

Shape Your Ipswich Reference No.	Submission Number	Submission Date	Properly Made	Primary Issue	Secondary Issue	Summary of Key Points Raised in Submission	Reviewer Comments	Proposed Action	Action details
13106	1	21/06/2023	Yes	Transport network	Planning scheme matter	Planning scheme matters raised, including rural zoning being too restrictive and concern with the clearing of old forest in Springfield and Ripley. Requested the sealing of a rural road and raised concerns with the standard of a State controlled road.	Ability to subdivide in the rural zone and environmental matters are dealt with in the planning scheme. The sealing of a rural road is a non LGIP matter. To be referred to Council's Infrastructure Strategy Branch for future project and funding considerations. The standard of the State controlled road is a non LGIP matter. The submission is also to be referred to the Department of Transport and Main Roads.	Mix of actions (specify)	The submission contents were noted by City Design planners. Recommendations: 1. No LGIP related changes proposed (ie. no change required to LGIP documentation or mapping). 2. To be referred to Council's Infrastructure Strategy Branch for future project and funding considerations. 3. To be referred to the Department of Transport and Main Roads.
13379	2	22/06/2023	Yes	Public Parks network	Providing for Growth (LGIP) - Parks	Request to improve the provision of walking trails to service Brentwood Forest.	The section of Woogaroo Creek adjacent to Brentwood Forest (Bellbird Park) is mapped in the LGIP for future linear park. The desired standards of service for linear park include the provision of pathways, however the specific location of appropriate pathway connections is subject to further detailed design.	No LGIP related changes proposed (ie. no change required to LGIP documentation or mapping)	The submission was referred internally on 30/6/2023 with the response incorporated in the reviewer comments.
13478	3	26/06/2023	Yes	Non-Scheme matters	Providing for Growth (Other)	Raised concerns with the reliance on State and Federal government funding to deliver State and Federal infrastructure to support projected growth. Identified concerns with the lack of jobs growth in Ipswich and impact on traffic to Brisbane. Provided the suggestion that land be allocated for an iconic building near the city centre.	The Minister's Guidelines and Rules require the population and dwelling projections to be based on those prepared by the Queensland Government Statistician refined to reflect development trends in the local government area. Following review, the growth rate was set to generally align with the QGSO 2018 low series and to better reflect historic and current rates of actual growth. The provision of State and Federal infrastructure is planned and delivered by the State and Federal governments. Council will continue to advocate for the provision of necessary State infrastructure to align with expected and desired growth. The non-residential (employment) projections were aligned with background studies to set the planning assumptions about employment growth, centres hierarchy, floorspace demand, and retention and participation rates across the local government area. Growth in employment is expected to align with population growth with steady retention and participation rates. The planning scheme provides suitable zoning and policy directions to support employment growth and opportunities to deliver iconic buildings, including in the Ipswich CBD.	No LGIP related changes proposed (ie. no change required to LGIP documentation or mapping)	NA
13493	4	28/06/2023	Yes	Public Parks network	Providing for Growth (LGIP) - Parks	Raised concerns regarding the future provision of additional linear park along the Bremer River, citing the impacts this will have to properties in East Ipswich, particularly CPTED concerns.	The draft LGIP Public Parks network identifies existing and future land for Linear Park for land adjoining the Bremer River corridor. This corridor is identified in the current LGIP as adopted in 2018, for a future Waterside Park and was also included in the 2007 Public Parks Strategy. The concerns regarding CPTED and flooding are acknowledged and are highlighted as important elements of the desired standards of service, necessitating responsive design at the detailed design stage. The draft LGIP commenced public notification on 12 June 2023 in accordance with State legislative requirements. It is noted that the currently adopted LGIP identifying this area as future Waterside Park is freely available for public viewing at www.ipswichplanning.com.au .	No LGIP related changes proposed (ie. no change required to LGIP documentation or mapping)	The submission was referred internally on 30/6/2023 with the response incorporated in the reviewer comments.
13729	5	11/07/2023	Yes	Public Parks network	Providing for Growth (LGIP) - Parks	Raised concern with the flood risk and suitability of locating park infrastructure in the extreme flood risk category. It has been requested that the park network be reviewed in this location to consider the impact of flooding.	The identification of locations for future sports parks in the draft LGIP considered previous network planning as well as information available at the time of drafting. There are evident challenges faced with planning, designing and delivering sports parks within the City, particularly when factoring significant flooding constraints. This initial approach was consistent with the previous method for identifying land for future citywide sports grounds/courts, however this methodology will be reviewed in consideration of the method use for future neighbourhood recreation parks, which are mapped as 'floating' nodes/circles identifying the preferred locations yet acknowledging site-specific identification for acquisition is subject to more detailed investigations	Mix of actions (specify)	Recommendations: 1. Change LGIP ID No. 1026 to amend the mapping to represent a 20 hectare 'floating' circle/node in the same location, rather than reflecting the property boundaries of the parcel originally identified. 2. Amend future citywide sports parks identified in the draft LGIP that are subject to the same risks as the Walloon site more broadly across the network.
13731	6	12/07/2023	Yes	Planning Scheme matter	0	Planning scheme matters raised regarding the continued use and impacts from industrial uses located in the Redbank Motorway Estate on nearby residents.	Zoning and development controls are a planning scheme matter. The identified Redbank industrial area is a well-established, regionally significant, and historic industrial area which has industrial uses dating back to the 1940's. The continued use of this area for industrial purposes is a State interest with this area identified as part of the South West Industrial corridor under the South East Queensland Regional Plan (Redbank M16). The SEQ RP recognises this corridor as the most significant industrial cluster in SEQ. Both the current and draft Ipswich planning scheme include relevant code provisions, including specific assessment benchmarks relating to noise, lighting and air pollution in the draft planning scheme.	No LGIP related changes proposed (ie. no change required to LGIP documentation or mapping)	The submission contents were noted by City Design planners and were considered in the review of the draft planning scheme.
13737	7	12/07/2023	Yes	Planning Scheme matter	0	Planning scheme matters raised regarding the continued use and impacts, particularly noise pollution from industrial uses located in the Redbank Motorway Estate on nearby residents. Request to include additional legislative protections.	Zoning and development controls are a planning scheme matter. The identified Redbank industrial area is a well-established, regionally significant, and historic industrial area which has industrial uses dating back to the 1940's. The continued use of this area for industrial purposes is a State interest with this area identified as part of the South West Industrial corridor under the South East Queensland Regional Plan (Redbank M16). The SEQ RP recognises this corridor as the most significant industrial cluster in SEQ. Both the current and draft Ipswich planning scheme include relevant code provisions, including specific assessment benchmarks relating to noise, lighting and air pollution in the draft planning scheme.	No LGIP related changes proposed (ie. no change required to LGIP documentation or mapping)	The submission contents were noted by City Design planners and were considered in the review of the draft planning scheme.
13744	8	13/07/2023	Yes	Planning Scheme matter	0	Planning scheme matters raised regarding the continued use and impacts, particularly noise pollution from industrial uses located in the Redbank Motorway Estate on nearby residents. Request to include additional legislative protections.	Zoning and development controls are a planning scheme matter. The identified Redbank industrial area is a well-established, regionally significant, and historic industrial area which has industrial uses dating back to the 1940's. The continued use of this area for industrial purposes is a State interest with this area identified as part of the South West Industrial corridor under the South East Queensland Regional Plan (Redbank M16). The SEQ RP recognises this corridor as the most significant industrial cluster in SEQ. Both the current and draft Ipswich planning scheme include relevant code provisions, including specific assessment benchmarks relating to noise, lighting and air pollution in the draft planning scheme.	No LGIP related changes proposed (ie. no change required to LGIP documentation or mapping)	The submission contents were noted by City Design planners and were considered in the review of the draft planning scheme.
13745	9	13/07/2023	Yes	Planning Scheme matter	0	Planning scheme matters raised regarding the continued use and impacts, particularly noise pollution from industrial uses located in the Redbank Motorway Estate on nearby residents. Request to include additional legislative protections.	Zoning and development controls are a planning scheme matter. The identified Redbank industrial area is a well-established, regionally significant, and historic industrial area which has industrial uses dating back to the 1940's. The continued use of this area for industrial purposes is a State interest with this area identified as part of the South West Industrial corridor under the South East Queensland Regional Plan (Redbank M16). The SEQ RP recognises this corridor as the most significant industrial cluster in SEQ. Both the current and draft Ipswich planning scheme include relevant code provisions, including specific assessment benchmarks relating to noise, lighting and air pollution in the draft planning scheme.	No LGIP related changes proposed (ie. no change required to LGIP documentation or mapping)	The submission contents were noted by City Design planners and were considered in the review of the draft planning scheme.
13746	10	13/07/2023	Yes	Planning Scheme matter	0	Planning scheme matters raised regarding the continued use and impacts, particularly noise and light pollution from industrial uses located in the Redbank Motorway Estate on nearby residents. Request to include additional legislative protections.	Zoning and development controls are a planning scheme matter. The identified Redbank industrial area is a well-established, regionally significant, and historic industrial area which has industrial uses dating back to the 1940's. The continued use of this area for industrial purposes is a State interest with this area identified as part of the South West Industrial corridor under the South East Queensland Regional Plan (Redbank M16). The SEQ RP recognises this corridor as the most significant industrial cluster in SEQ. Both the current and draft Ipswich planning scheme include relevant code provisions, including specific assessment benchmarks relating to noise, lighting and air pollution in the draft planning scheme.	No LGIP related changes proposed (ie. no change required to LGIP documentation or mapping)	The submission contents were noted by City Design planners and were considered in the review of the draft planning scheme.
13763	11	14/07/2023	Yes	Planning Scheme matter	0	Planning scheme matters raised regarding the continued use and impacts, particularly noise pollution from industrial uses located in the Redbank Motorway Estate on nearby residents. Request to include additional legislative protections.	Zoning and development controls are a planning scheme matter. The identified Redbank industrial area is a well-established, regionally significant, and historic industrial area which has industrial uses dating back to the 1940's. The continued use of this area for industrial purposes is a State interest with this area identified as part of the South West Industrial corridor under the South East Queensland Regional Plan (Redbank M16). The SEQ RP recognises this corridor as the most significant industrial cluster in SEQ. Both the current and draft Ipswich planning scheme include relevant code provisions, including specific assessment benchmarks relating to noise, lighting and air pollution in the draft planning scheme.	No LGIP related changes proposed (ie. no change required to LGIP documentation or mapping)	The submission contents were noted by City Design planners and were considered in the review of the draft planning scheme.

Shape Your Ipswich Reference No.	Submission Number	Submission Date	Properly Made	Primary Issue	Secondary Issue	Summary of Key Points Raised in Submission	Reviewer Comments	Proposed Action	Action details
13772	12	14/07/2023	0	Planning Scheme matter	0	Planning scheme matters raised regarding the continued use and impacts, particularly noise pollution from industrial uses located in the Redbank Motorway Estate on nearby residents. Request to include additional legislative protections.	<p>Zoning and development controls are a planning scheme matter.</p> <p>The identified Redbank industrial area is a well-established, regionally significant, and historic industrial area which has industrial uses dating back to the 1940's.</p> <p>The continued use of this area for industrial purposes is a State interest with this area identified as part of the South West industrial corridor under the South East Queensland Regional Plan (Redbank M16). The SEQ RP recognises this corridor as the most significant industrial cluster in SEQ.</p> <p>Both the current and draft Ipswich planning scheme include relevant code provisions, including specific assessment benchmarks relating to noise, lighting and air pollution in the draft planning scheme.</p>	No LGIP related changes proposed (ie. no change required to LGIP documentation or mapping)	The submission contents were noted by City Design planners and were considered in the review of the draft planning scheme.
13857	13	15/07/2023	Yes	Transport network	0	<p>The submission requested the draft LGIP be updated to identify the trunk network required to support industrial development within the Ebenezer Regional Industrial Area (ERIA).</p> <p>Identified concerns that there are minimal plans for trunk infrastructure in ERIA and noted works will need to be delivered by the developers at their own cost, or be subject to a conversion application and Infrastructure Agreement. Concerned that the lack of planning and timing regarding the infrastructure networks is a significant impediment and discouragement to development of the ERIA.</p> <p>Cited that the Council Industrial Land Supply Analysis report indicates that additional industrial land in the Ebenezer Regional Industrial Area (ERIA) will need to be brought online, potentially by 2030 and suggested that part of the area will need to be included in Council's PIA.</p> <p>Suggested that to support the development of the Ebenezer Intermodal and unlock the huge economic and jobs potential of the ERIA, the LGIP needs to provide detailed plans for the trunk infrastructure necessary to serve the two existing approved developments and planned Ebenezer Intermodal Terminal.</p>	<p>The draft LGIP employment forecasts and transport modelling identify that there is limited demand in the Ebenezer area as forecast to 2046. This limited demand does not currently require or justify the inclusion of future trunk road within the LGIP timeframe. The recent Australian Government decision (April 2023) to prioritise delivery of the inland rail between Melbourne and Parkes has delayed any inland rail connection to Willowbank / Ebenezer to at least 2030/31.</p> <p>Council will continue to monitor changes in demand, development pressure, and possible future State catalytic infrastructure delivery in the Ebenezer area, and consider changes to the forecasting and PIA boundaries as part of future reviews. The Planning Act 2016 requires local government to review an LGIP included in the planning scheme within 5 years after it was included.</p>	No LGIP related changes proposed (ie. no change required to LGIP documentation or mapping)	<p>The submission was referred internally on 17/07/2023 with the response incorporated in the reviewer comments.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No LGIP related changes proposed (ie. no change required to LGIP documentation or mapping). 2. Continue to review and monitor the broader transport network and effectiveness of the OSS and infrastructure items included to service actual growth. 3. Continue to monitor industrial land growth and land availability across the Ipswich LGA and review updated information as it becomes available to inform future work, including review of the PIA. 4. Align future LGIP work with updates to the Ipswich Plan 2024 where appropriate.
13914	14	16/07/2023	Yes	Planning Scheme matter	0	Planning scheme matters raised regarding the continued use and impacts, particularly noise pollution from industrial uses located in the Redbank Motorway Estate on nearby residents. Request to include additional legislative protections.	<p>Zoning and development controls are a planning scheme matter.</p> <p>The identified Redbank industrial area is a well-established, regionally significant, and historic industrial area which has industrial uses dating back to the 1940's.</p> <p>The continued use of this area for industrial purposes is a State interest with this area identified as part of the South West industrial corridor under the South East Queensland Regional Plan (Redbank M16). The SEQ RP recognises this corridor as the most significant industrial cluster in SEQ.</p> <p>Both the current and draft Ipswich planning scheme include relevant code provisions, including specific assessment benchmarks relating to noise, lighting and air pollution in the draft planning scheme.</p>	No LGIP related changes proposed (ie. no change required to LGIP documentation or mapping)	The submission contents were noted by City Design planners and were considered in the review of the draft planning scheme.
13965	15	18/07/2023	Yes	Transport network	0	Raised concerns in relation to the level of traffic using Stafford Street, Booval and the need to regulate the volume of traffic and unsafe drivers. Requested the installation of traffic calming.	<p>Stafford Street is an existing trunk road that has been designed and is intended to service both local needs and a wider transport function. Council transport infrastructure is focused on providing a safe, reliable and resilient road network across the city that provides a balance between community expectations on efficient road network operation and affordability to service the needs of future growth. This will include levels of congestion at peak periods.</p> <p>To be referred to Council's Infrastructure Strategy Branch for future consideration and response in relation to traffic management.</p>	No LGIP related changes proposed (ie. no change required to LGIP documentation or mapping)	<p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No LGIP related changes proposed (ie. no change required to LGIP documentation or mapping). 2. To be referred to Council's Infrastructure Strategy Branch for future consideration and response.
N/A	16	2022	No	Non-Scheme matters	Providing for Growth (LGIP) - Parks	Suggested an alternative multi-purpose site to accommodate the proposed new Rosewood Refuse Transfer Centre, along with other public open conservation space, recreation space and other municipal purposes.	<p>The draft LGIP Public Parks network is based on projected demand. It is noted that the subject land is located outside the urban footprint, within a rural zone (pursuant to the draft Ipswich Plan 2024) and outside the draft Priority Infrastructure Area. It is not reasonable to identify the land within the draft LGIP for public parks purposes, particularly not for acquisition and embellishment within the next 10 years.</p> <p>To be referred to Council's Environment and Sustainability Department for future consideration of the other, non-trunk, nature-based recreation and strategic environmental matters.</p>	No LGIP related changes proposed (ie. no change required to LGIP documentation or mapping)	<p>The submission was referred internally on 21/07/2023 with response incorporated in the reviewer comments.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No LGIP related changes proposed (ie. no change required to LGIP documentation or mapping). 2. To be referred to Council's Environment and Sustainability Department for future consideration.
13987	17	24/07/2023	Yes	Transport network	0	<p>The submission supports the removal of local linear park ID 1181 (as identified in the current LGIP) and seeks the reinstatement of LGIP trunk road ID 149 (as identified in the current LGIP). The submission suggests the removal of the trunk road is inconsistent with ShapingSEQ goals and provided a supporting transport review by TTM suggesting the inclusion of the East-West road assists in the better performance of the strategic road network. The submission notes the current variation request application before Council and also suggests that the developable area in LGIP Map 2 be amended to reflect the variation request.</p>	<p>The support for the removal of the existing ID 1181 from the draft public parks network is acknowledged.</p> <p>Council's draft LGIP transport network has removed the overpass connection between the Ripley Valley PDA (Providence development) and Swanbank. This overpass was not included within the EDQ DCOP Trunk road network to service the PDA, and as such is not anticipated to be funded or delivered by PDA developers. The draft LGIP transport modelling indicates that without the overpass from the PDA to Swanbank, greater than 85% of the projected traffic that would utilise the east-west road is associated with development within the Swanbank catchment. It is noted that the project usage apportionment table included within the draft LGIP Extrinsic Material Report – Transport Network (Appendix D.1 of the Jacobs – LGIP Road Network Technical Report) requires updating to account for the revised traffic distribution and proportion use of the road network as a result of the removal of the PDA / Centenary Highway overpass link.</p> <p>Based on the forecast traffic volumes and limited through traffic demands on this link in 2046, an east-west trunk road connection between Weesley Way and Bundamba Creek is currently not warranted within the horizon of the draft LGIP. The road remains within Council's draft LGIP transport modelling, but as a lower order non-trunk road (industrial collector).</p> <p>The Developable Area map (LGIP Map 2) is indicative based on the zone extents at the time of preparation of the draft LGIP. The exclusion of the Environmental Management Zone from the developable area is consistent with the primary purpose of the zone. It would be premature to alter this mapping to reflect a proposed development application. However, should the zoning extent change due to further Council planning or delivered development, the indicative development area extent as identified in the LGIP could be amended as part of a future LGIP revision.</p>	Mix of actions (specify)	<p>The submission was referred internally on 25/07/2023 with response incorporated in the reviewer comments.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Update the usage apportionment table included within the draft LGIP Extrinsic Material Report – Transport Network (Appendix D.1 of the Jacobs – LGIP Road Network Technical Report) to account for the revised traffic distribution and proportion use of the road network as a result of the removal of the PDA / Centenary Highway overpass link. 2. Continue to monitor zoning decisions and the delivery of development and align future LGIP work with updates to the Ipswich Plan 2024 where appropriate.
13988	18	24/07/2023	Yes	Multiple topics	6.2 - Planning Assumptions	<p>The submission is primarily concerned with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -the absence of master plans for the western growth corridor (planning scheme matter); -the ability to identify existing trunk items on the mapping; -the changes to the parks OSS, particularly the removal of local components; -the limited extent of transport infrastructure identified for the western growth corridor; -the exclusion of local collector and major collectors from the transport network; -the planning assumptions, including the adequacy of the PIA, the rates of growth applied, particularly in the Ripley Valley PDA and western growth corridor, and the occupancy rates used in the modelling. 	<p>The Land Use Concept Master Plan information in the current scheme has largely been superseded by a combination of natural hazard mapping and application of a growth management overlay. It is noted that the draft LGIP modelling was undertaken based on updated designation mapping available at the time, prior to the final inclusion of the emerging community zone.</p> <p>The draft LGIP projections have included growth for the full planning horizon from 2021 to 2046, and for a realistic ultimate. Network planning has also been prepared based on the planning assumptions and projected growth to 2046 and had regard to ultimate. The LGIP projections were based on historic trend information and calibrated using the best available information at the time of preparation, including use of the OQSSO 2018 Medium Series occupancy rates. This is complemented by planning for a 25-year horizon from 2021 to 2046. Should growth occur at a significantly higher rate, this level of planning provides Council with the ability to quickly respond to development needs.</p> <p>The MGR states that trunk infrastructure identified in the LGIP must be the most cost-effective means of servicing urban development and a local government must be able to demonstrate financial sustainability and fund the trunk infrastructure in the LGIP. This requires Council's to review the desired standards of service (OSS) and identify an affordable OSS for trunk infrastructure to service expected growth.</p> <p>This has resulted in changes to the Parks OSS and network requirements, including the removal of local sport grounds and shift to the provision of neighbourhood recreation parks. It is also noted that the draft LGIP Transport OSS remains consistent with the current LGIP and identifies Arterial and Sub-Arterial roads in the Transport network. Lower order roads are identified as development infrastructure that is internal to a development or required to connect a development to the external infrastructure network.</p> <p>Although the PIA can and will accommodate most growth over the LGIP horizon, it does not need to capture all areas. The intent of the PIA is to identify those areas where development and supporting infrastructure can be provided in a cost-efficient manner consistent within the desired settlement pattern of the city as expressed through the planning scheme. The draft LGIP and extent of the PIA have been identified on that basis.</p> <p>Should new development fronts commence prior to expectations and out of planned sequence they can be undertaken, and conversion applications made by an applicant to address trunk infrastructure provision and funding.</p> <p>Council will continue to monitor actual growth and the availability of new information to inform future review and amendments as required, including the adequacy of the PIA.</p>	Mix of actions (specify)	<p>The submission was referred internally on 25/07/2023 with response incorporated in the reviewer comments.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No LGIP related changes proposed (ie. no change required to LGIP documentation or mapping). 2. Continue to monitor growth and infrastructure requirements to inform future amendments.

Shape Your Ipswich Reference No.	Submission Number	Submission Date	Properly Made	Primary Issue	Secondary Issue	Summary of Key Points Raised in Submission	Reviewer Comments	Proposed Action	Action details
13989	19	24/07/2023	Yes	Multiple topics	0	<p>The submission is concerned that the draft LGIP represents a significant departure from the provisions of the current LGIP, and the Infrastructure agreement for the land. The submission identifies that the draft LGIP removes a key trunk road infrastructure item, expands a parkland item on the site for a regional sports park over the entire site which impacts on continued progression to industrial and business park development of the site.</p> <p>The submission specifically requests that the draft LGIP be revised to reflect the existing use rights and the infrastructure agreement that is in place, as summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the subject site should be included in the priority infrastructure area; - the east-west road should be reinstated as a trunk item; - the trunk parkland should revert to be consistent with current LGIP and the infrastructure agreement; and - the land valuation for any trunk park should reflect industrial land valuation rates. 	<p>The MGR states that trunk infrastructure identified in the LGIP must be the most cost-effective means of servicing urban development and a local government must be able to demonstrate financial sustainability and fund the trunk infrastructure in the LGIP. This requires Council's to review the standards (DSS) and identify an affordable DSS for trunk infrastructure to service expected growth. As a result, network changes have been made, which includes identification of the site for a Regional Sports Park. The suitability of acquiring the site remains under further detailed consideration noting the Park Network extrinsic material highlights this as the preferred location.</p> <p>It is recognised that the plans for trunk infrastructure identify multiple parcels totalling over 190 hectares, whilst the DSS for a Regional Sports Park only requires 40 hectares. Although this is consistent with the previous method for identifying land for future citywide sports grounds/courts, the mapping is proposed to be amended to use the method applied to future neighbourhood recreation parks, which are mapped as 'floating' nodes/circles to identify the preferred locations, yet acknowledging site-specific identification for acquisition is subject to more detailed investigations.</p> <p>LGIP project 149 remains in Council's draft LGIP modelled transport network, but as a lower order non-trunk road (industrial collector). Based on the forecast traffic volumes and limited through traffic demands on this link in 2046 an east-west trunk road connection between Wesley Way and Bundamba Creek is not warranted within the horizon of the draft LGIP.</p> <p>The land value has been calculated using the same Unit Rate methodology as the balance of the network, however the complexity of the calculation owing to the multiple properties, zones and flooding constraints meant the calculation had to be undertaken separately and be included as a Project Cost. The current Adopted Infrastructure Charges Resolution facilitates a market cost recalculation and it is expected a new AICR will include this option consistent with the MGR.</p> <p>The PIA was reviewed and accepted by Urban Utilities and the Appointed Reviewer, with the current PIA providing for more than 10 to 15 years of growth, covering most of the urban area of Ipswich. Further expansion is not considered to be required at this time.</p>	Mix of actions (specify)	<p>The submission was referred internally on 25/07/2023 with response incorporated in the reviewer comments.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Update the usage apportionment table included within the draft LGIP Extrinsic Material Report – Transport Network (Appendix D.1 of the Jacobs – LGIP Road Network Technical Report) to account for the revised traffic distribution and proportion use of the road network as a result of the removal of the PDA / Centenary Highway overpass link. 2. Amend the Public Parks PFI to show the proposed Regional Sports Park as a 'floating node/circle' acknowledging the site specific identification for acquisition is subject to more detailed investigation. 3. Continue to advance detailed acquisition review and negotiations with the land owner, including consideration of alternative sites. 4. Continue to monitor industrial land growth and land availability across the Ipswich LGA and review updated information as it becomes available to inform future work, including review of the PIA. 5. Align future LGIP work with updates to the Ipswich Plan 2024 where appropriate.
13992	20	25/07/2023	Yes	Multiple topics	SC6.13 - Parks Planning Scheme Policy	<p>This submission is primarily concerned with the Parks Planning Scheme Policy, focusing on the following key matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - minimum area for neighbourhood recreation parks; - level of embellishment in neighbourhood recreation parks; - provisions relating to Dog Off-Leash Area (DOLA); - eligibility criteria for offsets; - inclusion of covered seating and shade nodes in Citywide linear parks; - staging methodology; and - referencing in specific figures. 	<p>The MGR states that trunk infrastructure identified in the LGIP must be the most cost-effective means of servicing urban development and a local government must be able to demonstrate financial sustainability and fund the trunk infrastructure in the LGIP. This requires Council's to review the standards (DSS) and identify an affordable DSS for trunk infrastructure to service expected growth. As a result, network changes have been made, which include the updating of the Parks DSS and Parks Planning Scheme Policy.</p> <p>The DSS has been designed to provide an acceptable, equitable and cost effective public parks network and the policy provides options for staging and alternative approaches. Council may review the DSS for embellishment within neighbourhood recreation parks as part of future amendments to the LGIP.</p> <p>Council has also identified in the Active Ipswich Strategy that a review of the DOLA policy, procedures and guidance material is a required as a future planning action.</p> <p>Additional clarity is proposed to be included regarding staging the delivery of neighbourhood recreation parks and to make minor referencing corrections.</p>	Mix of actions (specify)	<p>The submission was referred internally on 25/07/2023 with response incorporated in the reviewer comments.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amend the LGIP documentation to make minor text changes to improve the clarity of staged delivery of neighbourhood recreation parks, and to correct the referencing in Figure 6.13.5.S.B.1. 2. Continue to review and monitor the implementation of the new Parks DSS and Planning Scheme Policy to inform potential future amendments as necessary.
13994	21	25/07/2023	Yes	Multiple topics	0	<p>The submission is primarily concerned that the draft LGIP does not appear to recognise the role played by the two main infrastructure agreements for Springfield, the SIA and STCIA and their primacy under the Planning Act. It also identifies that there is little recognition of these agreements in the LGIP or the extrinsic material, and suggests the network planning and financial considerations are inconsistent with the agreements. The submission also raised concerns in relation to the Ipswich Retail Strategy Update and operational aspects to the SSP.</p>	<p>The draft LGIP, including the network planning has given regard to the SSP, SIA and STCIA and it is noted that the SIA and STCIA retain primacy where an inconsistency arises in relation to express matters detailed in the agreements, subject to the obligations and requirements of the agreements.</p> <p>The comments relating to the Ipswich Retail Strategy Update as prepared by SGS Economics are noted. Although the LGIP modelling has considered a realistic ultimate based on the best available information, including consideration of the independent report prepared by SGS Economics, it does not constrain the rights conferred under the SIA or STCIA, which continue to prevail, subject to the obligations and requirements of these documents.</p> <p>The SOW model provides a high-level review of expected charges revenue to enable consideration of the financial sustainability of the overall network.</p> <p>It is expected that the updated DSS and policies will apply when they take effect in a similar matter to how the previous DSS and policies applied in the current planning scheme.</p>	Mix of actions (specify)	<p>The submission was referred internally on 27/07/2023 with response incorporated in the reviewer comments.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amend the LGIP documentation to make minor text changes to correct the reference to the TCCP in Extrinsic Material Report 1, and to amend the reference from the SIA to the STCIA in Extrinsic Material Report 4. 2. Consider potential future rationalisation of the land for community facilities network in the TCCP as part of a future STCIA amendment in consultation with SGG. 3. Amend the Extrinsic Material Report 4 to note that actual delivery of land for community facilities through development or by land acquisition is subject to detailed site review, and that alternative locations to those identified may be considered. 4. Continue to monitor actual levels of growth across the Ipswich LGA and review updated information as it becomes available to inform future work, including growth in the SSP area and TCCP.
N/A	22	25/07/2023	Yes	Transport network	0	<p>This submission is concerned that some items in the draft LGIP may impact on TMR corridors and planning, including planning for the Centenary Highway and the Ipswich to Springfield future railway corridor. The submission also requests that Council consult with TMR on new or changed scheduled works identified in the draft LGIP that interact with State-controlled roads and State transport planning.</p>	<p>Whilst Council are happy to work collaboratively with TMR to achieve integrated transport network outcomes, it is noted that Council officers liaised with TMR officers whilst preparing several road corridor planning studies that informed the draft LGIP. It is further noted that State agencies were involved in detailed discussions with Council during the drafting of the LGIP, as well as through the formal state review period.</p> <p>The formal review by State agencies did not identify any matters of non-compliance or impose conditions prior to being publicly notified.</p> <p>Noting the above, no further formal consultation is considered to be required to progress the draft LGIP through the remaining stages of the MGR to adoption. Once TMR have adopted and released new planning and supporting transport modelling for State transport corridors, Council will be able to review and make any updates considered necessary to the Council road network as part of a future LGIP revision.</p> <p>Council remains committed to on-going discussion and collaboration with TMR.</p>	No LGIP related changes proposed (ie. no change required to LGIP documentation or mapping)	<p>The submission was referred internally on 25/07/2023 with response incorporated in the reviewer comments.</p>
N/A	23	25/07/2023	Yes	Public Parks network	SC6.13 - Parks Planning Scheme Policy	<p>This submission relates primarily to the Parks network, proposing minor changes to the DSS, minor improvements and corrections to the PFI, the correction of drafting errors and discrepancies in the extrinsic material, minor corrections and improvements to the Parks PSP, and consequential amendments to the planning scheme.</p>	<p>Council will finalise a review of the Public Parks Network documentation and will make corrections to address errors and improve clarity for inclusion in the final version of the LGIP.</p> <p>Council will also continue to review the updated policy documentation as part of on-going monitoring to inform future amendments to the LGIP, particularly relating to potential policy adjustments.</p>	Mix of actions (specify)	<p>The submission was referred internally on 25/07/2023 with response incorporated in the reviewer comments.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amend the Public Parks Network documentation to include relevant text and mapping changes to correct errors and improve clarity and consistency in policy. 2. Continue to review and monitor the implementation of the new Parks DSS and Planning Scheme Policy to inform potential future amendments as necessary.

Shape Your Ipswich Reference No.	Submission Number	Submission Date	Properly Made	Primary Issue	Secondary Issue	Summary of Key Points Raised in Submission	Reviewer Comments	Proposed Action	Action details
13997	24	25/07/2023	Yes	Multiple topics	Providing for Growth (LGIP) - Parks	<p>The submission raised concerns regarding the PIA and consultation with state agencies, and subsequent compliance with the MGR. It also raised issues regarding the planning assumptions, particularly regarding the allocation of growth, capacity issues for the eastern corridor and concerns with the occupancy rates used. Concerns were also raised regarding the Parks DSS, the reduction of creditable infrastructure in the LGIP, and the impact of this on housing affordability and development feasibility.</p>	<p>The draft LGIP was prepared using the best available information at the time, updating the base year from 2016 to 2021. This included using Census and ABS data to 2020 and the projections prepared for Economic Development Queensland to inform the DCOP for the Ripley Valley PDA.</p> <p>It is noted that the PIA will cater for nearly all growth out to the LGIP planning horizon (and likely further). To this end the reviewer checklist and report takes some time to discuss why the PIA remains appropriate even though it technically provides for more growth than required in the PIA (ie for at least 10 years but no more than 15 years).</p> <p>The LGIP was reviewed and endorsed by the Appointed Reviewer and approved by the State to proceed to public consultation. Early engagement was held with State agencies and Urban Utilities prior to the formal State review. The State highlighted that the projections 'reflect the balancing of the 'bottom up' and 'top down' approach as required by the MGR' and Urban Utilities provided in principle support, stating 'the proposed residential growth projection is a realistic growth projection and resembles the in-house Urban Utilities projection for the ICC area.'</p> <p>The availability of the 2021 Census data and new QGSO projections will assist to inform future review, and Council will continue to monitor growth across the Ipswich LGA to determine if amendments are required prior to the 5 year review. This will include monitoring the actual growth in the Ripley Valley PDA area and land availability.</p> <p>Although changes to the Parks DSS has occurred, they have been designed to provide an acceptable, equitable and cost effective public parks network and the policy provides options for staging and alternative approaches. Council will monitor the policy changes, and may review the DSS for embellishment within neighbourhood recreation parks as part of future amendments to the LGIP.</p> <p>Matters of non-compliance with the Act are not considered to warrant further consideration given that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the LGIP has used best available population and demographic data at the time of preparation; - the projections using this data have a strong correlation with observed population growth and QGSO 2023 updated data, and provide a solid basis on which to make assumptions about future growth; - the draft PIA provides for more than 15 years of growth; - State agencies were involved in detailed discussions with Council during the drafting of the LGIP, as well as through the formal state review period; - the appointed reviewer undertook a review in accordance with the Act and the MGR and recommended approval of the LGIP; and - the formal review by State agencies did not identify any matters of non-compliance or impose conditions prior to being publicly notified. 	Mix of actions (specify)	<p>The submission was referred internally on 25/07/2023 with response incorporated in the reviewer comments.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No LGIP related changes proposed (ie. no change required to LGIP documentation or mapping). 2. Continue to monitor actual levels of growth and land availability across the Ipswich LGA and review updated information as it becomes available to inform future work. 3. Align future LGIP work with updates to the Ipswich Plan 2024 where appropriate. 4. Continue to promote an appropriate mix of lot sizes and build form across the Ipswich LGA to improve housing choice and infrastructure sustainability.
N/A	25	25/07/2023	Yes	Public Parks network	0	<p>The submission related primarily to the Parks network, requesting that the draft LGIP be amended to better reflect existing development approvals, including the timing of infrastructure delivery. The submission focused on the removal of local recreation parks and changes relating to neighbourhood recreation and linear parks. It also raised concerns with changes to the Parks DSS, especially in relation to flexibility of embellishment, what is included as creditable items, and the provisions relating to DOLA.</p>	<p>The draft LGIP was prepared with a base date of 2021 and will be updated in the future to reflect the delivery of parks based on development that has occurred from this date.</p> <p>The DSS has been designed to provide an acceptable, equitable and cost effective public parks network and the policy provides options for staging and alternative approaches. The timing of delivery has been prepared to best reflect updated projections having regard to the complete network, and it is noted that amendments may occur in response to actual growth over time. Council may review the DSS for embellishment, including within neighbourhood recreation parks as part of future amendments to the LGIP.</p> <p>Council has also identified in the Active Ipswich Strategy that a review of the DOLA policy, procedures and guidance material is a required as a future planning action.</p> <p>Additional clarity is proposed to be included regarding staging the delivery of neighbourhood recreation parks and to make minor referencing corrections.</p>	Mix of actions (specify)	<p>The submission was referred internally on 25/07/2023 with response incorporated in the reviewer comments.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amend the LGIP documentation to make minor text changes to improve the clarity of staged delivery of neighbourhood recreation parks, and to correct the referencing in Figure 6.13.5.5.8.1. 2. Continue to review and monitor the implementation of the new Parks DSS and Planning Scheme Policy to inform potential future amendments as necessary.
13999	26 (repeat of 25)	25/07/2023	Yes	Public Parks network	0	Repeat submission, refer to Submission 25 above.	Repeat submission, refer to Submission 25 above.	Mix of actions (specify)	Repeat submission, refer to Submission 25 above.
N/A	27	25/07/2023	Yes	Multiple topics	0	<p>The submission raised a number of concerns and recommended these concerns be addressed prior to progressing the LGIP. The concerns related to the planning assumptions, trunk infrastructure planning and costing, the PIA, and compliance with the Planning Act 2016.</p>	<p>The concerns relate primarily to the LGIP not being based on the 2021 Census and more recently released 2023 QGSO projections, and therefore lack certainty. This information was not available at the time of preparing the LGIP projections. They also relate to concerns that suggest State agencies were not engaged.</p> <p>The draft LGIP was prepared using the best available information at the time, updating the base year from 2016 to 2021. This included using Census and ABS data to 2020 and the projections prepared for Economic Development Queensland to inform the DCOP for the Ripley Valley PDA. The LGIP was reviewed and endorsed by the Appointed Reviewer and approved by the State to proceed to public consultation. Early engagement was held with State agencies and Urban Utilities prior to the formal State review. The State highlighted that the projections 'reflect the balancing of the 'bottom up' and 'top down' approach as required by the MGR' and Urban Utilities provided in principle support, stating 'the proposed residential growth projection is a realistic growth projection and resembles the in-house Urban Utilities projection for the ICC area.'</p> <p>The availability of the 2021 Census data and new QGSO projections will assist to inform future review, and Council will continue to monitor growth across the Ipswich LGA to determine if amendments are required prior to the 5 year review. This will include monitoring the actual growth in the Ripley Valley PDA area and any acceleration of growth in the western corridor.</p> <p>The sustainability assessment in SOW model for the LGIP is intended to outline Councils' projections for cash flow from infrastructure charges from the base year, and the forecasted investment in future trunk infrastructure to the planning horizon. Whilst the value of the existing trunk infrastructure base is outlined in the SOW, the financial sustainability assessment is designed to be forward looking, reflecting future demand only.</p> <p>Suggested matters of non-compliance with the Act are not warranted, given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the LGIP has used best available population and demographic data at the time of preparation; - the projections using this data have a strong correlation with observed population growth and QGSO 2023 updated data, and provide a solid basis on which to make assumptions about future growth; - the draft LGIP provides projections for detached and attached dwellings; - the draft PIA provides for more than 15 years of growth, meaning that any overlapping between LGIP preparation and commencement are catered for within the excess capacity of the PIA; - State agencies were involved in detailed discussions with Council during the drafting of the LGIP, as well as through the formal state review period; - the appointed reviewer undertook a review in accordance with the Act and the MGR and recommended approval of the LGIP; and - the formal review by State agencies did not identify any matters of non-compliance or impose conditions prior to being publicly notified. 	Mix of actions (specify)	<p>The submission was referred internally on 27/07/2023 with response incorporated in the reviewer comments.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No LGIP related changes proposed (ie. no change required to LGIP documentation or mapping). 2. Continue to monitor actual levels of growth across the Ipswich LGA and review updated information as it becomes available to inform future work. 3. Align future LGIP work with updates to the Ipswich Plan 2024 where appropriate. 4. Continue to promote an appropriate mix of lot sizes and build form across the Ipswich LGA to improve housing choice and infrastructure sustainability.
N/A	28	25/07/2023	Yes	Planning Scheme matter	6.3 - Priority Infrastructure Area	<p>This submission relates primarily to land in south Thagoona and the planning intent for this land. It also requests that Council include this land in the PIA.</p>	<p>Zoning and related policy matters are a planning scheme matter. It is noted the subject land is located outside the urban footprint and is not contained in an urban zone.</p> <p>The PIA was reviewed and accepted by Urban Utilities and the Appointed Reviewer, with the current PIA providing for more than 10 to 15 years of growth, covering most of the urban area of Ipswich. Further expansion is not considered to be required at this time.</p>	No LGIP related changes proposed (ie. no change required to LGIP documentation or mapping)	<p>The submission contents were noted by City Design planners and were considered in the review of the draft planning scheme.</p>
14000	29	25/07/2023	Yes	Multiple topics	Planning scheme matter	<p>The submission is primarily concerned with the split zoning and future land rationalisation of the site, including the future upgrade of Kedgies Road. The submission seeks amendments to reflect the proposed future land rationalisation.</p>	<p>Council's draft LGIP includes the upgrade of Kedgies Road from Redbank Plains Road to Mount Jullierat Drive to a two-lane urban road standard (LGIP Project FUT_ICC_Q28). The estimated cost of this project within the draft LGIP, includes an appropriate allowance for the identified property requirements to facilitate the road upgrade from Redbank Plains Road to Mount Jullierat Drive, including the land requirements at the intersection with Mount Jullierat Drive.</p> <p>Any proposal for a road closure to facilitate a particular development outcome should be considered and assessed as part of a future development application over the site, and are not appropriate to be considered at this time as part of the LGIP. Network modelling identifies there is currently no need to construct Mount Jullierat Drive between Kedgies Road and Purser Road to a trunk road standard.</p> <p>It is proposed to review split zoning and consider consolidation as part of a future development application and rationalisation of the road network.</p>	Mix of actions (specify)	<p>The submission was referred internally on 27/07/2023 with response incorporated in the reviewer comments.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No change proposed (ie. no change required to LGIP or mapping). 2. Review split zoning and consider zone consolidation to align with a future development approval and rationalisation of the road network.

Shape Your Ipswich Reference No.	Submission Number	Submission Date	Properly Made	Primary Issue	Secondary Issue	Summary of Key Points Raised in Submission	Reviewer Comments	Proposed Action	Action details
14001	30	25/07/2023	Yes	Multiple topics	0	<p>This submission raised concerns regarding the planning assumptions, the transport network, the parks network and PSP, and infrastructure charging as applied to LAF24. It also specifically requested that Council include part of the land in the Developable Area, all the land in the PIA, and to update the LGIP to include a stormwater network for the western corridor.</p>	<p>The PIA was reviewed and accepted by Urban Utilities and the Appointed Reviewer, with the current PIA providing for more than 10 to 15 years of growth, covering most of the urban area of Ipswich. Further expansion is not considered to be required at this time.</p> <p>The Developable Area map (LGIP Map 2) is indicative based on the zone extents at the time of preparation of the draft LGIP. The exclusion of the Environmental Management Zone from the developable area is consistent with the primary purpose of the zone. It would be premature to alter this mapping to reflect a proposed development application.</p> <p>Council's current LGIP does not include a stormwater trunk network. As necessary stormwater infrastructure is provided at the individual site level through the development process, a stormwater trunk infrastructure network has not been included in the LGIP. This is a typical approach across many LGAs, and provides an appropriate standard of service to manage stormwater in a cost effective manner.</p> <p>The MGR states that trunk infrastructure identified in the LGIP must be the most cost-effective means of servicing urban development and a local government must be able to demonstrate financial sustainability and fund the trunk infrastructure in the LGIP. This requires Council's to review the standards (DSS) and identify an affordable DSS for trunk infrastructure to service expected growth. As a result, network changes have been made, including in relation to removal of the local recreation park and inclusion of the neighbourhood park.</p> <p>The DSS has been designed to provide an acceptable, equitable and cost effective public parks network and the policy provides options for staging and alternative approaches. The timing of delivery has been prepared to best reflect updated projections having regard to the complete network, and it is noted that amendments may occur in response to actual growth over time. Council will continue to review delivery timing based on updated forecasting or actual demands, and review the DSS for embellishment, including for linear and neighbourhood recreation parks as part of future amendments to the LGIP.</p> <p>Council has applied a charging model to estimate revenue consistent with the State prescribed charge for the draft LGIP rather than use a sector or lot specific charge calculation. This approach is consistent with section 120(1) of the Planning Act 2016, is necessary to support the financial sustainability of provision of trunk infrastructure across the LGA, and provides greater predictability of costs for developers. It is further noted that all Council networks are open networks and a single charge approach is an accepted approach across many Councils.</p>	Mix of actions (specify)	<p>The submission was referred internally on 27/07/2023 with response incorporated in the reviewer comments.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amend the LGIP documentation to make minor text changes to improve the clarity of staged delivery of neighbourhood recreation parks. 2. Continue to monitor actual levels of growth across the Ipswich LGA and review updated information as it becomes available to inform future work. 3. Align future LGIP work with updates to the Ipswich Plan 2024 where appropriate. 4. Continue to review and undertake scoping work to include a stormwater network as part of a future LGIP.
14002	31	25/07/2023	Yes	Multiple topics	0	<p>This submission raised concerns regarding the planning assumptions, the transport network, the parks network and PSP, and infrastructure charging as applied to LAF24. It also specifically requested that Council include part of the land in the Developable Area, all the land in the PIA, and to update the LGIP to include a stormwater network for the western corridor.</p>	<p>The PIA was reviewed and accepted by Urban Utilities and the Appointed Reviewer, with the current PIA providing for more than 10 to 15 years of growth, covering most of the urban area of Ipswich. Further expansion is not considered to be required at this time.</p> <p>The Developable Area map (LGIP Map 2) is indicative based on the zone extents at the time of preparation of the draft LGIP. The exclusion of the Environmental Management Zone from the developable area is consistent with the primary purpose of the zone. It would be premature to alter this mapping to reflect a development approval that has not yet commenced delivery.</p> <p>Council's current LGIP does not include a stormwater trunk network. As necessary stormwater infrastructure is provided at the individual site level through the development process, a stormwater trunk infrastructure network has not been included in the LGIP. This is a typical approach across many LGAs, and provides an appropriate standard of service to manage stormwater in a cost effective manner.</p> <p>The MGR states that trunk infrastructure identified in the LGIP must be the most cost-effective means of servicing urban development and a local government must be able to demonstrate financial sustainability and fund the trunk infrastructure in the LGIP. This requires Council's to review the standards (DSS) and identify an affordable DSS for trunk infrastructure to service expected growth. As a result, network changes have been made, including in relation to removal of the local recreation park and inclusion of the neighbourhood park.</p> <p>The DSS has been designed to provide an acceptable, equitable and cost effective public parks network and the policy provides options for staging and alternative approaches. The timing of delivery has been prepared to best reflect updated projections having regard to the complete network, and it is noted that amendments may occur in response to actual growth over time. Council will continue to review delivery timing based on updated forecasting or actual demands, and review the DSS for embellishment, including for linear and neighbourhood recreation parks as part of future amendments to the LGIP.</p> <p>Council has applied a charging model to estimate revenue consistent with the State prescribed charge for the draft LGIP rather than use a sector or lot specific charge calculation. This approach is consistent with section 120(1) of the Planning Act 2016, is necessary to support the financial sustainability of provision of trunk infrastructure across the LGA, and provides greater predictability of costs for developers. It is further noted that all Council networks are open networks and a single charge approach is an accepted approach across many Councils.</p>	Mix of actions (specify)	<p>The submission was referred internally on 26/07/2023 with response incorporated in the reviewer comments.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amend the LGIP documentation to make minor text changes to improve the clarity of staged delivery of neighbourhood recreation parks. 2. Continue to monitor actual levels of growth across the Ipswich LGA and review updated information as it becomes available to inform future work. 3. Align future LGIP work with updates to the Ipswich Plan 2024 where appropriate. 4. Continue to review and undertake scoping work to include a stormwater network as part of a future LGIP.
N/A	32	25/07/2023	Yes	Multiple topics	0	<p>This submission raised concerns regarding the planning assumptions, including in relation to the base population, occupancy rates, the spatial allocation of growth, particularly the rate of growth applied in the Ripley Valley PDA, and in relation to the PIA. The submission was also concerned with the suitability of the transport network proposed for the western growth corridor.</p>	<p>The draft LGIP was prepared using the best available information at the time, updating the base year from 2016 to 2021. This included using Census and ABS data to 2020 and the projections prepared for Economic Development Queensland to inform the DCOP for the Ripley Valley PDA. The comments regarding the high rate of growth in the PDA are noted, and Council will continue to monitor actual rates of growth to inform future review and amendments as required.</p> <p>The availability of the 2021 Census data and new QGSO projections will assist to inform future review, and Council will continue to monitor growth across the Ipswich LGA to determine if amendments are required prior to the 5 year review. This will include monitoring the actual growth in the Ripley Valley PDA area and any acceleration of growth in the western corridor.</p> <p>The PIA was expanded (particularly in the western growth corridor) to include additional areas based on recent development at the time of preparing the LGIP. The current PIA provides for more than 10 to 15 years of growth, covering most of the urban area of Ipswich.</p> <p>The transport network has been prepared to reflect future network demand with timing consistent with projected demand.</p> <p>Council's strategic transport model (STM-MM) is a multi-modal model, with the trips assignment to private vehicles, public transport and active transport modes varying based on the location of the development, proximity to trip attractors (eg. shops, school, employment, etc), access to alternate travel modes (eg. train or bus) and congestion on the road network. As such, there is not a direct link between the trip generation within the strategic transport model and the first principle traffic generation rates outlined in table based on industry standards.</p> <p>It is noted that whilst only one Council road upgrade is identified within the draft LGIP within this catchment, the area is primarily serviced by a number of existing and planned State controlled arterial roads.</p>	Mix of actions (specify)	<p>The submission was referred internally on 27/07/2023 with response incorporated in the reviewer comments.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No LGIP related changes proposed (ie. no change required to LGIP documentation or mapping). 2. Continue to monitor actual levels of growth across the Ipswich LGA and review updated information as it becomes available to inform future work. 3. Align future LGIP work with updates to the Ipswich Plan 2024 where appropriate. 4. Continue to review and monitor the broader transport network and effectiveness of the DSS and infrastructure items included to service actual growth.

Shape Your Ipswich Reference No.	Submission Number	Submission Date	Properly Made	Primary Issue	Secondary Issue	Summary of Key Points Raised in Submission	Reviewer Comments	Proposed Action	Action details
N/A	33	25/07/2023	Yes	Multiple topics	0	<p>The submission raised concerns regarding the PIA and consultation with state agencies, and subsequent compliance with the MGR. It also raised concerns regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -the planning assumptions, particularly regarding the allocation of growth, including high rates of growth applied in the Ripley Valley PDA and capacity issues for the eastern corridor; -the occupancy rates used, which were considered to be high; -the Parks DSS; -suitability of the transport network proposed for the western growth corridor; and -infrastructure charging as applied to LAF24. <p>The submission also specifically requested that Council expand the PIA and better reflect higher rates of growth across the western growth corridor, and to update the LGIP to include a stormwater network for the western corridor.</p>	<p>The draft LGIP was prepared using the best available information at the time, updating the base year from 2016 to 2021. This included using Census and ABS data to 2020 and the projections prepared for Economic Development Queensland to inform the DCOP for the Ripley Valley PDA.</p> <p>The PIA was expanded (particularly in the western growth corridor) to include additional areas based on recent development at the time of preparing the LGIP. It is noted that the PIA will cater for nearly all growth out to the LGIP planning horizon (and likely further). To this end the reviewer checklist and report takes some time to discuss why the PIA remains appropriate even though it technically provides for more growth than required in the PIA (ie for at least 10 years but no more than 15 years).</p> <p>The LGIP was reviewed and endorsed by the Appointed Reviewer and approved by the State to proceed to public consultation. Early engagement was held with State agencies and Urban Utilities prior to the formal State review. The State highlighted that the projections 'reflect the balancing of the 'bottom up' and 'top down' approach as required by the MGR' and Urban Utilities provided in principle support, stating 'the proposed residential growth projection is a realistic growth projection and resembles the in-house Urban Utilities projection for the ICC area.'</p> <p>The availability of the 2021 Census data and new QGSO projections will assist to inform future review, and Council will continue to monitor growth across the Ipswich LGA to determine if amendments are required prior to the 5 year review. This will include monitoring the actual growth in the Ripley Valley PDA area and land availability.</p> <p>The transport network has been prepared to reflect future network demand with timing consistent with projected demand. It is noted that whilst only one Council road upgrade is identified within the draft LGIP within this catchment, the area is primarily serviced by a number of existing and planned State controlled arterial roads.</p> <p>The MGR states that trunk infrastructure identified in the LGIP must be the most cost-effective means of servicing urban development and a local government must be able to demonstrate financial sustainability and fund the trunk infrastructure in the LGIP. This requires Council's to review the standards (DSS) and identify an affordable DSS for trunk infrastructure to service expected growth. As a result, network changes have been made, including in relation to removal of the local recreation park and inclusion of the neighbourhood park.</p> <p>The DSS has been designed to provide an acceptable, equitable and cost effective public parks network and the policy provides options for staging and alternative approaches. The timing of delivery has been prepared to best reflect updated projections having regard to the complete network, and it is noted that amendments may occur in response to actual growth over time. Council will continue to review delivery timing based on updated forecasting or actual demands, and review the DSS for embellishment, including for linear and neighbourhood recreation parks as part of future amendments to the LGIP.</p> <p>Council has applied a charging model to estimate revenue consistent with the State prescribed charge for the draft LGIP rather than use a sector or lot specific charge calculation. This approach is consistent with section 120(1) of the Planning Act 2016, is necessary to support the financial sustainability of provision of trunk infrastructure across the LGA, and provides greater predictability of costs for developers. It is further noted that all Council networks are open networks and a single charge approach is an accepted approach across many Councils.</p> <p>Matters of non-compliance with the Act are not considered to warrant further consideration given that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -the LGIP has used best available population and demographic data at the time of preparation; -the projections using this data have a strong correlation with observed population growth and QGSO 2023 updated data, and provide a solid basis on which to make assumptions about future growth; -the draft PIA provides for more than 15 years of growth; -State agencies were involved in detailed discussions with Council during the drafting of the LGIP, as well as through the formal state review period; -the appointed reviewer undertook a review in accordance with the Act and the MGR and recommended approval of the LGIP; and -the formal review by State agencies did not identify any matters of non-compliance or impose conditions prior to being publicly notified. 	Mix of actions (specify)	<p>The submission was referred internally on 27/07/2023 with response incorporated in the reviewer comments.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No LGIP related changes proposed (ie. no change required to LGIP documentation or mapping). 2. Continue to monitor actual levels of growth across the Ipswich LGA and review updated information as it becomes available to inform future work. 3. Align future LGIP work with updates to the Ipswich Plan 2024 where appropriate. 4. Continue to review and monitor the broader transport network and effectiveness of the DSS and infrastructure items included to service actual growth. 5. Continue to review and undertake scoping work to include a stormwater network as part of a future LGIP.
N/A	34	25/07/2023	Yes	Financial Sustainability	Providing for Growth (LGIP) - Transport	<p>This submission primarily relates to concerns regarding the poor financial sustainability of the LGIP and raises concerns regarding a selection of road projects.</p>	<p>The Desired Standards of Service were reviewed and updated based on contemporary standards. The DSS for each network is consistent with typical trunk infrastructure design standards and generally conforms to industry standards and historical levels and standards of service in the Ipswich LGA.</p> <p>Despite better reflecting current growth rates, updating the DSS to contemporary standards, and seeking to rationalise the networks, it is acknowledged that the SOW clearly identifies a material shortfall in future infrastructure charges relative to network demand across the LGA.</p> <p>For example, a key focus of Council's transport planning and investment, is to facilitate and encourage residents to shift to more sustainable transport modes (such as walking, cycling and public transport). However, it is important to acknowledge that given the quantum of growth forecast, a number of major road upgrades and new road projects will still be required to address road safety, transport network resilience and to support forecast growth. Such major road upgrades in established urban areas come with significant costs, and Council does not take the decision to include such major projects within our future planning lightly.</p> <p>The Ministers Guidelines and Rules identifies that local governments must be able to fund trunk infrastructure investment from a combination of sources, which may include a mix of rates revenue, levies, borrowings, other revenue and grants as well as infrastructure charges. This recognises that a range of funding sources is likely to be required to fund LGIP infrastructure, particularly considering the revenue limitations of the prescribed charge. Council adopted the draft LGIP, recognising that a range of funding sources would be required.</p> <p>Whilst an LGIP is required to be adopted at a point in time and is based on detailed planning for individual network requirements, Council remains committed to continuous review and improvement of its infrastructure planning during the life of the LGIP. This may include methodology review, DSS changes, asset deferral, and the further rationalisation of networks to improve financial sustainability.</p>	Mix of actions (specify)	<p>The submission was referred internally on 27/07/2023 with response incorporated in the reviewer comments.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No LGIP related changes proposed (ie. no change required to LGIP documentation or mapping). 2. Continue to monitor actual levels of growth across the Ipswich LGA and review updated information as it becomes available to inform future work. 3. Align future LGIP work with updates to the Ipswich Plan 2024 where appropriate. 4. Continue to review network rationalisation options and deferrals, including potential DSS changes to improve financial sustainability. 5. Continue to work with the State on the infrastructure charging framework to improve cost recovery.
N/A	35 (repeat of 32)	25/07/2023	Yes	Multiple topics	0	Repeat submission, refer to Submission 32 above.	Repeat submission, refer to Submission 32 above.	Mix of actions (specify)	Repeat submission, refer to Submission 32 above.