastructure.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	243,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Express concern with small lot subdivision standards and requirements.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted and will be considered in the development of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the new planning scheme.	478, 479,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Support the main street around the future train station on School Road.	The support expressed in the submission is noted.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	320,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Request for specific land in Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part) in the New Suburban (NS2) designation to be included in the New Suburban (NS1) designation.	Development processes in Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part) require the submission and approval of and the submission and approval of detailed development applications. In order that the Strategic Framework remained as contemporary as possible, where detailed development plans have been lodged or the overall intent of development can reasonable justify the proposed development prospect, urban expansion land is included in the New Suburban 1 (NS1) designation. Where detailed development approvals or formal commitments have not been achieved and resolution of development constraints and infrastructure networks are not achieved, urban expansion land is included in the New Suburban 2 (NS2). The submission of a development application that effectively resolves development constraints may achieve NS1 densities over part or all of a site.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	452,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Express support for the proposed designation of New Suburban (NS1) over specific land in Redbank Plains, including the lot sizes and densities as outlined in Table 3.4. Also requested that the Environmental Management designation be altered to better reflect the actual extent of the drainage line.	The support expressed in the submission is noted. The Environmental Management (EM) designation is indicative and subject to further detailed assessment noting the site has a current development application under consideration.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the new planning scheme.	424,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Request that the Transitional Bushfire Risk Area on specific land in Eden's Crossing be narrowed based on recent Bushfire Assessment reports provided in support of a recent approval.	Overlay Map 8 - Bushfire Risk Areas integrates and replaces the Bushfire Prone Area (BPA) map consistent with the State Planning Policy (SPP) and mapping included on the SPP Interactive Mapping System. The SPP is a statutory instrument which expresses the State government's interests in land use planning and development, and is required to be appropriately integrated into the new planning scheme. The new planning scheme will include relevant codes and provisions, including in relation to Transitional Bushfire Risk Areas and Potential Bushfire Impact Buffers. The comments expressed in the submission are noted and will be considered when preparing the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during the drafting of the new planning scheme, particularly the codes and provisions relating to transition and buffer areas.	255,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Request for specific land in Bellbird Park in the Establish Suburban (ES4) designation to be included in the Medium Density or Low-Medium Density designation.	The distance of the land from centre location does not warrant further densification.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	182, 215,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Request for specific land in Bellbird Park in the Establish Suburban (ES2) designation to be included in the High Density designation.	The proposed designation is consistent with the prevailing development form of adjacent land and the distance of the land from centre location does not warrant high density development.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	173,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Request for specific land in Redbank Plains to be included in a zone that permits at least one dwelling or development for large residential lots of 2 ha in size.	The proposed designation reflects the current buffer zoning and the extent of development constraints applicable to the land. The comments expressed in the submission regarding permitting at least one dwelling in the proposed Environmental Management designation are noted and this matter will be reviewed as part of the drafting the scheme provisions.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the new planning scheme.	414,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Request for specific land in Redbank Plains in the Establish Suburban (ES2) designation to be included in the Establish Suburban (ES4) designation.	The proposed designation is consistent with the adjoining existing development to the south.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	444,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Express support for the proposed designation of Medium Density (MD1) over specific land in Redbank Plains.	The support for the proposed designation is noted.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	444,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Suggest that flood modelling submitted with a forthcoming development application for specific land in Redbank Plains which could be used to further refine Overlay Map 10 - Flooding and Major Urban Catchment Flow Paths.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted, however this matter is a function of the development assessment process relevant at the time of application.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	444,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Request for specific land in Bellbird Park in the Establish Suburban (ES3) designation to be changed to be included in the Establish Suburban (ES4) designation without locational requirements.	The proposed lot sizes of 600 to 700m ² are generally consistent with surrounding established development and the location does not warrant the development of smaller lots.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	478, 479,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Request for specific land in Bellbird Park in the Establish Suburban (ES3) designation to be changed to be included in the Establish Suburban (ES4) designation.	The proposed designation reflects the current zoning and provides for a transition of larger urban lots adjacent to Happy Jack Gully to smaller lots, higher density development as you get closer to the Redbank Plains District Centre.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	350,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Express objection that specific land in Bellbird Park be taken for future park and green space.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted, however the proposed Environmental Management (EM) designation is intended to provide for multiple and complementary values, including the protection of environmental values such as riparian buffering to Woogaroo Creek. The designation also reflects relevant development constraints, including biodiversity, slope and flood. The land has not been proposed to be included in the Recreation and Open Space (REC) precinct. The line between the Low Density Residential (LL1) designation and the Environmental Management (EM) designation is indicative and subject to further detailed assessment. Further consideration of these matters will be considered as part of drafting the scheme provisions.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the new planning scheme.	337,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Expresses comment in relation to specific land and the mapping included on Strategic Valuable Features Map 1 - Strategic Greenspace Areas and Links, Strategic Valuable Features Map 2 - Watercourses and Designated Wetlands, and Strategic Valuable Features Map 3 - Scenic and Visual Amenity Values, as generally being supportive of urban development. It was also suggested that an identified watercourse should be removed.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted, however the strategic valuable features mapping, particularly when considered in connection with the proposed designation and overlay mapping highlight the significance of the biodiversity across the site and the need to address development constraints including slope, the retention of native vegetation, and management of natural waterways. Recommend review of the Woogaroo Creek riparian corridor and identified minor waterways for potential inclusion on Strategic Valuable Features Map 1 - Strategic Greenspace Areas and Links.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the new planning scheme.	439,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Expresses comment regarding mapping included on Overlay Map 8 - Bushfire Risk Areas and Overlay Map 9 - Difficult topography in relation to specific land as being able to be managed through urban development.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted, however this matter is a function of the development assessment process relevant at the time of application.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	439,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Expresses objection to specific land in Bellbird Park being included in the Low Density Residential (LL1) designation or in the Established Suburban (ES2) designation (Alternate Option 1). Also objects to the reduced footprint as shown on Alternate Options map 1.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. Additional consideration of the constraints and biodiversity values would be required to support the footprint identified for large lot development as being suitable for higher density purposes.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the new planning scheme upon determination of the appeal.	439,
3.7.6	Area 5 Bellbird Park, Redbank Plains, Augustine Heights (part)	Request for land in Eden's Crossing to better reflect recent approvals, including expansion of the Neighbourhood Centre (NC) designation, adjustment to the Recreation and Open Space (REC) and Environmental Management (EM) designations, and the suggested inclusion of the Powerlink easement in the Special Purpose (SP) designation.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted and adjustment of the designations to better reflect approvals will be considered in the development of the new planning scheme. The use of the Special Purpose (SP) designation for land in power easements is not supported, rather the Environmental Management (EM) designation remains the preferred strategic designation having the primary strategic function of separating and buffering land uses and conserving strategic corridor links, including power easements or areas that contain vegetation or provide connections to other native vegetation.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the new planning scheme.	255,
3.7.7	Area 6 Redbank Plains and Collingwood Park	Express the view that there should not be small lots, dual occupancies or medium to high density development in Collingwood Park.	A mix of land uses are considered to be suitable in Collingwood Park, which includes low, medium and high density areas based on a range of factors such as the consideration of existing zoning, biodiversity values, development constraints, proximity to centres, and the availability of infrastructure and services.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	197, 318,
3.7.7	Area 6 Redbank Plains and Collingwood Park	Express the view that additional land be included in the Environmental Management (EM) designation with connection provided to the Conservation (CON) designation. Also expressed concern for a lack of recreation areas.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted, however the proposed designations generally reflect existing zonings or development approvals and there is limited opportunity available to provide for additional environmental linkages internal to Collingwood Park. The Local Government Infrastructure Plan identifies the local public park trunk infrastructure network intended to service existing and future urban development (up to ultimate development) based on the current planning scheme. Local recreation parks are often identified and delivered through the development process.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	37,
3.7.7	Area 6 Redbank Plains and Collingwood Park	Support the proposed designation of Local Centre (LC) over specific land in Collingwood Park.	The support for the proposed designation is noted.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	454,

Section	Strategic Framework Theme	Submitter Issues	Response	Recommendation to Council	Submitter No.
3.7.7	Area 6 Redbank Plains and Collingwood Park	Request for specific land in Redbank in the Low Density Residential (NS2) designation to be changed to be included in the Medium Density Residential (MD2) designation. Also requested that the area available for development be consistent with the existing area.	The proposed designations generally reflect the current zonings and the need for future development to consider constraints, including biodiversity, flooding, site access and mining. The Environmental Management (EM) designation provides for multiple and complementary values, including vegetation retention and conserving strategic corridor links. The use of the dotted line between the designations also highlights a degree of flexibility in determining the boundary through the development assessment process with the area included in the Environmental Management (EM) designation being consistent with the proposed Defined Flood Event extent.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	266,
3.7.7	Area 6 Redbank Plains and Collingwood Park	Request for specific land in Collingwood Park (south of Eagle Street) in the Low Density Residential (NS1) designation to be included in the Medium Density designation and Local Centre designation.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted and will be considered in the development of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the new planning scheme.	406,
3.7.7	Area 6 Redbank Plains and Collingwood Park	Request for specific land in Collingwood Park (south of Eagle Street) to be included in the Local Centre designation.	The development of new or existing local centres will require development assessment, including the relationship to the centres hierarchy and economic need.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	454,
3.7.7	Area 6 Redbank Plains and Collingwood Park	Request for specific land in the Special Opportunity designation to include provision for a mix of uses including residential and specific provision to allow for highway related uses.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted and will be considered in the development of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the new planning scheme.	349,
3.7.7	Area 6 Redbank Plains and Collingwood Park	Request for specific land in Redbank Plains in the Medium Density designation to be included in the Low Density Residential (NS1) designation and Local Centre (LC) designation. Expresses concern that the designation does not recognise the existing uses and development assessment approvals.	The submission is not supported as current development options should not compromise the future logical development of the locality where: - the land is in proximity to a future major public transport corridor and transit node; - the land is proximate to a future Local Centre designation and other employment opportunities; - the land can be developed to a higher density with minimal visual amenity impacts; and - the introduction of a higher density designation could provide an opportunity to introduce a greater variety of built forms to the Local Area. The Medium Density 1 (MD1) designation does not diminish the use rights attributed to the land or existing development assessment approvals.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	138,
3.7.8	Area 7 Swanbank, New Chum, Redbank Plains (part)	Expresses the view that Council should consider retaining the Cooneana Heritage Centre, the Swanbank Heritage Rail, the large water bodies and bushland in a park where environmental values may co-exist with sympathetic development.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. Preliminary advice from the State has indicated that the new planning scheme use the standard suite of zones consistent with the regulated requirements of the <i>Planning Regulation 2017</i> , which excludes the use of the Special Opportunity Zone.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the new planning scheme, particularly in relation to the possible inclusion of the Cooneana Heritage Centre in the Tourism designation.	221,
3.7.8	Area 7 Swanbank, New Chum, Redbank Plains (part)	Express the view that the Swanbank Industrial Area be protected for unconstrained industrial development, particularly providing opportunity for the waste industry, resource recovery and recycling.	It is proposed to consider the inclusion of the Cooneana Heritage Centre in the Tourism designation. No further changes are proposed. The inclusion of appropriate planning provisions in the new planning scheme are considered necessary and warranted. The Environmental Management (EM) designation has been used to retain a buffer between existing and planned residential and industrial areas and the new planning scheme will be drafted having regard to appropriate mitigation measures and the separation of incompatible uses, including the preparation of relevant codes and provisions that will apply to new development.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the new planning scheme.	465,
3.7.8	Area 7 Swanbank, New Chum, Redbank Plains (part)	Express the view that there be no expansion of existing dumps, no waste incinerators or waste to energy incinerators, and no heavy industries in Swanbank.	The new planning scheme is unable to make development prohibited, only the State is able to make specific development prohibited. The new planning scheme will be drafted having regard to appropriate mitigation measures and the separation of incompatible land uses, including the preparation of relevant codes and provisions that will apply to new development.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the new planning scheme.	380,
3.7.8	Area 7 Swanbank, New Chum, Redbank Plains (part)	Expresses support for the removal of the key resource area mapping in the vicinity of Swanbank Coal Road, Swanbank.	Support for the removal of key resource area mapping in the vicinity of Swanbank Coal Road, Swanbank is acknowledged.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	461,
3.7.8	Area 7 Swanbank, New Chum, Redbank Plains (part)	Express the opinion that Council should provide incentives to facilitate initiatives such as 'Waste to Energy'.	The Queensland Government has only recently released the Energy from Waste Policy - Discussion paper for consultation, resolution of the assessment, regulation and operation of Energy to Waste has not been finalised. It is therefore considered extremely premature for any local government to pre-emptively determine the levels of assessment, regulation or operation of Energy to Waste until the State government has finalised its review of this industry.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	472,
3.7.8	Area 7 Swanbank, New Chum, Redbank Plains (part)	Express concern that the Environmental Management designation does not reflect specific development approvals.	Environmental management areas have a primary strategic function of separating and buffering land uses and conserving strategic corridor links that contain areas of vegetation or provide connections to other native vegetation that form significant urban and rural nodes including in association with the Carole Park, Redbank, Dinmore / Riverview, Swanbank / New Chum and Ebenezer / Willowbank Regional Business and Industry Areas. Where the Environmental management designation compromises or dissect existing lawful operations the designation should be amended to reflect existing lawful operations to the extent that these operations do not compromise the appropriate buffering of incompatible land uses or the conservation of strategic corridor links.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to review and update the Environmental management designation to ensure the designation does not compromise or dissect existing lawful operations.	288, 457,
3.7.8	Area 7 Swanbank, New Chum, Redbank Plains (part)	Express concern that: - waste management operations with in Swanbank and New Chum, are not compromised and are permitted to expand; - the 750 metre buffer to waste management operations is considered excessive; and - planned undeveloped residential land should be removed where such development may give rise to potential reverse amenity issues. Also request that specified land identified as Waste Activity and Buffer Areas be removed and included in the Waste Activity Area.	The mapping and supporting document for the management of waste activities in the local government area reflects Temporary Local Planning Instrument (TLPI) No. 1 of 2018. The Statement of Proposals, Strategic Framework and associated TLPI provide a policy response in respect to landfill and waste industry uses occurring in the Swanbank / New Chum industrial area, to ensure this regionally significant economic area is appropriately regulated to protect existing, approved or planned sensitive land uses from adverse impacts associated with waste activities. Existing use rights attributed through development approvals and the like continue to have effect.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	472, 486,
3.7.8	Area 7 Swanbank, New Chum, Redbank Plains (part)	Expresses support for the inclusion of the area surrounding Swanbank Coal Road, Swanbank in the Medium Impact Industry (MI) designation.	Support for the inclusion of the area surrounding Swanbank Coal Road, Swanbank in the Medium Impact Industry (MI) designation is acknowledged.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	461,
3.7.8	Area 7 Swanbank, New Chum, Redbank Plains (part)	Expresses support for the Industry Investigation (II) designation (Alternate Option 3.7.8A) as shown on Alternate Options Map 1 along with support for the preferred designations over adjacent land in Swanbank. Concern was raised in relation to Alternate Option 3.7.19E as shown on Alternate Options Map 1, with support given to the preferred Special Opportunity (SA89) designation.	The support and additional comments expressed in the submission are noted. Preliminary advice from the State has indicated that the new planning scheme use the standard suite of zones consistent with the regulated requirements of the Planning Regulation 2017, which excludes the use of the Special Opportunity Zone. It is recommended that the designations and Alternate Options be reviewed in the area, including a review of the Special Opportunity (SA89 and SA90) designations to ensure an appropriate balance is achieved having regard to development opportunities, constraints and inability to use the Special Opportunity Zone.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the new planning scheme, particularly in relation to review of the designations.	474,
3.7.8	Area 7 Swanbank, New Chum, Redbank Plains (part)	Request for specific land in Swanbank in the Environmental Management (EM) designation to be included as future industrial.	The proposed designation reflects the current planning scheme zoning with the Environmental Management (EM) designation intended to provide for multiple and complementary values including buffering and vegetation retention. The designation also reflects relevant development constraints, including biodiversity, mining and transmission lines.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	351,
3.7.8	Area 7 Swanbank, New Chum, Redbank Plains (part)	Request for specific land in Swanbank in the Environmental Management (EM) designation to be included as future industrial and that the current range of uses permitted in the Regional Business and Industry Investigation Zone and Regional Business and Industry Buffer Zone be retained in the proposed future zones.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted and will be considered in the development of the new planning scheme, including consideration of the intended range of uses and code preparation. The proposed designation generally reflects the current zoning over the site with the Environmental Management (EM) designation intended to provide for multiple and complementary values, including buffering and vegetation retention. The use of the dotted line between the designations also highlights a degree of flexibility in determining the boundary through the development assessment process. It is proposed that the designations be reviewed as part of the development of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the new planning scheme.	296, 472,
3.7.8	Area 7 Swanbank, New Chum, Redbank Plains (part)	Express concern that the proposed designations over specific land in Swanbank does not appropriately recognise existing development approvals, associated infrastructure agreements and reduces the extent of developable land. It was suggested that the Mixed Use designation may be more appropriate, and concern was raised in relation to the area included as Environmental Management and alignment with other strategic framework maps.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted, however the proposed designations were prepared having regard to available State mapping and additional information, including waterway, flooding and biodiversity mapping. The Mixed Use Zone is not supported in place of the Low Impact Industry (BP - Business Park) designation, which is considered to be the highest and best use of the land. The proposed designations do not remove the ability to undertake development consistent with existing lawful approvals, and the use of the dotted line between the designations also highlights a degree of flexibility in determining the boundary of the designations through the development assessment process should the existing approvals not be utilised. Further refinement of the strategic framework mapping is likely to occur as the new planning scheme is drafted.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the new planning scheme.	290,
3.7.9	Area 8 Riverview	Expresses concern regarding the location of a Local Centre at McEwan Street and Station Road, Riverview.	A Local Centre in this location is considered appropriate given the close proximity to Riverview Railway Station and is proposed as a main street precinct in the form of street level retail and commercial uses with residential apartments above.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	292,
3.7.9	Area 8 Riverview	Expresses the view that areas designated as Environmental Management (EM) have increased in the proposed strategic framework.	The area identified as Special Opportunity have reduced in the area bounded by Kenneth Street, Riverview Road, Station Road, the Brisbane-Ipswich Rail line and the confluence of the Brisbane and Bremer Rivers, due to revised flood mapping and the inclusion of the Goodna Bypass.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	292,
3.7.9	Area 8 Riverview	Expresses concern regarding the designation of the future Goodna Bypass as Special Purpose and regarding the identification of intersections or connections to be further investigated.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. It is considered that the a future major road warrants inclusion as part of the Local Framework mapping, noting that the Strategic Transport Network Map (SFM5A) is largely indicative and the actual location of any future infrastructure has yet to be determined.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	292, 355,
3.7.9	Area 8 Riverview	Expresses the view that current Regional Low Impact Business and Industry areas in Riverview should be considered for Medium Impact Industry.	The proposed Low Impact Industry designation is consistent with the current planning scheme zoning of Low Impact Business and Industry. The comments in the submission are noted and will be considered in the development of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the new planning scheme.	355,

Section	Strategic Framework Theme	Submitter Issues	Response	Recommendation to Council	Submitter No.
3.7.9	Area 8 Riverview	Expressed concern with the development of land west of McCosker Street, Riverview	The land was the subject of a Court Order from the Planning and Environment Court (P&E Court) and as such the decision of the Court cannot be reversed or amended by Council.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	53,
3.7.9	Area 8 Riverview	Request for specific land in Riverview within the Low Density Residential (ES3) designation to be included in the Low-Medium Density Residential (LMD) designation.	The distance of the land from the existing neighbourhood centre supports and its proximity to high frequency public transport, warrants review of the land use designation. The comments expressed in the submission are noted and will be considered in the development of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the new planning scheme.	100,
3.7.9	Area 8 Riverview	Request for specific land in Riverview and Bundamba areas identified in the Low Impact Industry (LI) and Environmental Management (EM) designations to be reviewed for consistency with an existing preliminary approval.	The submission identifies some inconsistencies between the approved plans of the preliminary approval and the draft Local Framework mapping.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to amend the Draft Strategic Framework Local Area Framework mapping.	340,
3.7.9	Area 8 Riverview	Expresses concern that Strategic Framework Map 5A - Strategic Transport Network identifies an extension to Endeavour Road (dead end road) as a Major Road link.	Endeavour Road is identified as a major road link south of the Future State Controlled Road (Goodna Bypass). The comments expressed in the submission are noted and will be considered in the development of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the new planning scheme.	292,
3.7.9	Area 8 Riverview	Expresses concern that the Strategic Framework Map 6 - Strategic Green Infrastructure Map identifies Open Space and Recreation on Riverview Road, Riverview in conflict with the Special Purpose land use designation (identifying the future Goodna Bypass).	The comments expressed in the submission are noted and will be considered in the development of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the new planning scheme.	292,
3.7.9	Area 8 Riverview	Expresses that there are currently a variety activities in the area of Special Opportunity (SA31) designation, and request that these uses are able to continue (and be enhanced) in the future.	<p>The comments expressed in the submission are noted and will be considered in the development of the new planning scheme.</p> <p>Preliminary advice from the State has indicated that the new planning scheme use the standard suite of zones within the regulated requirements of the <i>Planning Regulation 2017</i>, which excludes the use of the Special Opportunity Zone.</p> <p>It is recommended that the designations be reviewed in the area, including a review of the Special Opportunity (SA31) designation to ensure an appropriate balance is achieved having regard to development opportunities, constraints and inability to use the Special Opportunity Zone.</p>	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the new planning scheme.	292,
3.7.9	Area 8 Riverview	Expresses concern with the Local Government Infrastructure Plan mapping showing a waterside park on the southern bank of the Bremer River where it joins the Brisbane River (District Waterside Park 1196).	The matter be referred to the Sport, Recreation and Natural Resources Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department for consideration when preparing the Local Government Infrastructure Plan.	<p>1. That the submission be referred to Council's Sport, Recreation and Natural Resources Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department.</p> <p>2. That the Manager City Design be authorised to consider the advice from Council's Sport, Recreation and Natural Resources Branch in the drafting of the new planning scheme and subsequent local government infrastructure plan.</p>	292,
3.7.10	Area 9 Bundamba, Blackstone, Ebbw Vale and Dinmore	Expresses support for intact bushland being conserved for wildlife, buffer to residential buildings, highway, electrical lines and areas zoned industrial.	The support expressed in the submission is noted.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	39,
3.7.10	Area 9 Bundamba, Blackstone, Ebbw Vale and Dinmore	Express concern that Bognuda Street was not included in section 3.7.10.5 (1)(d).	Although Bognuda Street was not specifically listed in section 3.7.10.5 (1)(d), the majority of the street (from Law Street to Ashburn Street) is identified as an Existing Major Road Link on Strategic Framework Map 5A - Strategic Transport Network.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	394,
3.7.10	Area 9 Bundamba, Blackstone, Ebbw Vale and Dinmore	Expresses the view that specific land in Bundamba in the vicinity of River Road and Archer Street be rehabilitated as bushland and included in the Environmental Management (EM) designation.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted, however the proposed designations generally reflects existing zonings or development approvals.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	188,
3.7.10	Area 9 Bundamba, Blackstone, Ebbw Vale and Dinmore	Request for specific land in Bundamba in the Environmental Management (EM) designation to be included in the Medium Density (MD1) designation.	<p>The land is dissected by the Southern Regional Water Pipeline Easement which provided a logical boundary for the Medium Density 1 (MD1) designation.</p> <p>It is noted that the Environmental Management designation could be amended in this locality to only accommodate the Southern Regional Water Pipeline Easement.</p>	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to amend the Environmental Management (EM) and Medium Density designations in the Draft Strategic Framework Local Area Framework mapping to reflect the location of the Southern Regional Water Pipeline Easement.	206,
3.7.10	Area 9 Bundamba, Blackstone, Ebbw Vale and Dinmore	Requests for specific land along Hoepner Road, Bundamba be included in the Low Impact Industry (LI) designation. Further expresses concern that the Alternate Option 1 in the Local Framework may impact on the South West Industrial Corridor Regional Economic Cluster and is therefore not supported.	The comments in the submission are noted. It is proposed that the land be included in the Low Impact Industry (Business Park) precinct of the Low Impact Industry designation. The designation is a good representation of the current use of the premises.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	393,
3.7.10	Area 9 Bundamba, Blackstone, Ebbw Vale and Dinmore	Request for specific land in Bundamba in the Established Suburban (ES3) designation be retained in the current 'Bundamba Stables Residential Zone'.	The submission seeks inclusion of the land into a designation that is no longer is consistent with the Regulated Requirements s16(2) prescribed for local planning instruments under the <i>Planning Regulation 2017</i> . The operation of any existing lawful uses are not affected by the introduction of any future planning instruments.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	317,
3.7.10	Area 9 Bundamba, Blackstone, Ebbw Vale and Dinmore	Request for specific land currently included in the Local Business and Industry Zone in Bundamba be included in the same designation rather than being split into the Neighbourhood Centre (NC) and Medium Density Residential (MC1) designations.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted and will be considered in the drafting of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	278,
3.7.11	Area 10 Karalee, Barellan Point, Chuwar	Expresses support for the inclusion of conservation land to the west of Chuwar	The support expressed in the submission is noted.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	407,
3.7.11	Area 10 Karalee, Barellan Point, Chuwar	Expresses support for the Low Density Residential (LL1) designation over specific land and expressed the view that the proposed Alternate Options 3.7.11A and 3.7.11B as shown on Alternate Options Map 1 and 2 were not appropriate except for the proposed Environmental Management (EM) designation to preserve a conservation corridor.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted and will be considered in the drafting of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	432,
3.7.11	Area 10 Karalee, Barellan Point, Chuwar	Expressed support for the preferred Local Area Framework but does not the support options considered in Local Area Framework.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted and will be considered in the drafting of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration of the matters raised during review of the strategic framework provisions (residential densities) and during drafting of the new planning scheme (zoning).	196, 230, 265, 272, 312, 360, 460,
3.7.11	Area 10 Karalee, Barellan Point, Chuwar	Expressed support for the Alternative Local Framework option but does not the support the preferred designations identified in Local Framework.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted and will be considered in the drafting of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration of the matters raised during review of the strategic framework provisions (residential densities) and during drafting of the new planning scheme (zoning).	71, 150, 153, 189,
3.7.11	Area 10 Karalee, Barellan Point, Chuwar	Expresses concern with the inclusion of specific land in the Medium Density designation on the southern side of Junction Road, Karalee. The submission identifies that Medium to High Density housing should be limited to the northern side of Junction Road.	<p>The proposed designation of Medium Density Residential (MD1) provides opportunity for an increased housing choice in Karalee on land which is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - proximate to a District Centre and other employment opportunities; - proximity to a major transit node; - the land can be developed to a higher density with minimal visual amenity impacts; and - the introduction of a medium density designation could provide an opportunity to introduce a greater variety of built forms to the Local Area. 	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	392,
3.7.11	Area 10 Karalee, Barellan Point, Chuwar	Expresses concern that specific land in Karalee should not be included in the Medium Density Residential (MD1) designation.	<p>The South East Queensland Regional Plan '<i>ShapingSEQ</i>' sets a dwelling supply benchmark of providing an additional 111,700 dwellings (to accommodate an additional 319,900 people) between 2016 and 2041.</p> <p>The subject site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - is proximate to a District Centre and other employment opportunities; - is in proximity to a major transit node; - can be developed to a higher density with minimal visual amenity impacts; and - the introduction of a higher density designation could provide an opportunity to introduce a greater variety of built forms to the Local Area. 	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	341,
3.7.11	Area 10 Karalee, Barellan Point, Chuwar	Requests that the large lot character of Karalee be retained.	The draft strategic framework, including the local frameworks, precinct maps and land use transect, were prepared having regard to the valuable features to be conserved, development constraints, achieving a diversity of housing forms, sustainable growth management and infrastructure provision to support both the retention and conservation of existing urban character and the growth and development of new urban development across the Ipswich local government area.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	331,

Section	Strategic Framework Theme	Submitter Issues	Response	Recommendation to Council	Submitter No.
3.7.11	Area 10 Karalee, Barellan Point, Chuwar	Request for specific land in Karalee in the Medium Density Residential (MD1) designation to be included in the Medium Density Residential (MD2) designation.	Subject to a detailed housing needs assessment, is considered that the submission may have merit in this locality, as: - the subject site is proximate to a District Centre and other employment opportunities; - the land is in proximity to a major transit node; - the land can be developed to a higher density with minimal visual amenity impacts; and - the introduction of a higher density designation could provide an opportunity to introduce a greater variety of built forms to the Local Area.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to undertake a housing needs assessment for Local Framework - Area 10 Karalee, Barellan Point, Chuwar and that if the outcomes are favourable that consideration be given to changing the land use designation from Medium Density Residential (MD1) to be included in the Medium Density Residential (MD2) designation.	275,
3.7.11	Area 10 Karalee, Barellan Point, Chuwar	Expresses concern that the depiction of development constraint overlays unduly restrict the future development of specific land west and south of Mt Crosby Road and Brodzig Road Chuwar respectively.	The mapping of development constraints is generally undertaken in accordance with the State government's interests expressed in the State Planning Policy (SPP) and supporting mapping included on the SPP Interactive Mapping System. The SPP is a statutory instrument which expresses the State government's interests in land use planning and development and is required to be appropriately integrated into the new planning scheme. In addition Council has reviewed and commissioned independent mapping to ensure that development constraints are locally contextualised. Despite this, mapping in the SOP and Strategic Framework is not intended to provide full details at an individual property level. Further refinement of mapping is likely to occur as the new planning scheme is drafted. Development involving the reconfiguration of land (subdivision) requires the submission and approval of a development application which address development constraints over the land.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	347,
3.7.11	Area 10 Karalee, Barellan Point, Chuwar	Expresses support for specific land in Chuwar to be included in the Low Impact Industry (Business Park) designation west of Mt Crosby Road, Chuwar.	The support expressed in the submission for the designation is noted.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	395,
3.7.11	Area 10 Karalee, Barellan Point, Chuwar	Expresses support for specific land in Chuwar, north of Francis Street to be included in Alternate Option 2 - Low Density Residential (ES2). Request that: - the Established Suburban Neighbourhood (ES2 – 800-900m ² lots @ 8-12 dwellings/hectare) designation be increased; - the removal of the Environmental Management Precinct where it has been applied to infrastructure corridors (e.g. KRA and electricity easements); - the removal of the Environmental Management Precinct where it has been applied to minor watercourses and buffers; and - the inclusion of 'shifting boundaries' in recognition that further detailed site investigations may lead to a shift in the boundary between urban and non-urban precincts.	The determination of the final local framework designations for Area 10 will be contingent on the overall review of submissions to the Strategic Framework and input from State Agencies. The Environmental Management (EM) designation has the primary strategic function of separating and buffering land uses and that also contain areas of vegetation and provide connections including in association with infrastructure (e.g. road) reserves and significant urban waterways as well as providing strategic corridor links including regional cross-border corridors and priority local corridors.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	509,
3.7.12	Area 11 North Ipswich, Tivoli, North Tivoli and Moores Pocket	Expresses the view that land along Pine Street, North Ipswich in the Residential High Density designation be included in a commercial designation.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. The proposed High Density Residential (HD2-MU) designation provides for a mix of ground level retail activities incorporating High Density Residential development on upper levels. Notwithstanding, the new planning scheme will be drafted having regard to the comments raised.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	17,
3.7.12	Area 11 North Ipswich, Tivoli, North Tivoli and Moores Pocket	Requests specific land along Lowry Street, North Ipswich within the Low Density Residential designation be included in the Residential Medium Density designation.	The zone of the subject land was amended from the Residential Medium Density to Residential Low Density on 29 September 2014 as part of adopting Planning Scheme Major Amendment Package 02/2013 - Flooding. The proposed precinct aligns with the current zoning of the property, which reflects the policy intent to discourage residential intensification within areas identified at risk of flooding.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	226,
3.7.13	Area 12 Brassall	Expresses support for the Alternative Option 3.7.13A within the Local Framework.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. The new planning scheme will be drafted having regard to the comments raised.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration of the matters raised during review of the strategic framework provisions (residential densities) and during drafting of the new planning scheme (zoning).	12,
3.7.13	Area 12 Brassall	Additional retail should be encouraged in the Brassall/Pine Mountain area	The relevant proposed strategic framework provisions (3.5 Growth Management) provides a rationale for the distribution of retailing throughout the city and identifies a local centre at the intersection of Fernvale Road and Diamantina Boulevard, Brassall.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	476,
3.7.13	Area 12 Brassall	Expresses support for Local Centre designation in the vicinity of Diamantina Boulevard and Fernvale Road, Brassall.	The support expressed in the submission for the local centre is noted.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	362,
3.7.13	Area 12 Brassall	Expresses concern that the designation of Environmental Management (EM) of land west of Henry Street, Brassall is effectively down-zoning the land and removing potential development rights.	The land was the subject of a reconfiguration approval in which land required for open space must be dedicated. It is noted that the Environmental Management (EM) designation does not fully reflect the reconfiguration of a lot approval and accordingly should be amended to reflect this approval.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to amend the Draft Strategic Framework - Local Framework mapping to reflect the reconfiguration of a lot approval.	416,
3.7.13	Area 12 Brassall	Request for specific land in east of Wyman Street, Brassall in the Low Density Residential (ES3) designation be included in the Low-Medium Density Residential designation.	The distance of the land from the centre location does not warrant further densification. The land is not in proximity to a major transit node (normally on an existing or proposed railway station). The designation proposes a density of 10-16 dwellings per hectare in a variety of urban forms.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	427,
3.7.13	Area 12 Brassall	Request for specific land along Pine Mountain Road, Brassall in the Low Density Residential (ES3) designation be included in the Low Impact Industry or for business purposes, or Low Density Residential designation (ES4).	The comments expressed in the submission are noted however, the land is currently zoned and surrounded by low density residential development. It is therefore considered that the highest and best use of the land is to be retained in a low density residential designation. In order to promote a greater diversity of housing in this locality, further consideration could be given to including the subject site in the low density residential designation (ES4).	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	295,
3.7.14	Area 13 Ipswich, West Ipswich, Sadliers Crossing, Coalfalls and Woodend	Expresses concern with loss of businesses in the Ipswich city centre and mall or supports the Ipswich CBD remaining the heart of Ipswich.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. The Draft Strategic Framework and new planning scheme plan for and supports the growth of the Ipswich city centre as the cultural, administrative, civic and economic heart of the Ipswich local government area.	That no change be recommended to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	142, 259,
3.7.14	Area 13 Ipswich, West Ipswich, Sadliers Crossing, Coalfalls and Woodend	Expresses the view that the Ipswich city centre should accommodate a range of convenience shopping; and attractions such as entertainment, arts, library, green space and a family friendly environment, skating rink, ten pin bowling and with a variety of cafes and restaurants.	The relevant proposed strategic framework provisions (3.5.4 Centres and employment), provides a hierarchy of centres and a description of their role within the city. Local Framework – Area 13 Ipswich, West Ipswich, Sadliers Crossing, Coalfalls and Woodend provides details of the proposed growth pattern of the city centre (3.7.14.4 Growth Management). The Draft Strategic Framework and new planning scheme plan for and supports the growth of the Ipswich city centre as the cultural, administrative, civic and economic heart of the Ipswich local government area. Further, development of provisions for the use and adaptive reuse within heritage precincts in the city centre will be included in the drafting of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	48, 240, 480,
3.7.14	Area 13 Ipswich, West Ipswich, Sadliers Crossing, Coalfalls and Woodend	Expresses that the Ipswich City Centre Master Plan and improved walkability options within the Ipswich principal centre, connecting Nicholas Street, Top of Town precinct, Riverlink and Riverheart should be included in the new planning scheme.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. Table 3.2 of the Draft Strategic Framework addressed overarching citywide key strategic planning documents. The Draft Strategic Framework and new planning scheme plan for and support the growth of the Ipswich city centre, and will be drafted with consideration to the walkability of the principal centre and other Council strategies and plans.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	382, 388,
3.7.14	Area 13 Ipswich, West Ipswich, Sadliers Crossing, Coalfalls and Woodend	Expresses objection to the Character Mixed Density (CMD) designation in the area described as "north of the Ipswich railway line and generally bound by Burnett Street, Gladstone Road and Ferrett Street, Sadliers Crossing" with concern that the proposed density expresses a lack of sympathy to the historic area's character.	The proposed designation of the specific area is consistent with the current planning scheme zone intent of Character Housing Mixed Density given the proximity to public transport and the Ipswich Principal Centre. Development within identified character locations is to conserve pre-1946 buildings with new development designed to be sympathetic and respectful of cultural heritage significance of the setting. The objection to the land use designation has been reviewed and the current designation is still considered appropriate to focus increased residential densities in areas with good access to public transport, employment and services in accordance with the strategies of the South East Queensland Regional Plan 'Shaping SEQ'.	That no change be recommended to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	447,
3.7.14	Area 13 Ipswich, West Ipswich, Sadliers Crossing, Coalfalls and Woodend	Requests for specific land in along Salisbury Road, Ipswich and proposed within the Special Opportunity designation be included in the Community Facilities designation/zone	The Community Facilities designation is considered to better reflect the land use activities on the site and will be considered in the drafting of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework (designation) and drafting of the new planning scheme (zoning).	298,
3.7.14	Area 13 Ipswich, West Ipswich, Sadliers Crossing, Coalfalls and Woodend	Requests specific land along Warwick Road, Ipswich be recognised as a key element of the social infrastructure and community facilities network within the local framework for Area 13.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted and will be considered in the drafting of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	294,
3.7.15	Area 14 Basin Pocket, North Booval, Booval, Silkstone and East Ipswich	Expresses support for Option 3.7.15(C)&(D) for the area south of Booval Shopping Centre to be included in the Medium Density Residential designation as shown on Alternate Options 1 of the Local Framework mapping.	The support expressed in the submission is noted and will be considered in the drafting of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	7,

Section	Strategic Framework Theme	Submitter Issues	Response	Recommendation to Council	Submitter No.
3.7.15	Area 14 Basin Pocket, North Booval, Booval, Silkstone and East Ipswich	Expresses discontent that land within the vicinity of Cardew Street, East Ipswich is proposed in the Character Residential Low Density (CL3) designation and suggests the area be included in the Medium or High Density Residential designation owing to proximity to the Ipswich city centre and high frequency public transport.	The proposed land use designation is consistent with the policy intent in respect to areas identified as being within the Defined Flood Event area, by proposing a land use designation that aligns with the proposed planning provisions for residential development within a moderate risk area by discouraging the intensification of residential uses. The requested change to the land use designation has been reviewed further and is still considered to be appropriate.	That no change be recommended to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	88,
3.7.15	Area 14 Basin Pocket, North Booval, Booval, Silkstone and East Ipswich	Expresses the view that high density residential within proximity to the proposed Norman Street Bridge including along the Bremer River be reinstated as per the zoning in the current planning scheme.	The support expressed in the submission is noted and will be considered in the drafting of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	93,
3.7.15	Area 14 Basin Pocket, North Booval, Booval, Silkstone and East Ipswich	Requests the specific area along Cherside Road, Eastern Heights in the vicinity of Limestone Park, proposed within the Character Residential Low Density designation be included as Medium Density Residential designation or a land use designation which enables small lots given the areas access to surrounding centres, employment, high frequency public transport and education facilities.	Sufficient land accommodating increased residential densities to be delivered through diverse housing forms is planned in closer proximity to the Ipswich City Centre, educational establishments and high frequency public transport. The proposed designation reflects the current planning scheme zoning of Character Housing Low Density and established historic character of the surrounding area, and provides a unique opportunity for the preservation of a character streetscape fronting Limestone Park.	That no change be recommended to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	172,
3.7.15	Area 14 Basin Pocket, North Booval, Booval, Silkstone and East Ipswich	Expresses support for the Booval district centre and the South Station Road mixed use concept.	The support expressed in the submission is noted.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	219,
3.7.15	Area 14 Basin Pocket, North Booval, Booval, Silkstone and East Ipswich	Expresses support for the retention of the Character Residential Low Density designation in the older suburbs such as Newtown.	The support expressed in the submission is noted.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	219,
3.7.15	Area 14 Basin Pocket, North Booval, Booval, Silkstone and East Ipswich	Expresses support for the medium density residential outcome south of the Booval District Centre as shown on Alternate Options 1 map and suggests possibility of building heights greater than 2 storeys to enable a transition from low to high densities.	The support expressed in the submission for the Alternate Options 1 land use designation is noted and will be considered in the drafting of the new planning scheme. The sub precincts of the Medium Density Residential designation provide for the transition of building heights between low-medium-high density by including building heights ranging from 2 to 5 storeys depending on the sub area (i.e. MD1, MD2 or MD3).	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	231,
3.7.15	Area 14 Basin Pocket, North Booval, Booval, Silkstone and East Ipswich	Expresses support for the medium density residential outcome within the area south of the Booval District Centre as shown on Alternate Options 1 map.	The support expressed in the submission for the Alternate Options 1 is noted.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	327,
3.7.15	Area 14 Basin Pocket, North Booval, Booval, Silkstone and East Ipswich	Expresses support for Option 3.7.15(C)(iii) within the area of North Booval, as shown on Alternate Options 1 of the Strategic Framework mapping.	The support expressed in the submission for the Alternate Options 1 land use designation is noted.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	371,
3.7.15	Area 14 Basin Pocket, North Booval, Booval, Silkstone and East Ipswich	Expresses land between Brisbane Road and Blackstone Road, Newtown be included in a medium density residential designation.	Sufficient land accommodating increased residential densities (e.g. medium and high density residential) is planned in proximity established higher order centres and high frequency public transport. The distance of this area from nodes that support residential intensification does not warrant further densification.	That no change be recommended to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	343,
3.7.15	Area 14 Basin Pocket, North Booval, Booval, Silkstone and East Ipswich	Expresses objection to the creation of hatchet lots and the impact of development on the historic character of the Newtown area.	The Strategic Framework's proposed strategy within established suburban areas is generally for a density consistent with the existing established character of the location. In the example of Frederick Street, Newtown between Brisbane Road and Glebe Road the proposed designation is Character Residential Low Density (CL2) which proposes a minimum lot size for new development of 800m ² generally consistent with the average lot sizing in the location. The Strategic Framework proposes to meet the demand for new housing predominantly within master planned communities and other expansion areas, consolidation areas focused around higher order centres and public transport, and limited residential development outside the urban areas.	That no change be recommended to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	352,
3.7.15	Area 14 Basin Pocket, North Booval, Booval, Silkstone and East Ipswich	Requests specific areas along Booval Street, Booval proposed in the medium density residential designation be considered for inclusion in a character designation to protect the heritage values.	The comments expressed in the submission have merit and are noted. The new planning scheme will be drafted having regard to the comments raised.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	431,
3.7.15	Area 14 Basin Pocket, North Booval, Booval, Silkstone and East Ipswich	Expresses objection to the medium density residential designation and further development within proximity to the intersection of Marian Street and Railway Street, Booval, including the construction of public housing. Suggests the area maybe more suitable to a lower density strategy.	The proposed designation of the specific area is consistent with the current planning scheme zone intent of Residential Medium Density given the proximity to high frequency public transport and the Booval District Centre. The land use designation has been reviewed and it is still considered appropriate to focus increased residential densities in areas with good access to high frequency public transport, employment and services in accordance with the strategies of the South East Queensland Regional Plan ' <i>Shaping SEQ</i> '.	That no change be recommended to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	477,
3.7.15	Area 14 Basin Pocket, North Booval, Booval, Silkstone and East Ipswich	Expresses support for initiatives such as 88 Limestone Street in the Ipswich city centre and Top of Town areas.	The comments and support expressed in the submission are noted.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	219,
3.7.15	Area 14 Basin Pocket, North Booval, Booval, Silkstone and East Ipswich	Requests the specific land along Countess Street, East Ipswich proposed in the Established Suburban (ES4) designation be maintained in the Medium Density Residential designation in alignment with the current zoning of the property.	The proposed designation is consistent with the policy intent in respect to areas identified as being within the Defined Flood Event area, by proposing a land use designation that aligns with the proposed planning provisions within a moderate risk area by discouraging the further intensification of residential uses. The requested change to the land use designation has been reviewed further and is still considered to be appropriate.	That no change be recommended to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	46,
3.7.15	Area 14 Basin Pocket, North Booval, Booval, Silkstone and East Ipswich	Requests specific land along Blackall Street, East Ipswich in the Low Density Residential designation be included in the High Density Residential designation.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. The new planning scheme will be drafted having regard to the comments raised.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	61, 287, 409,
3.7.15	Area 14 Basin Pocket, North Booval, Booval, Silkstone and East Ipswich	Expresses support for the inclusion of the specific land near the intersection of Glebe Road, Cherside Road and Brisbane Road, Newtown in the Neighbourhood Centre designation.	The support expressed in the submission for the preferred land use designation is noted and will be considered in the drafting of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	277,
3.7.15	Area 14 Basin Pocket, North Booval, Booval, Silkstone and East Ipswich	Requests specific land along Frederick Street, Newtown in the Character Residential Low Density designation be included in the Low Density Residential designation.	The subject site contains a pre-1946 dwelling within the Character Housing Low Density designation, which is reflective of the current planning scheme zoning of Character Housing Low Density. The site is adjacent to a pocket of Low Density Residential designation containing post-war dwellings. The subject site reflects the heritage intent of the Character Housing Low Density and does not warrant removal from the designation.	That no change be recommended to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	343,
3.7.15	Area 14 Basin Pocket, North Booval, Booval, Silkstone and East Ipswich	Request specific land along Glebe Road, Booval in the Character Residential Low Density designation be included in the adjacent Medium Density Residential designation. The submitter purports they were not notified in 1999 of the specific land being included in the current zone of Character Housing Low Density.	The submission examples identify dwellings outside of a character land use designation with the exception of a modern dwelling within the Character Low Density Residential designation that was approved prior to the introduction of the 'special heritage character precinct' planning provisions of the Ipswich Eastern Corridor Structure Plan formally into the Ipswich Planning Scheme. The specific land contains a pre-1946 dwelling within the Character Residential Low Density designation, which is reflective of the current planning scheme zoning of Character Housing Low Density. The subject site exhibits heritage consistent with the intent of the Character Residential Low Density area and does not warrant removal from the designation. Council records indicate that correspondence was issued in April 1997 to the owner regarding Council's intent to include the specific land in a 'special heritage character precinct' of the Ipswich Eastern Corridor Structure Plan.	That no change be recommended to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	346,
3.7.15	Area 14 Basin Pocket, North Booval, Booval, Silkstone and East Ipswich	Expresses that without the availability of the draft planning scheme that the subject lands along Oxford Street, North Booval appears to be a down zoning to the Environmental Management (EM) designation.	The Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework) is an early step in the process of the drafting the new planning scheme and is not the final Strategic Framework or a draft version of the new planning scheme. The consultation (including proposed land use designations) was undertaken to seek early feedback on the community's thoughts, concerns and suggestions to help shape the final version of the Strategic Framework and inform the future drafting of the new planning scheme. The Statement of Proposals and Draft Strategic Framework at this preliminary stage does not have weight in relation to land use rights. Following review of this early consultation outcomes, a final strategic framework and full draft of the planning scheme is to be prepared. Information about the new planning scheme and its progress through its stages is to be published through Council's website or alert services periodically.	That no change be recommended to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	365,
3.7.15	Area 14 Basin Pocket, North Booval, Booval, Silkstone and East Ipswich	Request specific land along Cherside Road, Eastern Heights be included in the Special Uses Zone in recognition of the current lawful use of the site.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted and the new planning scheme will be drafted having regard to the comments raised.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	445,
3.7.15	Area 14 Basin Pocket, North Booval, Booval, Silkstone and East Ipswich	Requests for specific land along Railway Street, Booval in the Medium Density Residential (MD3) designation to be included as commercial.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted, however sufficient land is provided for by the District Centre (Core and Frame) to support the delivery of appropriate non-residential uses and the current residential designation is considered an appropriate designation for the land.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	481,
3.7.16	Area 15 Raceview, Flinders View, Ipswich (part)	Expresses concern that specific land along Ash Street, Flinders View was included in the Community Facilities (CF) designation limiting expansion plans for the local centre.	Although the land was proposed in the Special Opportunity (SA10) designation consistent with the current planning scheme, preliminary advice from the State government has indicated that the new planning scheme use the standard suite of zones consistent with the regulated requirements of the <i>Planning Regulation 2017</i> , which excludes the use of the Special Opportunity Zone. Noting the size of the existing local centre immediately adjacent, it is recommended that the land be reviewed for inclusion in the Medium Density Residential (MD1) designation as the highest and best use for the land. It is also proposed that a dotted line be used between the Local Centre (LC) and Medium Density Residential (MD1) designations providing a degree of flexibility to consider the expansion of the local centre, subject to application, where it can be demonstrated an expansion is consistent with the centre hierarchy and relevant provisions of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	376,

Section	Strategic Framework Theme	Submitter Issues	Response	Recommendation to Council	Submitter No.
3.7.16	Area 15 Raceview, Flinders View, Ipswich (part)	Requests for specific land along Raceview Street, Raceview in the Medium Density Residential (MD1) designation to be changed to provide for commercial uses.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted, however the proposed designation is consistent with the current zoning and does not remove the ability to continue to use the site for an existing lawful use consistent with relevant legislation. Having regard to the current availability of neighbourhood and local centres in proximity to the site, it is considered that the inclusion of an additional centre is unwarranted.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	385,
3.7.16	Area 15 Raceview, Flinders View, Ipswich (part)	Requests for specific land along Robertson Road, Raceview in the Special Opportunity designation to be changed to provide for commercial/retail uses.	<p>Although the land was proposed in the Special Opportunity (SA7) designation consistent with the current planning scheme, preliminary advice from the State government has indicated that the new planning scheme use the standard suite of zones consistent with the regulated requirements of the <i>Planning Regulation 2017</i>, which excludes the use of the Special Opportunity Zone.</p> <p>Having regard to the current availability of neighbourhood and local centres in proximity to the site, it is considered that the inclusion of an additional centre is unwarranted. It is recommended that the land be reviewed for inclusion in the Established Suburban (ES3) designation consistent with the surrounding prevailing designation.</p>	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the new planning scheme.	437,
3.7.16	Area 15 Raceview, Flinders View, Ipswich (part)	Requests for specific land within proximity to the intersection of Cascade Street and Raceview Street, Raceview which is proposed within the Medium Density Residential (MD1) designation be considered for a Local Centre designation.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted, however the proposed designation is consistent with the current zoning and does not remove the ability to continue to use the site for an existing lawful use consistent with relevant legislation. Having regard to the current availability of neighbourhood and local centres in proximity to the site, it is considered that the inclusion of an additional centre is unwarranted.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	390,
3.7.16	Area 15 Raceview, Flinders View, Ipswich (part)	Requests specific land north-west of the South Station Road and Nolan Street, Raceview intersection proposed in the Medium Density Residential (MD1) designation and the Neighbourhood Centre (NC) designation to be included in the Local Centre (LC) designation.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted and will be considered in the development of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the new planning scheme.	206,
3.7.16	Area 15 Raceview, Flinders View, Ipswich (part)	Expresses concern that the Medium Density Residential (MD1) designation is inconsistent with the policy intent for areas identified as being constrained by the flooding.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted and will be considered in the development of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the new planning scheme.	503,
3.7.17	Area 16 Churchill	Expresses objection to the inclusion of specific land along Woodgate Street, Churchill in the preferred land use designation of Low Density Residential, with support expressed for Option 3.7.17C of Low-Medium Density Residential as shown on Alternate Options 1 map.	The comments expressed in the submissions including objection to preferred land use designation and support for the proposed land use designation shown on the Alternate Option 1 map are noted. The new planning scheme will be drafted having regard to the matters raised in the submissions.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	297, 426,
3.7.18	Area 17 Yamanto, Churchill (part)	Requests for a range of changes to the preferred designations relating to land in proximity to the Yamanto district centre, including the expansion of the District Centre, inclusion of High Density Residential either side of the future Ipswich to Springfield railway line, and further infill opportunities in specific Established Suburban areas.	<p>The proposed designations are generally consistent with the outcomes sought by Implementation Guideline No. 29 - Yamanto Central Planning and Development Guidelines that were prepared to promote traditional neighbourhood design principles in consultation with landowners. The comments expressed in the submission will be considered in the development of the new planning scheme, including the consideration of the intended range of uses and code preparation.</p> <p>The proposed use of Established Suburban designations promotes additional diversity in housing form and choice across the local government area whilst maintaining the established suburban character of existing neighbourhoods.</p>	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	260,
3.7.18	Area 17 Yamanto, Churchill (part)	Requests for specific land along Fitzroy Street, Churchill to not lock in more restrictive zoning and to allow for an increase to the residential part of the site.	Although the line between the Low Density Residential (ES2) designation and the Environmental Management (EM) designation is indicative and subject to further detailed assessment, the extent of the Environmental Management (EM) designation is consistent with the Defined Flood Event in Overlay Map 10 - Flooding and Major Urban Catchment Flow Paths. The draft Strategic Framework identifies that the intensification of residential uses, including the creation of new residential lots is to be avoided where within areas identified as being constrained by flooding.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	310,
3.7.18	Area 17 Yamanto, Churchill (part)	Requests to retain the current designation of Major Centres - Yamanto Secondary Business Area over specific land or to include land in the District Centre Frame (DCF) designation.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted and will be reviewed as part of the development of the new planning scheme, particularly with regard to the possible inclusion of the Mixed Use Designation / Zone to provide for a range of non-residential transition uses and to incorporate medium density residential development in support of the centre.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to review the designations in the Yamanto centre having regard to the centres hierarchy and the possible use of the Mixed Use Designation / Zone in the area bounded by Leonard Street, Pisasale Drive and the land in the District Centre Frame (DCF) designation fronting Warwick Road.	206, 260,
3.7.18	Area 17 Yamanto, Churchill (part)	Expresses support for the inclusion of the Yamanto centre into the District Centre Core (DCC) designation to the west of the proposed public transport corridor as shown on the Preferred Map in preference to the High Density Residential (HD1) designation as shown on the Alternate Options 1 Map. Also suggested that the wording should be revised to allow for mixed-use development (inclusive of residential development) to provide for development of up to 5 storeys over the entire area (not just in Main Street) and indicated that Table 3.3 - Hierarchy of Centres should reference residential development as the omission conflicts with the intent for Main Street.	<p>The comments expressed in the submission are noted and will be considered in the development of the new planning scheme.</p> <p>District centres are intended to provide for a mix of uses, including higher density residential uses and it is recommended that wording changes be considered to strengthen this intent.</p>	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the new planning scheme, particularly to clarify that the District Centre designation is intended to provide for residential uses and in relation to building height.	469,
3.7.18	Area 17 Yamanto, Churchill (part)	Requests that specific land in proximity to the Yamanto district centre and proposed within the High Density Residential (HD1) designation be included in a Special Opportunity designation to provide for a mix of use types (including non-residential) and to accommodate a broader range of housing typologies.	Preliminary advice from the State government has indicated that the new planning scheme use the standard suite of zones consistent with the regulated requirements of the <i>Planning Regulation 2017</i> , which excludes the use of the Special Opportunity Zone.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	469,
		Also expressed the view that the use of prescriptive language in the local framework does not provide for appropriate diversity of product in the High Density Residential (HD1) designation as provided for in the missing middle housing typologies as outlined in section 3.5.5.	<p>Sufficient land is provided for by the District Centre (Core and Frame) to support the delivery of appropriate non-residential uses and the location of the land warrants the highest density of residential uses to support the district centre and proposed public transport corridor.</p> <p>The comments regarding planning provisions as expressed in the submission are noted and will be considered in the development of the new planning scheme.</p>		
3.7.18	Area 17 Yamanto, Churchill (part)	Requests that specific land in proximity to the Yamanto district centre and within the Environmental Management (EM) designation be included in the Recreation and Open Space (REC) designation.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted, however the proposed Environmental Management (EM) designation has a primary strategic function of separating and buffering land uses, and is intended to provide for multiple and complementary values, including conserving strategic corridor links and providing opportunity for recreation. The designation also reflects relevant development constraints, including for stormwater management.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	469,
3.7.18	Area 17 Yamanto, Churchill (part)	Request for specific land in Yamanto in the Low Density Residential (ES2) designation be included in a Special Opportunity designation.	<p>Preliminary advice from the State government has indicated that the new planning scheme use the standard suite of zones consistent with the regulated requirements of the <i>Planning Regulation 2017</i>, which excludes the use of the Special Opportunity Zone.</p> <p>It is recommended that the land bounded by Warwick Road, Powells Road and the Centenary Highway, Yamanto be reviewed for potential inclusion in the Low-Medium Density Residential (LMD) designation.</p>	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	181, 220,
3.7.18	Area 17 Yamanto, Churchill (part)	Requests for specific land within proximity to Warwick Road and Hall Street, Yamanto and within the Low Impact Industry (Business Park) designation be included in the Special Opportunity designation to provide greater flexibility, including providing for large format retail, showroom, office and medical uses.	<p>Preliminary advice from the State government has indicated that the new planning scheme use the standard suite of zones consistent with the regulated requirements of the <i>Planning Regulation 2017</i>, which excludes the use of the Special Opportunity Zone.</p> <p>Whilst the Business Park designation is intended to complement adjacent centres and not compete with these centres, it is recommended that the new planning scheme be drafted having regard to the comments raised, particularly in relation to the range of uses and associated provisions that will apply to the Business Park designation.</p>	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	361,
3.7.18	Area 17 Yamanto, Churchill (part)	Requests that the vision for Main Street in Yamanto be expanded to promote place making outcomes, allow for purely non-residential built form options, and that the park / plaza and community facilities be included in the Local Government Infrastructure Plan.	<p>The Local Government Infrastructure Plan identifies the local public park and the land for community facilities networks intended to service existing and future urban development (up to ultimate development) based on the current planning scheme.</p> <p>The matter is to be referred to Council's Infrastructure Strategy Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department and the Performance Branch of the Coordination and Performance Department for consideration.</p> <p>The comments regarding planning provisions as expressed in the submission are noted and will be considered in the development of the new planning scheme.</p>	<p>1. Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme;</p> <p>2. That the submission be referred to Council's Infrastructure Strategy Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department;</p> <p>3. That the submission be referred to Council's Performance Branch of the Coordination and Performance Department; and</p> <p>4. That the Manager City Design be authorised to consider the advice from Council's Infrastructure Strategy Branch and from Council's Performance Branch in the review of the draft strategic framework, drafting of the new planning scheme and subsequent local government infrastructure plan.</p>	469,
3.7.18	Area 17 Yamanto, Churchill (part)	Request for specific land in Yamanto in the Low Impact Industry (LI) and Environmental Management (EM) designations to be changed to provide for residential uses.	The proposed designations reflects the current zoning and the extent of development constraints applicable to the land, including Q Fever.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	484,

Section	Strategic Framework Theme	Submitter Issues	Response	Recommendation to Council	Submitter No.
3.7.19	Area 18 Ripley Valley	Expresses the view that future residential development in Ripley provide greater separation between dwellings for maintenance and health purposes.	Land within the Ripley Valley Priority Development Area is administered for planning and development purposes under the <i>Economic Development Act 2012</i> and accordingly can not be regulated by the Ipswich planning scheme.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	352,
3.7.19	Area 18 Ripley Valley	Expressed support for the inclusion of particular land in the Conservation (CON) designation.	The support expressed in the submission for the Conservation land use designation are noted.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	407,
3.7.19	Area 18 Ripley Valley	Expresses the view: - that Council has not zoned sufficient land for private educational facilities within the Ripley area and that new designation / zoning and overlays in the area should not prevent the viability of a future educational establishment; - of displeasure with the amount of natural habitat that native fauna have lost in Ripley; - that the mapping of biodiversity and watercourse can significantly affect development capacity; and - that the Overlay Map 10 - Flooding and Major Urban Catchment Flow Paths should not apply in the Ripley Valley area.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. Land within the Ripley Valley Priority Development Area is administered for planning and development purposes under the <i>Economic Development Act 2012</i> and accordingly will not form part of the Ipswich planning scheme. Notwithstanding, the areas identified are proposed to be designated new suburban, a residential designation intended to provide for community uses in addition to a variety of dwelling types and small-scale services, facilities and infrastructure. Biodiversity and Flooding and Major Urban Catchment Flow Path overlays indicate areas where biodiversity should be preserved or where flooding or overland flow is present. Corresponding designations of Environmental Management (EM) or Recreation and Open Space (REC) recognise the importance of these constraints in particular areas. Where these constraints are present, uses appropriate to these designations are preferred, and other uses may be considered at a reduced in scale and intensity.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	32, 464, 487, 488,
3.7.19	Area 18 Ripley Valley	Expresses support for future railway stations planned for the Ripley Valley.	The support expressed in the submission is noted. The extension of the Springfield railway line to the Ripley area is identified as strategic infrastructure in the draft Strategic Framework, however the extension of railway network in Ripley is a State government matter.	No change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	32,
3.7.19	Area 18 Ripley Valley	Expresses the view that the proposed land use designations are not consistent with the land use locations in the Ripley Valley Urban Development Area - Development Scheme.	The land use designations proposed for Local Framework - Area 18 Ripley Valley has been drafted with consideration of the State government's Ripley Valley Urban Development Area - Development Scheme and approved development applications.	No change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	487, 488,
3.7.19	Area 18 Ripley Valley	Requests changes to the designation of specific land in the Ripley major centre (town centre / urban core) to better reflect the submitter's master plan.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted, however as the master plan has not yet been approved and further changes to the draft Strategic Framework are not considered to be warranted at this stage. Land within the Ripley Valley Priority Development Area are administered for planning and development purposes under the <i>Economic Development Act 2012</i> and accordingly will not form part of the Ipswich planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	373,
3.7.19	Area 18 Ripley Valley	Expresses support for Alternate Options 3.7.19B and 3.7.19C on Alternate Options 1 map and requests for minor changes to the designation of specific land in the Ripley East district centre.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted and will be reviewed as part of the development of the new planning scheme. Land within the Ripley Valley Priority Development Area are administered for planning and development purposes under the <i>Economic Development Act 2012</i> and accordingly will not form part of the Ipswich planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	438,
3.7.19	Area 18 Ripley Valley	Requests for specific land along Watsons Road, South Ripley proposed within the Recreation and Open Space (REC) designation be amended to be consistent with adjoining land.	The proposed land use designation reflects the current planning scheme zoning which has been in effect since 18 September 2009 and is also consistent with the Ripley Valley Priority Development Area - Parks and Open Space Map. Land within the Ripley Valley Priority Development Area is administered for planning and development purposes under the <i>Economic Development Act 2012</i> and accordingly will not form part of the Ipswich planning scheme.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	190,
3.7.19	Area 18 Ripley Valley	Expresses concern with the inclusion of specific land along Cumner Road, White Rock in the Environmental Management (EM) designation.	The proposed designation generally reflects the current planning scheme zoning which includes the majority of the site in the Conservation Zone and remainder in the Recreation Zone. The Environmental Management (EM) designation is intended to provide for multiple and complementary values including buffering and vegetation retention. The extent of the designation also reflects relevant development constraints, including biodiversity, topography and flooding. Land within the Ripley Valley Priority Development Area is administered for planning and development purposes under the <i>Economic Development Act 2012</i> and accordingly will not form part of the Ipswich planning scheme.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	216,
3.7.19	Area 18 Ripley Valley	Requests for specific land along Siddans Road, Deebling Heights in the Conservation (CON) designation be included in the New Suburban (NS2) designation.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted, however inclusion of the land in the Low Density Residential (NS2) designation is not supported having regard to the development constraints, including biodiversity, watercourses, scenic amenity, topography and servicing constraints. It is recommended that consideration be given to inclusion of the land in the Environmental Management (EM) designation which better reflects the characteristics of the land. The Environmental Management (EM) designation has the primary strategic function of separating and buffering land uses and conserving strategic corridor links, including areas that contain vegetation or provide connections to other native vegetation.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	279, 280,
3.7.19	Area 18 Ripley Valley	Requests for specific land along Broadway Court, Deebling Heights in the Conservation (CON) designation be included in the Low Density Residential (NS2) designation.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted, however inclusion of the land in the Low Density Residential (NS2) designation is not supported having regard to the extent of native vegetation and development constraints, including biodiversity, watercourses, scenic amenity, topography, and servicing constraints.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	410,
3.7.19	Area 18 Ripley Valley	Requests for amendment to the land use designation of specific land within the Paradise Waters estate in Deebling Heights to reflect approved development.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted, however the Conservation (CON) designation has been used to reflect the environmental values of the land based on a reconciliation of the development approval and the <i>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> approval (EPBC Act approval). Further consideration may be given to the designation used over the areas identified as 'bushfire zone areas' in the EPBC Act approval. The use of the dotted line between the designations also highlights a degree of flexibility in determining the boundary through the development assessment process. It is proposed that the designations be reviewed as part of the development of the new planning scheme. Land within the Ripley Valley Priority Development Area is administered for planning and development purposes under the <i>Economic Development Act 2012</i> and accordingly will not form part of the Ipswich planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	451,
3.7.20	Area 19 Purga, Goolman and Peak Crossing	Expresses the view that rural land is not economically viable and should be considered for more intensive uses.	The regulatory provisions of the State government's South East Queensland Regional Plan (ShapingSEQ) for areas outside of the 'Urban Footprint' and not identified as areas designated for future non-rural uses or increased residential density, prevent urban and rural residential sprawl in the Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area (RLRPA) and manages other activity, including subdivision, to protect these values. The regulation also serves to protect areas that might be required for accommodating future urban growth beyond the planning horizon of <i>ShapingSEQ</i> . A non-residential urban use would need to show that the proposal has been able to demonstrate an overriding need in the public interest to establish the use. It is noted that there is no guarantee that such an approved use will be able to demonstrate an overriding need to expand or diversify the use in the future or that a similar use could establish overriding need nearby.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	305,
3.7.20	Area 19 Purga, Goolman and Peak Crossing	Requests that specific land along Ipswich Boonah Road, Purga and Ellison Road, Goolman is not suitable for rural uses and therefore higher order uses such as light industry and commercial or rural living uses should be considered.	The regulatory provisions of the State government's South East Queensland Regional Plan (ShapingSEQ) for areas outside of the 'Urban Footprint' and not identified as areas designated for future non-rural uses or increased residential density, prevent urban and rural residential sprawl in the Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area (RLRPA) and manages other activity, including subdivision, to protect these values. The regulation also serves to protect areas that might be required for accommodating future urban growth beyond the planning horizon of ShapingSEQ. A non-residential urban use would need to show that the proposal has been able to demonstrate an overriding need in the public interest to establish the use. It is noted that there is no guarantee that such an approved use will be able to demonstrate an overriding need to expand or diversify the use in the future or that a similar use could establish overriding need nearby.	No change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	305,
3.7.20	Area 19 Purga, Goolman and Peak Crossing	Expresses support for the Alternate Option 3.7.20A for the Industry Investigation (II) designation and requests increasing the Industry Investigation designation east of Option 3.7.20A which is currently proposed as Rural 1 (Agriculture).	The support for Option 3.7.20A expressed in the submission is noted. The request for inclusion of the area immediately to the east of Alternate Option 3.7.20A is acknowledged, and will be reviewed in the development of the new planning scheme.	No change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	200, 206, 286,
3.7.20	Area 19 Purga, Goolman and Peak Crossing	Requests that the area surrounding Ipswich Boonah Road, Purga, bordered by the Cunningham Highway and the Centenary Highway proposed as Rural 2 (Pastoral) and Recreation and Open Space designations, be designated as Recreation and Open Space (REC).	The proposition that the area surrounding Ipswich Boonah Road, Purga, and bordered by the Cunningham Highway and the Centenary Highway, is suitable for recreational and sporting activities is noted, including its particular strengths for such use which include proximity to local urban areas and centres, and proximity to major road accesses providing excellent connectivity to urban centres throughout South East Queensland.	No change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	483,
3.7.20	Area 19 Purga, Goolman and Peak Crossing	Outlines the planning history and the creation of two lots (described as Lot 102 on SP303190 at 183 Pisasale Drive, Yamanto and Lot 101 on SP303190 at 16 Ipswich Boonah Road, Purga) as a result of the construction of the Centenary Highway. In relation to Lot 102 on SP303190 requests inclusion in a residential zone based on its proximity to and as a logical extension to existing urban development in Deebling Heights and its location in the Urban Footprint under the South East Queensland Regional Plan. In relation Lot 102 on SP303190 requests inclusion in a zoning for Commercial, Industrial or Recreational based on its proximity to the Yamanto centre, adjacent land uses including the Swifts Rugby League Club, that it is free from flooding and does not display any attributes associated with the planning intent of a Rural B (Pastoral) zoning.	Lot 102 on SP303190 at 183 Pisasale Drive, Yamanto. The land is located in the Urban Footprint across an existing urban road from existing low density residential development. It is also located within approximately 800 metres of the Yamanto District Centre and future railway station. It is further noted that following the issuing of updated noise mapping (the Australian Noise Exposure Forecast (ANEF) Contours) by the Department of Defence the land is no longer included within the ANEF area. Lot 101 on SP303190 at 16 Ipswich Boonah Road, Purga is located outside the Urban Footprint under the South East Queensland Regional Plan with a presumption against the zoning of land for / development for urban purposes. The inclusion of the land in a rural designation in the Statement of Proposals reflects the land's location outside the Urban Footprint in the Rural Landscape and Production Area designation under the South East Queensland Regional Plan. Changes to the Urban Footprint boundary would need to be considered and determined through the Regional Plan review process. Notwithstanding, the edge of the Urban Footprint is defined by the Centenary and Cunningham Highways which are logical, discernible and defensible boundaries, with there being no need to expand the Urban Footprint in this location to accommodate the forecast urban growth.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to: 1. the further investigation of Lot 102 on SP303190 at 183 Pisasale Drive, Yamanto for inclusion in either the Residential Low Density Zone or Low Medium Density Residential Zone; and 2. the inclusion of Lot 101 on SP303190 at 16 Ipswich Boonah Road, Purga in the Rural Zone.	151, 345,
3.7.22	Area 21 One Mile, Leichhardt and Wulkuraka (part)	Requests for specific land along Dixon Street, Wulkuraka proposed in the Low Density Residential (ES2) designation to be included as commercial.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted, however there is no justification for the establishment of retail uses on the southern side of the railway line at Wulkuraka at this point in time.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	481,

Section	Strategic Framework Theme	Submitter Issues	Response	Recommendation to Council	Submitter No.
3.7.22	Area 21 One Mile, Leichhardt and Wulkuraka (part)	Requests that the specific land along Chubb Street, One Mile proposed in the Recreation and Open Space (REC) and Environmental Management (EM) designations be included in the Large Lot Residential designation.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted and will be considered in the development of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	192,
3.7.22	Area 21 One Mile, Leichhardt and Wulkuraka (part)	Expresses concern with the proposed land use designations and request reinstatement of the current planning scheme zoning over specific land within the vicinity of Sherman Road, Unnamed Road and Karrabin Rosewood Road, Karrabin.	The proposed designations of Industry Investigation (II), Environmental Management (EM), and Recreation and Open Space (REC) designations are generally consistent with the current zoning, and where variations occur, is owing to changes in the Major Flood Conveyance / High Risk and Defined Flood Event / Moderate Risk / Major Flood Storage mapping on Overlay Map 10 - Flooding and Major Urban Catchment Flow Paths.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	282, 408,
3.7.22	Area 21 One Mile, Leichhardt and Wulkuraka (part)	Requests that specific land in the Environmental Management (EM) designation be amended for low impact industry or Industry Investigation (II) designation.	The proposed designation of Environmental Management (EM) generally is a result of the substantial flooding constraint, state mapping of regulated vegetation or state mapping of wildlife habitat. The comments expressed in the submission are noted and will be considered in the development of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	254, 430, 470,
3.7.24	Area 23 Pine Mountain, Muirlea, Blacksoil (part), Haigslea (part), Ironbark	Expresses concern regarding the level of protection of biodiversity and existing vegetation when the designation identified the predominant and preferred land use as Rural 3 (Rural Living).	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. The new planning scheme will be drafted having regard to the comments raised.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	407,
3.7.24	Area 23 Pine Mountain, Muirlea, Blacksoil (part), Haigslea (part), Ironbark	Request for specific areas in Muirlea be designated for large lot residential uses or similar, maintain the option for eco-tourism in rural areas and expresses objection to the Rural 4 (Special Land Management) designation.	<p>The regulatory provisions of the State government's South East Queensland Regional Plan (ShapingSEQ) for areas outside of the 'Urban Footprint' and not identified as areas designated for future non-rural uses or increased residential density, prevent urban and rural residential sprawl in the Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area (RLRPA) and manages other activity, including subdivision, to protect these values. The regulation also serves to protect areas that might be required for accommodating future urban growth beyond the planning horizon of ShapingSEQ. A non-residential urban use would need to show that the proposal has been able to demonstrate an overriding need in the public interest to establish the use. It is noted that there is no guarantee that such an approved use will be able to demonstrate an overriding need to expand or diversify the use in the future or that a similar use could establish overriding need nearby. Areas of Muirlea are outside of the South East Queensland Regional Plan Urban Footprint, and not identified as areas designated for future increased density.</p> <p>The comments in the submission are noted. Variances in rural designations are proposed in order to reflect agricultural or biodiversity values, however the new planning scheme will be drafted having regard to the comments raised.</p> <p>Permitted rural development types will ultimately be determined when drafting the new planning scheme provisions in relation to the rural zones.</p>	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the submission including review of the Rural 4 designation mapping as part of the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	423, 463, 475, 489,
3.7.24	Area 23 Pine Mountain, Muirlea, Blacksoil (part), Haigslea (part), Ironbark	Expresses objection to the Rural 4 (Special Land Management) designation, and concern regarding the Biodiversity and Strategic Green Infrastructure overlays in regard to the mapping of domestic lawns, gardens, cultivations or orchards.	The proposed designations are generally consistent with previous zonings, the Biodiversity and Strategic Green Infrastructure mapping and relevant State government mapping. Notwithstanding, the comments expressed in the submission are noted and will be considered in the development of the new planning scheme.	To consider the issues raised in the submission during the drafting of any related scheme code provisions.	468, 475, 489,
3.7.24	Area 23 Pine Mountain, Muirlea, Blacksoil (part), Haigslea (part), Ironbark	Expresses objection to the designation for specific land owing to concern regarding impact upon value of the property and accuracy of biodiversity overlay underpinning the designation.	Council also has no control over market values and is required to ensure all owners and prospective purchasers are informed of development constraints. Notwithstanding, the comments expressed in the submission are noted and will be considered in the development of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	23, 24, 76, 77, 78, 136, 330, 413, 415,
3.7.24	Area 23 Pine Mountain, Muirlea, Blacksoil (part), Haigslea (part), Ironbark	Requests for specific land along Pine Mountain Road, Pine Mountain in the Community Facilities designation be included in the Rural 3 (Rural Living) designation.	The comments expressed in the submission have merit and are noted. The new planning scheme will be drafted having regard to the comments raised.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	447,
3.7.24	Area 23 Pine Mountain, Muirlea, Blacksoil (part), Haigslea (part), Ironbark	Requests for specific land in Pine Mountain and Ironbark be included in the Rural 3 (Rural Living) designation.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. The new planning scheme will be drafted having regard to the comments raised.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration of the matters raised during review of the strategic framework (residential densities) and as part of the drafting of the new planning scheme (zoning).	125, 256, 309,
3.7.25	Area 24 Walloon, Thagoona, Haigslea (part) and Mount Marrow	Requests for a broad scale detailed plan for the development of the area including future provision of services, improvement of roads and regular consultation with the areas landowners to facilitate planning and acquisition of properties.	The regulatory provisions of the State government's South East Queensland Regional Plan (ShapingSEQ) for areas outside of the 'Urban Footprint' and not identified as areas designated for future non-rural uses or increased residential density, prevent urban and rural residential sprawl in the Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area (RLRPA) and manages other activity, including subdivision, to protect these values. The regulation also serves to protect areas that might be required for accommodating future urban growth beyond the planning horizon of ShapingSEQ. A non-residential urban use would need to show that the proposal has been able to demonstrate an overriding need in the public interest to establish the use. It is noted that there is no guarantee that such an approved use will be able to demonstrate an overriding need to expand or diversify the use in the future or that a similar use could establish overriding need nearby. Areas of Walloon are outside of the South East Queensland Regional Plan Urban Footprint, and not identified as areas designated for future increased density.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	202, 325, 364,
3.7.25	Area 24 Walloon, Thagoona, Haigslea (part) and Mount Marrow	Expresses support for the expansion of Local Framework - Area 24 Walloon, Thagoona, Haigslea (part) and Mount Marrow, and the expansion of the urban area of Thagoona to the south of the railway line (including support for Option 3.7.24B). Requests expansion of the Urban Footprint to the north of Walloon.	<p>The support including for Option 3.7.24B expressed in the submission is noted.</p> <p>The regulatory provisions of the State government's South East Queensland Regional Plan (ShapingSEQ) for areas outside of the 'Urban Footprint' and not identified as areas designated for future non-rural uses or increased residential density, prevent urban and rural residential sprawl in the Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area (RLRPA) and manages other activity, including subdivision, to protect these values. The regulation also serves to protect areas that might be required for accommodating future urban growth beyond the planning horizon of ShapingSEQ. A non-residential urban use would need to show that the proposal has been able to demonstrate an overriding need in the public interest to establish the use. It is noted that there is no guarantee that such an approved use will be able to demonstrate an overriding need to expand or diversify the use in the future or that a similar use could establish overriding need nearby. Areas of Muirlea are outside of the South East Queensland Regional Plan Urban Footprint, and not identified as areas designated for future increased density.</p>	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	163, 276,
3.7.25	Area 24 Walloon, Thagoona, Haigslea (part) and Mount Marrow	Expresses the view that the area: - proposed as Low Density Residential (LL1) west of Poplar Street, south of Anthonys Road and bordered to the west by Guilfoyle's Gully should be designated Low Density Residential (NS); - identified within the mining overlay to the north of Karrabin Rosewood Road between Walloon and Thagoona and including Mt Marrow should be designated Low Density Residential (NS2); and - developed as Low Density Residential (LL1) to the west of Thagoona bordering LAF 26 should be designated Low Density Residential (NS).	The designation boundaries closely align with the precincts depicted in the Walloon Thagoona land use concept master plan. The land identified in the submission is subject to a series of significant development and natural constraints, and the ability to achieve urban densities are significantly limited.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	381,
3.7.25	Area 24 Walloon, Thagoona, Haigslea (part) and Mount Marrow	Requests amendments to the urban growth areas of Walloon to include / clarify descriptions for areas of residential growth, the future location of highway related services and additional local park.	The area is subject to a series of development applications where detailed assessment of the highest and best use of land will be resolved.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	418,
3.7.25	Area 24 Walloon, Thagoona, Haigslea (part) and Mount Marrow	Requests amendments to the urban growth areas of Walloon to include / clarify land use zones and the bringing forward of water and sewerage infrastructure.	The area is subject to a series of development applications where detailed assessment of the highest and best use of land will be resolved.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	418,
3.7.25	Area 24 Walloon, Thagoona, Haigslea (part) and Mount Marrow	Requests that specific areas in proximity to the intersection of Haigslea Malabar Road and Warrego Highway, Haigslea, proposed in the Rural 3 (Rural Living) designation be amended to the Special Purposes designation and the proposed Special Purpose designation be amended to the Local Centre designation and be utilised for non-residential and non-rural purposes.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. The new planning scheme will be drafted having regard to the comments raised.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration of the matters raised during review of the strategic framework (residential densities) and as part of the drafting of the new planning scheme (zoning).	274, 456,
3.7.25	Area 24 Walloon, Thagoona, Haigslea (part) and Mount Marrow	Requests for specific land in Walloon in the Low Density Residential (LL1), Recreation and Open Space (REC), and Medium Density Residential (MD1) designation be included in the Medium Density (MD1) designation reflective of the Walloon-Thagoona Land Use Concept Master Plan in the current planning scheme.	The designation boundaries closely align with the precincts depicted in the Walloon Thagoona land use concept master plan. The land identified in the submission is subject to a series of significant development and natural constraints, and the ability to achieve urban densities are significantly limited.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	19,
3.7.25	Area 24 Walloon, Thagoona, Haigslea (part) and Mount Marrow	Request for specific land in Walloon in the Low Density Residential (LL1), Recreation and Open Space (REC), and Environmental Management (EM) designations to be included in the Medium Density (MD1) designation, and location of the recreation land be reviewed in consideration of the Walloon-Thagoona Land Use Concept Master Plan in the current planning scheme.	The designation boundaries closely align with the precincts depicted in the Walloon Thagoona land use concept master plan. The land identified in the submission is subject to a series of significant development and natural constraints, and the ability to achieve urban densities are significantly limited.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	259,

Section	Strategic Framework Theme	Submitter Issues	Response	Recommendation to Council	Submitter No.
3.7.25	Area 24 Walloon, Thagoona, Haigslea (part) and Mount Marrow	Request that specific land along Seidels Road and Daisy Blair Lane, Walloon and proposed in the Industry Investigation (II), Recreation and Open Space (REC), and Environmental Management (EM) designations be included in a rural designation.	The proposed designations are consistent with the current planning scheme zonings, development constraints and the Walloon Thagoona Land Use Concept Master Plan for the area. Existing use rights attributed through development approvals and the like continue to have effect.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	339,
3.7.25	Area 24 Walloon, Thagoona, Haigslea (part) and Mount Marrow	Expresses the view that area has greater development potential than that shown on the local area framework mapping.	The proposed Environmental Management (EM) designation includes areas that are recognised as having environmental value (either existing or as having the potential to provide future connectivity) and/or in combination with, a potential to provide buffering between uses, or management of a significant constraint issue in a practical and effective manner that offers the best development outcomes for the city as a whole over the projected life of the future scheme.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	368,
3.7.25	Area 24 Walloon, Thagoona, Haigslea (part) and Mount Marrow	Requests that the Local Framework for Area 24 Walloon, Thagoona, Haigslea (part) and Mount Marrow be amended to include reference to the future Haigslea Service Centre.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. The new planning scheme will be drafted having regard to the comments raised.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration of the matters raised during review of the strategic framework (residential densities) and as part of the drafting of the new planning scheme (zoning).	456,
3.7.25	Area 24 Walloon, Thagoona, Haigslea (part) and Mount Marrow	Expresses concern that the Environmental Management (EM) designations does not reflect the preliminary approval and requests removal from this land use designation.	The proposed Environmental Management (EM) designation includes areas that are recognised as having environmental value (either existing or as having the potential to provide future connectivity) and/or in combination with, a potential to provide buffering between uses, or management of a significant constraint issue in a practical and effective manner that offers the best development outcomes for the city as a whole over the projected life of the future scheme. The preliminary approval was taken into consideration for the drafting of the local framework mapping.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	368,
3.7.25	Area 24 Walloon, Thagoona, Haigslea (part) and Mount Marrow	Request that the Scenic and Visual Amenity Values (SVFM3) mapping and Environmental Management (EM) designation reflect the preliminary approval; and a merit based assessment should apply.	The proposed Environmental Management (EM) designation and Scenic and Visual Amenity mapping includes areas that are recognised as having environmental value (either existing or as having the potential to provide future connectivity) and/or in combination with, a potential to provide buffering between uses, or management of a significant constraint issue in a practical and effective manner that offers the best development outcomes for the city as a whole over the projected life of the future scheme. The preliminary approval was taken into consideration for the drafting of the local framework mapping.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	364, 368,
3.7.25	Area 24 Walloon, Thagoona, Haigslea (part) and Mount Marrow	Requests that specific areas along the Warrego Highway and Haigslea Cemetery Road, Haigslea and proposed in the Rural 3 (Rural Living) designation be amended to the Special Purposes designation to be utilised for non-residential and non-rural purposes.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. The new planning scheme will be drafted having regard to the comments raised.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration of the matters raised during review of the strategic framework (residential densities) and as part of the drafting of the new planning scheme (zoning).	325,
3.7.26	Area 25 Marburg	Requests that specific land east of Rosewood Marburg Road, Marburg and proposed as Rural 2 (Pastoral) be designated Rural 3 (Rural Living).	The proposed designation is consistent with the surrounding Rural 2 (Pastoral) designation and is consistent with the Rural B (Pastoral) zone of the current planning scheme.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	490,
3.7.27	Area 26 Rosewood	Expresses support for Alternate Option 3.7.27A or areas of Low Density Residential (NS2) north of Karrabin Rosewood Road and west of Blakes Road, Rosewood. That additional area be included in the Character Mixed Density designation.	The support for Option 3.7.27A and matters raised in the submission are noted, and will be considered in the development of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	149, 374,
3.7.27	Area 26 Rosewood	Expresses the view that the minimum lot size in Rosewood should be 1,000 m ² .	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. The draft Strategic Framework provides for the allocation of residential designations that support the delivery of affordable housing and provide choice in housing through supporting the development of a diversity of housing types, forms, sizes, densities (including lot sizes) and tenures in appropriate locations.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	1,
3.7.27	Area 26 Rosewood	Expresses concern regarding the inclusion of specific land south of Karrabin Rosewood Road, Rosewood in the vicinity of the golf course, that is proposed in the Recreation and Open Space (REC) designation and on Strategic Framework Map 6 - Strategic Green Infrastructure.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted and considered to have merit. The new planning scheme will be drafted having regard to the comments raised.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration of the matters raised during review of the strategic framework (residential densities) and as part of the drafting of the new planning scheme (zoning).	59,
3.7.27	Area 26 Rosewood	Expresses the view that specific rural land west of Rosewood: - is in proximity to a major district centre, community facilities and other urban infrastructure; - is in proximity to a major transit node; - development and environmental constraints can be avoided or mitigated; - can be developed to large lot and urban densities; - the introduction of a mix of urban density designations could provide an opportunity to introduce a greater variety of built forms to the Local Area; and - rural uses are not identified as a priority in this locality and suburban uses are considered the highest and best use of the land.	The land is outside of the South East Queensland Regional Plan's (<i>ShapingSEQ</i>) Urban Footprint and not identified as an area designated for future non-rural uses or increased residential density, the regulatory provisions prevent urban and rural residential sprawl in the Regional Landscape and Rural Production Area (RLRPA) and manages other activity, including subdivision, to protect these values. The regulation also serves to protect areas that might be required for accommodating future urban growth beyond the planning horizon of ShapingSEQ.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	508,
3.7.28	Area 27 Ebenezer, Willowbank, Jeebropilly, Mount Forbes, Mutdapilly	Expresses support for the Ebenezer Regional Industrial Area in the Ebenezer / Willowbank local framework area.	The support expressed in the submission for the Ebenezer Regional Industrial Area is noted.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	254,
3.7.28	Area 27 Ebenezer, Willowbank, Jeebropilly, Mount Forbes, Mutdapilly	Requests that specific land within the proposed Rural 3 (Rural Living) designation close to the Southern Freight Rail Corridor should be designated for commercial.	The proposed land use designations reflect the current land uses. The distance of the land from the business and industry area does not warrant further intensification of urban uses.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	1,
3.7.28	Area 27 Ebenezer, Willowbank, Jeebropilly, Mount Forbes, Mutdapilly	Requests that: - specific land proposed in the Rural 2 (Pastoral) designation adjacent to the Ebenezer Regional Industrial Area - Southern Planning Unit be included in the Environmental Management (EM) designation; - environmental corridors be reduced to 100 metres width in certain areas; and - areas be used for infrastructure in the Environmental Management (EM) designation be designated Special Purpose.	The proposed Environmental Management (EM) designation includes areas that are recognised as having environmental value (either existing or as having the potential to provide future connectivity) and/or in combination with, a potential to provide buffering between uses, or management of a significant constraint issue in a practical and effective manner that offers the best development outcomes for the city as a whole over the projected life of the future scheme. Shifting boundaries indicate where designations will be resolved as part of future development applications.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	254, 446,
3.7.28	Area 27 Ebenezer, Willowbank, Jeebropilly, Mount Forbes, Mutdapilly	Requests that specific land in and west of the Ebenezer Regional Industrial Area - Southern Planning Unit be designated Medium Impact Industry (MI) or Rural 3 (Rural Living).	The Ebenezer Regional Industrial Area land use designations and boundaries reflect the highest and best use, and the adaptive reuse of land subject to development constraints (i.e. previous mining activities) and development opportunities (i.e. proximity to RAAF Base Amberley, Southern Freight Rail Corridor and intermodal inland port, and connects to Ipswich and Brisbane. As well as accommodating difficult to locate motorsports and entertainment events).	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	191, 254,
3.7.28	Area 27 Ebenezer, Willowbank, Jeebropilly, Mount Forbes, Mutdapilly	Express the view that the Neighbourhood and Local Centre locations along the Cunningham Highway could be moved.	Where Neighbourhood and Local Centres have not yet been developed, they are shown with indicative locations, and the location may change (but within the general vicinity) when development of the centre commences.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	446,
3.7.28	Area 27 Ebenezer, Willowbank, Jeebropilly, Mount Forbes, Mutdapilly	Request for specific land in Mount Forbes in the Rural 4 (Special Land Management) designation to be included in an industrial zoning.	Although currently in the Regional Business and Industry Investigation Zone under the current planning scheme, the proposed designation reflects the strategic planning intent of the Ebenezer Regional Industrial Area Implementation Guideline, biodiversity values, and development constraints over the land.	That no change be recommended to the Statement of Proposals (including draft Strategic Framework).	462,
3.7.28	Area 27 Ebenezer, Willowbank, Jeebropilly, Mount Forbes, Mutdapilly	Expresses concern that waste management operations with the Ebenezer area may be compromised, and requests that specified land be amended from the SFM3 Waste Activity and Buffer Areas and included in the Waste Activity Area.	The mapping and supporting document for the management of waste activities in the local government area reflects temporary local planning instrument (TLPI) TLPI No. 2 / 2018 (Waste Activity Regulation). The Statement of Proposals, Strategic Framework and associated TLPI provide a policy response in respect to landfill and waste industry uses occurring in the Ebenezer / Willowbank / Jeebropilly industrial area, to ensure this regionally significant economic area is appropriately regulated to protect existing, approved or planned sensitive land uses from adverse impacts associated with waste activities. Existing use rights attributed through development approvals, Planning and Environment Court Consent Orders and Environmental Authorities, have force and effect. The Statement of Proposals, Strategic Framework and associated TLPI: - seeks to balance economic interests against social and environmental interests, at significant risk of being impacted by the current and expected waste activity proposals in the Ebenezer / Willowbank / Jeebropilly industrial area; and - seeks to further regulate applications for new or expanded waste activities to protect existing, approved and planned residential and other sensitive receiving uses from adverse impacts including air quality and amenity (e.g. odour, dust, noise).	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	458,
3.7.28	Area 27 Ebenezer, Willowbank, Jeebropilly, Mount Forbes, Mutdapilly	Request for specific land in Ebenezer along the Cunningham Highway, Willowbank and proposed in the Special Opportunity designation be broadened to include neighbourhood centre, caravan park, motel, relocatable home park and camping ground.	It is considered that the submission may have merit in this locality, as: - the subject site is developed with caravan park, motel, relocatable home park and camping ground facilities; and - the land can be developed with a mix of uses, excluding permanent residential (due to a variety of noise impacts).	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to amend the Draft Strategic Framework Local Area Framework mapping such that specific land in Area 27 Ebenezer, Willowbank, Jeebropilly, Mount Forbes, Mutdapilly in the Special Opportunity (SA97) designation to be included in the Mixed Use designation/zone.	206,
3.7.29	Area 28 Tallegalla, Woolshed and The Bluff	Expresses concern for the inclusion of particular land in the Industrial designation and expresses support for the inclusion of land within the Conservation (CON) designation.	The comments and support expressed in the submission are noted. The new planning scheme will be drafted having regard to the comments.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	407,

Section	Strategic Framework Theme	Submitter Issues	Response	Recommendation to Council	Submitter No.
3.7.30	Area 29 Ashwell, Lanefield, Calvert and Grandchester	Expresses support in principle for the proposed designations over specific land in Grandchester in particular regard to rural and eco tourism in the locality. Requests that the relevant codes and levels of assessment provide sufficient flexibility to promote rural accommodation, farm stays, nature-based activities, rural tourism and other recreation activities in the area.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted and will be considered in the development of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	223,
4.1	Other Matters				
4.1.0	Consultation Process	Expresses that the interactive mapping tool did not provide the capability to allow a submitter to see what they had submitted and sent to Council; or provide the opportunity to make an overall submission about the Statement of Proposals including Draft Strategic Framework or comment on proposed overlays.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted and will be considered in the development of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised in the review of the draft strategic framework and drafting of the new planning scheme.	23, 24, 76, 77, 78, 413,
4.1.0	Consultation Process	Expresses thanks to Council the process that landowners were formally advised of the Statement of Proposals and draft Strategic Framework.	The comments and support expressed in the submission are noted. The new planning scheme will be drafted having regard to the comments.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	23, 24, 76, 77, 78, 413,
4.1.0	Consultation Process	Expresses that insufficient information was provided, the information was too complex to understand or the consultation was not allow for meaningful participation with the community.	Owing to the complexities in providing site specific information to all properties in the Ipswich local government area and the potential risk for anomalies in the data, it is considered more effective to enable the community to access all available information through multiple sources. Communications with the community included options of how to gain support or further information, which could be accessed: 1. from Council’s website through an interactive platform to view the draft Strategic Framework and associated mapping, and information about the process, how to obtain further information and make a submission; 2. by contacting the dedicated hotline available to all members of the community to speak to professional town planning staff during office hours; 3. by emailing the dedicated enquiry address; or 4. visiting the counter at the Council Administration Building during office hours where professional town planning staff are available to answer enquiries. Extracts of information were also provided to the community (either via email or hardcopy) where they had no access to internet or experienced difficulty locating information.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	23, 24, 76, 77, 78, 107, 158, 159, 363, 175, 193, 195, 196, 210, 247, 268, 277, 287, 319, 321, 344, 353, 366, 397, 409, 410, 412, 413, 475, 492,
4.1.0	Consultation Process	Expresses that the public consultation timeframe is too short or request an extension to consultation timeframe past the 28 June 2019.	This early non-statutory public consultation of the Statement of Proposals (including draft Strategic Framework) was undertaken for a five week period commencing 27 May 2019 and formally concluding on 28 June 2019, with an extension being provided until 12 July 2019 (to facilitate formal reporting to Council) as advertised on Council’s website and communicated to requesters of an extension. As this early consultation is not required under the state’s land use planning laws and is intended to seek the thoughts, concerns and suggestions of the community, Council will continue to accept late feedback for consideration in the drafting of the new Ipswich Planning Scheme.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	246, 353, 359, 366, 475, 413,
4.1.0	Consultation Process	Expresses that there was no prior consultation on the development of the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	The Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework) is an early step in the process of the drafting the new planning scheme and is not the final Strategic Framework or a draft version of the new planning scheme. The consultation was undertaken to seek early feedback on the community’s thoughts, concerns and suggestions as a demonstration of transparency and to help shape the final version of the Strategic Framework and inform the future drafting of the new planning scheme. The consultation on this very early stage of preparing a new planning scheme was not required under the state government’s land use planning laws. Formal public consultation on the draft Ipswich planning scheme in accordance with the land use planning legislation (i.e. <i>Planning Act 2016</i>) is still to occur at a later date.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	260, 277, 279, 280, 353, 409, 410, 468,
4.1.0	Consultation Process	Express the need for continued engagement with Council in the development of the new planning scheme, or in relation to specific matters.	Future consultation activities will be undertaken in accordance with the State endorsed Communications Strategy. Information about the new planning scheme and its progress through its stages is to be published on Council’s website or alert services periodically.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	282, 290, 315, 318, 365, 400, 408, 413, 465,
4.1.0	Consultation Process	Expressed that the briefing session was discriminatory as it did not involve the community or organisations.	The key stakeholder briefing presentation along with the recording of the presentation was made available to the public through Council’s website and social media to ensure the same information was distributed to the community. The intent of the presentation was to provide a brief of the overall document and consultation process, and not address individuals queries. Individuals were directed to the same channels as the community to seek further information and provide feedback.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	353,
4.1.0	Consultation Process	Expressed that their household or other households had not received the notification letter advising of the public consultation on the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	An open letter from the Interim Administrator of Ipswich City Council was sent to all ratepayers and residents of Ipswich. We’re sorry that you did not receive your letter. Council records indicate that a letter was sent to your postal address and we have no record of the letter being returned to sender.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	246, 282, 359,
4.1.0	Consultation Process	Expresses that in the absence of elected representatives (i.e. mayor and councillors) that Council should not be progressing the new Ipswich Planning Scheme.	Public consultation for the new Ipswich Planning Scheme is to be undertaken in a two stage process in accordance with the Council adopted and state government endorsed ‘Communications Strategy’. Stage 1 of public consultation (current stage) was not required under the state’s land use planning legislation (the <i>Planning Act 2016</i>). The purpose of this informal, non-statutory public consultation on the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework) provided early opportunity for input from the community and stakeholders to guide the drafting of the new Ipswich Planning Scheme. Stage 2 involves the formal and statutory public consultation of the new draft Ipswich Planning Scheme in accordance with the requirements of the <i>Planning Act 2016</i> . The timeframe for Stage 2 public consultation on a formal draft of the new Ipswich Planning Scheme is estimated to occur next year, after the scheduled May 2020 local government general elections where a mayor and councillors are to be elected to represent the Ipswich community.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	10, 246, 353, 366, 468,
4.1.0	Consultation Process	Expresses that the consultation was poorly communicated to the public.	This early non-statutory public consultation on the Statement of Proposals (including draft Strategic Framework) was undertaken in accordance with Council’s adopted Communications Strategy endorsed by the state government. Council utilised the following methods to communicate the public consultation with the community: 1. an individual notification being sent to residents and property owners (i.e. the open letter from the Interim Administrator of Ipswich City Council); 2. a ‘notice’ in the form of an open letter to the community published in the local newspaper; 3. media releases in local Ipswich newspapers; 4. series of articles through Ipswich First; 5. Planning and Development eAlert to subscribers; 6. social media posts on Council’s Facebook and Twitter pages; 7. a static display in the Council Administration Building (including copy of the notice); 8. rolling advertisement on the East Street, Ipswich electronic billboard; and 9. posters at Booval, Orion, Riverlink and Redbank Shopping Centres. The submitters comments are noted and Council is committed to continue to strive to engage with the community.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	148, 158, 159, 175, 193, 195, 210, 247, 268, 287, 319, 321, 344, 363, 397, 408, 412,
4.3.0	Current Planning Scheme Application	Expresses the view that the current planning scheme should remain in effect until the new planning scheme takes effect.	The current <i>2006 Ipswich Planning Scheme</i> will remain in effect until it is superseded by the adoption and implementation of the new Ipswich planning scheme.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	10,
4.3.0	Current Planning Scheme Matter	Expresses concern with the level of non-compliance with approvals and the inability of preventing operators from commencing uses without approval.	Matters of non-compliance and environmental nuisance resulting from current approvals are regulated and managed under current legislative frameworks, including by state agencies under environmental licences. Specific instances of non-compliance, nuisance or unlawful use are able to be reported to the relevant authority for investigation and appropriate action.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	194,
4.3.0	Editorial Matters	Expresses an opinion regarding the public notification of development applications.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted however, the comments are related to matters addressed in the <i>Planning Act 2016</i> , the <i>Planning Regulations 2017</i> and the <i>Minister’s Guidelines and Rules</i> . Council is not in a position to amend State government statutory provisions.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	170,
4.3.0	General Acknowledgement	Expresses interest in the development of the new planning scheme with no identified matters of concern expressed at present, however seeks continued engagement with Council in the development of the new planning scheme.	The feedback and comments are noted and acknowledged. Future consultation activities to occur in accordance with Council’s adopted and the state endorsed ‘Communications Strategy’.	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	178, 206, 448,
4.4.0	New-Scheme Matters (Future Drafting)	Expresses the view that a local planning instrument should not be prescriptive but be flexible to promote innovative planning outcomes.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted. The new planning scheme will be prepared to comply with relevant legislation and will seek to balance the level of prescription when addressing state and regional planning interests, as well as local matters and infrastructure needs, whilst facilitating community and development aspirations with opportunity for innovation.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the new planning scheme.	223, 260, 277, 279, 280, 408, 409, 410,

Section	Strategic Framework Theme	Submitter Issues	Response	Recommendation to Council	Submitter No.
4.4.0	New-Scheme Matters (Future Drafting)	Expresses the need to consider additional matters relevant to the development of the new planning scheme, such as the use of wording, definitions, incentives, policy or code provision suggestions.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted and will be considered in the development of the new planning scheme.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration to the matters raised during review of the new planning scheme.	60, 86, 111, 113, 126, 131, 183, 198, 223, 225, 227, 271, 281, 283, 292, 313, 320, 352, 353, 355, 364, 368, 375, 383, 404, 417, 421, 438, 442, 449, 461, 469, 473, 475, 485, 487, 488,
4.4.0	New-Scheme Matters (Future Drafting)	Expresses the view that mapping: - including overlays, appears to have been generated by inaccurate mapping processes and criteria; - including the use / application of the broken line (shifting boundary) proposed between designations, particularly against Environmental Management designated areas is not clarified in the proposed framework; or - needs to be clear, for example, it is difficult to distinguish the stream types at larger scales in OV2 Watercourses and wetlands mapping, and the legend for the Bushfire transitional areas is not correct.	Mapping is generally undertaken in accordance with the State government’s interests expressed in the State Planning Policy (SPP) and supporting mapping included on the SPP Interactive Mapping System. The SPP is a statutory instrument which expresses the State government’s interests in land use planning and development, and is required to be appropriately integrated into the new planning scheme. In addition Council has reviewed, and commissioned independent mapping to ensure that mapped criteria is locally contextualised. Despite this, mapping in the SOP and Strategic Framework is not intended to provide full details at an individual property level. Further refinement of mapping is likely to occur as the new planning scheme is drafted.	Recommend that the Manager City Design be authorised to give consideration of the matters raised during review of the relevant proposed strategic framework and during drafting of the new planning scheme.	216, 292, 353, 355, 364, 406, 421, 438, 443, 451, 468, 475, 485, 487, 488,
4.5.0	Non-Scheme Matters - Community Information	Requested further information of a general nature related to development or Council projects.	Information about the new planning scheme or regarding Council projects can be found on Council’s website or additional media information is able to be obtained from the Ipswich First website: https://www.ipswichfirst.com.au/	Recommend no change to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	462,
4.5.0	Non-Scheme Matters - Personal Opinions	Expresses the view that various opinions regarding the operation of Council or personal issues not addressed by the Strategic Framework in particular or the planning scheme in general.	The comments expressed in the submission are noted however, the comments are not related to planning scheme matters.	That no change be recommended to the Statement of Proposals (including draft Strategic Framework).	1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 14, 33, 36, 53, 72, 75, 82, 83, 87, 92, 94, 96, 98, 103, 115, 119, 127, 144, 160, 180, 204, 229, 245, 253, 261, 318, 323, 306, 315, 329, 336, 351, 356, 370, 377, 380, 396, 400, 435, 449, 476, 509,
4.5.0	Non-Scheme Matters - Community, Cultural and Economic Development (Community & Culture)	Expresses: - the need for specific community or cultural facilities to be provided or augmented in a timely manner; - the view that they are very impressed with the services and resources that the libraries have to offer; or - the view that there is no need for a library at Rosewood.	The matter be referred to Council’s Community and Cultural Services Branch of the Community and Economic Development Department for consideration and appropriate prioritisation.	1. The submission is referred to Council’s Community and Cultural Services Branch of the Community and Economic Development Department for consideration and where appropriate prioritisation. 2. Recommend no change to the Strategic Framework. 3. Recommend review of drafting of scheme provisions.	1, 32, 141, 253, 314, 448, 499, 500,
4.5.0	Non-Scheme Matters - Queensland Urban Utilities	Express the need for water or sewerage infrastructure to be provided or augmented in a timely manner.	The matter be referred to Queensland Urban Utilities for consideration and where appropriate prioritisation.	1. That the submission is referred to Queensland Urban Utilities for consideration and where appropriate prioritisation. 2. Recommend no change to the Strategic Framework. 3. Recommend review of drafting of scheme provisions.	69, 323, 396,
4.5.0	Non-Scheme Matters - State Interest Matters	Identified matters of State Interest that need to be determined by State Agencies, including matters relating to State government policies or mapping.	The matter be referred to the Department of State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning for consideration and where appropriate distributed to the relevant State Agency for their consideration and comment.	1. That the submission be referred to The Department of State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning. 2. That the Manager City Design be authorised to consider the advice from DSDMIP in the drafting of the Planning Scheme. 3. That DSDMIP be requested to advise the Submitter of the outcome of the referral.	12, 16, 23, 24, 27, 44, 50, 54, 55, 76, 77, 78, 79, 90, 114, 127, 130, 137, 194, 197, 214, 219, 228, 254, 261, 264, 269, 283, 285, 290, 300, 305, 314, 323, 324, 329, 341, 380, 400, 413, 425, 448, 469, 482, 502, 509,
4.5.0	Non-Scheme Matters - Infrastructure & Environment (Environment & Sustainability)	Expresses: - the need for improved street tree plantings, weed management, or the provision of improved park facilities to be undertaken in a timely manner; - support and monitoring of powerful owl population; - support for the reforestation of floodplains and gully floors to provide habitat, prevent erosion and improve water quality; - the view that Council has well maintained parks except bushland; - support for the reforestation of hill tops and ridge crests throughout the local government area to provide links and stepping stones for fauna; - the need for Council to undertake fire management of bushland and parks; or - the view that they are very pleased with the parks and playground facilities throughout Ipswich.	The matter be referred to Council’s Environment and Sustainability Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department for consideration and appropriate prioritisation.	Recommend that the Manager City Design: 1. be authorised to refer the submissions to Council’s Environment and Sustainability Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department for consideration and where appropriate prioritisation; and 2. recommend no change to the Strategic Framework. 3. Recommend review of drafting of scheme provisions.	13, 27, 28, 32, 34, 45, 64, 67, 95, 127, 144, 201, 218, 229, 314, 316, 323, 324, 328, 341, 400, 448, 455, 500, 506,
4.5.0	Non-Scheme Matters - Infrastructure & Environment (Roads)	Expresses the need for specific road works to be undertaken in a timely manner.	The matter be referred to Council’s Infrastructure Strategy Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department for consideration and where appropriate prioritisation.	Recommend that the Manager City Design: 1. be authorised to refer the submissions to Council’s Infrastructure Strategy Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department for consideration and where appropriate prioritisation and the submitter be advised accordingly; 2. to make no change to the Strategic Framework in light of the submissions; and 3. where appropriate, to review of drafting of scheme provisions in light of the submissions.	30, 31, 35, 38, 40, 43, 56, 63, 66, 69, 70, 75, 83, 84, 85, 91, 112, 116, 119, 120, 121, 122, 128, 132, 133, 138, 139, 140, 145, 143, 146, 176, 179, 187, 199, 228, 232, 261, 306, 308, 311, 331, 336, 341, 348, 354, 372, 398, 428, 448, 498, 505, 506, 509,
4.5.0	Non-Scheme Matters - Infrastructure & Environment (Stormwater)	Expresses the need for specific stormwater and drainage works to be undertaken in a timely manner.	The matter be referred to Council’s Infrastructure Strategy Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department for consideration and where appropriate prioritisation.	Recommend that the Manager City Design: 1. be authorised to refer the submissions to Council’s Infrastructure Strategy Branch of the Infrastructure and Environment Department for consideration and where appropriate prioritisation; 2. to make no change to the Strategic Framework in light of the submissions; and 3. where appropriate, to review of drafting of scheme provisions in light of the submissions.	69, 83, 108, 307, 335, 396,

Section	Strategic Framework Theme	Submitter Issues	Response	Recommendation to Council	Submitter No.
4.5.0	Non-Scheme Matters - Planning and Regulatory Services (Building)	Identify specific matters relating to the implementation of building regulations.	The matter be referred to Council's Building and Plumbing Branch of the Planning and Regulatory Services Department for consideration.	1. That the submission is referred to Council's Building and Plumbing Branch of the Planning and Regulatory Services Department for consideration. 2. Recommend no change to the Strategic Framework.	29, 205, 336,
4.6.0	Non-Scheme Matters - Transparency in Decision Making	Expresses that there are a lack of controls on Council's to affect Council's decision making outcome and that all development applications submitted to Council should promulgated with the community, or Council and decision makers should be more transparent.	<p>The drafting and content of a planning scheme, and the assessment process and consultation requirements for the assessment of development applications are regulated by State government's planning legislation being the <i>Planning Act 2016</i> and subordinate <i>Planning Regulation 2017</i> .</p> <p>Planning documents and development applications are made available through Council's website, and Planning and Development webpages. Council is committed to the ongoing development of transparency to public.</p>	That no change be recommended to the Statement of Proposals (including Draft Strategic Framework).	41, 159, 174, 175, 247, 397, 405, 495,